

COMMITTEE ON
**SCIENCE, SPACE, AND
TECHNOLOGY**
CHAIRMAN LAMAR SMITH



For Immediate Release
May 7, 2013

Media Contacts: Kim Smith Hicks, Zachary Kurz
(202) 225-6371

**Statement of Energy Subcommittee Chairman Cynthia Lummis (R-Wyo.)
Hearing on “Keystone XL Pipeline: Examination of Scientific and Environmental Issues”**

Chairman Lummis: Good morning and welcome to today’s hearing, Keystone XL Pipeline: Examination of Scientific and Technical Issues. I want to thank Chairman Stewart for holding this hearing with me on such an important and pressing issue. I also want to thank the witnesses for being here today, and look forward to their testimony.

In the last few years, the U.S. energy landscape has changed dramatically. We have gone from a net importer to a net exporter of petroleum products; we have become the global leader in natural gas production and are expected to lead in oil production by the end of the decade. Instead of building import terminals for LNG, we are modifying these facilities to export our abundant natural gas resources.

Despite these changes, one issue has remained stagnant over the last four years, and that is the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline. This project would allow us to decrease our reliance on unstable or unfriendly sources of oil and increase our trading relationship with Canada, a friendly, democratic, and stable ally. Approval of the pipeline would also facilitate our own oil development, as the pipeline would also carry Bakken crude being produced in North Dakota.

In addition to increasing our energy security, the pipeline offers a safe and permanent solution to alleviate the bottleneck of U.S. crude oil in the midcontinent. In fact, it’s the safest solution that exists. The State Department concluded Keystone XL, with its 57 extra safety features, would have a degree of safety over any other domestic pipeline. Yet President Obama has slow walked the project, saying in 2012 that a deadline requiring him to approve or deny the pipeline “prevented a full assessment of the pipeline’s impact.” This was after thousands of pages of analysis and tens of thousands of public comments over a four year period.

Another year and another report later, the Administration has yet to approve the project. That the Administration would slow-walk a project that supports fossil fuels is perhaps no surprise to some of us. However, what I cannot understand is how the President can rhetorically claim to be committed to job creation and economic growth, and in practice obstruct a project that would support both. According to the State Department, the project would support over 42,000 jobs and result in two billion dollars in the pockets of hardworking Americans. This would represent a significant contribution to our slow economic recovery.

And that is just the beginning. Direct expenditures on construction and materials could amount to 3.3 billion dollars, and sales and use taxes could generate another 65 million dollars in revenue for the affected states. Yet another often overlooked economic benefit is the positive impact that trade with Canada has on the U.S. economy—trade with Canada benefits the U.S. economy more than trade with

any other nation in the world. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, for every dollar the U.S. spends on Canadian goods and services, Canada spends approximately 89 cents on U.S. goods and services. I hope this Administration realizes that actions speak louder than words. To voice support for job creation and economic growth is one thing; to actually do something about it is another. I hope the President will prioritize action over empty rhetoric and approve the project as soon as possible. We have waited long enough.

Thank you Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

###