

would save the Federal Government nearly \$480 billion over the next 10 years.

I applaud my colleague for his efforts in working to put our country on a more sustainable fiscal path. I hope that we can come together in a bipartisanship manner towards that end.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans from all 50 States will gather at over 11,000 events nationwide to celebrate National School Choice Week. These are not partisan gatherings focused on a particular piece of legislation, nor are the attendees advocating for one type of school over another; rather, these gatherings will highlight the importance of providing parents with diverse choices when it comes to the education of their children.

Far too often America's children are given educational opportunities dictated by what best serves someone else's economic interest or is focused on their own economic status or where they live. This is inappropriate. We need a better way.

I have supported legislation to expand charter schools. That is a bipartisanship thing that we can all agree on. That empowers parents. At the State level, Republican legislators and Governors have passed open enrollment laws and funding portability for education.

National School Choice Week is a great reminder that we must continue to pursue these vital reforms, ensuring all parents have freedom when deciding how to educate their children.

0915

LNG PERMITTING CERTAINTY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 48, I call up the bill (H.R. 351) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 351

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act".

SEC. 2. ACTION ON APPLICATIONS.

(a) DECISION DEADLINE.—For proposals that must also obtain authorization from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or the United States Maritime Administration to site, construct, expand, or operate LNG export facilities, the Department of Energy shall issue a final decision on any application for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act

(15 U.S.C. 717b) not later than 30 days after the later of—

(1) the conclusion of the review to site, construct, expand, or operate the LNG facilities required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S. C. 4321 et seq.); or

(2) the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONCLUSION OF REVIEW.—For purposes of subsection (a), review required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall be considered concluded—

(1) for a project requiring an Environmental Impact Statement, 30 days after publication of a Final Environmental Impact Statement;

(2) for a project for which an Environmental Assessment has been prepared, 30 days after publication by the Department of Energy of a Finding of No Significant Impact; and

(3) upon a determination by the lead agency that an application is eligible for a categorical exclusion pursuant National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 implementing regulations.

(c) JUDICIAL ACTION.—(1) The United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the export facility will be located pursuant to an application described in subsection (a) shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of—

(A) an order issued by the Department of Energy with respect to such application; or

(B) the Department of Energy's failure to issue a final decision on such application.

(2) If the Court in a civil action described in paragraph (1) finds that the Department of Energy has failed to issue a final decision on the application as required under subsection (a), the Court shall order the Department of Energy to issue such final decision not later than 30 days after the Court's order.

(3) The Court shall set any civil action brought under this subsection for expedited consideration and shall set the matter on the docket as soon as practical after the filing date of the initial pleading.

SEC. 3. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF EXPORT DESTINATIONS.

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LNG EXPORT DESTINATIONS.—As a condition for approval of any authorization to export LNG, the Secretary of Energy shall require the applicant to publicly disclose the specific destination or destinations of any such authorized LNG exports."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. 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. 351.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act sponsored by Congressman BILL JOHNSON of Ohio.

All of us recognize that the economy in the U.S. has been sputtering. We have had great advancements in technology, however, and innovation in hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling have led America to become the number one natural gas producing nation in the world.

Our natural gas output has rapidly increased since 2005 and is expected to continue rising in the decades ahead in response to growing demand. Plentiful natural gas is helping many domestic energy producers and manufacturers and is spurring new investment and job growth here in America.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has held multiple hearings and forums to discuss the domestic growth in natural gas production and its potential impact on trade, geopolitics, and energy production and consumption in America.

We now have the opportunity to bring more of this critical energy resource to other parts of the world while stimulating our energy security, economic growth, and foreign policy.

I might add that over the last year, many of us have been really surprised by the number of representatives from other countries in Europe and around the world who are pleading with America to export their natural gas so that those countries are not as dependent upon countries like Russia and others.

I might also add that, in 2012, the Department of Energy commissioned a report by NERA Economic Consulting to assess the economic impacts of LNG exports. NERA recently updated this study to include the most current projections from the Energy Information Administration.

Like the 2012 study, the update found that U.S. LNG exports will bring widespread economic benefits, touching many parts of our economy, and that those benefits would consistently increase as exports increase.

The NERA study also found that the construction of new LNG export projects is estimated to put up to 45,000 unemployed Americans back to work. I might also add that this legislation does not in any way change anything that FERC has responsibility for in approving siting of these natural gas pipelines and facilities for export, so we are not affecting in any way any environmental aspects of it.

I might also say that the reason this bill is being introduced is because we think that the Department of Energy has been dragging its feet a little bit. They have responsibility over the commodity of the natural gas, and they have to go through a process. This legislation also applies only to non-free trade agreements that the U.S. deals with.

Since 2010, the Department of Energy has issued a final decision on five of the 37 applications to export LNG to countries where the U.S. does not have a free trade agreement.

Now, DOE's authority to regulate the export of natural gas arises under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act. This provision creates a rebuttable presumption that a proposed export of natural gas is in the public interest. DOE must grant the application unless opponents of the application overcome the presumption, and there are 18 countries where we have these free trade agreements.

DOE's process to review applications to export LNG to non-free trade agreement countries is much more complex and unpredictable, and this legislation would help clarify that and create some certainty. It amends section 3 of the Natural Gas Act to give DOE 30 days to issue a final decision on an LNG export application after a complete NEPA environmental review on the facility.

Additionally, H.R. 351 provides for expedited judicial reviews by the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the export facility will be located, and this is important as well. It requires public disclosure of export destinations, so we know where it is going as a condition of approval of authorization to export LNG.

This is a very important piece of legislation. I want to commend Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio for introducing this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation which is simply unnecessary. The Department of Energy currently conducts a public interest review of all applications to export liquefied natural gas to a country without a free trade agreement with the United States.

To date, DOE has approved four such applications to export LNG and has issued conditional approvals to four additional applications. DOE has approved all applications that have completed their required NEPA review, and so there is no backlog or delay at the DOE to speak of.

With these permits alone, we have the ability to become one of the largest exporters of natural gas in the world, and so legislation to impose an arbitrary 30-day deadline on DOE, as suggested by the underlying bill, is simply unnecessary.

With regard to exporting natural gas, we should keep in mind that low domestic natural gas prices can provide an important competitive advantage to U.S. manufacturing, and simple economics tells us that additional demand due to unrestricted exports can raise domestic natural gas prices, so we should think twice about giving away this advantage for short-term export profits when we are trying hard to rebuild our long-term manufacturing base.

We should also remember that the bill will not result in LNG exports to Europe for some time, if at all. Although one LNG export terminal is set

to begin full operation later this year, all other terminals remain under construction or are in the planning process.

DOE's conditional approval for those facilities allows them to continue moving forward, but this legislation won't help speed up their construction or affect how quickly they can actually operate, so passing this bill today will not magically send LNG from the proposed terminals tomorrow.

When the United States actually begins to export significant quantities of LNG, it will most likely go to Asia, not Europe. The export terminals most likely to get constructed have already signed long-term contracts to supply LNG to various customers, and those destinations are primarily in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because I don't believe the phantom LNG export backlog is one of the pressing issues facing ordinary Americans, and I don't believe that expediting this type of infrastructure is what our country needs most.

I believe our country should be encouraging the use of renewable energy resources like wind and solar power. We should be investing in increased energy efficiency and a smart grid. We should be trying to find ways to make our energy infrastructure more resilient and capable of withstanding extreme weather events, like Hurricane Sandy.

These are the types of clean energy solutions that America should be investing in, the type that will enhance our energy security, reduce carbon emissions, and lower overall energy costs to customers.

Unfortunately, this bill doesn't achieve any of these goals. In fact, the 30-day deadline in the bill could have counterproductive results. If DOE is forced to make a decision before they have determined if the project is in the public interest, it may have no choice but to deny the application, and that outcome certainly doesn't benefit anyone, especially the applicants.

This is the third time this month that the Republican majority has brought secondhand energy legislation to the floor, legislation that passed the House last Congress. Like the two bills before it, H.R. 351 would also serve no real purpose.

I just hope that we can begin soon to look at new energy legislation that will move America forward in developing a clean energy infrastructure. In the meantime, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the author of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act. This important legislation will bring certainty to the Department of Energy's review process for LNG export applications, create American jobs, continue spurring America's manufacturing comeback, and provide a stable source of energy to our allies in Europe and around the world.

Thanks to the energy renaissance occurring throughout eastern and southeastern Ohio and across the United States, America is able to produce large quantities of natural gas like never before, enough to meet our domestic natural gas demands and export excess LNG to the global marketplace.

Through the abundance of natural gas, we have an opportunity to significantly affect geopolitics and to create American jobs, but only if we enact smart policies like H.R. 351.

The window of opportunity for LNG exports will not remain open indefinitely, so it is important that Congress act immediately. If Congress fails to act, companies will continue to face regulatory uncertainty, which creates hesitancy in securing financing for constructing LNG terminals, plus nations with near-term energy needs will look elsewhere.

Potential geopolitical benefits such as reducing the oppressive influence of other exporters like Russia and Iran, while simultaneously strengthening ties with our allies, could be ultimately jeopardized.

Some of my colleagues are concerned that increased LNG exports will not really help our allies in Europe, but that is simply not true. Regardless of where U.S. natural gas is sent, increasing the supply and competition in the international market will provide global consumers with greater choice and, most importantly, increased leverage when negotiating LNG pricing contracts.

In fact, by no longer importing such large amounts of LNG, the U.S. has already indirectly helped our European allies. With the passage of this legislation, even more LNG will be free to go to places that need it most.

Equally important, if we delay, domestic economic benefits may also fail to materialize, specifically the opportunity to create some 45,000 jobs by 2018 and increase hardworking taxpayer salaries by \$1 billion over 6 years. This is a win for manufacturing, especially those who make drilling equipment pipeline components, not to mention the refining, petrochemicals, and chemicals sectors.

For these reasons, Congress must pass H.R. 351. To date, DOE has issued a final decision on only five of the 38 pending LNG export applications received since 2010. This is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to help bring certainty to DOE's approval process, create jobs, help maximize American energy production, and help our allies abroad by voting for this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. PALLONE, for his leadership and for his positive contributions to this entire institution.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to oppose H.R. 351 because, once again, it is a proposed solution to a problem that we can't find, a problem that we have searched high and low for. This problem, Mr. Speaker, simply doesn't exist.

Here we are, here we go once again, coming up with solutions to a problem that doesn't even exist. When will my colleagues on the other side do something productively in this Congress and come up with real solutions to problems that do exist for the American people?

Mr. Speaker, currently, the Department of Energy, as we speak today, has already approved not one, not two, not three, not even four, but five applications—five—for existing LNG, and there are four more conditional approvals pending.

□ 0930

Altogether, Mr. Speaker, the approved applications authorize the export of over 10 million cubic feet per day of LNG. The pending applications collectively seek an additional 27.5 billion cubic feet of LNG exported each and every day—27.5.

Where is the problem? Show me the problem. Show me the way. Point out the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this 30-day deadline that arbitrarily mandates the DOE application process would short-circuit the public interest review—short circuit—it short. The public doesn't have any input. No review by the public.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. This arbitrary mandatory 30-day deadline would unnecessarily fast-track the DOE to hastily make a decision on export applications, regardless of how complex the application may be. The result of this ambiguous 30-day deadline may negatively affect DOE's ability to soberly and thoroughly assess the impact that cumulative exports may have on natural gas prices.

What would be the effect of gas at the station, at the pump, on the American people, and we all of a sudden, without any study, without any conversation, without any consideration, just force the DOE to arbitrarily meet this 30-day deadline? What is going to be the effect on the consumer in terms of these gas prices at the pump? Are they going to skyrocket as a result of this hasty, irresponsible action? Tell me, do you have answers to that?

It may even result in the unintended consequence of actually denying applications if the agency does not have the time to complete its due diligence. This is insane. This is the utmost of insanity.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this bill because at the end of the day when you skim away all of the rhetoric and all the hyperbole around this bill, it will not speed up energy exports to Europe and it will not speed up exports to our other allies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Elvis Presley: let this body return this bill to sender, return it to sender, address unknown, no such problem, no such home.

Mr. Speaker, let's send this bill back to committee where it can go through regular order, and we can have a thorough discussion on these important issues before voting on such a consequential bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), who has been a real leader in helping America become energy independent.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill because this is simply a commonsense bill.

As you know, the U.S. is now the largest producer of natural gas in the world and has proven gas resources to supply our needs for decades to come. This is an achievement that we have reached despite roadblocks and delays from the executive branch. The latest delay is the Department of Energy's rule from last summer to hold up export terminal applications.

This important bill streamlines the review process for LNG exports by requiring a timeline for making a decision and making agencies work together on the review. This is commonsense change, Mr. Speaker.

Innovations in the harvesting and production of natural gas have cut energy bills for families across the country. Those are the same innovations that have also made it affordable to ship LNG around the globe.

The responsible and safe development of our natural resources through new technologies, such as horizontal drilling, have begun an energy and manufacturing renaissance in America.

And who is feeling the benefits? American families and businesses with an affordable and reliable energy supply. But that could all end unless we let the free market work.

Let's end the administration's de facto ban on new exports and bring market stability to the global gas market. Let's get the government out of the way, and let's give our American innovators a chance to work.

Mr. Speaker, my district, the State of Ohio, and the entire Nation will reap the benefits of more jobs, increased pay, and lower energy costs if we pass this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 351 and end the self-imposed restrictions on LNG exports.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 21 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who is the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me explain the problem we have and the need for this bill today.

The bill is the exact same language that passed this House last Congress, and it came through our committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Now, what this bill does is give the Department of Energy some deadlines to make a decision on our national interests—that is what it does—so we can do it. They have held those permits sometimes up to 2 years to make that determination.

If you have a free trade agreement with the United States, we can export natural gas to you. But they need to decide the national interests. I want the DOE to do that, but I also want to make a decision in very quick time.

We know who our friends are, we know who our adversaries are. We don't really want to send it to our adversaries, we want to send it to our friends. So that is DOE's job.

The reason we need this bill is that right now today, or yesterday, gas is \$2.88 per million cubic feet. It was up about \$4, which is still not great for a producer. But what we have been doing in south Texas is flaring natural gas. It is bad for the environment. It is bad for the people who produce it because they don't have a customer. And what we need to do is be able to export what we can't use.

In Texas we are very proud of Blue Bell ice cream. In fact, their advertising slogan is: "We eat all we can and we sell the rest."

I have a chemical industry, I have a utility industry that uses natural gas. They are using it. But we still have a lot of production. So why would we not use all we can in our country and sell the rest and make somebody else pay for those jobs that we have in our community? And that is the problem.

We know the price of oil is going down. But oil and natural gas sometimes come out of the same well. So that is why we need to make sure that we have the right, on a reasonable timeframe, to export natural gas to countries that we want to be friendly with. I would love to have a natural gas export right now to Ukraine. The infrastructure over there is not there. It could get there with some reversing pipelines.

H.R. 351 represents a bipartisan effort to legislate and warrant its approval.

We worked together on this bill, and it represents that hard work.

The bill is good for the economy, the climate, and the U.S. security interests. The United States has natural resources to become the largest exporter of LNG in the world. Our natural gas reserves can meet all our domestic natural gas needs and still have an excess capacity of 3 trillion cubic feet.

Before we discuss H.R. 351 it is important we clarify the LNG permitting process, just so there is no confusion. A project applicant must submit two separate applications: the first to the Department of Energy and the second to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC.

In the Department of Energy, there are two complete separate processes. First, the project must submit an application to export. If the project sends LNG to a country with which the U.S. has a free trade agreement, the application is automatically approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the ranking member. I appreciate it.

If the project sends the LNG to a country without a free trade agreement, then the DOE must issue a permit based on the public interest. These are very important determinations. However, LNG will not leave the United States with DOE approval only.

For a project to actually export LNG, in either case, the applicant must receive a FERC permit. FERC reviews the environmental impacts of the actual LNG facility. FERC conducts and reviews all environmental impacts to satisfy the requirements of NEPA. No company will export a single cubic foot of LNG without FERC approval. FERC's process takes 12 to 18 months and costs approximately \$100 million.

We have worked extremely hard to protect the environment. It is the DOE non-FTA process that is the problem. The DOE currently has approximately 30 non-FTA permits awaiting decision. The DOE has held most of these permits almost 4 years. Even the DOE recognized this huge problem and tried to address the backlog last summer by changing the approval process. Unfortunately, the changes failed to expedite approval or provide any certainty to companies who are investing \$100 million, and these are U.S. companies.

H.R. 351 resolved this issue only after it receives all environmental permits.

H.R. 351 would place a 30-day timeline for the DOE to issue a decision after the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission completes its environmental reviews.

Once again, we have protected the environmental review process. We have protected the public interest. And DOE, which held some of these applications 4 years—we cannot allow DOE to sit on these permits any longer. They must do their job and do it in a timely fashion.

Opponents of H.R. 351 say if all permits are approved, we will export more than 35 trillion cubic feet. Opponents say exports will double or triple domestic natural gas prices. Opponents say exports of that size will endanger our domestic industry, raise electricity prices, and have ruinous effects on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I represent enormous petrochemical facilities, power generators, and workers.

I remember when domestic natural gas prices caused companies in my district to move jobs overseas.

If what opponents of H.R. 351 say were even remotely possible, I would be the first one to oppose this bill.

My constituents work at those facilities.

Those facilities pay taxes and fund the hospitals and schools in my district.

There are dozens of applications pending at DOE.

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

But each project deserves a fair opportunity at review.

Each company deserves the opportunity to pursue financing in the capital markets.

The government should not make those decisions.

Each LNG facility costs billions, not to mention the jobs associated with pipeline construction, electric transmission, local services, etc.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 351 and support this bipartisan effort.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), who has been a real leader on helping America become energy independent.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. natural gas exports will create American jobs and will bolster our strategic partnerships.

I serve as president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and many foreign leaders and officials have expressed to me their need for energy diversification. As you know, Russia, the largest supplier of natural gas to Europe, has repeatedly used natural gas pricing to draw governments closer to its orbit and punished West-leaning governments with higher prices.

U.S. natural gas exports will foster a more dynamic and competitive world energy market, helping to curb the use of energy as a political weapon. And regardless of where natural gas from the United States is shipped, increasing supply in the global market will help international customers with greater choice and leverage to negotiate prices.

In fact, the Obama administration has made this exact same argument. The State Department's energy envoy recently stated:

Now where the gas will go doesn't matter. The fact that we have approved exports of natural gas has already had an impact on Europe. And where the molecule actually ends up going also doesn't matter.

Now, I understand there have been questions about whether or not European countries, such as Ukraine, are

prepared to receive U.S. natural gas. Many of our European allies are implementing infrastructure projects to diversify their natural gas resources.

For example, Poland and Lithuania are opening LNG import terminals to reduce their dependence on Russian gas. Just last week, Poland and Ukraine announced an agreement to construct a pipeline that will allow Ukraine to access natural gas from two LNG import terminals, potentially from the United States. England and Spain already have contracts in place to receive U.S. natural gas.

These are just a few examples of how these infrastructure projects will help Europe diversify its natural gas resources.

Mr. Speaker, last year, President Obama, in a joint statement with European leaders, welcomed U.S. natural gas exports to help our European allies and our strategic partners.

I am encouraged by the President's statements. These words must be followed by action. The President must work with Congress to enact H.R. 351.

I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

□ 0945

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have heard my colleagues suggest that there is a delay in the DOE's approval of LNG export applications.

For instance, on Monday night at the Rules Committee, Mr. JOHNSON indicated that the DOE has approved only five out of 38 applications since 2010. Even if the gentleman from Ohio is correct in his assertion, the fact is that the five applications approved by the Obama administration since 2010 are five more than were approved by the Reagan administration or by either Bush administration. In fact, it is five more than were approved by the Clinton, Carter, Ford, or Nixon administration. In 2011, the DOE approved the first LNG export application for the Cheniere Sabine Pass facility. That facility is set to become operational at the end of this year. That was the DOE's first approval to export LNG since the 1960s.

The dramatic growth of natural gas production and supply in the United States was considered impossible a decade ago, so the DOE commissioned a study to help it decide how to address additional applications. After establishing a transparent and systematic system for reviewing and authorizing LNG export applications, the DOE began to rapidly issue decisions. The record demonstrates that the DOE has moved aggressively to authorize LNG exports, granting three additional final authorizations and four conditional approvals since August of 2013.

To date, the DOE has approved the export of enough LNG to make the United States the world leader in LNG exports. All other pending applications are still under review at FERC, not at the DOE, so it is important to understand that this bill does not change the

FERC review process—the site approvals, the environmental approvals. I would also remind my colleagues that the DOE automatically deems LNG exports to free trade agreement countries to be in the public interest.

Before the DOE can issue a decision on the pending applications, both FERC approval and construction will need to be completed. That could take months or, more likely, years, but this bill will not affect that timeline, which will be the critical factor in how much more gas can be exported. That is why I want to emphasize that this bill is unnecessary and will not materially change the LNG export situation anytime soon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, they say that you can't have too much of a good thing, but with our impressive natural gas production, that is exactly what we have today. We now have so much natural gas that we cannot only meet our own energy needs and still have extra to sell, but our natural gas boom can be used as a force for good here at home as a source for jobs and across the globe as a source of stable energy.

There is no question that the whole shale revolution helped break the fever of the Great Recession. Thanks to innovation and technological advancement, energy production remained a welcome bright spot in our national economy, but we aren't out of the woods yet. We all know that. Millions of folks, certainly in Michigan and across the country, still find themselves unemployed, underemployed, or facing stagnant paychecks. This bill, this legislation, will help accelerate their return to full employment.

At the request of the Department of Energy, NERA Economic Consulting evaluated the economic impacts of U.S. LNG exports. The NERA study showed a net positive impact to the United States economy and estimated that LNG exports would actually reduce the average number of unemployed workers by as much as 45,000 people by 2018. We will also see tens of thousands of additional jobs created in the supply chain. I am talking about good-paying jobs that will help families achieve a better life.

The bill will also advance our foreign policy goals. U.S. LNG exports can provide our allies with a secure and affordable supply of energy and can reduce the influence of hostile exporting nations like Russia, which continues to threaten Ukraine and, really, all of Europe's natural gas supply. Passing this bill will send the welcome signal to our allies in Eastern Europe that, yes, an alternative source of energy is on its way.

The domestic and geopolitical benefits make increasing U.S. LNG exports a win-win, but the Department of Energy continues to hold up the process.

Since 2010, the DOE has only issued a final decision on five applications to export LNG to countries with which we don't share a free trade agreement. This bill would help jump-start approvals so that we can start creating jobs and sending our surplus gas to those countries that need it the most. It would give the DOE 30 days to issue a decision following the completion of the environmental review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. UPTON. The U.S. is now a global energy superpower, and with that power, we have a chance to do some real good. Saying "yes" to energy is good for workers here at home and is good for global allies.

I thank Representative BILL JOHNSON for his leadership on this issue, and I would hope that everybody would support this bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Under the current approval process for LNG exports, the Department of Energy has a tool to protect American consumers, and that tool is the public interest determination. The DOE has the ability to weigh the benefits and costs of additional LNG exports, including the impact of increased domestic natural gas prices on consumers, who use gas to heat and cool their homes and to turn on the lights. Rigid deadlines, as suggested in this legislation, could prevent the DOE from conducting a meaningful public interest review, and that means that the DOE might not be able to ensure that high levels of LNG exports do not harm American consumers by raising the costs of electricity or home heating or cooling.

I think consumers, Mr. Speaker, have reason to be concerned. Experts at the nonpartisan U.S. Energy Information Administration examined this issue, and here is what they found:

In the scenarios with additional gas exports, consumers will consume less and pay more on both their natural gas and electricity bills.

Furthermore, the EIA calculated that high levels of LNG exports could mean increased residential, commercial, and industrial consumer energy costs of \$7 billion to \$14 billion per year between 2020 and 2040.

Make no mistake. American consumers will foot that bill. Recent experience with gasoline and propane exports also offers cautionary tales. The Midwest and Northeast experienced sharp propane price spikes and shortages last winter. Significant increases in propane exports were a key factor in the skyrocketing prices that hurt consumers.

Just yesterday, the Center for American Progress released an analysis on the potential impact of expanded LNG exports on consumers. They found that, in 2020, residential consumers

would pay 4.3 percent more for natural gas per year, and those in the Midwest—in States like Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas—would be the hardest hit by price increases. By 2040, consumers in the mid-Atlantic States would pay 10 percent more for natural gas per year.

These figures are not insignificant. We need to make sure that LNG exports do not hurt consumers. Right now, the DOE has the ability to do that. So, before we disregard any meaningful public interest review and allow the unrestricted exporting of LNG, let's be sure that our constituents won't be left footing the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act.

America's energy producers and the tens of thousands of Americans they employ stand ready to meet the demand for a reliable and secure source of natural gas from America and the world.

They have completed their reviews, have passed their tests, and are ready to get to work, but there is one big problem—the Obama administration is standing in the way. The President and his anti-American energy agenda have placed a de facto ban on LNG exports by logjamming their requests and using bureaucratic red tape to block America's progress.

This bill breaks the bureaucratic gridlock and expedites the approval of LNG exports. I have seen firsthand the jobs and the opportunities that an LNG facility has created for the people of east Texas, in my district. Let's help the American worker by approving H.R. 351.

Mr. PALLONE. Again, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time that remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are beginning the 114th Congress the way we ended the previous one—with legislation that is more about message than about solving real problems.

The message of H.R. 351 is that we are interested in elevating the interests of the oil and gas industry above any others. Consumers will not benefit from this policy, and manufacturers will not benefit from this policy. Eliminating the public interest determination sends that message clearly.

In spite of the assertions by its supporters, H.R. 351 won't do much for our allies either, especially those in Europe or Ukraine. The bill fixes no problem. There is no backlog of applications at the Department of Energy. Japan, our ally and the world's largest purchaser of LNG, has three importers who signed contracts in 2013 with three approved LNG export facilities, those being Freeport, Cameron, and Cove Point.

Because natural gas is such an important and strategic resource, we should, if anything, be questioning the administration about the wisdom of issuing so many approvals. Why? They are relying on assumptions, models, and estimates of recoverable domestic gas reserves that are very uncertain and that have been decreasing as new information becomes available.

Exporters sign these contracts to guarantee deliveries for some 10 to 20 years. I am not willing to risk price spikes for consumers, families, and small businesses or to risk the benefits of lower gas prices for our manufacturing sector for a slightly improved trade balance. I am unwilling to repeal the requirement for a consideration of the public interest before more export facilities are approved, not for a resource that is so strategic and widely used.

H.R. 351 does not fix any real problems, but it could, indeed, help to create some. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the President likes to talk about infrastructure. In his State of the Union Address, he said that there is bipartisan support for infrastructure legislation and that Republicans and Democrats need to "set our sights higher than a single oil pipeline."

We have listened, and we have done that.

After passing a bill to approve Keystone, this House passed another bill last week to reform the natural gas permitting process. Now the House is on its third energy infrastructure bill with Representative BILL JOHNSON's LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act. I know the President doesn't pay much attention to what goes on here on Capitol Hill, but three infrastructure bills in 3 weeks is hard to miss.

Here are some other numbers, Mr. Speaker, that I think the President really should remember: though the Department of Energy has received 37 permits in the past 5 years, it has only approved five permits in that time. That is one a year. If the President cared about infrastructure as much as he says, I think he would get his administration to process the rest of them now.

Passing this bill would also lead to the creation of an estimated 45,000 jobs. More permit approvals mean more opportunity. More opportunity requires more infrastructure. More infrastructure means more jobs. Delay has become a hallmark of this Presidency, but Americans are done delaying job creation by ignoring America's energy abundance.

□ 1000

American energy supports American jobs. It supports a strong economy. It also gives our friends—like Ukraine, our allies—an alternative source of energy, diluting the power countries like Russia and Iran who use their oil to coerce and even oppress.

Mr. Speaker, the President should know that here in the House we have set our sights very high; but, Mr. Speaker, the question is: Will the President set his sights higher than his veto pen?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, again, I wanted to return to the floor because the thought occurs to me, as it should to all of the American people, that we should consider the impact of this bill, the impact of LNG exports, and the impact that it would have on U.S. manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, let us protect, by all means, American jobs. Let us protect American manufacturing. Cheap domestic natural gas prices are providing a big boost and competitive advantage to U.S. manufacturing. We can all agree on that on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, the disagreement occurs when the other side, the Republicans, are asking us in this Congress to make a hasty decision that could undermine the advantage that we are now experiencing in the rapid increase in manufacturing.

This bill runs the risk of reducing our competitive advantage that we have now in the manufacturing sector. It requires DOE to rush its process and make final decisions on pending applications to export a huge quantity of LNG.

If all of the pending applications are granted, DOE will authorize the export of approximately 38 million cubic feet per day of LNG. That is more than half of the total U.S. natural gas consumption. It is more than the world's largest LNG exporter, Qatar, currently makes each and every day.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, in my mind or in the minds of the American people that exports of that magnitude will increase the domestic price of natural gas. It just makes common sense, and it is what the EIA found when it studied the economic impact of increased LNG imports.

Where is your study? How do you answer the conclusions of the EIA when it found again that the economic impact of increased influence will in-

crease the domestic price of natural gas? What amount of American manufacturing? What amount of American jobs? Let's protect American manufacturing. Let's protect American jobs.

Because this bill truncates DOE's public interest review, the Department may not even be able to fully analyze the impacts of the very high level of LNG exports on American consumers, on American jobs, and on American manufacturing.

My friends on the other side—and they are indeed my friends—always want to talk about American manufacturing, how we have to support American manufacturing, how we have to raise the level of American manufacturing, how we have to increase the American manufacturing sector, how we have to increase the American manufacturing jobs. This very bill could undermine all that sense of goodwill and all those pronouncements from the other side.

What about American manufacturing and what about American manufacturing jobs? Don't abandon American manufacturing. Don't abandon American manufacturing jobs. Don't abandon the American people. Let's slow this process down.

All we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is jeopardizing American manufacturing and American manufacturing jobs.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I am committed to developing sound energy policy, and that policy surely includes consideration of the role that natural gas can play in our energy mix.

Our energy picture is changing every year. The latest development is low oil prices, but we have other developments in recent years, including rapidly increasing domestic production of oil and natural gas and a welcomed increase in wind and solar electricity production.

We are becoming more efficient, but our energy infrastructure is becoming outdated. We need to look at the ways we produce and use energy, but we also need to look at the ways that we move, transmit, and store energy.

We need to innovate in the energy space, but we also need to maintain reliability and lower energy bills. We need to look at all our energy issues through the lens of climate change and public health.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are legitimate questions about whether we want to send our natural gas to other countries. That might help our trade balance, but it would have negative impacts on our domestic manufacturing sector.

I don't claim that I have all the answers. I know that we looked at some of these issues last Congress, but I don't agree that a clear consensus emerged. In any event, this is a new

Congress with scores of new Members who have never looked at this issue before.

I think we should take these issues back to the Energy and Commerce Committee and let the committee and its 12 new members do its job. Let us look at the facts again as they are today, not last year or last Congress. I think if we were to do that, we would see that even if this legislation was once necessary, it isn't anymore.

DOE has modernized its process and any backlog that once existed isn't an issue at this point. DOE and the administration have opened the way for LNG exports, but I think it continues to be necessary for us to assess whether approving an application for additional export is in the public interest because becoming the world's largest exporter of natural gas is not something we should do lightly, unadvisedly, or without the latest facts.

This January, we have spent much of our time bringing bills from last Congress to the floor and rushing them through to the Senate, which is still considering the Keystone legislation we passed the first week of this year.

I think we might well have served ourselves and the American people better by sitting down together in the Energy and Commerce Committee and working carefully on an energy policy aimed at the future rather than at an energy policy aimed at the past.

I am going to vote "no" on this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The former speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, talked a lot about the impact on the manufacturing base in America this legislation might have. I would like to point out that the National Association of Manufacturers, which is the largest manufacturing association in the United States, representing manufacturers in every industrial sector in all 50 States, in a letter dated yesterday, urges Members to support H.R. 351.

They go on to say that it is important to ensure that "market forces, rather than bureaucratic inertia, govern international trade." That is really what this legislation is all about; it is about market forces.

Representatives from countries around the world are coming to us and asking for this product. We are fortunate in America that we have an abundance of natural gas. In fact, the Energy Information Agency reported today that it is so abundant that natural gas prices have dropped to their lowest level since September 2012.

Earlier, there was an expression of concern about increased natural gas prices. We understand that prices go up and prices go down, but right now, they are at their lowest level since September 2012, and when natural gas

prices go down too low, you see less production. That increases prices as well.

We didn't just wake up one day and decide to introduce this legislation. Concerned groups involved in this business came to Congress and said: We need some help.

When we started having hearings on this a year and 2 years ago, the Department of Energy started trying to speed up the process a little bit, but we are not dictating what their decision should be on allowing the export to non-free trade agreement countries. We are just saying: You need to make the decision sooner, and we want some transparency. That is all this legislation is about.

Now, we understand that any time you talk in today's world about exporting a fossil fuel, one of the undercurrents is climate change, and I would remind everyone that CO₂ emissions in America are the lowest that they have been in 20 years.

This country does not have to take a backseat to any country in the world, and so we want the market to play its role. This is a good, commonsense piece of legislation that will create jobs in America, will encourage the expansion of more natural gas production at a time when the world needs it and we need it.

I would urge every Member of this House to vote in favor of H.R. 351, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 351, the "LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act."

Mr. Speaker, I am not anti-energy exploration. I am not anti-trade. I am, however strongly "pro-jobs," "pro-economic growth," and "pro-sustainable environment."

As a Member of Congress from Houston I have always been mindful of the importance of, and have strongly advocated for, national energy policies that will make our nation energy independent, preserve and create jobs, and keep our nation's economy strong.

That is why I carefully consider each energy legislative proposal brought to the floor on its individual merits and support them when they are sound, balanced, fair, and promote the national interest.

Where they fall short, I believe in working across the aisle to improve them if possible by offering constructive amendments.

Although I believe the nation would benefit by increased exports of natural gas, the legislation before contains several provisions that are of great concern to me.

Pursuant to Section 2, subsection (a) of the bill, an application for authorization to export LNG is "deemed" approved if the Department of Energy (DOE) or other federal agencies do not approve or deny the application within 30 days of the conclusion of the site review.

I have three concerns with this regulatory scheme.

First, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have a problem with "deeming" something done that has not been done in fact.

Thus, the provision is unwise.

Second, this provision is a remedy in search of a problem. There is no lengthy or intoler-

able backlog of neglected natural gas export authority applications awaiting action by DOE.

The provision is unnecessary because DOE has to date authorized the export of over 10 billion cubic feet per day of LNG to non-Free Trade Agreement countries.

Together with exports to FTA countries, this level of LNG exports that would transform the United States into one of the world's largest exporters.

Third, the provision is irresponsible because it would require DOE and other agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

Supporters of this bill argue that it is vital, in the face of Russian aggression and restrictions, to provide our allies in Europe with additional exports of LNG.

However, because actual exports through approved terminals are not expected to begin until late 2015, this legislation will have no impact on current exports.

And, limiting the time for review would prevent DOE from properly analyzing the domestic impact that of exporting large amounts of LNG.

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) estimates that increased exports could result in an increase of as much as 8 percent in domestic LNG prices.

Given the inherent delicacy involved in assessing the impact of trade authorizations, both domestically and abroad, this state of affairs is likely to lead to DOE erring on the side of caution and denying applications that may otherwise have been approved if it had more time and more resources to carry out its responsibilities.

For these reasons, I urge all Members to oppose the bill before us and urge my colleagues to join me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Garamendi moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 351, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND CREATING AMERICAN JOBS.

In reviewing an application for authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b), the Department of Energy—

(1) shall deny such application if the natural gas would be exported to any nation

that is a state sponsor of terrorism or otherwise threatens America's national security, or to any nation or corporation that steals America's military technology or intellectual property through cyber-attacks; and

(2) shall require, as a condition for approval of any such authorization, the applicant to ensure that United States-flagged and built ships and shipping containers are used to export the LNG as such vessels become available for charter.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, this final amendment to the bill will not kill the bill. Frankly, it will substantially improve it. It won't send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will come to the floor for a vote later this morning.

We have heard a lot of discussion here about jobs in the Rules Committee, and I thank the chair, Mr. WHITFIELD, for his interest in this particular proposal and for the Rules Committee listening to the debate very carefully about how we can significantly advance America's national interest.

□ 1015

Natural gas is a strategic asset. It has allowed us to substantially reduce our energy costs in the United States; replace, re-power many of our power plants; bring down the cost; and, frankly, lead to an increased manufacturing sector.

Shipbuilding is also a strategic national asset. Our Navy depends upon it. However, 107,000 Americans work in the shipbuilding industry in our ports and ship yards. It is a strategic asset, as are the mariners. American mariners are also a strategic asset.

What we are trying to do with this amendment is to bring together these three strategic assets of America and advance the American economy and our national security at the same time.

This amendment would simply require that if we are going to export liquefied natural gas, a strategic asset, then we should do it in a way that advances our national security and our economy by requiring that those ships be manned and "womanned" by American mariners, the captains, the engineers, the sailors, that they be American.

This is a safety issue. Natural gas is a very volatile issue, and, under current law, when it is imported, it has to have American mariners on board.

Similarly, by requiring that the ships be American-built, we will be able to employ several hundred thousand new men and women in our shipyards. If it is about jobs—and we all claim this bill is about jobs—then let's take it an-

other step. Let's take it another step, so that we really rebuild the American shipping industry, that we put American mariners to work, that we revitalize our shipyards, so that our U.S. Navy will be able to have a robust competition for their ships.

There are 117 shipyards in the United States that build ships. None of them, yet, build these tankers. They could if we pass this amendment.

Let's build it in America. Let's make it in America. This is a strategy that is employed by India, which has a tender out to buy gas from the United States. That tender requires that three of the ships used to transport that be built in India.

I say let's build the other seven in the United States. They want American natural gas; build the ships in America.

We know that this is a big industry. Cheniere needs 100 ships when they begin to ship natural gas, LNG, from their new terminal in Texas—100 ships. Are those American ships?

No, not without this amendment. Those ships will be Chinese ships in Chinese shipyards built by Chinese.

How about America? How about building it in America?

That is what this amendment is about. We can all agree that we want American jobs. Is there one among the 435 of us who wants the jobs to be in China or Korea or Japan? I don't think so.

Let's do it in America. This is an American-made amendment. This is an amendment for American workers, American shipyards.

This is not going to kill the bill. This is going to make this bill into a real "Make It In America," a real American jobs bill with hundreds of thousands of jobs spread throughout this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, work with us. Make this into a real, robust American jobs bill. Adopt this amendment. Put aside the normal game we play with MTRs, which is just kind of a Kabuki dance here.

Let's do it for the American workers, for the American shipyards all across this Nation. That is what this is about.

This is an unexpected opportunity that has come about because of our great natural gas industry here. Take advantage of it. Think about the national security. Think about our shipyards, the U.S. Navy, the mariners. Make it in America. Adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California for offering this motion to recommit. It has two basic parts to it. The first part relates to denying applications of natural gas that would be exported to any nation that is a state-sponsored terrorist.

We feel quite confident that, under the existing law and under H.R. 351, the Department of Energy is not going to approve the export of natural gas that is going to be in the public interest to any terrorist state.

The second question, which is a very important question—and as I said in the Rules Committee and say on the floor, I am delighted that Mr. GARAMENDI has raised this issue about U.S.-flagged ships being involved in the export.

As you know, his amendment goes to the Jones Act, and the Jones Act, as we all know, requires U.S.-flagged ships between ports here in the United States, but it does not expand to export and the use in other countries, and that raises a much broader issue than this very narrow-focused bill.

I do think that that discussion needs to take place at some point in time, but, at this time, I am going to respectfully request the Members to re-ject the motion to recommit.

I, and others, would look forward to talking to Mr. GARAMENDI in more detail about a broader debate on what impact expanding the Jones Act would have on our international trade.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Speaker will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 175, nays 237, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—175

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Adams | Carney | Cummings |
| Aguilar | Carson (IN) | Davis (CA) |
| Ashford | Cartwright | Davis, Danny |
| Bass | Castor (FL) | DeGette |
| Beatty | Castro (TX) | Delaney |
| Becerra | Chu (CA) | DeLauro |
| Bera | Cicilline | DelBene |
| Beyer | Clark (MA) | DeSaulnier |
| Bishop (GA) | Clarke (NY) | Deutch |
| Blumenauer | Cleaver | Dingell |
| Bonamici | Clyburn | Doggett |
| Boyle (PA) | Cohen | Doyle (PA) |
| Brown (FL) | Connolly | Duncan (TN) |
| Brownley (CA) | Conyers | Edwards |
| Bustos | Cooper | Ellison |
| Butterfield | Costa | Eshoo |
| Capps | Courtney | Esty |
| Cárdenas | Cuellar | Farr |

NAYS—237

| | | |
|----------|-------------|------------|
| Abraham | Duncan (SC) | Kelly (PA) |
| Aderholt | Ellmers | King (IA) |
| Allen | Emmer | King (NY) |

Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Hoyer Newhouse Torres
 Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, MARCH- Hudson Noem Trott
 ANT, BUCK, CRENSHAW, PALMER, Huelskamp Norcross Turner
 JORDAN, HANNA, and NUNES Hulgren Nugent Upton
 changed their vote from "yea" to Hunter Nunes Valadao
 "nay." Hunter Olson Veasey
 Hurd (TX) Palazzo Vela
 Heath (VA) Polk

Mr. WELCH, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Messrs. POLIS, TAKAI, JOHNSON of Georgia, and TONKO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected. The result of the vote was announced

as above recorded.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ~~answ~~ ^{was} ~~was~~ ^{to have} it.

the ayes appeared to have it.

I demand the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 133, not voting 23, as follows:

155, not voting 25, as follows.
[Roll No. 50]
YEAS 277

YEAS—277

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—277

NAYS—133

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| [Roll No. 50] | Adams | Davis, Danny | Johnson (GA) |
| YEAS—277 | Bass | DeGette | Johnson, E. B. |
| Abraham | Beatty | DeLauro | Kaptur |
| Aderholt | Becerra | Deutch | Keating |
| Buck | Beyer | Dingell | Kelly (IL) |
| Aguilar | Bishop (GA) | Doggett | Kennedy |
| Bucshon | Blumenauer | Edwards | Kildee |
| Allen | Bonamici | Ellison | Kind |
| Amash | Curbelo (FL) | Eshoo | Kuster |
| Babineau | Boyle (PA) | Esty | Langevin |
| Ashford | Brown (FL) | Farr | Larson (CT) |
| Babin | Brownley (CA) | Fattah | Lawrence |
| Barletta | Delaney | Foster | Levin |
| Cárdenas | Bustos | Gabbard | Loebssack |
| Barr | DelBene | Capps | Lofgren |
| Barton | Dent | Carney | Gallego |
| Benishek | Castro (TX) | Frankel (FL) | Lowenthal |
| Bera | Chabot | Carson (IN) | Fudge |
| Bilirakis | DeSantis | DesJarlais | Garamendi |
| Bishop (MI) | Chaffetz | Diaz-Balart | Loebssack |
| Clawson (FL) | Dold | Castor (FL) | Lofgren |
| Bishop (UT) | Cole | Chu (CA) | Gallego |
| Coffman | Doyle (PA) | Cicilline | Lowey |
| Black | Duffy | Clark (MA) | Maloney. |
| Blackburn | Collins (GA) | Clarke (NY) | Carolyn |
| Blum | Collins (NY) | Duncan (SC) | Matsui |
| Bost | Comstock | Duncan (TN) | McCullom |
| Boustany | Conaway | Ellmers | Hastings |
| Brady (TX) | Connolly | Clyburn | Higgins |
| Brat | Emmer | Clark (MA) | McDermott |
| Bridenstine | Cook | Cohen | Honda |
| Brooks (AL) | Cooper | Farenthold | McGovern |
| Brooks (IN) | Costa | Conyers | McNerney |
| Costello (PA) | Fitzpatrick | Courtney | Meng |
| | Fleischmann | Cummings | Jeffries |
| | | Jackson Lee | Moore |

| | | |
|--------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Moulton | Rush | Thompson (CA) |
| Nadler | Sánchez, Linda | Thompson (MS) |
| Napolitano | T. | Titus |
| Nolan | Sanchez, Loretta | Tonko |
| O'Rourke | Sarbanes | Tsontsas |
| Pallone | Schakowsky | Van Hollen |
| Pascarel | Schiff | Vargas |
| Payne | Scott (VA) | Velázquez |
| Pelosi | Scott, David | Walz |
| Pingree | Serrano | Wasserman |
| Pocan | Sewell (AL) | Schultz |
| Polis | Sherman | Waters, Maxine |
| Price (NC) | Sires | Watson, Coleman |
| Quigley | Smith (WA) | Welch |
| Rangel | Speier | Wilson (FL) |
| Rice (NY) | Swalwell (CA) | Yarmuth |
| Royer-Allard | Takai | |
| Ruiz | Takano | |

NOT VOTING—23

| | | |
|------------|-----------|-------------|
| Amodei | Engel | Neal |
| Brady (PA) | Gutiérrez | Nunez |
| Capuano | Heck (NV) | Perlmutter |
| Clay | Jones | Roe (TN) |
| Crowley | Lee | Rohrabacher |
| DeFazio | Lieu (CA) | Slaughter |
| DeSaulnier | Marino | Young (AK) |
| Duckworth | Meeks | |

□ 1057

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Call vote numbers 49 and 50. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on Roll Call vote number 49, and no on Roll Call vote number 50.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 2015 I was unable to be present and missed the following votes:

On Roll Call vote 49, on Agreeing to the Motion to Recommit With Instructions to H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act, I would have voted AYE.

On Roll Call vote 50, on Passage of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act, I would have voted NO.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 2015; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 2015, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2015

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, January 30, 2015; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 2, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HEALTHCARE.GOV

(Mrs. BLACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, more than a year after its launch, healthcare.gov remains just as flawed as the underlying ObamaCare law itself.

Most recently, we learned that the Obama administration was sharing

users' personal data with numerous third party vendors. When the administration was caught with their hand in the cookie jar, they quickly scaled back, but many unanswered questions remain.

That is why I have led a letter with Congressman PAT MEEHAN demanding answers regarding healthcare.gov data security and privacy policies. While we wait for their reply, we have also re-introduced the Federal Exchange Data Breach Notification Act, legislation simply requiring that the government notify consumers if their personal information is breached on the health care exchanges.

It defies all logic that this basic requirement isn't already law. It is time that we change that.

COMMON GROUND TO BE FOUND ON TRADE

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the State of the Union Address, the President outlined some areas where common ground can be found to work with Congress. One important area is trade.

I agree with the President that we should move forward on trade agreements to create jobs for our workers as we expand exports to help our manufacturers, our ranchers, and our farmers. With the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, we will allow American companies to sell our goods and services in the emerging markets of Asia and create jobs here at home. A new trade agreement with Europe to help streamline and modernize standards and regulations will level the playing field for American companies.

Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States, and these trade agreements will give us the opportunity to build on the success that we already enjoy. In Minnesota, 750,000 jobs are directly connected to international trade. It is time for the President and the Congress to move forward on a robust trade agenda to help create a healthier economy.

CELEBRATING LIFE OF JIM NYSTROM

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Jim Nystrom of Titusville, Pennsylvania, who passed away last weekend.

After serving in the military, raising a family, and building a successful practice as a CPA, Jim still answered the call of his community each and every time it was raised. Over the years, he served as president of the school board, as a city council member,

as mayor of the city of Titusville, and on almost every board and organization that needed volunteer help to fulfill their mission. When local businesses found themselves in trouble, Jim was always there, lending his advice and expertise that saved countless jobs in the process, never with the expectation of credit or recognition.

Please join me in celebrating the life of Jim Nystrom and in sending the sympathy of this institution to Jim's family and to the many friends who survive him.

You will long be remembered, Jim, for your drive, your generosity, and for a life well lived.

THANKING SAN DIEGO FIRE DEPARTMENT AND CHIEF BRIAN FENNESSY

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight San Diego Brian Fennessy, assistant fire chief of the San Diego Fire-Rescue Department, who is here in D.C. sharing his expertise fighting wildfires so that communities across the country can be better prepared.

This morning, Chief Fennessy testified before the House Transportation Committee's Economic Development Subcommittee on ways to speed up disaster recovery and save taxpayer dollars by lessening the harm of disasters.

In San Diego, we have learned many lessons from the numerous firestorms of the last decade, including the importance of increasing preparedness and emergency planning, and the need for coordination among various levels of government.

As extreme weather becomes more prevalent, sharing information from local experiences on what does work and doesn't work will only become more important.

So thank you to Chief Fennessy for sharing your experience, and I thank all of the brave men and women of the San Diego Fire Department.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been blessed with children in the back of our minds always fear for their health and their safety. Maine is one of the safest States in America. Even so, our families have not been immune to the horror of child kidnapping, rape, and sex trafficking.

Two years ago, Maine State legislator Amy Volk had the courage to lead a very painful public discussion about the risk of human trafficking in Maine. Her persistence resulted in the awareness of this horrific violence waged against our children living in