1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS CIAVARRA
3	HIF347030
4	
5	
6	THE IMPACTS AND FUTURE OF NORTH AMERICAN
7	ENERGY TRADE
8	WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2017
9	House of Representatives
10	Subcommittee on Energy
11	Committee on Energy and Commerce
12	Washington, D.C.
13	
14	
15	
16	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:15 a.m., in
17	Room 2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton [chairman
18	of the subcommittee] presiding.
19	Members present: Representatives Upton, Olson, Barton,
20	Shimkus, Latta, McKinley, Kinzinger, Griffith, Johnson, Flores,
21	Mullin, Cramer, Walberg, Duncan, Rush, McNerney, Peters, Welch,
22	Tonko, Loebsack, and Pallone (ex officio).
23	Staff present: Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Allie Bury,
24	Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Wyatt Ellertson, Research
25	Associate, Energy/Environment; A.T. Johnston, Senior Policy

Advisor, Energy; Ben Lieberman, Senior Counsel, Energy; Mary
Martin, Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy & Environment; Brandon
Mooney, Deputy Chief Energy Advisor; Mark Ratner, Policy
Coordinator; Annelise Rickert, Counsel, Energy; Dan Schneider,
Press Secretary; Peter Spencer, Professional Staff Member,
Energy; Jason Stanek, Senior Counsel, Energy; Madeline Vey,
Policy Coordinator, Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection;
Priscilla Barbour, Minority Energy Fellow; Jeff Carroll, Minority
Staff Director; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff
Director, Energy and Environment; John Marshall, Minority Policy
Coordinator; Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tuley
Wright, Minority Energy and Environment Policy Advisor; and C.J.
Young, Minority Press Secretary.

39 Mr. Upton. Good morning. Good morning, everybody, and 40 welcome to everyone that's here. Appreciate you all taking time 41 so close to the holiday season to be with us today. That's for 42 This hearing builds upon the Energy and Commerce 43 Committee's impressive record of hearings on energy security, job 44 creation, and infrastructure. 45 One of the many things that I appreciate about this 46 subcommittee is that we have members who represent both northern 47 and southern border states. 48 As a proud Michigander, I will be focusing my comments and 49 questions more on our relationship with Canada, while I am sure 50 my friends from Texas -- it was a nice win by Michigan over Texas in basketball last night -- will be focusing more on Mexico. 51 52 But one thing I want to make clear, this hearing is about North American integration, specifically, the impacts and future 53 of North American energy trade. 54 55 We want to examine how North American energy trade has 56 strengthened all of our economies and our trading relationships. Nationally, 14 million jobs are tied to trade with Mexico 57 In Michigan, it is nearly 400,000. This trade makes 58 and Canada. 59 us more competitive internationally and can prove to be the difference between creating or shedding 60 61 jobs. 62 Eighty-four percent of petroleum and coal products exported 63 from Michigan go to either Mexico or Canada. The energy markets 64 of Canada, Mexico, and the U.S. are becoming 65 increasingly interdependent, thanks in large part to the free 66 trade status of energy commodities. 67 When we think about energy trade, we are including crude oil, 68 refined petroleum products and other liquids, natural gas, and 69 electricity. 70 To sum it up, we have transmission lines that go across the 71 border, we have got pipelines that go across or under the border, 72 and we have goods and services that go across the 73 border as well. 74 Energy trade is much more than just commodities. There is 75 also a huge supply chain supporting everything. The multiplier 76 effect of energy trade is great throughout our economy. 77 Trilateral engagement is not just about trade, but also about 78 information sharing. Just last month, the Energy Information Administration announced the launch of a 79 80 website on North American Cooperation on Energy Information, or 81 NACEI. This resource consolidates energy-related data, maps, 82 references from the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. The current areas 83 84 of focus include comparing, validating, and improving respective energy import and export information; 85 sharing publicly available geospatial information related to 86 87 energy infrastructure, and exchanging views and information on 88 protection of cross-border energy flows with the harmonization

89 terminology, concepts, and the definitions of energy products. 90 This will allow each country to work together for the benefit 91 of all three countries. 92 The centerpiece of our trade relationship, of course, is 93 NAFTA, which entered into force on January 1st, 1994. On May 18th 94 of this year, the Trump Administration sent a 90-day notification 95 to Congress of its intent to begin talks with Canada and Mexico 96 to renegotiate NAFTA. 97 Currently, negotiations are holding intersessional meetings 98 in Washington though mid-December in advance of a sixth round of 99 negotiations which are scheduled to be 100 held from January 23rd to the 28th in Montreal. 101 My expectation is that today's hearing will provide some 102 context for the NAFTA negotiations. I look forward to hearing 103 the testimony of our witnesses and engaging in a conversation about the benefits of a robust North American 104 105 energy sector. And with that, I yield to the ranking member of the 106 107 subcommittee, Mr. Rush. 108 109 [The prepared statement of Mr. Upton follows:] 110 111 **************************

112 I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding 113 this important hearing on the impact and future of the North 114 American energy and trade. 115 Mr. Chairman, I have held several meetings with relevant 116 stakeholders concerned with the Trump administration's 117 ill-advised decision to try and unilaterally change or get rid 118 of existing agreements, existing accords, and treaties. 119 Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, we have heard the president 120 talk of reneging on a mass array of deals signed by the previous 121 administration on everything from the Iran nuclear deal to the 122 Paris agreement up to and including major trade agreements such 123 as NAFTA. 124 Personally, Mr. Chairman, while I did not vote for NAFTA when 125 126 127 128

it came before the House, I do have concerns over the constitutionality of a president singlehandedly changing or overturning a trade agreement that was passed by Congress.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, and as importantly, I also have grave concerns over the global perception of the credibility of the United States when neither our friends or allies nor other foreign powers can depend on the sincerity of the U.S. government if anything a new president -- if at any time a new president takes office he or she chooses to reverse or renege on agreements signed under the previous administration.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this appears to me a recurring theme of this president's chaotic governing philosophy where no

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

previous accord is ever safe from interference and any promise can be voided at any time regardless if it is made to friend or foe.

Mr. Chairman, based just on the merits, the Energy Information Administration estimates that energy trade between the North American countries exceeded \$140 billion just in 2015 alone and with the U.S. importing an estimated \$100 million and exporting over \$40 million in energy products with Canada and Mexico.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, just last year, former President
Obama signed the North American Climate, Clean Energy, and
Environment Partnership along with his counterparts from Canada
and Mexico.

This important agreement established several objectives, Mr. Chairman, and benchmarks aimed at advancing clean energy and reducing climate changing -- climate inducing pollutants between all three countries with the goal of 50 percent clean power generation by the year 2025.

Mr. Chairman, this pact would also help to develop cross-border transmission partners while improving it and aligning appliance and equipment efficiency standards between all three partners.

At a time when the U.S. has become more intertwined and interdependent in our dealings with other countries both economically as well as for national security purposes, we cannot

162 expect to be seen as a credible leader within the global arena 163 while at the very same time thumbing our nose at previous deals 164 and agreements just because they were signed by a president from 165 another party. 166 Instead, we must show leadership in Congress to demonstrate 167 to our friends and allies as well as to our foes and competitors 168 that the U.S. will honor the deals that we signed and we will not 169 renege on our promises. 170 Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you. I look forward to hearing 171 from our witnesses today and also want to at the same time welcome 172 our witnesses. And I yield back the balance of my time. 173 174 Chairman yields back. Mr. Upton. 175 I know the chairman of the full committee is on his way from 176 the hearing that's downstairs. So at this point I'll yield five minutes to the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone. 177 178 Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 179 Regardless of the outcome of the current NAFTA talks, the U.S. will continue to trade fossil fuel commodities with Canada 180 181 and Mexico for years to come and I'd like to see a change in our 182 focus. 183 Rather than focusing on trading fossil fuel commodities, we should prioritize expansion of renewable energy technologies and 184

According to the Energy Information Administration, more

how they can benefit the North American electricity grid.

185

than half of new electricity-generating capacity added to the grid between 2014 and '16 came from renewable technologies and we should look at expanding this technology so that we can make renewables a larger part of our electric exports.

In 2009, the U.S.-Canada clean energy dialogue was launched to encourage clean energy technology development among our two nations when key aspect of this collaboration focused on expanding and modernizing the North American transmission grid to facilitate movement of renewable power between the United States and Canada, and right now there are several large-scale transmission projects in the works to bring renewable power across the United States' borders with Canada and Mexico and the modernization of the grid in order to facilitate these types of projects is critical to the overall future of energy development in North America.

The United States has also forged a strong agreement with Canada and Mexico to address climate pollution and advance clean energy.

In 2016, the countries established the North American Climate, Clean Energy, and Environment Partnership.

Collectively, the partnership set a goal of 50 percent clean power generation and the more than 40 percent reduction on methane emissions by 2025.

And the Trump administration has been silent on this commitment. But based on the president's foolish decision to

213 hopes that he will fulfill this commitment. 214 It's unfortunate that the Republic majority has focused 215 today's hearing primarily on fossil fuels. Instead, I believe 216 it's even more important for us to focus on ways we can continue to work with our neighbors to reduce carbon emissions and expand 217 218 trade and clean energy technologies. We have a knowledgeable 219 panel of witnesses before us and I look forward to hearing their 220 testimony. 221 I don't know if anyone else wanted -- yes, I yield the 222 remainder of my time to Mr. Green. 223 Thank you, Ranking Member, for yielding to me. Mr. Green. Energy trade between the U.S., Canada, and Mexico has been 224 225 at all-time high in recent years. Where the U.S. is the largest 226 producer of crude oil on the continent, Canadian reserves far 227 Mexico also has significant discoveries of outstrip our own. offshore sites in the Gulf over this summer. 228 229 Many Texas refineries rely on Mexican imports for their 230 source of crude oil. At the end of this year, Mexico has a demand of about 600,000 barrels a day of gasoline imports due to their 231 232 lack of refining capacity. 233 A huge percentage of this 600,000 barrels of day will come 234 from the refinery complexes we have along the Texas Gulf coast. 235 While the U.S. and Canada have integrated our energy markets to 236 a great degree post-NAFTA and with Mexico's recent reforms in the

walk away from the Paris climate agreement, I do not have high

237 coming years cooperation among the countries will only get 238 stronger. 239 NAFTA has been a success in many ways but did not contain 240 many provisions on energy policy. Our first goal when discussing 241 how to improve NAFTA should be closer ties and friendship among 242 all three countries. 243 Our second goal should be an integrated North American energy 244 This is one reason I introduced our cross-border 245 infrastructure bill with our colleague, Representative Mullin, 246 earlier this year. 247 There are 11 cross-border projects awaiting a decision by 248 249 250 create the regulatory rules by which infrastructure is constructed. 251

the Department of State in the present and including electric lines and water pipelines. It's Congress' responsibility to

Our bill, H.R. 2883, which passed our committee on the floor of the House, would create a regulatory process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of State, Department of Energy to permit cross-border infrastructure by recognizing the energy trade between Mexico, Canada as in our national interest.

It is my hope that the Senate will soon take up this language so we can continue building on that success and we should embrace the changes taking place in North America and harmonize our policies with those of our neighbors to the north and the south.

And again, thank you for the time by our ranking member.

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

262 I yield back. 263 Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. 264 We are ready for the testimony. I want to appreciate our 265 witnesses providing the testimony in advance. It'll be made part 266 of the record. You will be given each the opportunity take five minutes to 267 268 summarize that statement and then we will begin with questions. 269 Our witnesses today, Karen Harbert, president and CEO, 270 Global Energy Institute, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and a former 271 under secretary from the Department of Energy -- goes back a long 272 ways; Chet Thompson, president of the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers; Allen Burchett, global head of 273 274 strategic projects on behalf the National Association of 275 Manufacturers; and Alan Krupnick, senior fellow for the Resources 276 for the Future.

Ms. Harbert, we will start with you. Welcome. Nice to see you.

277

279 ?STATEMENTS OF KAREN HARBERT, PRESIDENT AND CEO, GLOBAL ENERGY 280 INSTITUTE, U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; CHET THOMPSON, PRESIDENT AND 281 CEO, AMERICAN FUEL AND PETROCHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS; DR. ALAN 282 KRUPNICK, SENIOR FELLOW, RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE; ALLEN 283 BURCHETT, GLOBAL HEAD OF STRATEGIC PROJECTS, ABB INC., ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS 284 285 286 STATEMENT OF MS. HARBERT 287 Ms. Harbert. Nice to see you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and 288 thank you, Ranking Member Rush, and all members of the committee. As the chairman said, I am Karen Harbert, president and CEO 289 290 of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Global Energy Institute. 291 As many of you have noted, the U.S., Canada, and Mexico have 292 a long history of shared energy trade but for most of that time 293 as a global economic leader and a large energy consumer the U.S. has been purchasing large supplies of oil and natural gas from 294 295 both nations. 296 Today, the U.S. has the largest hydrocarbon resource base 297 in the world plus very large nuclear and renewable bases in this 298 country. 299 The speed with which the U.S. has moved from energy scarcity 300 to abundance has been nothing short of breathtaking. is fortunate to have two neighboring countries -- Canada and 301 302 Mexico -- that are also large energy producers. Canada ranks

number eighth globally and Mexico twenty-fourth.

304 Unthinkable 10 years ago today, North America's abundant 305 energy resources are upending the global energy market. Combined 306 production from the U.S., Canada, and Mexico accounts for 19 307 percent of all crude oil, 20 percent of natural gas, and 12 percent 308 of all coal output. 309 Having a large share of world energy production in North 310 America not only helps our own energy and national security, it 311 also helps global energy security by diversifying supplies, 312 ensuring that a large share of global output occurs in reliable 313 countries. We have always had a very open trade relationship with 314 While our trade relationship with Mexico has 315 Canada. traditionally been strong, Mexico has long prohibited foreign 316 317 investment in its hydrocarbon sector. But that all changed in 2013 when Mexico instituted 318 319 constitutional reforms to put an end to the more than 70-year 320 monopoly enjoyed by state-owned oil company Pemex. 321 Today, the U.S. is a net importer of crude oil from both 322 In 2016, the U.S. imported about 580,000 Mexico and Canada. barrels per day from Mexico and nearly 3 million barrels per day 323 from Canada. 324 325 Notably, the U.S. now imports more oil from Canada and Mexico That's very important to take note of. 326 than OPEC. 327 Since 2011, the U.S. has been a net exporter of refined 328 There was lively trade in products among U.S., Canada,

329 and Mexico, and the trends now favor the United States, growing 330 its share. 331 Although the U.S. is a net importer of natural gas from 332 Canada, that is not expected to remain much longer. The U.S. has 333 been a net exporter of gas to Mexico since the mid-1980s and 334 exports are growing tremendously. 335 As more infrastructure is added linking the U.S. and Canada, 336 we welcome legislation to facilitate that. We expect that the 337 U.S. will be a net exporter to both countries. 338 In 2016, Mexico and Canada accounted for 13 percent of all U.S. net coal exports which yielded a \$440 million trade surplus. 339 We expend the downward trend in coal exports to continue and 340 exports to other countries to grow. We have a growing and 341 342 integrated electricity market. There are 25 transmission crossings between the U.S. and Canada and 11 crossings between 343 the United States and Mexico. 344 345 So in summary, for the last six years we have been running 346 a trade surplus with Canada and Mexico in refined petroleum and coal, and while the trade deficit in oil and gas remains, it will 347 be shrinking rapidly. 348 349 The abundance of affordable energy in North America has given 350 U.S. businesses a critical leg up. We pay about two to four times less for natural gas, coal, and electricity than many of our 351 352 competitors. 353 But the benefits aren't limited to just industry.

354 Over the last six years, average annual consumers, too. 355 household energy expenditures declined by 14.1 percent. 356 As these trends demonstrate, the U.S. Now on to NAFTA. 357 energy economy has nothing to fear from NAFTA and a lot to gain. 358 A modernized NAFTA could sustain advantages for North American 359 industry and advance the market-based integration of our energy 360 sectors. 361 However, we are concerned that withdrawing from NAFTA would 362 impose unacceptably high cost to the U.S. when we are engaged in 363 historic tax reform and regulatory reform to get our economy 364 growing above 3 percent. We are also worried about attempts to undermine the investor 365 366 state dispute settlement protections in NAFTA, which are 367 indispensable to maintaining our growing energy sector and 368 provide neutral arbitration to ensure other countries treat our 369 investors fairly. 370 In short, the robust energy trade amongst the U.S., Canada, 371 and Mexico would be threatened by a withdrawal from NAFTA. Given 372 all of this, it is our strongest recommendation that if NAFTA modernization cannot be reached that the administration must 373 374 retain its commitment to the current trade agreement. Today, the story of North American energy is one of increased 375 economic, national, and energy security for all three countries. 376 377 Thank you very much. 378 [The statement of Ms. Harbert follows:]

379

380

381 Mr. Upton. Thank you.

382 Mr. Thompson.

?STATEMENT OF MR. THOMPSON

Mr. Thompson. Good morning, everyone. Thank you, Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Rush, and the rest of the subcommittee members for the opportunity to testify today.

My name is Chet Thompson. I am the president of American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers. AFPM represents 97 percent of the nation's refining and petrochemical manufacturing capacity including 118 refineries, 248 petrochemical facilities in 33 states.

We support more than 3 million jobs and add approximately \$600 billion each year to the U.S. economy. Our members make the gasoline, the diesel, the jet fuel, and the petrochemicals that make our modern way of life possible.

We are the world's largest refining industry today and a global leader in petrochemical production, making us the backbone of global manufacturing and transportation.

Our energy trade relationships with Canada and Mexico are critical to enhancing our position. I am going to expand -- I would like to expand on only a few points in my written testimony.

First, Canada and Mexico are helping us achieve North

American energy security. Although U.S. crude production has

increased dramatically over the last, you know, decade or so, our

refineries still import on average 8 million barrels a day of

crude.

408 Canada and Mexico combined supply nearly have of this volume. 409 In fact, Canada is the largest supplier of crude oil to the U.S., 410 supplying more than 3 million barrels a day, or 41 percent of all 411 of our imports. 412 We get more from Canada than all the other OPEC members 413 Mexico supplies 600,000 barrels a day. They're our 414 fourth largest supplier, representing 7 percent. Not only do we 415 support to our neighbors -- import from our neighbors but we also 416 export a substantial amount of our energy as well. 417 The U.S. exports nearly 5 million barrels per day of petroleum products. About a third of that goes to Canada and 418 419 Mexico each year. Mexico is our largest export market for 420 U.S.-refined products. 421 Last year, we exported approximately 14 billion gallons of 422 petroleum products to Mexico. This helped meet more than half 423 of their gasoline demand and contributed approximately \$11 424 billion of energy trade surplus -- surplus with Mexico. 425 Likewise, we exported almost 9 billion gallons to Canada. 426 Together, exports to Canada and Mexico have grown from essentially 427 zero before NAFTA to more than 1.4 million barrels per day. That's about 7 percent of our total refining production and 428 429 about a third of our exports just to those two countries alone. 430 As a result of our increased energy production and the 431 increasingly integrated North American energy market, the IEA now 432 projects that North America will be energy secure by 2020.

This is good for our country and it's good for the American consumer. We also export a substantial volume of chemicals to both Mexico and Canada. Trade in all chemicals has more than tripled over the last two decades from approximately \$20 billion in 1994 to \$63 billion in 2014.

My second point -- North American trade is growing our economy. Our relationships with Canada and Mexico have made our

economy. Our relationships with Canada and Mexico have made our energy industry strong and that strength has attracted more investment.

Indeed, right now there is more than \$185 billion in the queue for further investments in our refining and petrochemical industries.

With that investment comes the need for more employment and a strong work force. Demand for skilled labor positions is expected to grow by 12 percent by 2024. We will hire additional skilled labor to work as welders, electricians, pipefitters, boilermakers, and many other positions.

Changes in the global energy market, advances in technology, and legal reforms will provide further opportunities for U.S. companies. For example, the opening of the Mexican energy sector has allowed us to compete and sell our products in Mexico, leading to billions of dollars of investment by U.S. companies.

My last point I would like to make is that AFPM fully supports

NAFTA and believes it helps achieve energy security. North

American energy security is the result of our plentiful natural

458 resources that we are blessed with, the ingenuity of our energy 459 sector, but also NAFTA. NAFTA has played a very important role 460 in our growth. 461 Thus, we support the continuation of NAFTA but think the 462 agreement should be modernized. For example, NAFTA's investment 463 protection should be strengthened consistent with other more 464 recent U.S. free trade agreements, or at the very least, investor 465 protections must be maintained. 466 Second, NAFTA should help increase regulatory coordination 467 in cross-border energy infrastructure. Finally, NAFTA customs procedures should be streamlined and modernized to reflect the 468 469 way that energy and petrochemical trading occurs today across our 470 borders. 471 So, again, I appreciate the opportunity to be here and look 472 forward to answering your questions. 473 Thank you. 474 [The statement of Mr. Thompson follows:] 475 476 *********INSERT 3******

477 Mr. Upton. Thank you.

478 Dr. Krupnick.

24 479 ?STATEMENT OF MR. KRUPNICK 480 481 Mr. Krupnick. Mr. Chairman --482 Mr. Upton. You got to hit that button. 483 Mr. Krupnick. There we go. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, and other members of this 484 485 subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to speak today about 486 energy trade with our Mexican and Canadian neighbors. 487 I come before you as an economist, a senior fellow, and leader 488 of the North American Energy Initiative at Resources for the 489 Future. 490 RFF's mission is to improve environmental, energy, and 491 natural resource decisions through impartial economic research and policy engagement. RFF is nonadvocacy and does not take 492 493 positions on issues so these opinions are mine. Today, I am here to advocate for greater harmonization and 494 495 integration of energy markets and economic and environmental 496 policies across the three countries, and I am very happy to hear 497 the words today harmonization and integration across the aisle 498 at this hearing from the members. That's great. 499 So with appropriate policies and agreements with our neighbors, North American can be the world's energy powerhouse. 500 501 Free trade in energy and electricity promises greater economic

prosperity, a cleaner environment, and greater energy security

in all three countries.

502

These countries have been moving towards harmonization in these sectors for years now. On the economic front, the Mexican energy reforms opened up oil and gas leasing and exploitation to U.S. companies. The reforms also expanded markets for our pipelines, generation technology, and natural gas.

Mexico continues to greatly increase natural gas imports from the U.S. to replace oil fire generation. This development will reduce electricity generation costs, lower air pollution emissions from power plants, and increase energy security for Mexico, which is a good thing.

And U.S. producers have access to a large market for their natural gas. If, however, NAFTA negotiations go badly or if political interference in the strait occurs, we could see increase costs and delays in exporting gas.

We might even run the risk of Mexico eventually turning away from the U.S. as a supplier, and we certainly wouldn't want that for American producers or Mexican consumers.

The electricity sector, likewise, can benefit from increased integration. We have found the cross-border interconnections and capacity planning occur less frequently than they should to maximize electricity reliability.

On the environmental front, as was mentioned, during the Obama administration the U.S. became party to several tripartide agreements to improve energy efficiency, reduce methane emissions, work towards major CO2 reductions.

These gains are being reversed by the Trump administration even as Canada and Mexico continue to solidify their policies to reduce greenhouse gases.

Canada has implemented a national carbon price for provinces that do not already have a price for trading system. Mexico, along with its limited carbon tax, is in the process of implementing a pilot cap and trade program, and joining California and some Canadian provinces in that.

So what can be done in general and specifically by Congress to realize the benefits of greater harmonization? First, the bill that you have introduced is a great start and be vocal in supporting free energy trade and investment protections already in NAFTA. We wary of unintended consequences of NAFTA failing.

Second, remember that as the U.S. continues to roll back climate regulations such as its methane rules, our neighbors may grow increasingly concerned about competitiveness issues.

Mexico and Canada may likewise become hesitant in efforts to align environmental policies in the future, limiting our opportunities that might improve environmental outcomes at lower cost to the private sector and consumers here in the United States.

Third, Congress can support past and future efforts to align economic, environmental, and safety regulations for offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. There is already an agreement to build upon and DOI has worked closely with Mexican regulators to share best practices and align offshore safety regulations.

554 Such work should continue so that we can ensure successful and 555 responsible offshore drilling. 556 Fourth, Congress can help promote, along with our neighbors' 557 counterparts, the vision of renewable capacity growth in areas 558 that capture their locational advantages -- for instance, solar 559 in Mexico, hydro in Canada -- for selling into an integrated North 560 American grid. 561 Lastly, Congress can work to further improve the U.S. infrastructure siting and permitting process. Pipelines, 562 563 transmission lines are needed to execute this vision of a North 564 America system. Streamlining and strengthening this process can occur while 565 improving environmental social outcomes, for example, by using 566 567 cost benefit analysis in permitting decisions. 568 As our two neighbors are likewise facing similar challenges in this area, we should aim to share best practice. 569 570 So, ultimately, the fates of the Mexican-Canadian-U.S. 571 energy sectors are intertwined. The interdependence actually benefits the three countries, increases our joint energy 572 573 security. 574 Congress can play an important role in seeing this vision 575 become a reality. 576 Thank you. [The statement of Mr. Krupnick follows:] 577 578

579

**********INSERT 4*******

Mr. Upton. Thank you very much.

581 Mr. Burchett.

?STATEMENT OF MR. BURCHETT

Mr. Burchett. Good morning Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Rush, members of the subcommittee, and my fellow panellists.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Allen Burchett and I am global head of strategic projects for ABB.

I am testifying on behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers, which represent nearly 14,000 small, medium, and large manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states.

We are the number-one manufacturer of power grids in the world and a leader in industrial automation for the petrochemical industries. We are the number-one producer of electric motors and the second largest producer of electric drives and industrial robots. We supply the energy, the electricity, and manufacturing sectors with enabling technologies that help them stay competitive.

ABB has a strong and growing U.S. manufacturing footprint and is proud of our 20,000 employees across 50 manufacturing facilities including those in Michigan, Texas, Oklahoma, Ohio, Virginia, and North Carolina, which is home to our U.S. headquarters.

Over the past decade, we've invested over \$11 billion the United States, tripling our workforce. We have chosen to invest in the U.S. because it's our largest market worldwide and we

607 believe in being close to our customer. We believe in the 608 American worker. 609 A strong North American supply chain has supported our 610 domestic growth and investments, enabling ABB to competitively 611 manufacture here. 612 For manufacturers throughout the U.S., the North American 613 commercial market is the most important market in the world. 614 60 percent of U.S. manufacturing output in 2016 -- \$1.36 trillion -- was sold in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. 615 616 Canada and Mexico alone purchased one-fifth of all U.S.-manufactured goods in 2016, more than the next 10 U.S. 617 Eleven manufacturing sectors have 618 trading partners combined. experienced growth of more than 50 percent since 1993. 619 620 Of particular interest to this subcommittee, energy products 621 have led the pack, with over 250 percent growth. Most U.S. 622 manufacturing sectors, 36 out of 42, count Canada or Mexico as 623 their top foreign market. 624 Despite growth in manufacturing and a changing energy 625 landscape has created a major need for new and improved energy 626 delivery infrastructure. Investor-owned utilities alone expect to invest more than \$300 billion over the next three years. 627 628 ABB has been a participant in this manufacturing boom and has developed an integrated North American supply chain that 629 630 supports our domestic manufacturing capabilities and operations. 631

While much of the manufacturing of these technologies

632 happens domestically -- many of our customers are domestic --633 certain parts of the manufacturing processes occur in Canada and 634 Mexico, and many of the offerings produced in the U.S. are exported 635 to customers in Canada and Mexico. 636 I would like to provide a few examples. ABB is the largest 637 producer of power transformers in the world. These transformers 638 can be found at power plants, manufacturing facilities, and in 639 neighbourhoods across the U.S. We build transformers at plants in Mississippi, Virginia, Missouri, and Tennessee. 640 641 Yet, the insulation material used as inputs into these 642 transformers are sourced from a Canadian company. Bartlesville, Oklahoma, ABB manufactures measurement and 643 644 analytics products for the oil and gas sector. 645 Our factory imports metal housings from the supplier in 646 Mexico and electronic circuit boards from an ABB plant in Canada, which are both then incorporated into the final products 647 manufactured in Oklahoma. 648 649 Many of our U.S. factories also export to Canada and Mexico. 650 For example, 50 percent of high-voltage surge arresters manufactured in Mount Pleasant, Pennsylvania are sold to Mexico 651 652 and Canada. 653 ABB's Sugarland, Texas facility supplies electric infrastructure control systems to Mexico's electric grid operator 654 655 and Canadian power generation.

Restrictions on trade or new barriers between the U.S.,

657 Canada, and Mexico including on data transfer and digital 658 solutions would put up barriers too large on markets in Canada 659 and Mexico and could put upward price pressure on the 660 U.S.-manufactured goods to all of our North American customers, 661 potentially making U.S.-made products less competitive and 662 adversely affecting our domestic factories. 663 In conclusion, ABB believes the future of the U.S. economy 664 is bright. This is particularly true on the energy sector. The integration of the three major North American economies has 665 666 enhanced ABB's competitiveness, encouraged our investments in the 667 United States. Building on the North American Free Trade Agreement's legacy 668 669 of economic growth and job creation, we can set the stage for 670 further gains in these areas by modernizing the agreement in ways that eliminate remaining distortions and barriers, raise 671 672 standards, strengthen neutral enforcement mechanisms, and remove 673 unnecessary red tape at the border. 674 Thank you for the opportunity to testify before the 675 subcommittee today and I look forward to answering your questions. 676 [The statement of Mr. Burchett follows:] 677 **********INSERT 5******

679 Mr. Upton. Well, thank you. Thank you all for 680 participating and at this point we'll start our questions. 681 I have to say at the onset that, boy, if there's anything 682 that our constituents understand it's gas prices and, you know, 683 back in 2008 the average gas at the pump was \$384 a gallon. Today, 684 or this last weekend I saw it for \$2.24. 685 But I think maybe it's a little bit higher in some other areas 686 of the country. But it's a pretty dramatic decline and, you know, 687 as you think about what NAFTA has done and where we are, as you 688 pointed out in your testimony, Ms. Harbert, that we've now been 689 running a trade surplus with Canada and Mexico in refined petroleum and coal and the trade deficit with these countries in 690 691 oil and gas has been shrinking rapidly. 692 It's in large part because we now really truly have a North 693 American energy independent plan that is -- that is coming to fruition, which is one of the reasons why these prices of energy 694 695 have fallen, whether it be in LNG, whether it be with the gas at 696 the pump as well. 697 You indicated at the end of your testimony that if NAFTA was changed dramatically it truly would threaten our -- not only our 698 energy security but I have to presume it would also dramatically 699 700 increase prices to consumers as well. 701 Can you -- can we explore that a little bit? 702 Certainly. We have benefited from increased Ms. Harbert. 703 trade in North America and by lifting the oil export ban and

704 increasing our LNG exports around the world the American consumer 705 and the American industry has benefited tremendously. 706 Consumer prices have gone down by about 14 percent, and if 707 that were to change and for some way we would jeopardize either 708 the certainty provided by NAFTA or the investor protections provided by NAFTA or even the reforms that have been undertaken 709 710 in Mexico, that would threaten production in the United States 711 because it could not find its natural markets. 712 It would also undermine current investments planned for 713 Mexico, which would then bottle in some of our domestic capacity. 714 So it's a lose-lose if we undermine NAFTA in any way that has been the basis for an incredible energy integration effort that is 715 providing tremendous benefits to industry, consumers, to our 716 717 national security as we are now getting more oil from them than from OPEC, and also, obviously, our energy security. 718 Mr. Upton. Mr. Thompson, as we know, the Gulf Coast is home 719 to the most technologically advanced refineries in the world. 720 721 Many of us have been down there to see these advances. 722 How has the North American energy integration benefited the 723 consumers of these products and what -- how might we strengthen 724 as these negotiations are going on with the three countries? 725 What might you suggest to actually improve our situation in 726 regard -- in regard to the technological improvements that could 727 be done?

Mr. Thompson. Thank you for the question.

729 I will just add that we have sophisticated facilities in far 730 more than just Texas. We have some in your fine state and we have 731 them in 33 states. So there's -- you know, a strong energy sector 732 helps out most of the country. 733 As far as, you know, NAFTA goes, as we talked about it, it's 734 pretty simple at its core. We got a lot of product from Canada 735 and we were able to sell a lot of finished goods to Mexico, and 736 this is good for consumers. We get more than -- you know, 40 percent of all of our imports 737 738 come from Canada and we get it, you know, duty free. So that means lower price for crude, which benefits the American consumer. 739 740 As far as additional protections, you know, we think that 741 a more robust chapter in NAFTA dealing with energy, dealing with 742 how it's developed and the modern way its trade would benefit all. 743 We certainly believe that we would benefit from having the three countries work together on infrastructure. 744 So we can find 745 the best ways to get crude to our refineries and products to 746 consumers in the most efficient way. 747 Mr. Upton. So, Ms. Harbert, you know, as we think back to where we were, back particularly in the '70s, I mean, we've got 748 749 the new abundance that's there now -- the developments in shale technology, all those different things. 750 751 Many of the laws and regulations were written back in those 752 days when we weren't exporters. What are some of the things --

what are some of the things that we could do to prevent us from

754 being held back as it relates to energy exploration and increasing 755 exports to -- not only to these two countries but the other 756 countries around the world? 757 Ms. Harbert. Well, first, I think it's do no harm. 758 do anything to impair our ability to export to North America and 759 Make sure that we can get those export facilities sited 760 very quickly. 761 We have to make sure that the regulatory process -- and you 762 guys have been working on this -- is fair, transparent, and 763 incorporates cost benefit analyses. 764 And last but not least, there is significant room for 765 permitting reform both within the country to move our products 766 around more efficiently and also to export them to North America, 767 both to Canada and to Mexico, and to import them as well. We've had a seven-year waging war on importing more oil from 768 But we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that we have a 769 770 tremendous opportunity to export our own natural gas --771 clean-burning natural gas -- to Mexico with some additional 772 permitting reforms. So both, I think, a laser like focus in the upcoming debate 773 774 on infrastructure in the Congress, who really need to take a very 775 hard look at continuing reg reform and certainly permitting 776 reform. 777 Mr. Upton. Thank you. 778 Mr. Rush.

780 Dr. Krupnick -- Dr. Krupnick, right? 781 Mr. Krupnick. Sorry. Krupnick, yes. 782 Krupnick. I am sorry. In your written Mr. Rush. 783 statement you ask the members to envision a world where the three 784 North American countries act as a free trade energy bloc which 785 could rival every other nation or bloc in its ability to influence 786 world markets for oil and gas. 787 If we were to continue along the path we are currently on 788 with no changes to NAFTA and additional coordination, 789 harmonization, and integration between the U.S., Canada, and 790 Mexico, how long do you envision it would take for North America 791 to truly rival a competitor like OPEC? 792 Mr. Krupnick. Well, this is -- this idea of a future energy bloc -- the United States, Canada, and Mexico operating as a unit 793 -- is, I think, a useful exercise to think about an ideal situation 794 795 from an energy perspective. 796 We are, obviously, I don't think, ever going to head in that 797 -- we are heading in that direction but we are never going to be We are not going to have an E.U. type structure with 798 there. 799 Mexico, Canada, and the United States. 800 But I think it's useful for thinking about how to realize 801 as many gains from trade and as many -- as lowest possible cost 802 to industry of addressing environmental regulations, let's say, 803 by harmonizing those regulations across countries so that there's

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman.

805 So I think it's a useful paradigm. It's not something I see 806 that's actually going to happen in my lifetime, anyway. 807 Thank you. Mr. Rush. 808 Mr. Thompson, in your testimony you noted that in 2016 alone 809 the U.S. exported \$20.2 billion worth of energy products to Mexico 810 and imported \$8.7 million worth of energy products. 811 How -- in terms of jobs, how many U.S. energy jobs would 812 potentially be impacted if the administration were to 813 unilaterally make changes to NAFTA in a way that might upset our 814 two trading partners and possibly hurt the mutually beneficial 815 energy trade that we all can agree is very notable and profitable for all three countries? 816 817 Mr. Thompson. Thank you for the question. 818 We are optimistic that we are going to come through with 819 modernized NAFTA and these negotiations are going to stay on track. 820 821 We certainly are proud of our -- what our industry means from 822 an employment perspective. As I said in my testimony, we support 3 million jobs and those jobs are there because of our strong 823 824 energy sector and it certainly are going to be strengthened the 825 more we work with our neighbors to the north and the south. We believe that there's lots of opportunities in Mexico now 826 that they have liberalized their energy network and we already 827 828 have a number of companies. We have Andeavor and Valero and Exxon

sort of only one regulatory model that industry needs to address.

832 going to continue grow and as that grows it's going to strengthen 833 our need for employment. 834 I want to just ask all the panellists, is there Mr. Rush. 835 anyone on the panel who believes that we would benefit -- our 836 nation would benefit if the administration unilaterally opened 837 up negotiations on NAFTA and insists on establishing new terms 838 that would be more beneficial to the U.S.? 839 Mr. Thompson. Well, to be clear, we certainly believe that NAFTA would benefit by being modernized. 840 So we do think if 841 modernized it could benefit the energy industries we talked about. 842 We believe that there could be a more robust chapter on energy 843 We believe that the United States should make sure in NAFTA. 844 that, you know, direct investors are protected, particularly now 845 that Mexico has liberalized its energy system. 846 We think that a modernized NAFTA could do that. We think that it could be enhanced to help us with regulatory cooperation 847 with Mexico and Canada. So there are, Mr. Rush, lots of things 848 849 that could be improved through NAFTA modernization. Ms. Harbert. We, at the Chamber, believe that withdrawal 850 would be devastating to the U.S. economy. Modernization is 851 852 preferable. First, do no harm and then make it better. 853 That's what modernization means, and that includes, from **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

Mobil have entered the market -- the downstream market in Mexico

We are supplying over half of their gasoline needs and that's

for the first time in many, many decades.

829

830

854 American business perspective, making sure that we have those 855 investment protections in place that ensure that we have an 856 ability to adjudicate our disputes fairly. 857 So we need to stay in this game. I think we've all laid out 858 -- all the panellists have laid out the stakes. They're high, 859 and we need to find a way to get to yes. 860 Mr. Rush. Thank you. 861 Mr. Krupnick. I just want to raise, there's more going on than just NAFTA. So we shouldn't lose sight of these other 862 863 agreements that the administration is giving short shrift to or 864 even walking away from on the environmental side. 865 Mr. Burchett. From a North American Manufacturers' and an ABB point of view. We support modernizing the agreement. 866 867 Mr. Rush. Thank you. 868 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 869 Mr. Upton. Thank you. 870 Mr. Barton. 871 Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Mr. Barton. Rush, for holding this hearing. 872 Before I ask my questions, I want to thank Karen Harbert for 873 874 her help in passing the repeal of the ban on crude oil exports. You and the Chamber were big helps in that, and we've exported 875 as much as 2 million barrels a day in the last year and I think 876 877 we are about a million and a half barrels a day now. So thank 878 you and your organization for that.

879 I want to ask a little bit different question than Mr. Rush 880 did, but it's basically the same thing. From reading your 881 testimony and listening, my impression is that all of your 882 organizations support staying in NAFTA in some way. 883 Is there anybody that advocates getting out Is that true? 884 of the NAFTA treaty? Everybody's shaking their head so we'll say that that's a 885 886 I will ask Mr. Thompson, is -- will there ever be a day when no. the U.S. refineries, which has really configured their refineries 887 888 to use the heavier Mexican and Canadian crudes, that they will 889 reconfigure to focus on the lighter U.S. shale crudes? 890 Mr. Thompson. Well, I certainly couldn't say there will 891 day. But right now, I think they're configured in the 892 most efficient way possible. As you know, oil is a global commodity and the most efficient -- you know, we are configured 893 right now the most efficient that we can be. The heavier crudes 894 895 that we are designed to handle we are handling and the lighter 896 stuff that can be better processed is being exported. 897 And so can I say never? No. But I think right now we have 898 a very efficient system that's operating the way the global market 899 dictates. 900 Well, if that's the case, then we almost have 901 to maintain some sort of a NAFTA arrangement because the Canadian 902 and the Mexican crudes are the sour -- more sour, heavier crudes. 903 Is that not correct?

904 Mr. Thompson. That's correct. And, you know, I shook my 905 head in agreement but I will say it out loud. 906 Yes, we certainly and wholeheartedly agree that we should 907 stay in NAFTA. 908 This is a little bit off the NAFTA issue. Mr. Barton. But 909 in that happy day if it ever were to occur that we would actually 910 build a new U.S. refinery -- and I know that's unlikely -- I know 911 we expand and modernize -- but if were to actually from scratch 912 build a new U.S. refinery, how would that refinery be configured? 913 Would it still be configured for the heavier crudes that we 914 import or would it be configured to use the lighter crudes that 915 apparently now we are exporting? 916 Mr. Thompson. You know, frankly, I am not in the best 917 position not answer that. I think, you know, people much smarter 918 than me would design it in a way where they believe they'll have 919 the best access to crude. 920 Could it be configured to handle the lighter stuff? 921 But there's arguments to handle the heavier stuff as well. 922 I will say on this point, you know, there is -- you know, we have adequate refining capacity, you know, today to meet our 923 924 domestic needs. So, you know, right now there's no need to build 925 an additional refinery. 926 I will ask Ms. Harbert, with the -- I Mr. Barton. Okav. 927 don't know how you exactly how you say it but the Mexican 928 legislature and president have changed their policy and changed their laws to allow international companies to own more and be more invested in Mexico. How is that going? Are they --

Ms. Harbert. Well, and first, let me thank you for your support and leadership in lifting oil export ban which has done a tremendous benefit to the American economy, and the EIA estimated for 2018 we will -- we will produce more oil than ever before in our nation's history and, obviously, a lot of that will continue to be exports and particularly supplanting oil from other countries that don't like us so much.

You know, in Mexico it's happening and we have to congratulate the legislature and the president for being very courageous in doing something that took a long time to undo. And every major American company is down there with an office looking at how they can take advantage of this opportunity. Permits have been granted, infrastructure is being built, and, you know, to stop something right in the middle of its tracks of enjoying a boom of reinvesting back into Mexico would be tragic.

There are companies that, you know, have a lot of pent-up energy and a lot of pent-up demand for realizing a better relationship with Mexico.

So it's going great but it can only get better and what we have to worry about is that a change in NAFTA or a change in leadership in Mexico that would jeopardize any of that certainly, you know, we would have to take that with a grain of salt -- a grain of caution.

954	Mr. Barton. All right.
955	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
956	Mr. Upton. Mr. McNerney.
957	Mr. McNerney. I want to thank the chairman, thank the
958	witnesses this morning. I will start with Mr. Thompson.
959	You mentioned that North America will be energy secure by
960	the year 2020. Could you explain what that means exactly? What
961	does energy security mean to you?
962	Mr. Thompson. Well, let me just say that that's not, you
963	know, me saying it. That's the International Energy Agency
964	the IEA that's saying it and what that means is that we are
965	producing a level of liquid fuels that satisfy our North American
966	needs.
967	So, basically, we are producing enough to satisfy our own
968	needs and we are not relying on any other country for our energy
969	needs.
970	Mr. McNerney. So we'd cut OPEC off, basically, from
971	American
972	Mr. Thompson. Well, we would have that we would have the
973	potential to cut them off. Again, you know, whether the market
974	would dictate that is another matter.
975	But we could. We would be energy secure at that point.
976	Mr. McNerney. Do you disagree, Doctor?
977	Mr. Krupnick. I just wanted to mention that, you know, oil
978	is a global market and the price a price of oil is determined
	II

979 in a global market in the absence of, let's say, Saudi Arabia's 980 cutting back its supply voluntarily or on its own to change price. 981 So we can never really be independent of other countries, 982 other producers, because we'll always be dependent through the 983 price. 984 But, obviously, as our oil demand falls and our supply --985 domestic supply grows it does give us a greater measure of energy 986 security. Mr. McNerney. Well, you all -- you have been advocating for 987 988 harmonization, Dr. Krupnick. But just yesterday we had a hearing 989 on the CAFÉ standards -- tremendously difficult to get 990 harmonization within the United States itself. So is there a 991 pathway for us to reach harmonization with the other countries? 992 Mr. Krupnick. Well, initially, I would just hope that we 993 could get behind the agreements that we already had with other -- with Canada and Mexico. The ones I mentioned were on 994 995 environmental issues. 996 There's an agreement with Mexico and the United States to jointly inspect facilities in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico 997 to make sure that they're living up to the safety standards that 998 999 both countries are enforcing. 1000 So I think there's a lot that can be done bilaterally and 1001 trilaterally. 1002 Mr. McNerney. Well, you mentioned that pulling out of the 1003 Paris conference, I think I understood you to mention or imply,

1004 that that hurt the confidence of investors. Could expand that 1005 a little bit? 1006 I don't know if I exactly said it that way Mr. Krupnick. 1007 but I think what we are seeing is that companies around the world 1008 and international companies that are located and based in the 1009 United States, plus companies in the United States, are already 1010 using what we would call as economists shadow prices of carbon 1011 -- that is, internal prices of carbon to help in their investment 1012 planning. 1013 So whether we pull out of the Paris Accords or not, companies 1014 can't afford not to bet on a future without climate legislation 1015 in the United States. So they have to take the long view with 1016 investments, let's say, in pipelines lasting 40 years. 1017 They've got to take the long view in their investment decisions about what's going to happen to climate policy in the 1018 1019 future, in the U.S. and around the world, and they're doing that 1020 irrespective of whether we are currently in the Paris Accords or 1021 not. 1022 Mr. McNerney. One last question. You said that Congress 1023 could help promote renewable capacity using local resources. 1024 Could you expand on that a little bit as well? 1025 Mr. Krupnick. Yes. So I am not in Congress. 1026 the levers that you all have to use. Some of it is just moral

suasion to -- some of it is, as I am sure, is passing bills.

But Mexico is a -- is blessed with very good solar energy

1027

1028

I don't know

1029	and Canada has a lot of unexploited hydro electric energy. So
1030	the United States could benefit and Mexico and Canada could
1031	benefit by taking advantage of these vocational advantages that
1032	these countries have to have our electricity be cheaper for
1033	American consumers.
1034	Mr. McNerney. And these can be cost competitive with
1035	traditional fuels?
1036	Mr. Krupnick. Well, they can be, certainly in the hydro
1037	front they can be, and potentially in Mexico. Kind of better
1038	having solar in Mexico than having solar in New England.
1039	Mr. McNerney. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
1040	Mr. Upton. Mr. Olson.
1041	Mr. Olson. I thank the chair, and welcome to our four
1042	witnesses with a special Texas welcome to Secretary Harbert.
1043	Ma'am, you and I share a common bond. We are both Rice als
1044	Jones '85. Welcome. There we go. Well, Jones beats Hanson
1045	at all the sports that matter. So, again, welcome.
1046	Also welcome to Mr. Burchett. As you know, sir, ABB has a
1047	presence there in Sugarland, Texas, as you mentioned. Please
1048	come down and visit. You will love to see the facility. It's

Also, right around the corner is a restaurant called the Live Oak -- the best burgers in Fort Bend County, right there at Live Oak right by ABB in Sugarland, Texas.

And this is no news, but North America and energy trade is

amazing.

1049

1050

1051

1052

1054 vital to the world's economy. Heavier crude from Canada is a 1055 critical part of the American refining space. 1056 We all know that the Eagle Ford shale does not stop at the 1057 Rio Grande, waiting for a visa to cross, and we know that as Mexico 1058 improves its energy sector, our ties with that neighbor will only 1059 grow stronger. 1060 And make no mistake, we are on the verge of replacing OPEC 1061 with a de facto NAPEC -- North American Petroleum Exporting 1062 Countries. 1063 And, of course, my own state of Texas' ties to Mexico are 1064 also important for electricity. They have been invaluable to our 1065 -- in our electricity market. For example, in August of 2011, my state was hit with a 1066 1067 statewide heat wave -- over 100 degrees on every square inch of our state the entire month of August. 1068 1069 That put us in a situation of some rolling blackouts. 1070 sent power across the river to help us out. Over 200,000 homes 1071 were powered by energy electricity from Mexico. 1072 It's an important relationship for Texas and America to have. 1073 My first question is for you, Mr. Burchett. In your written 1074 testimony, you talked about how, one, electric transformers come 1075 together from sites all across the North America, and that's a 1076 great example of how trade works in energy. Can you discuss how trade deals like NAFTA make that possible 1077 1078 and what would happen in the global supply chain -- if it spikes

1079	with terrorists?
1080	Mr. Burchett. Thank you, Congressman Olson. And by the
1081	way, my office is in Houston, Texas. So I do get to Sugarland
1082	quite often. So
1083	Mr. Olson. Remember, the Live Oak. Live Oak.
1084	Mr. Burchett. Live Oak. Got it.
1085	So ABB is a you know, we are a multinational
1086	multi-billion-dollar company and we look at we make investments
1087	all the time. What drives those investments is consistency,
1088	stability, low trade barriers.
1089	And so when we think of NAFTA, that helps drive those types
1090	of investment because we have the consistency and the stability
1091	that's provided there.
1092	Mr. Olson. Okay.
1093	Ms. Harbert, a question for you and the U.S. Chamber of
1094	Commerce. You were pretty clear in your testimony that our
1095	Chamber never ever wants to see America walk away from NAFTA.
1096	At a local five-star Chamber of Commerce in Sugarland, the
1097	Fort Bend Chamber of Commerce led by Kerry Schmidt, repeats that
1098	message to me every single time we meet at home.
1099	With that said, are there items that could be included in
1100	negotiations which would hamstring the agreement even if we stay
1101	part of it?
1102	To put it here in D.C. terms, is there a poison pill that's
1103	possible that looks benign that could bring the whole structure

down?

Ms. Harbert. Well, and thank you for your kind comments and I will try and get the Hanson Athletics to step it up a little bit.

You know, I am glad to see that the echo chamber is working because the business community is united in its support of NAFTA -- modernization, not withdrawal, and protection of those parts of NAFTA that are very important to the business community, specifically investor protections that are in there.

If those were taken out, I think American industry would have a very, very large problem in agreeing with the future terms of NAFTA. There are lots of things that can be done to improve it. But that would be one that would be very difficult and if were to see that go away and then we would have steep tariffs, you can know what would happen to the American consumer here.

So we have our eyes laser like focused on the investor protections to make sure they are included.

Mr. Olson. I think I am out of time and, Mr. Chairman, again I thank the witnesses and merry Christmas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Upton. Mr. Peters.

Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks to the witnesses for being here. Ms. Harbert, when we saw each other the last time it was probably 80 degrees where we were. Not that way today.

1129 Thanks for being here. Just a couple observations. 1130 of all, there's a lot to like about energy abundance for consumers, 1131 for manufacturing, and it's also -- even if our friends to the 1132 north and the south -- Mexico and Canada -- even if we don't act 1133 like OPEC it's still advantageous to have friendly countries to 1134 trade with for energy. 1135 Another observation -- this really has been about petroleum 1136 and hydrocarbons, not just -- not all energy trade. We haven't 1137 talked about next-generation nuclear or renewables. 1138 That's also part of the discussion. But just focused on what 1139 we've covered here, it does strike me as, with all this abundance, 1140 an odd time to be opening up Alaska to offshore drilling. I don't see the need for that. A tax -- it's part of tax 1141 1142 bill, part of a tax bill. They didn't even ever discuss the \$2 1143 billion of subsidy we provide at a time of all this abundance, 1144 and then at the same time we are talking about depleting the 1145 strategic petroleum at prices that almost couldn't be lower. Ιt 1146 doesn't seem like it's very smart. I observe that as part of the 1147 context. 1148 Ms. Harbert, I am with you on regulatory reform and 1149 permitting reform. Actually, in my previous I was -- I 1150 represented a lot of clients who tried to get through government

I believe we can achieve high environmental standards with less drag on the economy. Would like to work with you on that.

processes that could be very, very frustrating.

1151

1152

53 1154 Along those lines, one thing I would point out is what's 1155 happening around methane right now. I think -- I saw today that 1156 the American Petroleum Institute -- and this is great news --1157 started its own business partnership to deal with reducing VOCs 1158 and methane. 1159 They are probably observing what I am observing is that these 1160 rules are becoming politicized and that's bad for business because 1161 what's going to happen is you get this back and forth. If the 1162 -- if the president wants to undo everything because it's got

So I congratulate the American Petroleum Institute. I know the Chamber is interested in certainty. We can have good methane rules that protect us and the environment and are certain for business. I would like to work with you on that.

Obama's name on it, that's not good for business either.

And I am with you on NAFTA. For me in San Diego, one of the most important parts of our economy is our trade with Mexico. Our relationship with Mexico is very important to us.

I am a supporter of President Obama's TPP negotiations.

Again, the business community seems united behind this. I don't particularly -- I can't speak for all Democrats here but I understand the need for dispute resolution that's free from some of the hometowning, particularly in developing nations. I think that makes a lot of sense.

Maybe we should just rename it the Trump Pacific Partnership and be on with it. Maybe get a vote on it that way.

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1179 But what I did want to just say, because a lot of this has 1180 been covered, I heard mostly discussion in terms of modernizing 1181 about leaving it the same, making sure that we preserve dispute 1182 resolution, make sure that we don't -- we do no harm. 1183 I just wanted to give you an opportunity. I think we've been 1184 asked this before. Are there any specific changes you'd like to 1185 see in terms of modernization that we should be asking for? 1186 And Mr. Burchett, I will start with you. 1187 Mr. Burchett. Thank you, Congressman. 1188 There are more experts than I on the NAFTA agreement. 1189 in my career I remember when it started and I was doing business 1190 It's been 23 years. So I would defer to the experts in Mexico. 1191 on NAFTA for the modernization. 1192 But it just seems to me that given the -- given the changes 1193 that's happened in the 23 years, given the shale gas revolution, 1194 given the high-tech things that we do now, like the refineries 1195 mentioned by Congressman Upton, which is ABB technology, and given 1196 the level of trade that I see with our 50 manufacturing plants 1197 and a nice footprint in Canada also of manufacturing and a nice 1198 footprint in Mexico, it seems time to modernize. 1199 Anything, Ms. Harbert? Mr. Peters. Yes. 1200 Ms. Harbert. I have a couple of very specific things -- that a new NAFTA would ensure that the cross-border trade of crude oil 1201 1202 and natural gas and refined product wouldn't be subject to any

quantitative measures or tariffs -- secondly, that we could more

1204 safely or more quickly develop safe cross-border interconnections 1205 of electricity and hydrocarbons, and lastly -- there's two more. 1206 We really need to look at and prohibit local content rules 1207 that the industry could not meet and we should take a hard look 1208 at some common standards and regulations. 1209 Not all -- where it makes sense in the energy sector so we 1210 can more harmonize, which is a scary word to our friends in the 1211 north. They don't like that word. But we could find some 1212 commonality. 1213 Mr. Peters. Okay. That's very constructive. 1214 Dr. Krupnick, anything you want to add, briefly? 1215 I think this has been pretty well Mr. Krupnick. No. 1216 covered. 1217 Mr. Peters. Okay. I really appreciate you -- I look forward to working with you to see if we can't say what's good 1218 1219 and make it better. 1220 And Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1221 Mr. Upton. Mr. Shimkus. 1222 Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate my 1223 colleague from California's questions. I've got a -- just a 1224 picture should go up on the screen, and I was trying to find another 1225 one but, really, that just gives you, you know, either pipelines, 1226 crude oil crossings, and sometimes they don't show going in to Mexico but there's a little, like, a dot where the crossing 1227 1228 location is for crude, for refined product, for hydrocarbon gas liquids, for natural gas, and for electric transmission.

So I think what we struggle with is those of us who have been on the committee, which is one of the reasons why I love the committee -- we are interconnected. We are there. We've been there for a long time. We are going to continue to have this.

So the -- why I think the hearing is important is -- and Ms. Harbert, you just raised some of the issues of the concerns that if there's a pull out of NAFTA what damage do you do to that interconnected North American grid or North American crude oil or oil refined product lines.

Does anyone want to mention that real quick?

Ms. Harbert. Looking at your map, if you can imagine in a world without NAFTA anything that would be coming into the -- for example, to Texas, if, you know, electricity, if there was going to be a toll or a tariff put on there that we would have higher prices than we actually, you know, charge in America, that would be a huge disincentive for our energy security because we depend on this, as you well pointed out, and if we change that economic equation that's going to raise prices here at home and we are going to have to search for other suppliers.

Mr. Shimkus. And right now there's uncertainty because of conflicting messages. So I am from southern Illinois. We are pork and beans and corn. NAFTA is very, very important for my commodity-based products.

But we also have the fear -- every small town in America

1254 really has that small manufacturing facility that's moved. So 1255 that's the conflict of NAFTA for members. 1256 In fact, not to point out ABB but they announced a closure 1257 of the St. Louis plant -- a transformer manufacturer. I don't 1258 know where it's going. But I do know -- I drive by it every day 1259 when I go to the airport. 1260 So that's the struggle with how do you renegotiate while 1261 keeping the benefits of that or for my corn to be sold where you're 1262 ensuring that our manufacturing sector is equally treated, 1263 because we can't negotiate wages. 1264 We can't negotiate environmental standards. Well, maybe 1265 some people think we can but, historically, those are things left to the individual country to be able to do. 1266 1267 Anyone want to comment on that -- those challenges? 1268 Mr. Krupnick. I could say something about the map and one 1269 thing that's not on the map. So there are a number of pipeline 1270 -- there's a lot of plans to grow the number of pipelines coming 1271 into Mexico to meet that rising natural gas demand. So those 1272 could be put in jeopardy. 1273 And then on -- in the Gulf of Mexico, the lease sale -- lease 1274 sale one -- round one was completed. Two is almost completed. 1275 Three is supposedly going to get into deep water and that could 1276 be held up. 1277 Mr. Shimkus. Right.

Mr. Krupnick. So it could put us and, of course, indirectly

the Mexicans at risk as well.

Mr. Shimkus. And for those that have followed the committee and what I've done in public statements, comments, Keystone Pipeline, Keystone XL, which feeds right, obviously, from the oil sands all the way down to my district. There was a big terminal there, and then it spreads throughout all the Midwest. So and we've seen not just an international negotiation but we've seen, obviously, just internal politics delay pipeline construction.

Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Thompson. So let me just say, I can say with certainty that my refining facilities are the most efficient in the world and we are not relocating anywhere, you know, under NAFTA. We are going to be there.

But, you know, as our transportation demand for fuel flattens out, our facilities need export markets to continue to grow and prosper.

Mr. Shimkus. Right. I think that's a good point and I was going to jump on that with the last 40 seconds. Just for the liquid transportation fuels debate, we had that hearing yesterday on CAFÉ and greenhouse gas, and the debate of EV penetration.

Now, it's not huge across the country but electric vehicle penetration in California is noticeable, and international comments about, like, Norway and France who are trying to make -- or China, that really will -- could disrupt this market -- crude oil and refined products. Don't you think?

1304	Mr. Thompson. It certain EV penetration could indeed,
1305	yes. It could be very disruptive.
1306	Mr. Shimkus. So we need to keep the liquid transportation
1307	market.
1308	Mr. Thompson. We need to keep the liquid transportation
1309	market strong.
1310	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much. I yield back.
1311	Mr. Upton. Mr. Loebsack. Oh, I am sorry. He left.
1312	Mr. Tonko.
1313	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Welcome, witnesses.
1314	One area where our energy sector is undeniably and quite
1315	literally interconnected is the United States and Canadian
1316	electrical grid systems.
1317	In 2016, the U.S. imported 73.1 million megawatt hours of
1318	electricity from Canada, about a quarter of which went to New York
1319	State, my hope state.
1320	Dr. Krupnick, do the interconnections between the United
1321	States and Canadian power systems improve greater reliability on
1322	both sides of the border?
1323	Mr. Krupnick. Well, sure. The short answer to that is yes.
1324	For to maximize the benefits of cross-border electricity trade
1325	what we have a report that talks about about what to do.
1326	There are several margins to increase reliability and one of them
1327	is to have capacity planning be a joint exercise between, let's
1328	say, control areas in the United States and in Canada. So

1329 Mr. Tonko. Thank you. 1330 So that's not -- there's a lot of things that Mr. Krupnick. 1331 we can do beyond what we are doing. 1332 Mr. Tonko. Thank you. 1333 And the Canadian hydropower is becoming increasingly 1334 important for New York State's plan to meet its clean energy 1335 targets. 1336 So I see big potential for increased renewable electricity 1337 trade, such as the importation of Canadian hydro, which will 1338 reduce emissions in our country. 1339 But these projects rely on cross-border transmission 1340 infrastructure. What unique challenges exist to siting, 1341 permitting, and constructing cross-border transmission compared 1342 to domestic transmission projects? 1343 Ms. Harbert. Well, I can take a stab at that. 1344 You know, you're absolutely right. The provision of 1345 Canadian electricity to the Northeast more broadly is hugely 1346 important for grid reliability. The Northeast suffered a very 1347 devastating blackout in the early 2000s and from that was 1348 established the north -- the Electricity Reliability Coordination 1349 Council, which seeks to look at these things and manage the grid 1350 up there more responsibly. And so that's an important new 1351 organization that helps us to do that. 1352 Cross-border is still hard and it takes approvals from both

sides of the border.

1353

Sometimes it takes state and local, because

1354 it's not just going -- crossing the border. It's going through 1355 other municipalities and counties that might not be excited about 1356 having a new transmission line. 1357 So we really need to take a look at the redundancy of federal, state, and local permitting so that we get things built in a 1358 1359 predictable time frame. 1360 Mr. Tonko. Thank you. Anyone else want to respond to that? 1361 Yeah. 1362 Mr. Burchett. Yes. So as ABB, we invented high-voltage DC 1363 transmission, which is the way you do a lot of these interconnections. So we do them all over the world. 1364 We are 1365 working on one with Denmark and U.K. now. 1366 One of the biggest ones is for New England and it's to get 1367 the power from Canada there. So in talking to our customers, I 1368 have heard them describe the regulatory approval process as, 1369 quote, unquote, "a game of Chutes and Ladders," and that can seven 1370 to 10 years. And so what they would -- you know, would -- of 1371 course, they would like to see an expedited process but the 1372 technology is there to get particularly hydroelectric power from 1373 Canada into New England. 1374 Thank you. Mr. Tonko. 1375 Yesterday marked the second anniversary of the Paris climate 1376 agreement. One hundred and ninety-seven parties have signed the 1377 Paris Agreement and 170 parties have ratified it.

The United States is the only country with the intention to

1379 Progress in North American and global emissions 1380 reductions will be hindered by the absence of our leadership --1381 United States leadership. 1382 But we have seen no indication that our neighbors intend to 1383 back away from their Paris commitments or their carbon pricing 1384 policies. 1385 So Dr. Krupnick, do you believe it will be more difficult 1386 for the United States, Canada, and Mexico to cooperate on 1387 cross-border and environmental policy harmonization if the United 1388 States continues to be disengaged on global action on climate 1389 change? 1390 The answer is yes, of course, it'll be more Mr. Krupnick. difficult, and as I've tried to indicate, there is still at a state 1391 1392 level, at a regional level, there is still opportunities for that kind of engagement, let's say, that we are seeing from California 1393 1394 with Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, and so on in their CO2 trading 1395 program. 1396 So it's not like all these interactions are going to stop. 1397 But, of course, we'll be -- we'll be hurt in our ability to 1398 negotiate further. 1399 Mr. Tonko. Right. And so the consequences, I believe, are 1400 probably that there -- we would be less likely to align their 1401 policies with ours and are there limits then to opportunities to 1402 lower costs to business and consumers?

Mr. Krupnick. Yes. Anytime you put barriers into a

1405 somewhere along the line. 1406 Yes. With that, I thank you and yield back. Mr. Tonko. 1407 [Presiding.] The gentleman yields back. 1408 The chair now calls upon the gentleman from West Virginia, 1409 Mr. McKinley, for five minutes. 1410 Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1411 In our binding or majority memorandum binder we said -- I 1412 read that we have -- apparently we have 73 gigawatts of electricity 1413 are being imported from Canada currently. For everyone to 1414 understand, that's the equivalent of anywhere between 70 and 120 1415 power plants. So I would like to focus on those implications if I could 1416 1417 for -- with this panel, because currently -- the first is currently 1418 under construction is a Lake Erie connector. That's a 1419 1000-megawatt high-voltage underwater transmission line that 1420 would provide the first direct link between Ontario power 1421 generators and the America PJM. This will enable -- this Lake Erie connector will enable a 1422 1423 subsidized Canadian power company to compete with American 1424 private sector energy producers. 1425 Secondly, the Quebec electricity sector is dominated by 1426 Canada's largest utility and it's a state-owned and operated 1427 monopoly which is heavily subsidized. According to CBC news 1428 reports, Canadian electricity producers are generating more power

cooperation interaction you're going to create increased costs

1429 than they consume and sell off excess power to the United States 1430 at rates below the cost of production, closed quote. 1431 This unfair competition may result in lower utility bills 1432 for us in America but this outsourcing of our electric generation 1433 costs American jobs and lost state and local tax revenue. 1434 Therefore, I am concerned that the U.S. markets are becoming 1435 the dumping ground for Canadian state-subsidized electricity, 1436 much like we've become the dumping ground for cheap subsidized 1437 steel from China. Those are my concerns. 1438 The Canadian government subsidizes electric exports to the 1439 United States, the government dumps electricity at below rate and 1440 it results in lost jobs and state revenue. 1441 So my question -- perhaps it's to you, Ms. Harbert -- should 1442 the new NAFTA negotiations -- and I would encourage those 1443 negotiations to take place -- address this unfair market 1444 distortion? 1445 Ms. Harbert. Sure, and one thing to point out, when we 1446 negotiated NAFTA the first time around energy wasn't even part 1447 of the equation. We didn't know how much we had, Canada had, 1448 Mexico had. We didn't anticipate the full integrated energy 1449 economy that we have today. 1450 So, you know, as we proceed in the fifth and sixth and, 1451 hopefully, conclusion of this, there are issues like that that 1452 should be discussed.

But at the same time we also have to realize that in the

1454 Pacific Northwest of our country, we are exporting a tremendous 1455 amount of hydropower up into Canada and some of those are from 1456 government-owned facilities as well -- back to the, you know, the 1457 TVA days and all of that. 1458 So, you know, it's something that should be looked at. That 1459 is not particularly my exact area of expertise but I think it 1460 should be talked about. But it probably floats on both sides of 1461 the border that we would have to consider that -- the equation. 1462 Mr. McKinley. Anyone else on the panel have comments about 1463 the subsidized --1464 Mr. Krupnick. Sure. I think subsidies to renewables, 1465 subsidies to fossil fuels -- anywhere you see subsidies there's 1466 a case for eliminating them. All that I think it's important is 1467 that if we are eliminating subsidies on one type of fuel we should 1468 eliminate them on others as well. 1469 And so if Canada is subsidizing their hydro then that's an 1470 issue that should be taken up. 1471 Mr. Thompson, anything? Any comments? Mr. McKinley. 1472 Mr. Thompson. Well, this was certainly out of, you know, 1473 my area of expertise but I will say this speaks more broadly to 1474 the reasons that we need a separate, more complex title than NAFTA 1475 dealing with the energy issues. 1476 As Karen said, we need to -- at the time NAFTA -- when it 1477 was originally developed these issues weren't in front of us and 1478 we need to because --

1479	Mr. McKinley. Okay. Because according to these same
1480	reports they're saying that we're ultimately going to be a net
1481	importer of electricity the PJM from Canada.
1482	So I am interested to know whether or not something like this
1483	in a NAFTA agreement should allow for some kind of cost recovery
1484	or tariff, if I use the T word. Any thoughts?
1485	Mr. Burchett. As a as a final statement, I would from
1486	an ABB standpoint, we are a technology provider so we do the
1487	high-tech and what I will tell you about those interconnects is
1488	the power can flow both ways.
1489	So I don't know what the potential there is in the future.
1490	From a subsidy standpoint I have no point of view. But I know
1491	the technology can go both ways.
1492	Mr. McKinley. Okay. I yield back.
1493	Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back.
1494	The chair now calls upon the gentleman from the same home
1495	state as our chairman who wants me to say publicly I recognize
1496	that Michigan beat Texas in basketball yesterday 57 to 52.
1497	Mr. Walberg, you have five minutes.
1498	Mr. Walberg. With that kind introduction, Mr. Chairman, I
1499	won't add anything to it. Great basketball game.
1500	Mr. Olson. Thank you.
1501	Mr. Walberg. Ms. Harbert, thank you for being here and
1502	thanks to each of the panel members for being here.
1503	Many people think energy and they think oil and gas. What

1504 other industries benefit from North American energy trade? 1505 Well, I like to say that every one of our 50 Ms. Harbert. 1506 states is in the energy business. You may not be producing it but you're in the supply chain and, obviously, we are all 1507 1508 consumers. 1509 So with a more integrated North American energy market, all 1510 of our consumers -- our families are benefiting, our industries 1511 are profiting -- not profiting but are benefiting from lower 1512 prices. 1513 And let's not forget that industries have moved back to 1514 America. The fertilizer industry is back, helping your pork and 1515 The petro chemical industry is beans and et cetera, and corn. 1516 back in the Gulf that was -- used to be in the Middle East. 1517 steel industry is back in some form or fashion in Pennsylvania and Ohio. 1518 1519 So manufacturing is back and critical inputs to our manufacturing are back. So it is an energy revolution in all 50 1520 1521 states. 1522 Mr. Walberg. And I think that's important for us to get out 1523 very clearly. We often think of energy in combative terms at 1524 times -- it's not in my back yard -- and the impact is sometimes 1525 forgotten as well. So for us here in Congress and policy to think along those 1526 lines but also the industries to make sure that we broadcast it, 1527

assist in the long haul.

1529 Mr. Harbert, the low cost of natural gas and electricity is 1530 driving a revival in U.S. manufacturing and providing our economy 1531 with a competitive advantage. 1532 However, free trade and market principles also allow 1533 producers of energy commodities such as natural gas and LNG to 1534 export their commodity abroad. 1535 How do we strike the right balance so that everybody 1536 including U.S. consumers can reap the positive economic benefits? 1537 Ms. Harbert. Well, natural gas is real great story for 1538 We are producing more natural gas than we can consume, 1539 and in order to continue to produce at that level they need export 1540 markets and that's what guarantees lower prices in those 1541 industries that are coming back. 1542 We have additional capacity being planned into Mexico that 1543 will be good because Mexico will then stimulate additional demand 1544 for our natural gas by developing new industries and new 1545 consumers. 1546 So having more than we consume is a good thing. They're not 1547 going to sell it at the expense of domestic producers because --1548 domestic industry. They're getting all that they need but in 1549 order to keep those prices low for that domestic industry we want 1550 to be able to export. 1551 Mr. Walberg. Okay. Not a zero sum game then? 1552 Ms. Harbert. No. 1553 Mr. Walberg. Okay. Dr. Krupnick.

1554 Mr. Krupnick. There are -- during the debate over LNG 1555 licensing for export there were many studies done on what the 1556 effect of those exports of natural gas would be on U.S. domestic 1557 prices and the best ones of those clearly said that there would 1558 be very little effect on prices. 1559 We have -- with the shale gas revolution we have such rapid 1560 response ability now in the fields to even small changes in prices 1561 with increased supply that we are in -- we are in a new era and 1562 I don't think we have to worry about increased exports of our 1563 natural gas. 1564 Mr. Walberg. Thank you. 1565 Mr. Thompson, what types of opportunities are opening up for 1566 American companies with Mexico's energy reforms? 1567 And we often talk about hydrocarbons but what about 1568 electricity? 1569 Mr. Thompson. Well, I can't speak to electricity. That's not what my members do. 1570 1571 But I can speak to with the opening up -- the liberalization 1572 of their downstream sector we have a number of companies that are 1573 now entering the Mexican market. 1574 We had -- Andeavor has opened up the first Arco station in 1575 Mexico and they're supplying fuel from their refinery in the state 1576 of Washington. 1577 We have -- Valero now has entered into agreements to provide 1578 products -- Exxon Mobil, BP, Chevron. So we have a lot of U.S.

1579 companies now that are entering Mexico to supply needed fuel to 1580 the Mexican economy. 1581 Thank you, and Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Mr. Walberg. 1582 Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back. 1583 The chair now calls upon the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Latta, 1584 for five minutes. 1585 Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and 1586 thank you very much for our panel today. 1587 You know, if I could follow up from my friend from Michigan, 1588 Ms. Harbert, when we were talking about the shale revolution 1589 because, of course, in Ohio what we have seen happen on the --1590 eastern side of the state and also in western Pennsylvania when 1591 you look at the Utica and the Marcellus Shale that it has created 1592 a revolution out there with wide-ranging benefits to the economy and when you're looking at the creation of millions of jobs at 1593 1594 a time when, you know, things are struggling out there. 1595 But overall, how has the consumer benefited from this 1596 revolution that we've seen out here right here at home? 1597 Well, it's an American supply chain that has Ms. Harbert. 1598 jumped in and fulfilled. We are making new products to fuel that 1599 revolution, which means more jobs, and for the American consumer 1600 prices are -- low natural gas prices here have saved the American 1601 family money. 1602 Over the last six years, prices have gone down by about 14

percent for energy for a family, which provides additional

purchasing power which stimulates the economy.

You know, in addition, if we were able to get more pipeline

capacity out of the Marcellus and into the Northeast, those consumers up there would benefit from low natural gas prices as well.

So it's jobs, it's new industries, it's low prices, and we are being more competitive with our exports overseas because our prices are two to four times lower than they are in Europe, which is a good thing. So we are more competitive on the global stage because of these low prices.

Mr. Latta. Yes. Well, thank you very much.

And Mr. Burchett, our electrical systems are evolving rapidly with the technological innovation and regulatory policies that's driving the change. In your view what does the grid of the future need to look like in order to deliver electricity, more efficiency, and more cost effectively?

Mr. Burchett. So when we think of the future grid as we are working with most of the investor-owned utilities and our customers, I mean, we know the words reliable are there. We know the words renewable are there.

But we also, when we look at power generation, we view it as an all of the above situation.

Our future does have solar, wind, but also coal and nuclear -- traditional generation. If you look at studies from EIA out for the next 30, 40 years you still see all the different fuel

elements in play.

With the technology in play, there's more around a distribution grid in the automation and being able to fully automate the grid so that when an occurrence occurs you got -- the interruption and restoration of power happens almost immediately. So --

Mr. Latta. Thank you very much.

Mr. Thompson, with the huge increase in domestic production, our imports have, you know, fallen dramatically, as being discussed. We've cut OPEC imports in half in less than a decade. How has our energy security situation changed as a result of the North American energy trade?

Mr. Thompson. Well, thank you for the question.

So as, you know, you noted, our domestic production is near all-time highs and, you know, so we are, you know, more energy secure than we have been in quite some time.

Now, that certainly hasn't eliminated our need to import crude into our country and that's more because, you know, our facilities are configured to handle the heavier crudes.

So we are able to take our lighter crudes and export them to facilities that are better designed and equipped to handle those. But we've been able to get more of our crude from our, you know, friends up north in Canada and 41 percent of all of our imports come from Canada and that's a good thing.

And as the IEA said, that we are all on track here as North

1657 Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back. 1658 The chair now calls upon the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. 1659 Kinzinger, for five minutes. 1660 Mr. Kinzinger. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I know 1661 there's -- based off of the last question I do want to make the 1662 point that I think, you know, energy security is essential, not 1663 just, you know, for our economy, which is great -- obviously, 1664 important -- but also because a lot of foreign actors use energy 1665 as a weapon and I think it's essential to note that, you know, 1666 if the West is ever going to fight back against some of the policies 1667 of the East or Russia, it's essential that we have a very strong 1668 energy platform to do so because the Russians in many case use 1669 -- cases use energy as a weapon to try to extract political favors 1670 from foreign actors and foreign governments and I think that's 1671 an essential point to know. 1672 Ms. Harbert, since NAFTA was originally negotiated, Mexico 1673 has instituted a number of reforms including opening its energy 1674 markets. What do these reforms mean for consumers in our country? 1675 Ms. Harbert. First of all, I just want to underscore what 1676 1677 you just said, which is the mass security dividend of our energy 1678 revolution is enormous -- that we are able to provide exports to **NEAL R. GROSS**

America to be energy secure by 2020.

Mr. Latta.

Well, thank you very much.

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

1654

1655

allies who have been forced into choosing a single source for their oil or for their natural gas. So providing that choice provides national security for them and for us, providing choice.

The opening up of the -- the reform of the hydrocarbon sector in Mexico which took a very long time and some courageous political actors to do has been an open invitation for American companies because they did the reform right and they're continuing to improve it.

And so we've already had several lease sales there and there's one that's going into deep water and our companies that have the best technology around are going to be the ones bidding on it.

So that, from an environmental standpoint, is very important. But also, as we have more of our -- all of our resources flowing across borders in North America, which makes that energy market more efficient, it keeps prices low -- electricity prices, fuel prices, natural gas prices -- and it's stimulating that manufacturing revolution that's putting more Americans back to work.

Mr. Kinzinger. And so you mentioned a little bit about, you know, future bids and technology. What are new opportunities that you see to engage Mexico's energy sector further?

Ms. Harbert. Well, they're sort of threefold at the moment and all of them are ongoing and in rapid fire, which is cross-border electricity, which has -- we've had that for a while

1704 but now there's a lot more demand on the Mexico side so more 1705 interconnected electricity. 1706 Natural gas -- we have a lot of American companies that are 1707 building pipeline right now, right at the border, waiting to go across and that will stimulate more demand for our products under 1708 NAFTA because they will have a more -- bigger middle class that 1709 1710 can purchase our products. 1711 And then there's offshore, which I think between the North 1712 Sea and the Gulf of Mexico those are the most advanced companies 1713 ever. So we should take great comfort and that is our companies 1714 that will be investing in the Gulf of Mexico and these tricky, 1715 you know, deep shore --1716 Mr. Kinzinger. And what do we do to ensure that the 1717 renegotiations won't have adverse consequences on our energy 1718 industry? 1719 Well, on of the most critical things that we Ms. Harbert. 1720 are looking at is the investment protections that have been 1721 provided for and need to be maintained. 1722 So the Mexican energy economy is reformed -- that's bright 1723 Investment likes some certainty and so two things investment. 1724 could upend that, which would be a withdrawal from NAFTA or 1725 something that jeopardizes the -- a NAFTA that does not have the 1726 investor protections. 1727 And so we as the business community are united and those 1728 investor protections need to be maintained in any type of

1729 modernized NAFTA. 1730 Mr. Kinzinger. Okay. 1731 Mr. Burkett or Burkett, I am not sure -- in your testimony 1732 you provide examples of how ABB's supply chain spans North America including a supporting number of manufacturing sites in the U.S. 1733 1734 As you say, the -- U.S., Canada, and Mexico do not simply 1735 trade with each other -- we build things together and rely on each 1736 other's markets to support millions of jobs. 1737 How can we ensure that NAFTA renegotiations won't have 1738 adverse consequences on ABB and similar U.S. manufacturers that 1739 have robust trade cooperation through North America as a central 1740 part of their business? Mr. Burchett. Yes, that's -- you know, that's from an ABB 1741 1742 perspective. From a-from the National Association of Manufacturers, we are also now talking 14,000 small, medium, and 1743 1744 large businesses that, you know, have similar levels of 1745 integration with Canada and Mexico, right. 1746 So when-and quite simply, when we look at what needs to 1747 happen, for manufacturers we, obviously, do a lot of investment. So the consistency, the stability, the lack of volatility allows 1748 1749 us to make those investments, and these low trade barriers. So 1750 it's a pretty simple formula for us. Investment likes 1751 consistency. 1752 Mr. Kinzinger. Yes. And with my 20 seconds left, I yield 1753 Thank you all for being here. back, Mr. Chairman.

1754 Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back. 1755 The chair now calls upon the gentleman from South Carolina, 1756 Mr. Duncan, for five minutes. Mr. Duncan. My son tore an ACL on Sunday, Mr. Chairman, and 1757 he had a doctor's appointment so I've been Face Timing and trying 1758 1759 to inform his wife on what's going on. So I appreciate it. 1760 As you can see, I am sitting down here. I've been in the 1761 Congress for seven years but I am the newest member on this 1762 committee. Before I came to the E and C, I chaired the Western Hemisphere 1763 1764 Subcommittee, and I held numerous hearings on energy issues in 1765 the Western Hemisphere, specifically focussing on Canada and Mexico in a lot of those hearings. 1766 1767 Yesterday, the House passed H.R. 357, reaffirming its strategic partnership with Canada, and when I think about the 1768 1769 inner connectivity between Mexico and Canada, a lot of the -- some 1770 of the testimony that's been given today. 1771 You know, Canadian oil coming to America refineries, 1772 producing petroleum products that are then exported from the U.S. 1773 back to Canada and Mexico and really other parts of the world. 1774 It is a strategic alliance there. But when I think about Mexico, natural gas pipelines 1775 1776 providing natural gas to Mexico, oil coming back to U.S. 1777 refineries, there is tremendous inner connectivity there. 1778 But it goes beyond North American strategic alliance.

78 used to talk about American energy independence. 1779 Then I talked 1780 about North American energy independence and I really broaden that 1781 to hemispheric energy independence because if you think about 1782 Canada and Mexico and you think about the energy renaissance in 1783 this country and our ability to export an abundant natural gas 1784 through LNG, then you think about the needs in this hemisphere. 1785 You think about the Carribean nations that are relying on Venezuela and the Venezuelan situation. 1786 That's opportunity for 1787 Americans and American businesses and the oil and gas industry. 1788 But there are other opportunities where American technology

But there are other opportunities where American technology can be exported. When we think about energy exports we just think about product.

But we have fracking technology and other down hole technology that can be utilized off shore, say Guyana, which just discovered a tremendous oil field -- 32 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, not counting the oil.

I don't have that number right off the top of my head. But it's an abundant find. American technology both onshore and offshore can be exported within this hemisphere. So I want to ask Ms. Harbert, because you seem to have a lot of knowledge about global energy initiatives, what are other opportunities that American industries can take advantage of? Because we are a leader in the energy area.

Ms. Harbert. Well, you're absolutely right and the countries in Latin America, save for Venezuela -- Argentina, Peru,

1789

1790

1791

1792

1793

1794

1795

1796

1797

1798

1799

1800

1801

1802

1804 Brazil -- they have welcomed American investment in the energy 1805 sector because they know we have the best technology and the best 1806 techniques available. 1807 We've been able to develop gas in Peru. We've been able to, 1808 with some hiccups along the way, be big investors in Argentina 1809 and the demand in Latin America as a developing world is going 1810 to go up. 1811 And so the opportunities for us to invest in some of those 1812 repositories in Latin America but also to export from America is 1813 huge, just like it is in Africa. 1814 Africa is going to be an industrializing part of the world 1815 and we want to be part of that industrialization through energy 1816 as a foundation for it. They don't have all the energy we need. 1817 So the opportunities, if you look at the International Energy 1818 Agency forecast, the demand for fossil fuels not only is constant 1819 but goes up and we will provide fossil fuels. We'll provide 80 1820 percent of all new -- the world's energy resources in 2050. So 1821 huge opportunities to export, way beyond just North America. 1822 Mr. Thompson, are our refining capacity and Mr. Duncan. 1823 refineries ready to receive, say, Guyanan oil for refining so that 1824 those products can be shipped around the globe? 1825 Mr. Thompson. Yes. We have the capability to take crude 1826 from all around the world and most importantly, you know, we look 1827 forward to the opportunity to export products back to the rest 1828 of the world.

1829 You know, last year we exported 72 billion gallons and with 1830 the U.S. energy -- or transportation fuel demands staying 1831 relatively flat now we need those export markets. 1832 Mr. Duncan. Right. 1833 Mr. Chairman, in the remaining time I want to point all the 1834 committee members and the panellists to a Wall Street Journal 1835 article today, I believe: "Fracking Our Way to Mideast Peace." 1836 It's worth reading, and with that I yield back the balance. 1837 Mr. Upton. [Presiding.] The chair thanks the gentleman 1838 and yield back. 1839 The chair now calls upon the gentleman from Texas, Mr. 1840 Flores, for five minutes. 1841 Mr. Flores. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate 1842 you holding this hearing and I appreciate the panel for joining 1843 us today. 1844 When NAFTA was negotiated, Mexico's energy sector was largely closed to foreign investment. This is important to me 1845 1846 because I was -- one of my firms did substantial energy activity 1847 in Mexico and it was a very closed market. It was very arduous 1848 to deal in the energy space down there. 1849 But in recent years, as you have heard, I mean, Mexico has 1850 opened up -- Mexico has opened up their markets and they have --1851 they've shown real leadership and we have substantial trade 1852 activities that opened up just in a short period of time.

But in order for all of us -- Canada, the United States, and

Mexico -- to take advantage of that market opening, U.S. companies need to have the certainty that their investments will be protected against government mistreatment.

The NAFTA renegotiation presents an opportunity to recognize Mexico's energy reforms and to maintain and strengthen NAFTA's investment protections, and this is why it's important.

Mexico is the number-one export destination for U.S. gas exports, making up 60 percent of Mexico's total gas supply. Most of that gas comes from my home state of Texas. Mexico is also the number-one export destination for U.S. petroleum products.

Half the gasoline U.S. refineries exported this year went to Mexico and energy and production activity off the shore of Mexico is just starting as well, creating new opportunities for U.S. businesses -- many folks that are friends of mine that I used to do business with when I was in the energy business.

It's my understanding that the U.S. -- excuse me, that the White House and the USTR are supportive of locking in these energy reforms as is Mexico. Unfortunately, there are proposals and a NAFTA renegotiation would undercut if not eviscerate important investment protections in NAFTA typically via the well-recognized ISDS mechanism.

So in light of the foregoing, here are my questions. Ms. Harbert, I believe that you touched on the importance of investment protection via the ISDS mechanism in your written testimony.

1879 Will you please comment on the USTR's proposal to scale back 1880 investment protection, particularly the consequences for the 1881 energy sector? And Mr. Thompson, I will ask you the same thing. 1882 Ms. Harbert. Thank you or the opportunity. 1883 You're absolutely right. Anything from the U.S. side that 1884 would seek to upend the certainty that is necessary to continue 1885 the investments brought about by the reform are certainly 1886 unwelcome and I think they would have the following repercussions. 1887 Number one, it would jeopardize that American investment and 1888 that's what we are actually trying to protect. We would also 1889 jeopardize North American energy security. 1890 Without having that free cross-border trade we wouldn't have 1891 the benefit of both the import and export of energy from both of 1892 your trading partners, which would be a big setback to energy 1893 security. 1894 We would also jeopardize North America becoming the center 1895 of gravity of the world's energy market and that -- we talked about 1896 I mean, we are going to just throw that away and let 1897 them become dominant again? That would be a huge national 1898 security issue for us. And last but not least, let's not lose the fact that this 1899 would raise costs on the consumer because if we are forced to only 1900 1901 consume our domestic resources from North America and our 1902 producers don't have export, they're going to start producing less

and that really is a lose-lose for the American economy.

1904 So serious consequences. Those investor protections are 1905 fundamental and they are present in all other trade agreements. 1906 I don't know why we'd want to make something new here. 1907 Mr. Flores. I agree. I agree. 1908 Mr. Thompson. 1909 Mr. Thompson. Yes. So I echo everything Ms. Harbert said. 1910 We have members that are investors at the moment hundreds of 1911 millions of dollars to enter the Mexican downstream market. 1912 If you take away ISDS protections, it's going to jeopardize 1913 that. We need to make sure that the Mexican market stays open. 1914 We need an agreement that locks that in and we need to protect 1915 our investors. It's critical that the ISDS mechanisms remain in 1916 NAFTA. 1917 Mr. Flores. Okay. So, I mean, just simply, I mean, to put 1918 it this way. 1919 I mean, on one hand the White House says, we believe in energy 1920 dominance for our country and for North America. On the other 1921 hand, the USTR is undercutting that by any conversation about 1922 getting rid of the ISDS mechanisms. Is that a simple way to put 1923 it? 1924 And we hope through continued discussions that Ms. Harbert. 1925 they can understand how important it is for all the reasons I 1926 articulated. 1927 But at the end of the day, if we are trying to protect American 1928 investors, let's not take away the thing that protects American 1929 investors. 1930 Mr. Flores. Exactly. Okay. 1931 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my 1932 time. 1933 [Presiding.] The gentleman yields back. Mr. Olson. The 1934 chair now calls upon the gentleman from the Commonwealth of 1935 Virginia, Mr. Griffith, for five minutes. 1936 Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me 1937 apologize to you and for the committee. I usually like to come 1938 and listen to everything and today, because I've been in another committee hearing, I have been unable to do so. But your 1939 1940 testimony is important and we appreciate you being here today. 1941 So I have no problem with this trading with our friends, north 1942 and south. But there needs to be, I believe, a more balanced and 1943 fair deal between our respective countries. 1944 My district in southwest and south side Virginia was 1945 devastated by NAFTA and we lost tens of thousands of jobs. 1946 know, back when that was all going on, you know, there would be 1947 a press conference and 3,000 people would be out of work. 1948 We didn't get those jobs back. We also have a heavy -- that 1949 was textiles predominantly. We also have a heavy dose of coal 1950 in my district and, you know, it shows me part of the problem we 1951 have with NAFTA. 1952 A lot of the coal mining in Mexico -- and we are not importing 1953 a lot but we do some. But that's not the issue. The point is 1954 they have coal mines there. But a large part of their coal 1955 industry is now controlled or managed by elements of their drug 1956 cartels and the working conditions are horrible. 1957 But we are supposed to be considered equals, and the same 1958 problem happens with all industries. So what do we do in areas 1959 that have been devastated like my district where the jobs never 1960 came back, the help from the federal government was never there 1961 to rebuild our economy, and I am dealing with communities that 1962 have parts of their downtown that used to flourish they're now 1963 -- you know, there's a block I am thinking of in particular that's 1964 just empty. 1965 It's not like a shell of itself. All of the stores are gone. 1966 It's just not there. It's a ghost part of that community. 1967 of it's surviving but just barely. Part of it's doing better. 1968 How do we solve that problem? As we look at making a better 1969 deal, how do we rectify when you have disparities in working 1970 conditions, disparities in regulations, that then make the 1971 American product uncompetitive against our colleagues and our 1972 friends in the south who don't have those rules? 1973 And some went to Canada but they're more like us in the regard 1974 of their regulations and rules. Who wants to handle that? Ms. Harbert. Well, I will take a stab at one part of that 1975 1976 -- two parts of it.

First, I do think it's important to recognize that coal

exports are on the rise in America and 13 percent of all of our

1977

coal exports are going to Canada and Mexico -- predominantly
Mexico, right. So they are a good and important and potentially
growing destination for our coal exports.

On the relocation of industries, you know, I think that is why we find ourselves back at the table, that we want to update and modernize NAFTA from where it was, you know, 30 some odd years ago and that there's an opportunity to open up some of these things and look at that, and it's complicated.

And if you have ever been in a trade negotiation, you know, if you come out with -- the acronyms they use are mind boggling. And so I think that's the reason we are at the table. At the end of the day, there are going to be, you know, industries that choose to move for economic reasons. That has been the history of free enterprise and capital markets and free trade.

But there are things that we are looking, you know, at the coal industry in particular. We have the Appalachian hub that's going to be built, a new ethylene storage hub in Appalachia that will take some of those coal miners and put them to work in something else.

Mr. Griffith. Where is Appalachia is that going to be?

Ms. Harbert. Well, that's a great question and that's up

for the industry to decide and those -- and all of the states in

Appalachia to say what makes the most sense. But at the end of

the day, it will benefit that region and provide sort of, you know,

a relief valve for some of the miners that lost their jobs.

2004 But it's not just NAFTA. I think we have to realize it's 2005 It's artificial intelligence. It's mega, you know, 2006 It's all kinds of things that, you know, 21st technoloy 2007 has brought us that make moving around a little bit easier. 2008 Mr. Griffith. Well, let me just say, I actually believe that 2009 if we could get some of our textile industry back it would mostly 2010 be robotics. But that would still be some good high-paying jobs. 2011 But when we lost those jobs 20 years ago, 25 years ago, it 2012 was all based on regulations and wages and it just disappeared. 2013 In a matter of a couple of years, we went from being vibrant to 2014 having been crushed. We made a bad deal. We got to fix it. 2015 I yield back. Thank you. 2016 Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back. 2017 The chair now calls upon the gentleman with the Bakken Shale Play in his home state of North Dakota, Mr. Cramer, for five 2018 2019 minutes. 2020 Mr. Cramer. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are 2021 known for lots of other things as well. A lot of food. 2022 First of all -- and I am sorry I had to step out for a little 2023 bit -- but this has been a really good hearing. All of you, 2024 tremendous job. Thank you. Very well done, and I share all of 2025 your concerns with what's going on with regard to NAFTA. 2026 And it's particularly in the energy area -- and I am concerned 2027 about some other things too but the energy area being sort of new, 2028 if you will, since NAFTA was first passed to seek to present so

many opportunities.

But here's an opportunity I want to raise just sort of rhetorically and then get your responses to it. And by the way, I am going to be -- I am going to be sort of fuel agnostic on this.

I really don't think the fuel matters. I think that what matters is whether it's intellectual, whether it's fossil, whether it's technology -- just there's so much opportunity.

But we talk a lot about trade with one another, you know, the big three of us, and we are all important to each other. As I like to tell my Canadian friends, however, as important as you are to us we are critical to you. So we have a leverage that you don't and always remember that, and our president understands that very well.

So anyway, but here's what I think we miss so oftentimes in the discussion that I wish -- I wish we could get to. Just as sure as all the statistics you have shared in terms of how much we trade with one another and what -- a large percentage of our business with, you know, the other two -- Mexico and Canada -- I think somebody said that the next 10 added up don't add up to what -- in certain areas what Mexico and Canada add up to for us in terms of market.

What I get enthused about is the opportunity as a bloc -- as a seamless -- and by the way, when I was sitting here earlier I pulled up my -- one of my favourite maps in the world is the North American petroleum products pipeline map.

89 2054 It knows nothing of borders and I remember the first time 2055 we reversed a pipeline in North Dakota, that instead of bringing, 2056 you know, Canadian crude down we went Bakken crude up on the very 2057 same line. Just not necessarily even to get it to Saskatchewan 2058 but perhaps to get it to the Gulf Coast. I mean, that's how 2059 important that infrastructure is. So I appreciate all the 2060 emphasis on infrastructure. 2061 But what I -- I just -- I would love to just hear some comments 2062 and maybe beginning with you, Ms. Harbert, and all of you could 2063 if you have an opinion.

> But what's the potential opportunity from a security as well as -- an economic security as well as a national and energy security opportunity? If we as a bloc get our act together, harmonize everything we are talking about, and then -- and then who needs OPEC, right? I mean, that's -- that's how I view it.

So just open it up for discussion.

Ms. Harbert. Absolutely. The national security dividend of this should not go unnoticed in the energy sector. First, from an American standpoint, we are importing more oil from Canada and Mexico than we are from OPEC and so that's been a change in energy fortune for sure.

And the opportunity to full develop the resources of Canada, the United States, and Mexico and become the center of the world's energy market, which would send shock waves into not just OPEC but Russia sort of warms my heart.

2064

2065

2066

2067

2068

2069

2070

2071

2072

2073

2074

2075

2076

2077

Mr. Cramer. Yes.

Ms. Harbert. So I think that we shouldn't lose -- this is not just an economic negotiation. This is a national security negotiation as well because the stronger we are, the more competitive we are on the world's stage as a bloc, if you will, but also from an energy standpoint, the more energy secure we are the more economics -- the more national secure we are and that provides our allies with choices of where they can get their oil, their gas, their technology. They probably can't import their renewables but there's growing renewables within our bloc and it's a tremendous win-win.

Mr. Cramer. Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Thompson. Well, let me say without sounding too corny, I mean, I think it would give us lots of things. It would give us unprecedented freedom in North America -- freedom and to take away the leverage that the rest of the world or certain parts of the world have over us now.

It will give us prosperity. Our nations will prosper. Our employees will prosper. Our consumers will prosper. We'll continue to benefit from low oil prices and low gasoline prices and good high-paying jobs. We can become an energy-dominant region.

I think the possibilities are endless. We should all be, you know, trying to get there.

Mr. Cramer. Doctor?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2104 Mr. Krupnick. In our report to the Department of Energy on 2105 these issues, we call very strongly for thinking about ways of 2106 moving towards this bloc -- a concept that you're talking about 2107 and we talk about that as well. 2108 So I think the way to move forward on this is to give DOE 2109 responsibility and the charge to develop pathways for the future. 2110 What are the current challenges? How deep do you have to go in 2111 environmental policy and tax policy to make all this a reality? 2112 You know, I am amazed at how much agreement there is about 2113 moving in this direction and it's great. But someone needs to 2114 think through it carefully. 2115 Thank you. Mr. Cramer. 2116 Mr. Olson. The gentleman yields back. The chair thanks him 2117 for bringing up the bloc we call NAPEC -- North American Petroleum 2118 Exporting Countries. 2119 And seeing that there are no further members who wish to ask 2120 question, I would like to thank all the witnesses for being here 2121 today. 2122 Merry Christmas. And pursuant to committee rules, I remind 2123 members that they have 10 business days to submit additional 2124 questions for the record and ask that all witnesses submit their 2125 responses within 10 business days upon receipt of those questions. 2126 [The prepared statement of Chairman Walden follows:] 2127 2128

2129

2130	Mr. Olson. Without objection, this subcommittee is
2131	adjourned.
2132	[Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]