

RECOGNIZING PRINCIPAL GRANT HANEVOLD OF SUNRISE MOUNTAIN HIGH SCHOOL

□ 1003

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize high school principal of the year for 2015, Grant Hanevold of Sunrise Mountain High School in Las Vegas.

I have always believed that providing the Nation's youth with a quality education is one of the best investments that we can make to ensure that this century is yet another American century.

Principal Hanevold represents the spirit of service that is often missed at too many of our Nation's schools. He understands that educators must invest time and effort in their communities which they serve.

By incorporating teachers, parents, and community members into the decisionmaking process, Principal Hanevold was able to get everyone to buy in on his vision and take pride in what they were accomplishing together. This established a culture of success at Sunrise Mountain that ultimately led to a remarkable 13 percent increase in graduation rates.

Congratulations to Nevada's principal of the year, Grant Hanevold.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1002

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST) at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.

ADAPTATION TO CHANGING CRUDE OIL MARKETS

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill, H.R. 702.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 702.

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

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 702) to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), a member of the committee.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 702, but, more importantly, I rise today in support of American jobs.

The U.S. daily production of oil has increased dramatically in the past 14 years. That number is projected to continue to increase due to advances in technology, but companies need a new market. At this point, the ban is not protecting the economy. Instead, the economy is being restricted, and Americans are being denied jobs.

My district and State rely on good-paying oil industry jobs. At a time when our economy can't afford to see unemployment numbers rise, oil companies are being forced to cut back their workforce. Lifting the ban on crude oil exports will mean new jobs for Mississippians that will allow them to support their families.

I urge my colleagues to support and vote for H.R. 702 and for American jobs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 702, a poorly crafted bill that needlessly and recklessly sweeps away 40 years of critical energy protections for national security, our economy, consumers, and the environment.

H.R. 702 is a blunt object that doesn't just undermine current protective authorities related to crude oil; it also prohibits any Federal official from taking any action at any time if that action either restricts or enforces a restriction on the export of oil. The term "restriction" is undefined and potentially dangerous in scope.

The bill would also override any other law that would impose any restriction by any Federal official on exports. That means that the bill does nothing to preserve any environment or safety statutes or regulations, and it doesn't even preserve the Defense Production Act, one of the most important tools any President has to ensure our national energy security in the face of a threat.

Let's be clear, Mr. Chairman. The President has already stated that he will veto this bill. Further, any legislation of this nature is completely un-

necessary since the President already has the authority to ease or even remove restrictions on crude oil exports, and the Obama administration has taken major steps to exercise that authority by approving crude oil swaps with Mexico and applications for the export of condensate.

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that it is imperative for Congress to consider a host of factors before we lift the current restrictions and, certainly, if we are to completely dismantle our Nation's ability to restrict oil exports, as proposed by H.R. 702.

First, Mr. Chairman, there are consumer impacts, especially related to the price of crude oil and gasoline. A recent study found that changes to U.S. oil export policy will have little to no impact on the future price of oil.

What we do know is that changes in our crude oil policy will lead to a significant payday for oil producers, with increases in annual profits approaching \$30 billion by 2025.

Next, there are the impacts on our refinery capacity and associated jobs, well-paying middle class jobs that have grown over the past few years due to increased production. Unrestricted exports of crude oil put those jobs at jeopardy and could mean exporting those jobs and losing out on critical investments in future refining capacity.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, there are, of course, the environmental and climate impacts of lifting the export ban. Energy policy is fundamentally linked to environmental policy. Each is a facet of the other. Increasing crude oil exports means increasing domestic production and its impacts on climate change, public health, worker safety, property owners, and protection of our drinking water supplies.

As I have said before, this legislation eagerly embraces short-term profits and benefits without understanding or even considering the cost of such a major action. We simply can't afford to make that mistake. We should ensure we fully understand and consider the enduring consequences of our actions and choose the cleanest and most sustainable path forward.

I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that the potential impacts of H.R. 702 on national security, on the economy, on consumers, and on the environment can be considered acceptable.

So, Mr. Chairman, increased crude exports certainly help oil companies. It is a bonanza for the oil companies, but without any guaranteed benefits for consumers. I urge my colleagues to join me and the President in saying "no" to this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTON. My understanding, in general debate, the majority, or proponents, have 30 minutes, and then the opponents have 30 minutes; is that correct?