

I would also say that, under the gentleman's amendment, any modifications, such as volume expansion, downstream or upstream interconnections, or adjustments to maintain flow, would potentially be required to obtain a Presidential permit for the modification, even if the original project already has one. Then even operational changes may be subject to a Presidential permit, and ownership changes would be.

So, for those reasons, as I said, I respectfully would oppose the gentleman's amendment and ask the Members to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, two things. I want to speak to the leader of our Energy and Commerce Committee, but also to the proponent of this bill, Mr. GREEN.

We can have too much regulation or we can have too little regulation, and they both have problems. Mr. GREEN talks about the hassle his company is having getting a name change. That is ridiculous. That company should be able to change its name and not have to go through the hassle of a permit. Then when the agency holds back and doesn't even give them an answer for 3 years, we have a problem, and I agree with that. Under my amendment, those issues like a name change would not be at all subject to the permitting process.

On the other hand, we in Vermont are concerned about a reversal of flow and having tar sands go through. It is a really big deal. Forty-two towns in my State passed resolutions saying that they wanted to have a say in this. It is known that spills happen, and tar sands bills are a much bigger deal than other kinds.

What we have in the legislation is not working together to find what is the balance or to try to move us towards a balance so there are not unnecessary burdens for a name change and simple things, but, on the other hand, we don't abolish the review process altogether.

This legislation doesn't seek that balance. What this legislation does is, in effect, abolish the review process, and that is a problem, so our going from too much review on a name change to no review on tar sands coming through Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine.

Our legislation, I think, is the only thing that is being considered that, in fact, offers a balance. If it is a name change, a minor deal, no permit required. If it is significant, then, yes, you are going to have to go through the review.

I want to thank the chairman and the Speaker and the body for its time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont will be postponed.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### DOMESTIC PROSPERITY AND GLOBAL FREEDOM ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1610

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, America's natural gas output has been rising since 2006, and the Energy Information Administration expects the increases to continue for decades to come. As a result, we can meet domestic demand for affordable natural gas while also producing a surplus for export to our allies around the world. The only thing standing in

the way is outdated Federal redtape that greatly delays the construction of LNG export facilities.

H.R. 6, the bill before us, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, is a targeted bill that cuts redtape and puts the Department of Energy on a reasonable deadline to act on LNG export applications.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, GENE GREEN from Texas, for his cosponsorship of this bipartisan bill, and I urge the support of every Member in this Chamber for H.R. 6.

According to the lead study conducted for the Department of Energy, natural gas exports would be a net benefit to the American economy. These exports would improve the balance of payments and support up to 45,000 jobs associated with additional natural gas production as well as the construction and operation of LNG export facilities by 2018. Needless to say, these new jobs could not come at a better time for our economy.

Remember the concerns many of us had over the U.S. economy hemorrhaging billions of dollars every year going overseas to pay for energy imports. Well, for natural gas, the roles can be reversed, and we could be the ones selling energy on the global market and bringing in billions of dollars in job-sustaining revenues.

The economic impacts alone make natural gas exports a winning policy, but the geopolitical impacts are an incredible benefit as well and have been ignored for far too long. Allies around the world have told us that they would greatly benefit from American LNG.

Last October, the Committee on Energy and Commerce held a forum that included ambassadors and other officials representing 11 U.S. allies, all of whom strongly urged us to enter the global LNG marketplace. Since then, several other allies have stepped forward with the same request. This includes our friends in eastern Europe unfortunate enough to be reliant on Russia for natural gas.

Not only do these nations face unfair pricing, but political pressure, as a result of their dependence on Russia. These nations believe that the very passage of this legislation, the signal that we are serious about LNG exports, would immediately reduce Russia's negotiating leverage even before the first molecule of LNG shipment actually goes out. H.R. 6 will start doing good the very day it is enacted.

I should note that our efforts on LNG exports began before the current crisis erupted in Ukraine. Russia's actions over the past several months demonstrate the importance of this bill, and Russia's recent decision to cut off supplies to Ukraine further underscore the need for America to provide Europe an alternative supply of natural gas. Indeed, we can effectively push back against Russia's aggression and help our friends without ever putting any troops in harm's way.

□ 1615

Beyond Europe, we can also strengthen our economic ties with allies in Asia, who would rather buy their energy from us than from less reliable Middle Eastern suppliers.

We can also assist nations in achieving their environmental goals by offering the option of clean-burning natural gas, and we can help many developing countries by providing them with an energy source that is cheaper than the choices available to them now.

The economic benefits alone—or the geopolitical benefits alone—make LNG exports a worthwhile policy; but taken together, they make it a no-brainer. Unfortunately, the decades-old Federal approval process for LNG export facilities is acting as an impediment.

Proposed projects have languished at DOE for years on end. While DOE has recently announced some changes to the process, the agency is still under no deadline to act.

The amendment that I am offering with Mr. GREEN changes that. It provides that, once the extensive environmental review conducted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act is complete for a project, the Department of Energy has a 30-day deadline to issue a final decision on the application pending before the agency.

It is a sensible and workable solution to the current regulatory bottleneck. It is an answer to a call from our allies for energy security.

It is time to help our friends abroad. It is time to create jobs here at home. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 6.

I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON, I am writing concerning H.R. 6, the “Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act,” which the Committee on Energy and Commerce reported on June 19, 2014.

As reported, H.R. 6 contains a section on judicial review, which is within the Committee on the Judiciary’s Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House’s consideration of H.R. 6, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 6, the “Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.” As you noted, the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce contains a provision that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Specifically, subsection 2(b) provides for judicial review of U.S. Department of Energy orders and failures to issue a decision on applications for authorization to export natural gas.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo seeking a sequential referral on H.R. 6, and I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary’s jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and you will have my support for any such request.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 6 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
Chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was going to talk about this bill, and I will, but I really want to talk about the inflation in the naming of these bills. This is a bill to allow a faster process for exporting natural gas to other countries.

So what is it called? The Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. What do you follow after that? Peace and prosperity in our time, whatever that may, in fact, involve. I just think this bill is overrated in its title. I also want to say it is overrated in what it does.

There are 17 or 18 free trade countries, and they can have the export of natural gas to them right away. They are free trade countries that have an agreement with us. There is no problem in getting the approval for them. The question is: Are we going to approve export of natural gas to non-free trade countries?

The premise of this bill is that we are not doing enough to export natural gas to them or anyone else, I guess. Congressman GARDNER’s bill would change the approval process for liquefied natural gas exports, presumably because the Department of Energy is moving too slowly, because they can approve an application now for export anywhere around the world.

In fact, DOE has moved—quite properly, it seems to me—to authorize these LNG exports. They have already approved seven export proposals, and they are continuing to evaluate additional applications.

What these approvals that we have already granted—had granted—the U.S. is poised to transform into the world’s second largest exporter of LNG in the

world, just behind Qatar. If they approve one more application, we would go from exporting no LNG today to being the largest exporter in the world in just a few years.

So why do we need this legislation? Certainly not to get domestic prosperity and global freedom because this bill doesn’t accomplish either goal.

Currently, the Department of Energy goes through a process, and they perform a public interest determination when reviewing export applications, so they can carefully consider the effect of LNG exports on natural gas prices here and the impact of higher prices here on American consumers and these manufacturers that are benefiting from the lower price that they have seen for LNG here.

The public interest determination provides DOE an opportunity to examine a number of factors: energy security, geopolitical, and environmental considerations.

If we would have this bill adopted, it would short circuit this established review process for pending and future LNG export applications. The bill establishes a new deadline for DOE to decide on applications within 90 days of the close of the public comment period or enactment of the bill, whichever comes later.

That is a deadline that is established, so they are forcing the DOE to act, but if DOE looks at an application and they don’t feel that they are ready to make a decision in that period of time, they are more likely than not to just turn it down. That doesn’t seem to be a worthwhile goal, if we want to have more export of LNG.

This provision would require DOE simultaneously to review and make a decision on all the pending applications within 90 days. It is not realistic, and it certainly isn’t responsible.

With few exceptions, environmental reviews haven’t been completed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for any of these applications, so the deadline would force DOE to rush its review of each application and make its final decision without a final environmental review.

The other thing I want to comment on is all those ambassadors that told us they want this bill—because of the hold that Russia has over them—they might not even benefit if this bill were adopted because they are not free trade countries.

So there has to be an approval of an export for LNG to a non-free trade country. There is not an approval through the Department of Energy to any particular country. It simply approves the request of a company here to export the LNG.

Under our capitalist system, a business usually seeks the highest reward for its investment. The export of LNG to a non-free trade country is going to be better rewarded in Asia than it will be in Ukraine or in Eastern Europe, where they are so concerned, rightfully so, about what Russia is going to do. It

may not even help those countries, as so many of these ambassadors hoped it will.

I would say that this bill is not going to get us to export LNG any faster. Nothing in the bill affects the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's permitting of the actual LNG export terminals.

Rushing the DOE review is not going to speed up the construction of these projects. We need the construction of the infrastructure for the export of natural gas.

The last thing I want to say is there are some controversies about exporting LNG, not exporting it at all, but opening it up to export in a process where the export will be wide open.

A lot of manufacturers in this country are worried that, if we are exporting our LNG, that is going to raise the price of natural gas here at home. Well, of course it will. It will go to a lower price of LNG here at home to eventually a world price, if it could be freely exported around the world the way we have for oil. If that happens, they are afraid that this boom we have seen in manufacturing in the United States may be curtailed.

So it is not without controversy that people are looking at this legislation. In other words, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, if you lose your job because the price of natural gas goes up and you are working for a manufacturer that is benefiting from a lower price for natural gas here in the United States, they are not going to look at this as a bill that leads to domestic prosperity and global freedom, as the authors of this bill would have us believe.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that nothing in this bill changes the requirements of a NEPA analysis to be completed.

I share your frustration with the titles of bill names—the bill titles. Imagine our consternation over the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this bill to the floor.

I wholeheartedly support H.R. 6 for a number of reasons. I also want to address some of the issues that the gentleman from the other side raised.

First of all, let's consider international trade is the key to growth, it is the key to job creation, it is the key to reducing our deficits, and it is important geopolitically for the United States.

Because of this great advance in technology with hydraulic fracturing and drilling, we now have unprecedented levels supply of gas that we can use domestically for manufacturing, and we are seeing a domestic manufacturing renaissance.

Secondly, the amount of gas that we will export from this country, for a number of reasons, will not cause significant price spikes. In fact, it will add stability to the pricing of gas in this country and promote more drilling, which is what we need to do.

We need to take care of our own energy security here, and we can provide energy security for our partners—our trading partners—around the world. This is why we need to move forward on this.

It is clear that, over the last 2 years, the U.S. Department of Energy has raised its long-term forecast on gas production by nearly 40 percent, with price expectations having declined 15 percent over the same period.

So the point that the gentleman makes about price spikes because of LNG exports is really, really unfounded—an unfounded point.

LNG exports could contribute up to 450,000 jobs between the years 2016 and 2035 and add \$73.6 billion annually to our GDP.

My home State of Louisiana—in fact, the Third Congressional District, my district, is the leading area in this whole effort. We have currently the first two Department of Energy and FERC-approved facilities that are undergoing construction today.

The first one, the Sabine Pass facility, will see its exports probably the end of 2015, early 2016. The others will follow.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. We currently have eight—eight—that are waiting and have been waiting over a year—eight facilities waiting over a year for approval from the Department of Energy. That is before they go through the expensive FERC process.

This is why we need this legislation: to get the Department of Energy to move forward on this, so that we don't hold up something that is going to help us grow our economy, create jobs, and be very important geopolitically.

Trade not only acts as a catalyst for creating jobs, it reduces deficits, promotes American goods and services internationally, and energy should be no different.

That is why we need to move forward. We have a unique opportunity. Let's embrace it now, and let's do the right thing for our country.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana, I respect him greatly, and he made an argument. I don't fully agree with his argument, but that is the purpose of the debate, to discuss ideas and air our point of view.

The author of this legislation, I guess, couldn't help himself because he said: imagine the consternation when they found that the Affordable Care Act was named the Affordable Care

Act. There are millions of people around the country, for the first time, who are able to buy insurance that is affordable.

I don't believe, if this bill passed, that it would lead to domestic prosperity and global freedom. With all due respect to those who have a different point of view, what gall to say that this bill, which is controversial, and many Americans oppose because they feel it will hurt their prosperity here at home or our national security here at home, would think that an appropriate name is to say this bill is the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

Now that I have got that off my chest, Mr. Chairman, I want to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I don't think this bill is needed. LNG permits are being issued faster than they can be built.

This bill establishes a rigid deadline for DOE to complete its public interest review of LNG export applications. That approach raises significant concerns.

□ 1630

I would like to talk about two of the concerns: climate change and economics.

Mr. WAXMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCNERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. You don't think the bill is needed. Does that mean you are against domestic prosperity and global freedom?

Mr. MCNERNEY. No, I don't think that is what it means, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you. I just wanted that clarification.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Reclaiming my time, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change recently released its multiyear report on the state of climate science. The world's leading climate scientists examined the peer-reviewed science and confirmed that climate change is already happening on all continents and across the oceans and will get much worse if we don't act.

The impacts of runaway climate change will be severe: reduced crop yields, more heat waves and diseases, decreased water availability, and more extreme weather events.

That means that we need to scrutinize the energy infrastructure decisions that we make today because of their impacts on climate change in the future. Every decision to build a new LNG export terminal has climate implications. We need to understand and weigh those effects. Otherwise, we risk locking in infrastructure that will produce carbon pollution for decades to come or creating stranded investments that must be shut down before they have paid for themselves.

Natural gas combustion for electricity does emit less carbon pollution than coal, but natural gas production

does result in gas escaping, and natural gas is a much more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. We need to consider the effect of carbon emissions in the United States.

In addition, liquefying natural gas and shipping it overseas is an energy-intensive process that will result in some significant domestic carbon emissions. For example, the direct emissions from the Sabine Pass process will represent 2 percent of the entire State of Louisiana's emissions.

The Energy Information Administration's modeling shows that LNG exports would increase domestic natural gas production in the United States. Of course, that is obvious. This could increase emissions of methane, which is, as I mentioned, a potent greenhouse gas, unless we take very severe measures to control that pollution at the wellhead and throughout the natural gas system.

In a carbon-constrained world, we need to understand all of these domestic emissions' impacts and how they compare with emission impacts abroad. The DOE has taken a first step to begin looking at these issues but has not completed a rigorous study of the effects of the different levels of LNG exports on carbon emissions.

We need to make sure we understand the effects on climate change of major energy infrastructure investments that will last for decades.

My second concern is economic. Shipping natural gas overseas will raise domestic natural gas prices. That is basically the law of supply and demand—unless that law is no longer valid.

Manufacturing is seeing a domestic renaissance here in this country because of natural gas prices being lower. This is domestic manufacturing. We want to make things in America. We want to make it in America. We want to continue to see that renaissance. We want to see manufacturing increase throughout the country and throughout the States.

Therefore, I oppose the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would point out that our colleagues in the Senate have introduced legislation similar to our legislation here on LNG exports titled, the Freedom Through Energy Export Act, by our colleague from Alaska, Mr. BEGICH.

I point out, too, that when it comes to domestic prosperity, the fact that this could create 45,000 job opportunities, increasing the employment in energy to 3 million people by 2020, that is prosperity and freedom.

Hungary's Ambassador at Large for Energy Security, Dr. Anita Orban, testified that this legislation "sends a clear signal that the global gas market is changing, that there is the prospect of much greater supply coming from other parts of the world."

That is world security, freedom, prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), who has been a true leader on the issue of LNG exports.

Mr. TURNER. I want to thank the author of H.R. 6 for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, lifting self-imposed restrictions on natural gas exports is a win-win situation for the American people. It will create American jobs and strengthen our allies' independence, bolstering our economic and strategic partnerships.

As chairman of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, many foreign leaders have expressed to me the need for energy diversification and its importance to strengthen our strategic partnerships. We already cooperate with our allies on a variety of security issues. Energy security must also be a component of our strategic alliances.

America's emerging role as an energy producer has the potential to enhance our security relationships and influence the global marketplace.

As we have seen in Ukraine, Russia will not hesitate to use its energy resource dominance to expand its sphere of influence. Just last week, Russia's state-owned monopoly, Gazprom, cut off natural gas supplies to Ukraine.

In the Asia Pacific, Japan is a critical security partner as we counter threats posed by countries such as North Korea. Already the world's largest importer of natural gas, Japan is dependent on Russia, the Middle East, and Africa for nearly 50 percent of its natural gas imports and is seeking greater imports as a result of its 2011 nuclear power plant disaster.

Increasing U.S. natural gas exports, along with the development of other sources, such as the Southern Gas Corridor and the Eastern Mediterranean, will help diversify world natural gas supplies and create a more competitive, transparent, and diversified global natural gas marketplace. In fact, U.S. natural gas production has already influenced global markets.

Natural gas previously destined for the United States but no longer needed as a result of increased production was diverted to other markets. This increased supply has made the global natural gas market more competitive, helping to put more pressure on contracts indexed to the price of oil and allowing several European countries to renegotiate their long-term contracts with Gazprom.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TURNER. In fact, President Obama, Secretary of State Kerry, and Secretary of Energy Moniz have welcomed LNG exports to strengthen our strategic alliances. Mr. Chairman, I will submit their statements for the RECORD.

PRESIDENT OBAMA, CURRENT AND PAST ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS WELCOME U.S. LNG EXPORTS

President Barack Obama, in a joint statement with European leaders at the EU-US Summit on March 26, 2014: The situation in Ukraine proves the need to reinforce energy security in Europe and we are considering new collaborative efforts to achieve this goal. We welcome the prospect of U.S. LNG exports in the future since additional global supplies will benefit Europe and other strategic partners.

Secretary of State John Kerry, in a joint statement with European energy leaders at a meeting of the EU-US Energy Council on April 2, 2014: The Council further welcomed the prospect of US LNG exports in the future since additional global supplies will benefit Europe and other strategic partners.

Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz, in a joint statement with European energy leaders at the G7 Rome Energy Ministerial meeting on May 6, 2014: No country should depend totally on one supplier. We intend to promote a more integrated LNG market, including through new supplies, the development of transport infrastructures, storage capacities, and LNG terminals.

Mr. TURNER. Regardless of where U.S. natural gas is shipped, increasing supply in the global marketplace will provide international consumers with greater choice and thus increased leverage to negotiate prices.

U.S. natural gas exports will create jobs right here at home and will help foster a more competitive natural gas market.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 6.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, 7 percent of the American people approve of the United States Congress. I think one of the reasons for that low approval rating is that we have overpromised and underperformed what they expect of us.

If anybody would think that this bill in and of itself deserves to be called the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, I think they lose credibility with the American people. And there is not much more credibility to lose when they only support us at a rate of 7 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), for whom I have an enormous amount of affection, even though today we have had two bills where we have disagreed. He doesn't overpromise. He just states his views and supports what he believes in. Sometimes he even convinces me, but he is not doing a good job today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me. I have to admit that the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act is a bipartisan problem we have in this Chamber.

I rise as a cosponsor in support of H.R. 6.

H.R. 6 represents a bipartisan effort to legislate. I want to thank my colleague from Colorado, Congressman GARDNER, for working with me. I wasn't an original cosponsor, but through our committee process we

have worked it out. We achieved bipartisan support in the committee because we were working together. I think that is what the American people want Congress to do.

It is important to recognize that there are more than 30 export permits to export LNG. These permits represent more than 35 billion cubic feet a day in LNG exports.

Currently, the Department of Energy has conditionally approved six of them, but only one project has received final approval through DOE and through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

DOE has an important role in export to make sure that we don't increase our natural gas prices to where they are not affordable to our country. We are in an energy renaissance because of the success of natural gas, fracking, and directional drilling in our country, and we are producing more natural gas than we can use, whether it be for electricity production or for our chemical industry.

I represent a huge chemical complex in East Harris County. There is literally a renaissance in the expansion of those chemical industries. It is increasing jobs and our exports because a lot of those chemicals we are producing from our U.S. natural gas will be exported. So someone else will pay for those jobs in our district in East Harris County.

The Department of Energy has a role in this. The problem we have is that the Department of Energy has taken so long to approve these permits. The DOE really just needs to look if it is in our national interest. They include all these things under it. And that is correct.

Let me give you an example.

In Texas and North Dakota, we are flaring natural gas right now because we don't have customers in our country and we don't have a way to export it. It is bad for the environment. It is bad for the people who own those royalties because they are not getting paid for them. And it is just terrible to see something we can sell to someone else not be utilized.

So that is why I support this bill.

We wanted to find that sweet spot, so to speak, on where we can export what we are not using.

Those of you who are familiar with Texas, we hold in reverence our Blue Bell Ice Cream. If you are there, in their commercials they will say:

We eat all we can and sell the rest.

That is what I want to do with natural gas. I want to use all we can, but I want to sell all the rest we can't use so it will help our balance of trade, help some of our allies who need it, but also keep our workers working in both the oil patch and the gas patch.

My colleague states that one more approval would make us the largest LNG exporter in the world. But not all of these projects will be constructed. Only one has been approved all the way. Of the more than 30 applications,

no more than a handful of these projects will be constructed and ultimately export LNG.

Further, it is important that we clarify the LNG permitting processing before we discuss H.R. 6.

There are two completely separate processes. First, a project must submit an application to export. If the project will send LNG to a country with which the U.S. has a free trade agreement, the application is automatically approved. In fact, the Port of Brownsville got their application approved in 30 days.

If the project sends LNG to a country without a free trade agreement—non-FTA—the DOE must issue a permit based on the public interest. For a project to actually export LNG in either case, the applicant must receive a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission permit.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reviews the environmental impacts of the actual LNG facility. The FERC process takes 12 to 18 months and costs approximately \$100 million.

The issue H.R. 6 seeks to deal with is the non-FTA permits through the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy currently has 25 permits awaiting decision. The Department of Energy held most of these permits for more than 3 years. Even the DOE recognizes this is a huge problem and proposed changing the approval process.

While I support the DOE changes, unfortunately, they fail to provide any certainty. H.R. 6 would place a timeline for the DOE to issue a decision. Again, remember, the DOE is going to have 12 to 18 months to know that permit because it is going through the Federal regulatory process already.

We need to make sure that the environmental review process is protected—and that is what FERC does—but we also need to make sure that the DOE makes those decisions timely so they can get those permits issued.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 6 and provide certainty to the market.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. I would like to thank my colleague from California for his leadership on the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

This legislation would require the DOE to act quickly in considering applications to export liquefied natural gas.

New technologies have unlocked vast resources of natural gas across the country. Our natural gas production will increase by 56 percent between 2012 and 2014.

□ 1645

If you want to see what real natural gas development looks like in a place that could really use the economic development, come to northern West Virginia or to southwest PA. More production means more American jobs and more West Virginia jobs.

The Marcellus shale production in West Virginia is surging, and the possibility of LNG exports will mean more good-paying jobs here at home—and a lot of them. By 2035, LNG exports are expected to create 8,600 West Virginia jobs and put \$1.7 billion in State revenues.

We need to do everything possible to put West Virginia resources to work for West Virginians, and today's legislation will make a real, positive difference for working families and communities in my State and in States across the Nation.

This bill would allow us to import jobs and economic opportunity, while we export both energy and physical security to our friends and allies. More than a third of the natural gas consumed in Europe comes from Russia, and I am sure our allies would rather be buying natural gas from the United States.

Passing this bill will create jobs in West Virginia and across the country. It will grow our Nation's economy and strengthen our relationships with our allies. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. I want to thank Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. I am a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation that will help to increase U.S. liquefied natural gas exports and help boost our economy.

In my 15th Congressional District in Texas, oil and natural gas extraction from the Eagle Ford shale has transformed this region, bringing thousands of new jobs, and growing wealth to many rural communities in South Texas.

A study by the University of Texas showed that the Eagle Ford shale has provided a \$61 billion impact to Texas and has supported over 116,000 new jobs. More importantly, the boom in American natural gas production has drastically changed our many counties' energy future.

The United States is now the number one natural gas-producing nation in the world. The USA has more than enough natural gas to meet its domestic needs while also exporting to foreign countries at a huge benefit to the United States' economy.

Unfortunately, the existing application process at the Department of Energy has made it burdensome for companies to export liquefied natural gas to non-FTA countries. This bill will address that problem.

Mr. Chairman, this is a truly bipartisan effort that will resolve a longstanding issue within our administration on expediting exports of natural gas. Our bill, H.R. 6, will cut the red tape and move quickly to approve all pending liquefied natural gas applications at the Department of Energy for

our WTO allies, and it will provide future applicants with a much more reasonable process.

I want to thank Representatives CORY GARDNER and TIM RYAN for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes."

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and I applaud my colleague from Colorado for his leadership.

This bill will expedite exports of liquefied natural gas, or LNG, to our allies abroad by cutting the red tape and streamlining the regulatory process. As a Nation, this has the potential to revitalize our economy, allow us to become energy independent, and to strategically advance our interests overseas.

Now, I know many Hoosiers back at home might be asking themselves: How does this help me? After all, we have limited natural gas wells and processing plants in Indiana. Let me state clearly that the answer is: yes, it will help them.

The bill would be an economic boon to the Hoosier economy. As the Nation's leading manufacturing State, Indiana contributes to the LNG business heavily by making and manufacturing the equipment that makes the gas extraction possible.

The natural gas and oil industry has already created 136,000 jobs in Indiana, and it makes up over 4.1 percent of our entire labor income.

The future for Indiana looks even brighter with the expansion of LNG exports. It is estimated that Indiana's economy would grow by \$2.2 billion a year and produce as many as 12,800 new jobs by simply allowing shipments of gas to our trusted allies.

Just last week, I received a letter from the CEO of the Ports of Indiana that urged the passage of this legislation. He supports the passage because of the significant competitive advantage it will give our State, in terms of our geography and infrastructure, which will allow Indiana to further capitalize on LNG exports.

Now is the time to allow American entrepreneurship to increase domestic energy production and fuel job creation, but unfortunately, the administration has refused, time and time again, to get out of the way of this entrepreneurship.

The administration refuses to approve licenses for LNG exports, and as I speak now, there are 24 pending applications awaiting action from the Department of Energy. One has been waiting 917 days and counting.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is time to unleash the power of

America's abundant natural resources in order to capitalize on our ingenuity and create thousands of good-paying jobs in my home State of Indiana and across the Nation. I urge its passage.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman for his yielding, and I thank him for his work as ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Chairman, with H.R. 6, we are embarking on a policy that will lock us into higher and more volatile natural gas prices, and that will erode a key advantage we have for domestic manufacturing, that being low natural gas prices.

Natural gas is used widely throughout our economy. It is, indeed, a valuable commodity, and we should be setting policy to ensure that we use it efficiently and effectively. LNG terminals are expensive to build and require a lot of energy to operate. The contracts signed by exporters commit them to exporting LNG for anywhere from 10 to 20 years.

We already had a small taste of what happens if there is an unexpected event that increases domestic demand when ready supplies are low and exports have increased.

At a time when we are producing record amounts of propane, we had some of the worst shortages and price spikes we have seen in years. It was not entirely due to export increases, but it was definitely a factor. Many of our communities are paying the environmental costs of this natural gas boom. This bill is now going to deny them the benefits associated with sacrifices.

There are very real concerns that this legislation would harm economic growth, job creation, and American manufacturing. This bill will not allow the adequate consideration of the public interest, including impacts on United States' consumers and manufacturers, before granting the approval of natural gas exports to countries with which we do not have a free trade agreement.

In fact, because we do have free trade agreements with a number of countries, exports of LNG to them do not require any public interest analysis. The DOE has approved billions of cubic feet to be exported to nations with which we have free trade agreements and to others as well.

We are in the midst of a manufacturing renaissance due, in part, to an abundance of affordable domestic natural gas. We have seen 12 consecutive months of growth in the manufacturing sector and a growing trend of the reshoring of jobs back to the United States.

Why would we want to turn that trend around?

Exports on the scale that this legislation would enable will raise domestic natural gas and electricity prices for every American and undermine our manufacturing competitiveness.

The United States' natural gas prices are less than one-half of Europe's and one-third less than in places like Japan and South Korea. The integration of the United States' and Asia's natural gas markets would lead to increases in prices for consumers and businesses, undoing the economic conditions that have led to the recent growth in American manufacturing.

The industrial sector represents some 22 percent of American energy use, with natural gas being the single largest input. Energy is consumed in the industrial sector for a wide range of purposes—from processing to heating, cooling, and as feedstocks to produce non-energy products.

The chemicals, pulp and paper, iron and steel, refining, and nonmetallic minerals industries account for about one-half of all energy used in this sector.

These industries alone represent millions of American jobs. That is why I am so concerned that the Energy Information Administration, the EIA, found that increased natural gas exports will "lead to increased natural gas prices," and "larger export levels lead to larger domestic price increases."

The EIA looked specifically at the potential impact of these price increases on United States' manufacturers, and it found that a high level of LNG exports could increase natural gas costs for the industrial sector by between 5 and 27 percent annually.

The amendment I offered to the Rules Committee, an amendment which was not made in order, would have prevented section 2 of this bill from taking effect until there would be a determination that LNG exports would not adversely impact the competitiveness of the United States' manufacturing community.

American employers are struggling to compete in this global economy, especially with the jobs in the manufacturing sector. Domestic manufacturers are competing with countries that have low wages, limited environmental and worker protections, and manipulated currencies. Low-priced, abundant natural gas is a competitive advantage for domestic manufacturers. Let's not give that up.

This Congress has an obligation to prevent the loss of American manufacturing jobs. The revitalization of the American manufacturing industry and the bringing back of quality jobs from overseas should be the cornerstone of our efforts in Washington in order to help the private sector thrive and to put our people back to work.

This bill is only good for the natural gas-producing industry, and its increased benefits will be coming at everyone else's expense.

With that, I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, the Energy and Commerce Committee has



been tackling the issue of LNG exports for quite some time now.

What began as a solid case in favor of these exports has only grown stronger. I support this bill, H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and I applaud, in particular, the sponsor, CORY GARDNER, for his efforts on this important bipartisan bill.

Last October, we held a forum that consisted of nearly a dozen representatives of foreign governments, as well as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, all of whom expressed their strong interest in buying LNG from the U.S.

Three of them—Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Lithuania—are Eastern European allies that are currently dependent on Russia for natural gas. They described in great detail how Russia wields natural gas as a weapon against them, threatening to raise prices or to even cut off supplies as a means of exerting political pressure.

We need to respond, as we are seeing their warnings playing out with the ongoing crisis, obviously, today in Ukraine. If Putin is not deterred, he will likely use the same tactics on other Eastern European countries in the years ahead. Russia's aggression is real, and American LNG can provide a much-needed lifeline away from Putin's grip as an alternative supply source.

The Energy Information Administration's estimated reserves of natural gas continue to be revised upward, ensuring that we can continue to provide American manufacturers with low-cost supplies, while having enough for export markets, and the Department of Energy has even concluded that natural gas exports will be a net benefit to our economy.

Early in our efforts, the DOE insisted that its process for approving LNG export facilities wasn't broken, but over the last year, there have been very few approvals, and most applications continue to languish—some for even more than a year—and the line continues to grow.

The DOE's most recent changes to the process, while a slight improvement from the existing queue, are still very disappointing. They do nothing to address the core problem of open-ended delays. Congress needs to act.

□ 1700

Throughout our efforts on this topic, there has been bipartisan interest in LNG exports. Since the bill was first introduced, the bipartisanship has only grown, and for that, I commend the bill's author, CORY GARDNER, for working with GENE GREEN and others on an amendment adapting the bill's language to address a number of concerns.

I know that we have reached the point where the passage of this bill, H.R. 6, will be seen as a bipartisan success story, as it should; and the Senate should follow our lead, stand up for jobs, as well as our allies, and quickly send this bill to the President's desk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. UPTON. Because of advances in technology and innovation, we are now entering a new era of abundance. America is emerging, yes, as an energy superpower. We can enjoy the domestic benefits of being an energy superpower while also projecting our influence as a force for good abroad. The Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act allows us to do both.

This commonsense bill says "yes" to jobs, "yes" to energy, and I would urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 6.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for bringing this bill to the floor. It is so important that we exploit American domestic resources to create jobs, create global stability, and make lower prices for consumers. This bill does all those things.

So we have a lot to thank you for, Congressman GARDNER, for what this bill could accomplish, and I appreciate that.

Let me address a couple of points that I think have been erroneously made. Some said that current users of natural gas won't benefit as much if this bill were to become law. That is simply not true.

There is such an abundance of natural gas in this country that we can supply domestic needs and, at the same time, have liquefied natural gas exports to our friends and allies. We can do both, and everyone will benefit. The shale gas revolution in this country is so amazing that that has made this possible.

Secondly, some have said that there will not be the same quality of environmental reviews of LNG if this takes place, and that is simply not true either. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission maintains its role to permit the siting of facilities, just as under current law, and FERC, as they are known, is required by the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, to conduct an environmental assessment and, if necessary, an EIS, an Environmental Impact Statement, if that is required. That does not change either. The same requirements under NEPA will still be met under this law, should it become law. So we are not in any way degrading or compromising environmental standards. They are still going to be satisfied.

So, for all those reasons, I want to thank the sponsor of this bill, Representative GARDNER, and I ask all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado how many more speakers you have?

Mr. GARDNER. We have two additional speakers.

Mr. WAXMAN. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Then I presume the gentleman from Colorado will want to close on his bill. So after your two speakers, we will close on our side, and then you can close.

Mr. GARDNER. At this point, we only have two remaining speakers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago, companies were building terminals to import natural gas at the cost of billions of dollars because analysts agreed that the United States economy was going to need natural gas from overseas. Today that scenario has flipped on its head, and import terminals are dormant. The Department of Energy has 19 applications waiting to get permission to export U.S. natural gas.

Thanks to technology breakthroughs, U.S. natural gas reserves have climbed 72 percent since 2000. We have more gas than we can use here in the United States. Mr. Chairman, we have the best ice cream company in the world in Brenham, Texas, and their motto is: "We eat all we can, and we sell the rest." That is what our motto should be with natural gas. We should use all we can and sell the rest everywhere in the world that wants to buy it.

As chairman of the Trade Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, I did a hearing on more LNG exports in April. Every witness at the hearing, from the union representatives to a professor, agreed that we should export natural gas. We have too much gas and our allies have too little.

And then there is Russia. Russia has an energy stranglehold over Europe, including Ukraine. Just this past week, Russia announced it was going to require payments up front from Ukraine. Russia has already increased the price of natural gas and even stopped sending natural gas to Ukraine.

Isn't that lovely?

Ukraine needs access to natural gas down the road, and that could be the United States. We need to compete with Gazprom. That could be the United States. That is how we can help thwart Russian aggression in Eastern Europe.

Technically, the United States can export natural gas, but the approval process is slow as molasses. It is the government. The government takes too long to make a decision, and the Department of Energy wraps companies in red tape. Many times we can lose these natural gas contracts to our competitors.

So I support this legislation. I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the floor.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6, the

Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, championed by my friend and colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Congressman GARDNER of Colorado, a true leader in this area. This Act will help expedite approval of U.S. liquefied natural gas exports to our allies.

The United States is experiencing a North American energy boom that analysts predict can produce enough natural gas to meet our domestic demands as well as that of our global allies, including Ukraine and other Eastern European nations currently at the mercy of Russian energy supplies. Expediting U.S. liquefied natural gas exports serves our national security interests as an aggressive Russian regime looks to expand power in former Soviet Union countries. This legislation helps our allies in eastern Europe and across the globe, while creating jobs here at home through private investment and economic opportunity essential to improving the American economy.

As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, I am proud to have helped bring this important energy global security measure to the floor today, and I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage. This is in the national security interest of the United States of America.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), a sponsor of H.R. 6, somebody who has been with this bill, this legislation, from the beginning as we have worked on this bipartisan process.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I probably won't take all the time, but I did want to stand up in support of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chair, in my district in eastern Ohio, we have been—and I have heard speaker after speaker talk about the potential boom for our country and different regions of America. And my region that I represent is one of those areas along eastern Ohio.

I think if we are looking to address many of the issues of global warming, and I know there would be a lot of different discussions and opinions that I may have compared to a lot of people on the other side, but I believe that this is an opportunity for us to address that issue with liquid natural gas, to get it out into the marketplace, to make sure that the economic benefits are here in the United States, that our people in eastern Ohio, western Pennsylvania, into New York and the upstate New York area are able to benefit from this. FERC is going to have to approve these ultimately, at the end of the day, and so I don't think that we can pass up this opportunity to have a transition.

Now, I think, quite frankly, we missed the boat a few years ago when we had an opportunity to pass a comprehensive energy bill that would in-

vest into—in the bill that came before this House, money into coal research was an opportunity that I think we missed.

There was an opportunity for wind and solar and the alternatives that I think, ultimately, will be a part of an extended portfolio here in the United States. But today, the opportunity is with liquid natural gas and getting it abroad.

In one of my positions on the German Study Group, we were in Germany talking to Chancellor Merkel, and the first thing she said to us, as our delegation was over there, was let's talk about natural gas, the first thing, because she had Putin at that time, a year, year and a half ago, breathing down her neck, and now here we are. So I think there is an opportunity here. This is one step in a long process.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and hope we can continue to build out this energy portfolio with natural gas and the others that will come along the way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For those who want to export natural gas, this bill really isn't necessary because the Department of Energy is approving enough export of natural gas that will allow us, in a few years, to be the largest exporter of LNG in the world. So DOE is acting.

For those of you who are concerned about global freedom, well, when we get all the facilities going to be able to export the natural gas and once we get all of the approvals to export natural gas, the countries who are going to receive this natural gas are most likely going to be China, Japan, and India, because that is where they are paying higher prices for natural gas. It is going to be more profitable to ship the LNG there.

I don't fault the companies for doing that. They are in business to make money. It is going to provide more money to ship the natural gas there.

Well, what about Ukraine? What about the countries that are under threat from Russia?

Angela Merkel, the head of Germany, may not realize it, but natural gas is not going to be there for quite a long time. It is going to take years. Therefore, if you think domestic prosperity is hinging on the ability to export natural gas, we don't need this bill.

If you think global freedom is hanging on the balance waiting for this bill to become law—and by “global freedom” you don't mean freedom for China to get more natural gas or India or Japan, but Ukraine and countries in eastern Europe—don't count on this bill to bring about global freedom.

The bill is grossly titled because it is promising more than this bill can ever deliver, and I would urge that this bill is not necessary and ought to be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman for your leadership over this hour and thank the gentleman from California for the debate and the Members who came and debated this important piece of legislation today.

Look, we know this bill has the support of organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. People who represent the businesses of this country, the industrial might of this country, support H.R. 6 because they know that when we can produce our energy in our own backyard and help our allies to a greater prosperity for themselves, we are doing the right thing with H.R. 6.

□ 1715

This bill is the confluence of two policies that we try to promote but often fail to achieve: the policy of domestic job creation, where 45,000 people could be taken off the unemployment rolls because of H.R. 6. The other policy that we achieve with this legislation is to give our friends and allies a greater degree of freedom, a greater ability to be independent from Russia, their aggressive neighbors that just decide one day to invade.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6 is the work of a bipartisan group of lawmakers who have worked over the past several months to make sure that we have the support—not just from the Republican side of the aisle, but strong support from both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans who believe that we should answer the call from our friends and allies for energy security, for economic opportunity at home, and to make sure that we continue the energy revolution in this country.

Opposition to the bill, as I said in committee, is like hanging up on a 911 phone call from our friends and allies.

Let's pass this legislation. Let's achieve exactly what the title of this bill says: prosperity at home and help for our allies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on