

Our country is great, in part, because of our commitment to law and order. It is wrong to pursue a softening of our response to violent crime. To do so would invite more crime and produce more victims.

We must uphold the rule of law in America. Americans want it. Americans deserve it. That is exactly what this bill does. It defines violent crimes so that our immigration and criminal justice systems will have the tools necessary to remove violent immigrants from our country.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support this bill. Uphold law and order. Vote “yes” on the previous question. Vote “yes” on the resolution. And vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1051 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3773.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that

“the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida) at 1 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1051; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1051, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6691, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2018, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1051) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of “crime of violence”, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 181, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—224

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Aderholt	Buchanan	Crawford
Allen	Buck	Culberson
Amash	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Arrington	Budd	Curtis
Babin	Burgess	Davidson
Bacon	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Balderson	Calvert	Denham
Banks (IN)	Carter (GA)	DesJarlais
Barr	Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Barton	Chabot	Donovan
Bergman	Cheney	Duffy
Biggs	Cloud	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Dunn
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Emmer
Black	Collins (NY)	Estes (KS)
Blum	Comer	Faso
Bost	Comstock	Ferguson
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Brat	Cook	Fleischmann
Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)	Flores

Fortenberry	Lamborn	Rokita	Payne	Sánchez	Takano	Kinzing	Noem	Smith (MO)
Fox	Lance	Rooney, Francis	Pelosi	Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Knight	Norman	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	Latta	Roskam	Perlmutter	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Kustoff (TN)	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Gallagher	Lesko	Ross	Peters	Schiff	Tonko	Labrador	Olson	Smith (TX)
Garrett	Lewis (MN)	Rothfus	Peterson	Schneider	Torres	LaHood	Palmer	Smucker
Gianforte	LoBiondo	Rouzer	Pingree	Schrader	Tsongas	LaMalfa	Paulsen	Stefanik
Gibbs	Long	Russell	Pocan	Scott (VA)	Vargas	Lamb	Pearce	Stewart
Gohmert	Loudermilk	Rutherford	Polis	Scott, David	Veasey	Lamborn	Perry	Stivers
Goodlatte	Love	Sanford	Price (NC)	Serrano	Vela	Lance	Pittenger	Taylor
Gosar	Lucas	Scalise	Quigley	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez	Latta	Poliquin	Tenney
Gowdy	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert	Raskin	Shea-Porter	Visclosky	Lesko	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Granger	MacArthur	Scott, Austin	Rice (NY)	Sherman	Wasserman	Lewis (MN)	Ratcliffe	Thornberry
Graves (GA)	Marchant	Sensenbrenner	Richmond	Sinema	Schultz	LoBiondo	Reed	Tipton
Graves (LA)	Marino	Sessions	Rosen	Sires	Waters, Maxine	Long	Reichert	Trott
Graves (MO)	Marshall	Shimkus	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman	Loudermilk	Renacci	Turner
Griffith	Massie	Simpson	Ruiz	Soto	Welch	Love	Rice (SC)	Upton
Grothman	Mast	Smith (MO)	Ruppersberger	Suozzi	Wilson (FL)	Lucas	Roby	Valadao
Guthrie	McCarthy	Smith (NE)	Rush	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth	Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Wagner
Handel	McCaul	Smith (NJ)				MacArthur	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Harper	McClintock	Smith (TX)				Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Harris	McHenry	Smucker	Amodei	Huffman	Ros-Lehtinen	Marino	Rohrabacher	Walker
Hartzler	McKinley	Stefanik	Barletta	Jenkins (WV)	Royce (CA)	Marshall	Rokita	Walorski
Hensarling	McMorris	Stewart	Blackburn	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Mast	Rooney, Francis	Walters, Mimi
Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Stivers	Capuano	Moore	Shuster	McCarthy	Roskam	Weber (TX)
Hice, Jody B.	McSally	Taylor	Connolly	Neal	Speier	McCaul	Ross	Wenstrup
Higgins (LA)	Meadows	Tenney	DeSantis	Palazzo	Titus	McClintock	Rothfus	Westerman
Hill	Messer	Thompson (PA)	Ellison	Poe (TX)	Walz	Rouzer	Russell	Williams
Holding	Mitchell	Thornberry	Eshoo	Rooney, Thomas J.		McKinley	Rutherford	Wilson (SC)
Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Tipton	Gaetz			McMorris	Sanford	Wittman
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Trott				Rodgers	Scalise	Womack
Huizenga	Mullin	Turner				McSally	Schweikert	Woodall
Hultgren	Newhouse	Upton				Meadows	Scott, Austin	Yoder
Hunter	Noem	Valadao				Messer	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Hurd	Norman	Wagner				Mitchell	Sessions	Young (AK)
Issa	Nunes	Walberg				Moolenaar	Shimkus	Young (IA)
Jenkins (KS)	Olson	Walden				Mooney (WV)	Shuster	Zeldin
Johnson (LA)	Palmer	Walker				Mullin	Simpson	
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Walorski				Newhouse		
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Walters, Mimi						
Jones	Perry	Weber (TX)						
Jordan	Pittenger	Webster (FL)						
Joyce (OH)	Poliquin	Wenstrup						
Katko	Posey	Westerman						
Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Williams						
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Wilson (SC)						
King (IA)	Reichert	Wittman						
King (NY)	Renacci	Womack						
Kinzing	Rice (SC)	Woodall						
Knight	Roby	Yoder						
Kustoff (TN)	Roe (TN)	Yoho						
Labrador	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)						
LaHood	Rogers (KY)	Young (IA)						
LaMalfa	Rohrabacher	Zeldin						

NOT VOTING—24

□ 1326

Messrs. PETERSON, RUSH, and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 179, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—225

Adams	Delaney	Kildee	Abraham	Comer	Gosar	Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Aguilar	DeLauro	Kilmer	Aderholt	Comstock	Govdy	Fudge	Meng
Barragán	DelBene	Kind	Allen	Conaway	Granger	Gabbard	Moulton
Bass	Demings	Krishnamoorthi	Arrington	Cook	Graves (GA)	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Kuster (NH)	Babin	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)	Garamendi	Nadler
Bera	Deutch	Lamb	Bacon	Cramer	Graves (MO)	Gomez	Napolitano
Beyer	Dingell	Langevin	Balderson	Crawford	Griffith	Gonzalez (TX)	Nolan
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Banks (IN)	Crist	Grothman	Gottheimer	Norcross
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Larsen (CT)	Barr	Culberson	Handel	Green, Al	O'Halleran
Blunt Rochester	F.	Lawrence	Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Harper	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Bonamici	Engel	Lawson (FL)	Bergman	Curtis	Harris	Grijalva	Pallone
Boyle, Brendan	Españillat	Lee	Biggs	Davidson	Hartzler	Gutiérrez	Panetta
F.	Esty (CT)	Levin	Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Evans	Lewis (GA)	Bishop (MI)	Denham	Herrera Beutler	Hastings	Payne
Brown (MD)	Foster	Lieu, Ted	Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hice, Jody B.	Heck	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski	Black	Diaz-Balart	Higgins (LA)	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Bustos	Fudge	Loebsack	Blum	Donovan	Hill	Himes	Peters
Butterfield	Gabbard	Lofgren	Bost	Duffy	Holding	Hoyer	Peterson
Carbajal	Gallego	Lowenthal	Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lowey	Brat	Duncan (TN)	Hudson	Jayapal	Pocan
Carson (IN)	Gomez	Lujan Grisham,	Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Huizenga	Jeffries	Polis
Cartwright	Gonzalez (TX)	M.	Brooks (IN)	Emmer	Hultgren	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Gottheimer	Luján, Ben Ray	Buchanan	Estes (KS)	Hunter	Kaptur	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Lynch	Buck	Faso	Hurd	Keating	Raskin
Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	Maloney,	Bucshon	Ferguson	Issa	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Grijalva	Carolyn B.	Budd	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)	Kennedy	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	Matsui	Burgess	Fleischmann	Johnson (LA)	Khanna	Rosen
Clarke (NY)	Hanabusa	McCollum	Byrne	Flores	Johnson (OH)	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Hastings	McEachin	Calvert	Fortenberry	Jones	Kilmer	Ruiz
Cleaver	Heck	McGovern	Carter (GA)	Fox	Jordan	Kind	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Carter (TX)	Franklinghuysen	Joyce (OH)	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Cohen	Himes	Meeks	Chabot	Gaetz	Katko	Kuster (NH)	Sánchez
Cooper	Hoyer	Meng	Cheney	Gallagher	Kelly (MS)	Langevin	Sarbanes
Correa	Jackson Lee	Moulton	Cloud	Garrett	Kelly (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Costa	Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Coffman	Gianforte	King (IA)	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Courtney	Jeffries	Nadler	Cole	Gibbs	King (NY)	Lawrence	Schrader
Crist	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Collins (GA)	Gohmert		Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte		Lee	Scott, David
Cuellar	Kaptur	Norcross				Levin	Serrano
Cummings	Keating	O'Halleran				Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke				Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Khanna	Pallone				Lipinski	Sherman
DeFazio	Kihuen	Panetta				Loebsack	Sinema
DeGette		Pascarell				Lofgren	Sires
						Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
						Lowey	Soto
						Lujan Grisham,	Suozzi
						M.	Swalwell (CA)
						Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
						Lynch	Takano
						Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
						Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
						Massie	Tonko
						Matsui	Torres
						McCollum	Tsongas
						McEachin	Vargas
						McGovern	Veasey
						McNerney	Vela
							Velázquez

NOES—179

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Aguilar	Fudge	Meng
Amash	Gabbard	Moulton
Barragán	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Garamendi	Nadler
Beatty	Gomez	Napolitano
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	Nolan
Beyer	Gottheimer	Norcross
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	O'Halleran
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Blunt Rochester	Grijalva	Pallone
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Panetta
Boyle, Brendan	Hanabusa	Pascarell
F.	Hastings	Payne
Brady (PA)	Heck	Pelosi
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Peters
Bustos	Hoyer	Peterson
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Carbajal	Jayapal	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Polis
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Kaptur	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Keating	Raskin
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Richmond
Cicilline	Khanna	Rosen
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Ruiz
Clay	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kind	Rush
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Cooper	Langevin	Schakowsky
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Costa	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Courtney	Lawrence	Schrader
Crowley	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lee	Scott, David
Cummings	Levin	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sherman
DeGette	Loebsack	Sinema
	Lofgren	Sires
	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
	Lowey	Soto
	Lujan Grisham,	Suozzi
	M.	Swalwell (CA)
	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
	Lynch	Takano
	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
	Massie	Tonko
	Matsui	Torres
	McCollum	Tsongas
	McEachin	Vargas
	McGovern	Veasey
	McNerney	Vela
		Velázquez

Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)

Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Amodei
Barletta
Blackburn
Capuano
Connolly
DeSantis
Ellison
Eshoo
Huffman

Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Maloney, Sean
Moore
Neal
Palazzo
Poe (TX)
Rooney, Thomas
J.

Ros-Lehtinen
Royce (CA)
Ryan (OH)
Speier
Titus
Walz
Webster (FL)
Welch

□ 1334

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 6417

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 6417.

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

There was no objection.

ENSURING SMALL SCALE LNG CERTAINTY AND ACCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSON. 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 the bill, H.R. 4606.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1049 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. 4606.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1338

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. 4606) to provide that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas shall be granted without modification or delay, with Ms. CHENEY 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 Texas (Mr. OLSON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale

LNG Certainty and Access Act, a bill written by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

This important bill will speed up the review of applications to export small amounts of natural gas to the emerging small LNG markets in the Caribbean, Central America, and South America. This bill will strengthen our energy security, create jobs at home, and open new markets for Americans.

This bill is about creating a level playing field for the smallest projects. Right now, to export natural gas to a country that we have a free trade agreement with, it is approved without red tape. We want to do that for very small projects, too, no matter the buyer.

H.R. 4606 is truly focused on “small-scale” projects. We are talking about projects that amount to maybe one-tenth of 1 percent of the natural gas America consumes every single day. It is only 0.14 billion cubic feet per day. The big LNG products that you hear about are more like 2 billion cubic feet per day. That is 0.14 versus 2 billion cubic feet. These are tiny projects worth looking at. We want them to make their way to the emerging markets.

But don't let the small size fool you. Just as larger LNG exports help us push back against Vladimir Putin and help free Eastern Europe, small LNG will preserve American influence in Latin America. We can give our trading partners a cleaner, more dependable option than unreliable and unstable Venezuelan exports. That is why I call our LNG exports “liquid American freedom.” America will never turn off the spigot over politics.

Madam Chair, this is a bipartisan bill. It went through regular order in the Energy and Commerce Committee, where we held hearings and accepted a bipartisan amendment to perfect the bill.

The Department of Energy is also in support of this bill's intent. Passing this bill, they said, means “saving several months of review time, at a minimum.”

We have also heard from LNG producers, terminal operators, and overseas developers. One said it will provide certainty and speed up “America's rise as a world-class exporter of natural gas, creating U.S. jobs, growing our economy, strengthening global energy security, all while reducing emissions and pollution.”

I believe it is important to point out that H.R. 4606 makes absolutely no changes to environmental law. In fact, at our markup we accepted a bipartisan amendment that clarifies that any project would have to qualify for a broad exclusion under NEPA to be put on the fast track. This bill is not about waiving environmental laws.

□ 1345

Most importantly, DOD is working on the same problem and is improving their rules as we speak. They say that

many of the countries in the Caribbean and Latin America don't have enough demand to cover the costs of enormous import terminals for huge ships. The small-scale LNG export market is the only path that makes sense to bring affordable American energy to these projects and countries.

Congress needs to put DOE's policy into law. That is the only way we can create certainty. No one wants to make investments on a single administration's policy. Congress must create certainty, and this bill does just that.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill. It is good for our economy, our jobs, and our economic diplomacy.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This bill is unnecessary because the Department of Energy is aggressively approving liquefied natural gas exports. DOE currently conducts a public interest review of all applications to export LNG to a country without a free trade agreement with the United States, and this process is working just fine.

To date, DOE has granted final approval for 29 applications to export LNG. Over the past few years, the U.S. has emerged as one of the largest exporters in the world.

There is no backlog of applications or delay at DOE to speak of, and the Trump administration has taken every opportunity to promote U.S. natural gas abroad.

In July, the Department of Energy finalized a rule to automatically approve applications to export less than 0.14 billion cubic feet per day of LNG. It declares in this rule that all small-scale exports are always in the public interest, removes longstanding consumer protections of the Natural Gas Act, prevents the public from having the opportunity to know about or provide input on export proposals, and violates the public hearing requirements of the Natural Gas Act.

Rather than stand up for American consumers and manufacturers who benefit from low natural gas prices, the Trump administration is boosting the profits of oil and gas special interests by allowing them to export LNG without any regard for domestic impacts.

This bill is intended to codify DOE's small-scale LNG rule, but proponents have not justified the need for swift congressional action on a rule that was just finalized.

There are drawbacks to codifying the rule with such a prescriptive volume requirement. For example, should the circumstances arise where exporting this amount of LNG is no longer in the public interest, Congress would then have to enact a new law to make any necessary changes.

In addition, Madam Chair, an unrestricted export policy could lead to even higher levels of LNG exports, which could have significant impacts