RECOGNIZING PRINCIPAL GRANT HANEVOLD OF SUNRISE MOUNTAIN HIGH SCHOOL

(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.

□ 1003

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 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 unnecessary 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?

The CHAIR. On this bill, yes, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce each control 30 minutes.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), the original Democrat sponsor, have 6 minutes of the proponent's time to control as he sees fit.

The CHAIR. The Chair cannot entertain a unanimous consent request to change the scheme for control of general debate.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an additional parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTON. Could the Chair educate the illiterate Member from Texas on how I could give Mr. CUELLAR time that he may control on his side? If I can't yield it unanimously, how can I do that?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas may yield from his own time to engage in debate, and may yield to Members on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. BARTON. Continuing the parliamentary inquiry, if I do that, can he reserve part of that time, or does he have to use it all in one slot?

The CHAIR. The other gentleman from Texas would not control the time.

Mr. BARTON. He could not reserve any of it?

The CHAIR. Correct.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for the time to speak on this bill, which I wholeheartedly support, because ending this oil export ban will not only boost our economy, it will also improve our foreign policy.

I also rise with hesitation to a proposed amendment that would remove a provision of this bill boosting payments to the 60 ships of our maritime security fleet. These ships are essential in transporting cargo to the men and women of our Armed Forces who are serving overseas in harm's way. As evidence of this, 90 percent of all cargo moved to Iraq and Afghanistan has been transported on these privately owned ships.

As of right now, Mr. Chairman, the stipend provided by the government is too low to make this program viable to those who have stepped up to defend our Nation against foreign threats. Without this increase, it is likely that participants will drop out of the program. This, obviously, is a national security threat.

It is estimated that for the government to replicate this program, it would cost more than $50 billion in taxpayer money. This programs saves money while enhancing our security, and I encourage my colleagues to avoid supporting this amendment, but voting ''yes'' to lift this outdated oil export ban.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

I have been here in Congress for 21 years, and during that time, we always hear talk about we want to be energy-independent in the United States. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle always talk about the dream of energy independence, where we don't have to depend on any other country for our oil. It would change policy in the Middle East, and it would dramatically improve our national security. Well, the bad news is, Mr. Chairman, we are not energy-independent. We use 17 million barrels of oil a day, but we only produce 9 million, which means we are still importing nearly half of all the oil we use.

Now, here is the good news, Mr. Chairman. Horizontal drilling and all this oil we are finding in the shale formations gives us a chance to be truly energy-independent. We could produce an additional 9 million barrels a day, and we wouldn't have to depend on any other country in the world for our oil. All we have to do is produce what we have in our own country and make sure that we have refinery capacity to take care of this light sweet crude, and we are energy-independent.

So the question is, Mr. Chairman, why aren't we investing in our own domestic refinery capacity to keep high-paying jobs here in the United States in the refinery industry, in the maritime trades, and in manufacturing, like steelmaking? Why aren't we doing that for America while enhancing America's security?

We had the former commander of the USS *Cole*, Kirk Lippold, testify before our committee. He highlighted ''the significant national security risks associated with greater oil imports.'' He said that ''too many times in recent history, the U.S. has made oil deals with hostile or unfriendly governments that actually threaten our foreign policy and our national security objectives.

''Lifting the export ban will undermine U.S. power projection capabilities by undermining the competitiveness of our U.S. refineries.''

Do we really want to undermine the U.S. military?

And then we hear the story that, somehow, lifting this ban is going to help our European allies because it will reduce their dependence on Russian oil. Well, that is a myth, too.

As Commander Lippold testified before our committee, ''the primary recipient of this U.S. exported oil is going to be Asia, specifically, China.''

□ 1015

So we want to export U.S. oil to China and still have to import oil from countries that aren't necessarily friendly to us. Why would we do that?

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 702 is deeply flawed because it doesn't allow for any future oversight of oil exports under any circumstances. Even if there is an oil spike or a shortage, there is no ''safety valve'' to ensure that we have enough of this critical resource for our Armed Forces, our industries, and our constituents.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this bill undermines our national security, and we are still importing an incredible amount of oil. This just defies common sense, and we should reject it.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS), a cosponsor of the bill.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 702, legislation that would lift the 40-year-old ban on U.S. oil exports.

In 1975, President Gerald Ford signed the ban into law in response to gasoline shortages and the Arab oil embargo.

While the ban served a purpose nearly 40 years ago, much has changed since that time. Today we need an energy policy that aligns with our current economic and political climate.

The United States is the largest petroleum and natural gas producer in the world. Our self-imposed export ban doesn't make sense and does nothing but hinder economic growth.

If the ban is lifted this year, over 57,000 new supply chain jobs would be created in my home State of California by 2018, and nationwide nearly 450,000 new jobs would be created.

Having the option to put U.S. crude oil on the world market would benefit Americans. Lifting the ban would create jobs, strengthen the U.S. economy, and help reduce our trade deficit. It would also provide the international marketplace with more options, in turn, limiting the ability of energy commodities to be used as political weapons.

It is important to note that this bill doesn't require the U.S. to export crude oil. It simply provides the option needed for barrels to be used in the areas where they are needed most.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time so the Republicans can have another speaker.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) at the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), who is my original Democrat sponsor.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support and as a cosponsor of H.R. 702, which lifts the ban on crude oil exports.

Modern advances in hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling have allowed the United States access to large deposits of crude oil and natural gas. Last year our country produced over 350 million barrels of crude oil, and that number is steadily increasing.

The crude oil in our deposits is lighter and sweeter than the traditional heavy crude oil our refineries process. The export ban hinders our access to international markets that need the

sweeter type of crude and that have the refinement infrastructure for it.

I am convinced that lifting the outdated crude oil export ban will create jobs and economic opportunities for our communities as we strive for greater energy independence.

In the great State of Texas, lifting the export ban is estimated to increase the annual GDP by over $7.1 billion and create over 40,000 new supply chain jobs.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds on behalf of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. HINOJOSA. According to the Government Accountability Office, removing export restrictions will create employment opportunities, expand trade, and lower gasoline prices.

The economic and political landscape has evolved since the ban's inception in the 1970s. I am confident that now is the time to repeal the ban on the export of crude oil to increase our economic and energy competitiveness.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 702.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 702.

In the past 10 years, the United States has undergone an energy revolution. Our production of oil and gas has far exceeded all analysis or prediction. The success in the field has materialized into jobs in our district in the Houston area, both in the chemical and the refining industries.

The price of oil dropped from $100 a barrel to $45 a barrel. Gasoline prices have fallen from $4 per gallon to less than $2 in Houston.

I have represented our refinery complexes for many years. All of these benefited our economy and the consumer.

Unfortunately, the success has brought hardship upon the upstream producers. The energy sector, which led our country out of the recession, has now laid off approximately 150,000 folks. Bloomberg estimated that 40 percent of those layoffs were in Texas.

I know the oil patch is facing a tough and difficult time, and I want to help. That is why it is very difficult for me to oppose this bill today.

I support crude oil exports while protecting our domestic manufacturing jobs, including refining. We have the resource. We should use as much as possible here at home and sell what is left.

I am a legislator who would like to solve this problem, and I like working across the party lines to get results. In fact, I worked with my good friend from Texas, JOE BARTON, on many issues during our years in Congress. In fact, JOE and I sat together for years at the Texas A&M football games until we realized A&M would lose when we sat next to each other. So last Saturday, when they beat Mississippi State, we sat a ways apart so we didn't jinx them.

For months, I talked with Representative BARTON about the crude export issue. The crude oil export ban has been in place since 1975. In the seventies, the United States was in a tough spot, and we put the ban in place to protect our national interests.

That is more than 40 years of legislative history. Before we throw all of that away, we should make sure we have a policy that will make sense for the next 40 years.

I am hoping we can craft a bill that would create a process at the Bureau of Industry and Security within the Department of Commerce that would establish an authorization and reporting requirements for crude oil.

Crude oil is a valuable national resource, and the government should have some oversight as to where and when we send it overseas.

We export liquefied natural gas through a process developed at the Department of Energy. I have not been a fan of that process, but we have worked to improve it. We should have some basic requirements at the Department of Commerce to oversee crude.

Unlike LNG, crude is a raw commodity. Unlike refined products, raw crude oil doesn't have value added. Our refiners add value to that, and we export that refined product. So those are jobs created in our community.

Building LNG terminals and exporting refined product creates good-paying jobs and lots of capital expenditure. If exporting crude is the right policy, then let's do it correctly. Let's maximize the benefits for the United States.

Let's make sure U.S. crude doesn't end up in the hands of North Korea or any of our other foes. We need to know where this resource is going, how much of it is being sent, and how often it is being sent there.

We need to ensure that, if at any time, a potential bad actor enters the marketplace; the Department of Commerce has the ability to enforce the law.

The Department of Commerce is not an obstacle to exports.

In fact, I have struggled to find a more industry-friendly government agency.

The Department of Commerce has approved every application to export oil in the last five years.

That's 138 permits.

What's more impressive is Commerce approves 99 percent of all export applications, regardless of product.

Now, I agree that the Department could approve permits more efficiently but that's something we can legislate.

That's a "fix" I can support and believe would help our upstream producers.

Unfortunately, we were unable to find that compromise.

I did not want to oppose this bill but without changes it is not in the best interest of our country.

The time to address exports is now but we cannot just open the tap and hope for the best.

I do not want the United States to become a resource nation and I certainly do not want to go back to the days of the 1970s.

I look forward to working on this issue again and hope that a reasonable, commonsense approach can be reached.

I want folks in all sectors to get back to work.

For these reasons, I am forced to oppose H.R. 702 and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) just said.

The whole concept of this bill is to let willing buyers interact with willing sellers in a free market, transparent fashion.

If you subject the bill to some sort of a discretionary permitting requirement, as one of Mr. GENE GREEN's amendments would have done, you gut the bill. You destroy the entire purpose of the bill.

So as much as I respect my good friend from Houston, Texas, I respectfully have to object to that amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a member of the committee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman Emeritus Barton's tremendous leadership on this issue.

I rise today in strong support of the bill, bipartisan in nature, which will create thousands of American jobs, generate billions of dollars in revenues to States and locals, and use our Nation's natural resources as a counterbalance to the rogue actors currently dominating world oil markets.

American energy brings security and independence to the world and jobs and economic development to the United States.

It makes no sense that Iranian oil will soon be permitted to flow, but American-made energy is left untapped.

It is time to end the outdated restrictions on the export of U.S. oil and, instead, work to create and protect tens of thousands of U.S. jobs, enhance our national security, and help keep prices at the pump affordable for all consumers across the country.

American energy brings growth, prosperity, security, and independence to the United States and our allies. Our Nation should counter Iran and create thousands of U.S. jobs in the process.

Please vote for H.R. 702.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time there is on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 20½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), one of our original cosponsors and a strong proponent of this bill.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his work on this important proposition.

Mr. Chairman, for almost my entire life, the Nation has worked under prevailing science that said we have reached peak energy, we are out, that we have to plan for the future because we have no more oil.

Two years ago a discovery was found in New Mexico that will provide more oil from that one find than has been produced in our State from its entire history through the entire geographic part of New Mexico.

The science was a lie. We are finding oil.

What is happening right now is that the refineries use a heavy sour crude. The new finds in shale are producing light sweet, which is more valuable. It is easier to refine.

Yet, that light sweet oil is sitting in the pipelines in New Mexico, trying to get to Houston. It is selling at $17 below the market cost because there is no destination.

The Baltics have said they would use our oil, they would put our workers back to work. But this law prevents it. The law in place, H.R. 702, simply says: Open that door and put Americans back to work, Americans driving trucks, Americans at the convenient stores. Americans everywhere get the jobs.

The idea that this somehow undercuts jobs is absolutely a frivolous idea to present on this House floor.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, over the past couple of months, I have worked tirelessly to find a reasonable compromise with the sponsor of H.R. 702, my friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. BARTON), that would allow me and others with similarly situated constituencies to support this bill.

Although I share the concerns of many of my Democratic colleagues on how this bill might impact the environment and climate change, I have always stated that I believe in the all-of-the-above energy approach that balances environmental concerns and economic opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the Rules Committee I advocated for an open rule process that would have allowed Democrats to offer amendments that would reflect priorities and concerns of the minority party.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I myself submitted an amendment that would have expanded access for minority- and women-owned firms to more fully participate in the energy supply chain, which we know will be greatly enhanced if the export ban is lifted.

Mr. Chairman, although my friends in the environmental community wouldn't agree, in my district, we say: Oil is not just a commodity. Oil is indeed an economic opportunity.

□ 1030

Mr. Chairman, my most pressing concern is making sure up front and from the beginning that minority firms would be part of the pipeline economy and would directly benefit from vendor and contracting opportunities that lifting this ban would create. Instead, Mr. Chairman, despite positive rhetoric from members of the majority party, a closed rule was adopted.

While my comprehensive amendment was not allowed, Members are asked to vote now on Trojan horse amendments that would do nothing to actually benefit minorities and women as my far-reaching amendment was designed to do. Rather than shielding the majority party from charges of creating a multi-billion-dollar boondoggle for the energy industry, today there is not much in this bill as currently drafted that I can point to as really benefiting all segments of the American population.

As I have said time and time and time again, cut us in or cut it out. Cut us in or cut it out. Cut women in or cut it out. Cut the minorities in or cut it out.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, we will put the gentleman from Illinois down as undecided on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), who is the chairman of the Republican Study Committee and a member of the committee. He is from the home of the Fightin' Texas Aggies.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 702.

H.R. 702 results in five key benefits:

Number one, it benefits the American consumer with resulting overall lower energy prices. This particularly benefits lower-income and lower-middle-income Americans, providing greater financial security for these hardworking families.

Number two, it benefits the American producer and allows them to further reinvest in our domestic energy infrastructure, furthering our energy security and American jobs.

Number three, it benefits our geopolitical standing and strengthens ties with our global friends and allies, and it hurts those countries like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela who are opposed to American interests around the world.

Number four, it benefits the downstream refining community, as lower prices will stimulate volume demand for refined products. This volume gives them more financial capital to hire skilled American workers and to reinvest in their operation.

Number five, it strengthens our national defense by enhancing the Maritime Security Program, which supports a robust Merchant Marine for use by our military during times of international crisis.

These are five critical reasons why everybody wins after we lift the ban.

The President has threatened to veto this commonsense bill, and hardworking American families all over this country should ask: Mr. President, why are you putting the interests of Iranian terrorists ahead of the interests of hardworking American families?

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the Amash amendment and to support H.R. 702.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation for several reasons. First, except in very narrow circumstances, the bill does not allow any limits—not any limits—on exports of domestic oil regardless of potential threats to our national security, and that is our top responsibility as Members—our national security.

For decades there has been a bipartisan commitment in Congress and several administrations to energy independence and reducing our reliance on foreign oil. Given the continued dependence of our economy and our military on oil, energy independence remains critical to our national defense. But with little consideration of any national security implications, this bill allows unlimited exports of a critical strategic resource.

Mr. Chairman, the United States still imports 26 percent of the oil we consume and remains the world's top importer. Every barrel exported under this bill would have to be replaced by a barrel imported from elsewhere, leaving us more reliant on foreign countries.

The bill allows the President to limit exports only if he declares an emergency under the National Emergencies Act or the International Emergency Economic Powers Act or if he is directed by the International Energy Agency to respond to an international supply crisis. Outside of these narrow circumstances, the bill permits no restrictions on exports of crude oil. This means strategic considerations such as decreasing our reliance on imports from unfriendly regimes can play no part in deciding whether to allow exports. I don't think that is a good deal at all.

The bill also will have drastic impacts on the U.S. shipbuilding industry, tanker fleet, and refineries, all of which are critical to our national defense. Congress has recognized for nearly 100 years that it benefits our national security to maintain a robust domestic shipbuilding industry and commercial shipping fleet. For example, crude exports from Alaska which were legalized in 1995 must be carried on U.S.-flagged vessels crewed by Americans. This bill contains no requirement that exports be carried on U.S.-flagged tankers.

Under current law, the President can allow exports of crude oil if he finds they are in the national interest. This bill would allow unlimited exports regardless of whether they are in the national security interests of the United

States or not. I think that this is a slippery slope.

Commander Kirk Lippold, the retired Navy Captain of the USS *Cole*, testified before Congress earlier this year.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the retired Navy Captain of the USS *Cole* said the following: ''The national security implications of changing the existing policy regulating the export of crude oil are rife with unknown and probably unintended consequences that must be fully considered and addressed.''

I agree with Commander Lippold. This bill largely ignores those important national security concerns, and it is why I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), from the energy capital of the world, Houston, Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the administration has worked very hard to make sure the export ban on crude oil from Iran is lifted. But the administration has threatened to veto this bill that would lift the crude oil sanction ban on American oil. That doesn't make any sense to me—help the Iranians sell their excess crude oil abroad, but prevent America from selling our excess crude oil abroad. That is nutty.

Why does the President prefer the Iranians over Americans? It doesn't make any sense. The President should at least give us the same deal that he gave the Iranians: lift sanctions on them, lift the sanctions on American oil. We have a surplus. We need to sell it. ''Use all we can and sell the rest.'' That is the motto.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are lopsided on the time a little again, so I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Could we ask what the time differential is, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 20½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I am very honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON). Chairman UPTON is the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee from the great State of Michigan and my good friend.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I really thank Chairman Emeritus BARTON for doing a really significant, good job on getting this bill bipartisan support and working so hard over the last 18 months or so, and both in the last Congress and this Congress, to get this bill ready for the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, much has changed since the ban on crude oil was put in place in 1975. At that time, Congress and President Ford were responding to the Arab oil embargo crisis in an effort to protect this country from the unwanted impacts of the unstable global crude oil market. But we got good news today. Times have changed, and one of the biggest threats to the American energy boom today is not an international actor but, rather, our own ban on oil exports.

Lifting the crude oil export ban is a win for our economy, yes, it is. Study after study has shown that lifting the ban would actually lower prices at the pump, create thousands of jobs, generate hundreds of millions of dollars in economic benefits, and strengthen our geopolitical influence across the globe. It will actually also reduce the deficit by more than $1 billion with additional oil royalties. These are real benefits that will be felt not only in southwest Michigan, my district, but across the country; yet, somehow, this administration does not support this thoughtful solution.

Let's look at the benefits. According to the nonpartisan GAO, lifting the ban could lower prices by 1.5 to 13 cents a gallon, real savings that add up for every family's budget. Some estimates suggest that it could support the creation of an average of 394,000 jobs. Additionally, the bill before us would boost royalty payments, as I indicated, from Federal oil and gas leases. Collectively, all of these gains provide the making of a success story that would greatly benefit our economy at a time of great uncertainty.

This administration often likes to say that they are for an all-of-the-above energy policy, but the rhetoric, indeed, falls well short of reality. It doesn't make much sense that the White House is gung ho to lift the export ban in Iran, but when it comes to this country, the answer is ''no.''

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan bill would strengthen our hand in foreign diplomacy at a time when America has lost its standing on the global stage. By exporting our excess crude oil, we can help our allies seeking a safe and secure supply of energy. Instead of being beholden to OPEC and Russia for their energy needs, they can instead rely on their friends, the United States of America.

Creating jobs, keeping energy affordable, boosting energy production, and improving our energy security—that is what this bill does. I would urge my colleagues to support the Barton bill in a vote later on this morning.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 702. Not only does this bill incentivize more oil development while ignoring its impact on our climate, it also essentially guarantees billions more in profits for oil companies while doing virtually nothing to help consumers.

There are many more important issues that we should be spending our time on to actually help American families, like raising the minimum wage and making college more affordable, but instead we are passing a bill to help oil companies make more money.

Additionally, section 3 of the bill prohibits any Federal official from taking any action that could potentially restrict the export of oil. This broad language could seriously undermine critical health and safety responsibilities of the Federal Government.

For example, under current law, the Secretary of Transportation has the authority to shut down a crude oil pipeline if it poses a threat to life, property, or the environment. But what if an oil pipeline leading to an export terminal were in imminent danger of rupturing? Would the Secretary still have the authority to shut down that line, or would that action be considered a restriction on exporting crude oil under this bill?

Mr. Chairman, these are not hypothetical questions. This authority was recently used in my district to shut down line 901 of the Plains All American Pipeline when it ruptured last May. Since line 901 is the only way for the nearby offshore oil platforms to transport their oil to refineries, these platforms have had to shut down production entirely. Nearly 5 months after the spill, line 901 remains shut down, and there is no indication that it will be restarted in the near future.

It is not hard to imagine a similar event happening again, and the Secretary's authority to protect public health, property, and the environment during such an event must not be undermined.

□ 1045

Yet, if this bill were law, the Secretary's authority could be preempted entirely by section 3 of this bill. In other words, the bill could create a scenario in which the perceived right of oil companies to export their oil supersedes our very real responsibility to protect public health and safety.

The American people deserve better. This is a fatally flawed bill and sets the wrong priorities.

I urge its defeat.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), from District One of the great Pelican State, the distinguished Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Texas for yielding, but also for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor and building a strong bipartisan coalition to finally lift the ban on oil exports.

Mr. Chairman, this is a relic of the 1970s that doesn't fit with today's

world economy, but it also doesn't fit with the revolution that has happened in American energy because of American technology.

We have an abundance of natural resources now and an abundance of oil. We literally could be the Saudi Arabia of energy. Yet, there is a law that is on the books that bans the ability of the United States to export its own oil. There is no other nation in the world that has that limitation on their ability to sell that natural resource.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when the President is actually supporting this horrible deal with Iran that, among other things, allows Iran to export their oil to the world markets, the President at the same time is saying he opposes this bill that allows America to export its oil.

What is at stake, Mr. Chairman? What is at stake under this bill, if this bill passes, is it will create over 800,000 American jobs, good American jobs, here at home.

If this bill passes, Mr. Chairman, we can actually create over $800 million to reduce the deficit, deficit reduction, just by passing this bill.

What is also at stake, Mr. Chairman, if we pass this bill? We can help our allies around the world who don't want to have to get their oil from countries like Russia, where Vladimir Putin is using energy as a weapon against our friends. They can now get that energy from us.

Creating American jobs along the way, everything about this says yes. It is time to lift this relic of the 1970s. Let's finally allow American oil to be exported on world markets when we have such an abundance and we have the ability to create hundreds of thousands of new American jobs along the way.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding the time.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 702. The bill is an irresponsible giveaway to Big Oil at the expense of America's national security, at the expense of American consumers, and our longstanding policy of working towards energy independence.

Now, our current policy is not a ban. You can call it a ban, but it is not a ban. It allows and promotes oil exports to strategically important allies, to places in the national interest. It is a smart policy.

But now Big Oil wants free rein to ship America's natural resources to countries not in our national interest. This bill will eviscerate our thoughtful policy.

Despite assertions that the oil will go to allies in Europe and elsewhere, that is not supported by the facts. Who is most likely to benefit? Experts say China. The Energy Information Administration projects that China's oil consumption will double over the next 2 decades.

China has been very aggressive all across the globe in exploiting and locking down natural resources. They have gone to Africa. They have gone to South America. While we have been fighting battles in Afghanistan, they have been locking down contracts for natural resources in Afghanistan.

At the same time that America is dealing with Chinese cyber espionage and their geopolitical confrontations with our allies and the U.S., why would we help China gain a strategic foothold on America's natural resources? I would think that America's national security interests would compel you to defeat this bill.

You should also vote this bill down and side with American consumers instead and American jobs. America is still heavily dependent on imports of crude oil. We still import 25 percent today.

Any claims that sending American oil overseas would help consumers in America is entirely unsupported, no matter how many times they say it. Instead, what the studies show is that exporting American oil would feed the uncertainty of oil markets and likely increase costs to American consumers.

Back home in Tampa right now you can go to the gas station and fill up your tank at about $1.99 per gallon. So it defies logic to say that changing this policy that is working for America right now would really lower the price. I don't think so.

American jobs are also very likely to take a hit if this bill becomes law. Why? Because of the important jobs in the refining industry, the shipping industry. Those are American jobs. Side with the American jobs.

This bill is very poor public policy. Exports will be determined only by Big Oil to serve the interests of Big Oil, ceding complete control of this strategic national asset.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Just to close, Mr. Chairman, the cost to U.S. consumers, our policy of energy independence, our national security interests compel a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Cincinnati, the Buckeye State of Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor of leading the House Small Business Committee. A few months back we held a hearing on this very topic. We heard from small businesses about how this ban is holding them back. That is the untold story of this. This ban is hurting small businesses all across this country.

America is now the largest producer of oil and gas in the world. Lifting this decades-old ban is an opportunity to jump-start the economy. It would help 1 million Americans find work. It would increase the GDP. It would narrow the trade deficit, attract new capital to the U.S., and stabilize the global energy supply.

If America is going to lead the world in the 21st century, let's not keep one hand tied behind our back. Let's replace outdated energy policies with ones that are forward-thinking, ones that will create new jobs in a new American century.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentleman, this bill is about two things. It is about jobs and it is about national security. It will give us an opportunity to get Congress to join in with my good friend from North Dakota, KEVIN CRAMER, and BRAD ASHFORD from Nebraska, because this is about jobs and nobody needs jobs more than African Americans.

The hardest hit on unemployment is African American males. This allows us to be a part of being able to get language in that will help African American males get the kind of apprenticeship training with the Teamsters, with the AFL–CIO, with the operating engineers, all of those unions and contractors who are rebuilding this infrastructure for this oil.

Now, on national security, make no mistake about it, ladies and gentlemen. What do you think Russia is doing over in the Middle East? They want dominance over energy in the world, and he who controls the energy in the world controls the world. That is why they want to prop up Syria, because that is the seaport to get it out of the Middle East.

Stand up for jobs for the American people and protect the world from Russia. Vote to lift the ban on the oil exports.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say ''amen'' to what the gentleman from Georgia just said.

Mr. Chairman, what time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the entire delegation from the great State of North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the original cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

I have often said I don't know why it takes 36 Texans to do one person's job.

I have to tell you, I was prepared to give a great speech and then I listened to my friend from Georgia and, quite honestly, I feel inadequate to the task.

Because you stated it so eloquently and so beautifully, and I am committed to exactly what you talked about.

So maybe what I will try to do instead in my remaining seconds is remind us of the context that it was 72

years ago this week that the Yom Kippur War broke out that led to U.S. aid to Israel, which led to a 5 percent reduction out of OPEC of oil, which led to the very issue we are talking about today, that this historical context in a national security context is not irrelevant.

Let's not, I would say, let history repeat itself, but let's use the peaceful tools of energy development while creating jobs in America replace the weapons of war in Europe and in the Middle East. Let's use our influence for good by selling this American-made product that is produced by American workers, and let's do it in a bipartisan fashion today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), on behalf of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I am normally on the opposite side of the gentleman on the congressional baseball team and normally with Congressman DOYLE. So I hope we can win this one against Congressman MIKE DOYLE. So I thank the gentleman for the opportunity.

Two or three points I would like to make, Mr. Chairman.

One, in Ohio, lifting this ban means 16,000 jobs in Ohio, almost $3 billion in investment. Our friends, the operating engineers and the laborers who are going to do that work, are supportive of this bill.

I know we have some issues with the refineries, and I think we need to continue to work on that and see if we can fix that issue.

We have a number of studies that say the savings to the American consumer will be anywhere from 2 cents a gallon all the way up to 12 cents a gallon. Colombia University, Brookings, Aspen, Resources for the Future, all are saying this is going to reduce the cost of gas, which is a direct benefit for our consumers and our constituents who need it as we see this huge economic squeeze for the middle class.

Lastly, I have been sitting on the Defense Appropriations Committee now for a number of years, and this issue here can directly benefit our ability to deal with what is happening in the Middle East.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTON. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio on the understanding that he will not play his best game against us next summer.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield back. No. I am just kidding.

I also would also like to say, sitting on the Defense Appropriations Committee, we sit in these classified briefings and we see what is happening with Russia, we see what Putin is doing, we see what is happening in the Middle East, the Ukraine.

We need to export this oil. We need to export our natural gas. We need to have a bigger footprint in the world so that we can make sure that our allies have access to consistent energy flows coming here from the United States and creating jobs here in the United States.

Michele Flournoy, CEO and Founder of the Center for New American Security, former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy under President Obama says:

> By lifting the ban on U.S. exports of crude oil, U.S. policymakers have an extraordinary opportunity to enhance not only our economic vitality, but also our national security.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I support removing restrictions on the export of crude oil from the United States. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 702.

Current export laws are outdated, as we have heard. Since these laws were last visited nearly 40 years ago, U.S. oil production has increased significantly and the United States is now the largest producer of oil and gas.

Studies have shown that lifting the current ban on crude oil exports would create jobs, many in the rural areas. We in our part of the world have seen the benefits that domestic drilling can provide by looking at our neighboring State of North Dakota.

We need to do everything we can to support the use and production of domestic energy. H.R. 702 is an important part of that.

Following this bill's approval, I hope all Members of Congress will continue to support an all-of-the-above domestic energy production strategy by considering the national security and the economic development benefits of not just oil production, but of biofuel production and related products.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 702.

□ 1100

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Sugar Land, Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the committee and a sponsor of the bill.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, this picture shows why we have to end this ban on crude exports.

In October 1973, OPEC cut us off. We were getting 1.2 million barrels per day from OPEC, and that dropped down to a scant 19,000. Gas prices doubled. If you had to gas your lawn mower, you had to get in line behind cars.

Because of American innovation, that world is gone. We are now awash in American crude oil. OPEC's days of dominance are over; but we can't deliver a knockout blow until we end the ban on American crude exports, which we will do in a few short minutes. When that happens, American families will have lower prices at the pump. Thug oil nations like Venezuela, Russia, and Iran will lose bite.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTON. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, we will create thousands and thousands and thousands of good-paying American jobs.

I ask my colleagues vote today to end the ban on crude oil exports.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great Buckeye State of Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his extraordinary work on this bill.

This bill is important for our national security. It is important for jobs. We need to end the oil export ban so that we can export oil that has been generated as part of this energy revolution in this country that is going to be great for jobs and help our national security partners around the world.

Let's make the world safer. Let's give America more jobs. Let's end the oil export ban. Please support this bill today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, this is ill-advised legislation.

My friends on the other side of the aisle claim 800,000 jobs, a million jobs. They don't have any real defined ability to provide such an estimate. Actually, this is a number that is made up because, as some of the speakers have acknowledged, there will be offsetting job losses as a result of what is going to happen, for example, in the refining industry or what is going to happen in terms of some of the transport.

But that is beside the point. We actually have a policy that is working. There will come a time, perhaps, when it makes sense in a strategic matter to make an adjustment.

Right now, the President has the latitude to be able to help some of our strategic partners. He has that flexibility. We are awash in oil in this country, and to expect that somehow exporting more of it is going to make a dramatic impact at the pump here is a pipe dream. It won't. It might make a modest impact.

What we could do is provide a benefit to the large oil companies as part of a larger package that would help everybody. We have expiring tax provisions, for instance, dealing with the production tax credit, dealing with wind and solar that actually create far more jobs than will be found in the refining and in the oil production. And these are good, family-wage jobs all across the country

Let's put together a package that speaks to alternative energy continuity, that speaks to conservation, that speaks to a long-term strategy that is a win-win. I am absolutely confident that Mr. PALLONE and Mr. BARTON could sit down and deal with a

package that would have far more benefit for America.

If you are going to hand out another goodie to the oil companies, let's have a more comprehensive approach that meets our comprehensive energy needs. This bill doesn't do it.

Mr. BARTON. May I ask how much time remains, Mr. Chair?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) on behalf of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, the ban on crude oil exports is an outdated policy. It was 1975 that it was enacted. A lot has changed since 1975.

I believe this bipartisan, commonsense solution is needed to develop a comprehensive effort to deal with our energy policy in America that deals with both our short-term and our long-term needs. I think we have to use all the tools in our energy toolbox, and I think this is part of that effort.

New technologies have provided the United States with an abundance of crude oil that is only continuing in nature, combined with our renewables and our other energy sources.

We need to understand that this is about stimulating our economy and creating jobs, and it also has a very important geopolitical influence on bad actors, like Russia and Iran, who use energy as a political weapon.

I understand there are concerns by my colleagues about eliminating this ban and the negative impacts it will have. I have some concerns with small and midsized domestic refineries, which I have represented.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, this is a work in progress. We obviously need to address a number of other issues with the Senate.

I remind my colleagues, this is important. It is about jobs, the economy, and providing alternatives of energy to Russia and Iran, and that is why I support this legislation as we continue to work together in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the Golden Gate State of California (Mr. HUNTER), a distinguished subcommittee chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I am voting for this bill overall.

In California, we don't drill anymore, and we are cutting down on our refineries even, but this is important for the Nation.

One big part of this bill is the Maritime Security Program. If you don't know it, over 90 percent of all the stuff that we transfer to Iraq, Afghanistan, anywhere where there are American troops—all of their gear, their tanks, their weapons, their ammo, everything, for the most part—is shipped on American-flag commercial vessels.

Of the 50,000 cargo ships that travel the ocean every day, 79 of those are American-flag. That is it, 79 out of 50,000. Sixty of those are on call when America needs them to transfer our gear to our troops overseas.

When I was a lieutenant in the Marine Corps, on my second tour in 2004, I drove down to the San Diego Port with my Marine battery, and we loaded up all the equipment that we would then fall in on in Iraq 2 months later.

Without the Maritime Security Program plus-up that is in this bill, we would not be able to go fight wars. We would not be able to move our equipment. We would not be able to support our troops.

This is a national security bill. It is not only national security because it is energy security, but it is national security because that is how we support our troops overseas is with the Maritime Security Program, which this bill pluses up.

I just want to say thank you to the chairman and everybody who supports this.

I would urge my colleagues to not just support energy security, but support national security.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I had planned to support this bill, as a matter of fact, as a cosponsor; but since I have been unable to remove myself from the cosponsorship, I wish to speak on the record regarding my opposition to this particular bill.

While I believe that Congress should consider the potential for all energy sources to meet our Nation's current and future needs, I believe that this legislation lacks the proper safeguards and oversight for such a major change in our Nation's energy policy. The bill does not appropriately consider the implications of our national security, the economy, consumers, and, especially, the environment.

Exporting crude oil does not increase demand for oil or definitively increase the number of U.S. jobs in the energy sector. On the contrary, many U.S. jobs that are downstream in the domestic refining process may be threatened.

In addition, exporting oil to foreign countries for refining purposes would likely increase overall CO_2 emissions.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, the bottom line is that we must consider many factors related to our energy portfolio before we lift any current restrictions.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 702. Since I am unable to remove myself as a cosponsor of the legislation, I would like to speak on the record regarding my opposition to this particular bill.

While I believe that Congress should consider the potential for all energy sources to meet our nation's current and future needs, I believe that this legislation lacks the proper safeguards and oversight for such a major change in our nation's energy policy. The bill does not appropriately consider the implications for our national security, the economy, consumers, and especially the environment. Exporting crude oil does not increase demand for oil or definitively increase the number of U.S. jobs in the energy sector. On the contrary, many U.S. jobs that are downstream in the domestic refining process may be threatened.

In addition, exporting oil to foreign countries for refining purposes will likely increase overall CO_2 emissions, thus amplifying the impacts of climate change. Facing the challenge of climate change requires us to be responsible and accountable for our own natural resources. This bill does not provide any recourse to mitigate or even examine these potential impacts, and thus ignores this responsibility entirely.

It should be noted that the Obama Administration has made every effort to compromise by easing export restrictions where appropriate after careful review. The Commerce Department recently approved limited crude oil exchanges with Mexico. However, the President believes that unilaterally lifting the export ban is excessive, and I join him in his opposition. Lifting the crude oil ban for short-term gains with no accounting of the costs that will be incurred is ill-advised and short-sighted.

The bottom line is that we must consider many factors related to our energy portfolio before we lift any current restrictions. Without serious deliberation and oversight of the potential environmental and economic impacts of such as significant shift in our national energy policy, I must urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Peach State of Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) on behalf of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I come to the floor today to express my support of H.R. 702, much-needed legislation which will lift the arbitrary ban on the export of one of our country's most abundant natural resources: crude oil.

The current ban on exports is a relic of a different time before we as a nation knew just how much crude oil we have stored in the earth across this country. We are entirely too dependent on foreign oil sources, particularly from countries who have no regard for the American economy.

Today is different. In fact, from the period between 2000 and 2013, U.S. production of crude oil increased by nearly fourteenfold, from 250,000 barrels per day to 3.5 million. With this large amount of excess capacity, we can sell our oil to the global markets, which will bring U.S. crude prices in line with global prices, and global prices will go

down because of the increased supply. No less than 68 percent of consumers' cost of gasoline—and 57 percent for diesel fuel—come from the price of the source: crude oil.

Numerous studies have shown that the increased global supply will lead to lower prices at the pump. Not only will consumers have more money to spend on school supplies, food, clothing, and other household staples, but the prices of these goods will go down because the cost to transport them from manufacturer to store will decrease.

Possibly, more importantly, we have to consider the security implications of allowing the export of crude.

We are in the position of showing the world that we can provide a stable source of energy to friendly countries around the globe. Our supplies will dilute the market share of unfriendly countries and weaken their grip on our democratic ally nations who have to depend on some of our unfriendly countries for their oil supplies. We can provide an alternative source to those who don't want to support our adversaries and their adversaries.

So I thank my colleagues Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. BARTON for bringing forth this critically important legislation.

I urge my colleagues in the House to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 702.

Mr. PALLONE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I only have two speakers, myself and Mr. CUELLAR. I believe I have the right to close, so I would ask my friend from New Jersey how many speakers he still has.

Mr. PALLONE. Just myself and Mr. GARAMENDI remain.

Mr. BARTON. Well, at this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time remains on my side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a very, very important issue. It is a national security issue. My good friend from San Diego spoke to one part of our Nation's security, and that is the ability of this Nation to move its interests around the world not just with airplanes, but with ships.

Unfortunately, this is a very narrowly constructed piece of legislation that speaks to the interests of the petroleum industry and the many thousands of people who work there. We concede that. But this bill could also be a boon to another part of our Nation's security, and that is our maritime industry. Unfortunately, the bill does not do that.

While it does deal with the Maritime Security Program—and that is good—it does not deal in full potential with what we can do, and that is to require that this strategic asset, oil, be shipped on American-built ships with American mariners. That is not in the bill. It should be. It could be.

If it were, our shipyards and our mariners all around this Nation would have tens of thousands of jobs, and we would secure yet not only the interest of our petroleum industry but, also, the interest of our maritime industry as well as the shipyards upon which this Nation's national defense depends. Put it in the bill. Then let's see how many votes you can get.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), my chief sponsor, the gentleman that represents south Texas and the Eagle Ford Shale.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. BARTON for the leadership he has provided on this bill.

I rise in support of H.R. 702 that repeals the ban on crude oil. This ban reflects an America of yesterday. It is our job, as Members of Congress, that our laws reflect the America of tomorrow.

If you look at why this is important, this ban hurts the economy and prevents the creation of jobs. This ban imposes an estimated $200 to $300 billion cost to the economy and discourages domestic, made-in-America crude oil production.

By lifting the ban now, we will create 359,000 new jobs. How do I know? Because I represent the Eagle Ford and I have seen small-business people, men and women, that work very hard every single day to have this type of job. And I think we owe it to them and across the Nation.

This ban also reduces the Federal direct spending by $1.4 billion, according to the CBO. So it also helps our deficit. This ban is something that we need to change, and we need to make sure that we lift this ban.

What about gasoline prices? You heard Mr. RYAN. You heard other folks. According to the General Accounting Office, this will bring prices down from 1.5 cents to 13 cents. The CBO says the same thing: 5 cents to 10 cents. The administration's own agency, the Energy Information Administration, says it will bring it down one penny or remain. It doesn't go up. It goes down.

This ban also doesn't allow us to use our powers in foreign policy. Why are we allowing Russia or Iran to dictate what happens in this world? This is why we need to make sure that we support the repealing of this ban.

Now, who supports this? Mr. BARTON, you know it is a bipartisan bill. Democrats and Republicans support this bill, but it is also supported by business, small-business owners, and by some of the labor organizations. We have talked to those labor organizations.

Mr. Chairman, support H.R. 702, a bipartisan bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the administration, the President, has issued a SAP saying that he would veto this bill. This bill is going nowhere because of that veto and the potential for a veto.

All this legislation does is to give a windfall of $30 billion in profits to the oil industry, no strings attached, no sacrifices required.

The legislation is opposed by over 40 environmental groups: the United Steelworkers, the IBEW, the BlueGreen Alliance, and the Industrial Energy Consumers of America.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, it is supported by the American public who, regardless of party, support investing in refineries at home rather than lifting crude export restrictions. In fact, around 70 percent of voters oppose allowing oil companies to export more U.S. oil.

The Republican majority has spent the whole week doing little more than attacking women's health and assisting Big Oil for their big profits. It is time to come together in the name of energy and national security. In the name of common sense and economic good sense, I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, we have had a very enlightening debate for the last hour. I would say 30 Members of Congress have stood up and spoken either in favor or opposition to the bill.

I want it to be noted that a large number of my friends on the Democratic side have risen in support of the bill. I want to compliment Mr. CUELLAR for his strong leadership in that area. This is a bipartisan bill.

When we do our town hall meetings, Mr. Chairman, person after person stands up and says: Why can't you folks in Congress get along? Why don't you try to be positive? Why don't you try to do what is right for America? Why don't you work together on a bipartisan basis?

Mr. Chairman, that is what this bill does. This is a bipartisan bill.

We have a large number of Democratic cosponsors and a large number of Republicans. This bill will help all 50 States. As Mr. BISHOP and Mr. SCOTT have stated on the Democratic side, it helps low income, it helps minorities, it helps women. It helps every sector of the economy, not just the oil industry, not just the roughnecks, not just the drillers. It helps truck drivers. It helps steelworkers. It helps refinery workers. It even helps computer programmers. You name it, it helps it.

Some estimates are this bill, if enacted, would create as many as a million jobs. We know, for a fact, that the

collapse in oil prices in the last year and a half has cost the U.S. economy over 500,000 jobs, 750,000 jobs. Those are real people.

That is not Big Oil, Mr. Chairman. That is people that get up every morning and kiss their wives, hop in their car, go to work and work hard 8, 10, 12 hours a day, get the bills at the end of the month and hope they have enough money to pay the bills. It is blue-collar America. It is not Big Oil. It is everybody in this country, Mr. Chairman.

This bill is a market-based bill: willing buyer, willing seller. The U.S. has the largest oil reserves in the world. We have the capability to be number one in the world. Why on God's green Earth don't we use it? Why are we the only nation in the world that is restricted in one of the blessings that God has endowed our great Nation with?

We could produce, if we wanted to, up to 20 million barrels a day. We are producing right now 9 million barrels a day. U.S. oil can go anywhere in the world if we allow it to. That is an economic asset. It is a military strategic asset. All we have to do is repeal an archaic law that was passed in 1975 when we couldn't export a barrel of oil if we wanted to. We were importing two-thirds of our oil.

We have a bipartisan bill that helps everybody in America, that is in the economic interests of America, that is in the environmental interests of America, that is in the military strategic interests of America.

Mr. Chairman, let's work together. Let's send this bill to the Senate with strong bipartisan support. God bless America. God bless this great country. Pass H.R. 702.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 5, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee on H.R. 702, a bill to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions, which was referred to us on February 4, 2015.

I agreed that the Foreign Affairs Committee might be discharged from further action on this bill so that it could proceed expeditiously to the Floor, subject to the understanding that this waiver does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would request your support for the appointment of Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I respectfully ask that you place our letters on H.R. 702 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on Energy and Commerce as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2015.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for your assistance regarding H.R. 702, a bill to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions, which was referred to our respective committees on February 4, 2015.

I appreciate your willingness to agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee might be discharged from further action on H.R. 702 so that it can proceed expeditiously to the floor, and I agree that this waiver does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, I would support your request for the appointment of Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will place our letters on H.R. 702 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this legislation.

Increased U.S. energy exports benefit our national security and foreign policy. The Administration has created an absurd situation. While they are lifting sanctions on Iranian crude oil, they are fighting to keep sanctions on American crude oil. It makes no sense.

I am, however, concerned by language that would increase subsidy payments to U.S. shipping companies participating in the "Maritime Security Program." By increasing our oil exports, as this legislation does, that's already a boon to U.S. shipping. So why the government subsidy?

So I will support an amendment that is to be offered to strike this provision of the bill.

But Mr. Chair, if this maritime subsidy is ultimately part of this legislation, the door is then open to offset it by eliminating yet another damaging subsidy: U.S. cargo preference for international food aid.

Over the past three years, the Foreign Affairs Committee has led efforts to reform U.S. international food aid programs so we could reach more starving people in less time, and for less money.

A stumbling block to this effort has been a requirement in U.S. law that U.S. food aid be shipped on U.S. vessels—even though many of them are foreign-owned. This requirement remains year-after-year despite the fact that the Defense Department has concluded that relieving a portion of our food aid budget from U.S. purchase and shipping requirements would have no effect on U.S. maritime security.

If maintained in this bill, the proposed increase for "Maritime Security Program" payments literally "sinks" the arguments against food aid reform. One wasteful corporate subsidy is bad enough; a second that kills our ability to reform food aid and save lives would be beyond conscience, and something I am confident this body would wisely reject.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 702, a bipartisan bill to lift the 40-year old, self-imposed, crude oil export ban.

The United States is now among the top oil producing nations in the world. Lifting this export ban will bring us roaring back into the global oil markets at a time when market conditions are particularly competitive.

Contrary to what some of my friends across the aisle may say, this bill would actually lower gas prices here at home. We live in a global economy, and participation in a global market leads to competitive pricing. The non-partisan Government Accountability Office—in addition to the world-renowned analytics firm, HIS—have both determined that enacting this bill will lower gas prices, create hundreds of thousands of jobs, and provide a much-needed boost our economy.

With all these benefits, why would we continue to hold onto this export ban? The only reason it was imposed in the first place was in response to the Arab oil embargo. That was over 40 years ago. It is prudent to move past these decades-old issues, and instead focus on the issues we face today.

Today, we are facing a dangerous nuclear deal with Iran—a deal of President Obama's making. And one component of this terrible deal is that sanctions will be lifted on Iran so that they will be able to access a much larger portion of the world oil market, yielding billions of dollars to their coffers. Why would we make a deal with Iran—a deal that allows them to export their oil so they can fund terrorism around the world—but still hold onto this self-imposed ban?

Without this bill, the U.S. would be missing out on billions in direct revenue to the Treasury, not to mention the secondary revenue streams from improved economic conditions.

Let's pass this bill to unleash economic growth. Let's pass this bill to create hundreds of thousands of much-needed jobs. Let's pass this bill to counterbalance the exports of Iran, Russia, and the OPEC nations.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bipartisan bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss H.R. 702, a bill to "Adapt to Changing Crude Oil Market Conditions."

H.R. 702 repeals the law prohibiting the exports of crude oil that has been on the books for more than 40 years, a response to the Arab Oil Embargo led by OPEC in 1973 that sent oil prices soaring and inflicted substantial damage on the American economy.

Let me express my appreciation to Chairman Emeritus BARTON and Ranking Member PALLONE for their leadership and commitment to American energy independence, economic growth, national security, and expanding opportunities and diversifying the energy sector workforce.

I support H.R. 702 because it holds the promise of moving our country towards energy independence, create good-paying jobs, lowering gasoline prices, promoting our geopolitical interests, and strengthening our defense capabilities.

But I strongly am "pro-jobs," "pro-growing economy," "pro-sustainable environment and development," and for homeland and national security.

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

As the Member of Congress from Houston, the energy capital of the nation, I have always been mindful of the importance and have strongly advocated for national energy policies

that will make our nation more energy independent, preserve and create jobs, and keep our nation's economy strong.

The Eighteenth Congressional District, which I represent and is home to Shell Oil, ConocoPhillips, Chevron Phillips, BP Corporation of North America, Marathon Oil, Enterprise Products Partners (Oil and Gas Pipelines), and Halliburton (Oilfield Services), and many others.

My constituents have a strong interest in policies that maintain or enhance the competitiveness of American petroleum energy business in the world oil markets.

Mr. Chair, the world is very different than it was in 1973 when the ban on crude oil exports was adopted.

And much of the change we see today is attributable to America's unconventional oil boom.

U.S. crude production is now more than 11 million barrels per day according to the U.S. DOE's Energy Information Administration, up from 7 million barrel per day in 2008.

And it is estimated that U.S. output will exceed 18 million barrels a day by 2040.

Crude inventories are at an 80-year high, and imports have declined nearly 30 percent between 2005 and 2013.

Mr. Chair, paradoxically, continuation of the crude oil export ban may pose one of the biggest threats to this U.S. production boom and to the economy.

This is because increased production has led to a substantial decline in oil prices over the past year and the resulting decrease in revenues has forced U.S. producers in my district and elsewhere to slash investment and cancel projects.

Since last autumn the industry has cut more than 125,000 jobs, including many in my district.

I have met and know many of the employers and workers affected by industry job reductions.

Lifting the crude oil export ban would offer American crude oil producers new markets for their product and would mean fewer layoffs.

Studies by the highly respected Brookings Institution and other organizations suggest that the economic benefits to the nation of repealing the ban on crude oil exports would be substantial.

Specifically, it is predicted that repeal of the crude oil export ban will: 1. generate over $1.4 billion in revenue to the federal treasury over the next 10 years from oil and gas leases, according to the Congressional Budget Office; 2. lower gasoline prices by 13 cents per gallon according to the Government Accountability Office; 3. support up to 964,000 additional American jobs; 4. allow the United States to help its allies, enhance its energy security, and weaken the influence and market power of OPEC and Russia; and 5. strengthen the 60-ship Maritime Security Fleet, assuring that United States flag ships and crews will be available to provide support to the military in defense of our national interests and our allies.

The economic benefits projected to be derived from a repeal of the crude oil export ban are stunning in their magnitude: 1. 300,000 additional jobs by 2020; 2. $5.8 billion savings in fuel costs each year between 2015 and 2035; 3. $70 billion in additional investment in U.S. exploration, development, and production of crude oil between 2015 and 2020; 4. 500,000 barrels per day increase in domestic crude oil production in 2020; 5. $38 billion in additional economic activity in 2020; 6. $13.5 billion in additional federal, state, and local revenue in 2020; and a 7. $22 billion reduction in the U.S. trade deficit in 2020.

It is estimated that in my own congressional district, lifting the ban would generate an additional 500 jobs and inject an additional $275 million into the local economy, resulting in an increase in government revenues in the amount of $227.7 million.

Another positive impact of repealing the crude oil export ban is that the U.S. crude oil production would increase 1.2 million barrels per day average between 2016 and 2030.

Additionally, manufacturing jobs are expected to increase by an average of 37,000 per year through 2025 and analysts predict that construction jobs will increase 217,000 in the peak year 2017, while related professional services jobs would grow by an average of 148,000 per year.

Repeal of the crude oil export ban is expected to spur capital investment in machinery, exploration, and development by $7 billion in 2020.

The gross domestic product would increase by nearly $73 billion in 2016 and by at least $134 billion in 2018.

Total government revenues would increase by a combined $1.3 trillion between 2016 and 2030.

The revenue generated translates to an expected average annual increase of $2,500 in disposable income per household, additional jobs for American workers, and lower gasoline prices for American consumers.

As it relates to our geopolitical stance, Mr. Chair, lifting the crude export ban will enhance our national influence in international affairs because we will be stronger economically and more energy independent.

This will enhance our ability to achieve our geopolitical objectives of maintaining peace and security across the globe which in turn furthers our national security interests.

For all of these reasons, I support H.R. 702 and urge my colleagues to join me and also support Jackson Lee Amendments 9 and 10.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of the substitute is as follows:

H.R. 702

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States has enjoyed a renaissance in energy production, establishing the United States as the world's leading oil producer.

(2) By authorizing crude oil exports, the Congress can spur domestic energy production, create and preserve jobs, help maintain and strengthen our independent shipping fleet that is essential to national defense, and generate State and Federal revenues.

(3) An energy-secure United States that is a net exporter of energy has the potential to transform the security environment around the world, notably in Europe and the Middle East.

(4) For our European allies and Israel, the presence of more United States oil in the market will offer more secure supply options, which will strengthen United States strategic alliances and help curtail the use of energy as a political weapon.

(5) The 60-ship Maritime Security Fleet is a vital element of our military's strategic sealift and global response capability. It assures United States-flag ships and United States crews will be available to support the United States military when it needs to mobilize to protect our allies, and is the most prudent and economical solution to meet current and projected sealift requirements for the United States.

(6) The Maritime Security Fleet program provides a labor base of skilled American mariners who are available to crew the United States Government-owned strategic sealift fleet, as well as the United States commercial fleet, in both peace and war.

SEC. 2. REPEAL.

Section 103 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212) and the item relating thereto in the table of contents of that Act are repealed.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL POLICY ON OIL EXPORT RESTRICTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, to promote the efficient exploration, production, storage, supply, marketing, pricing, and regulation of energy resources, including fossil fuels, no official of the Federal Government shall impose or enforce any restriction on the export of crude oil.

SEC. 4. STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall conduct a study and transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate recommendations on the appropriate size, composition, and purpose of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

SEC. 5. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act limits the authority of the President under the Constitution, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), or part B of title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6271 et seq.) to prohibit exports.

SEC. 6. NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT ENHANCEMENT.

(a) PAYMENTS.—Section 53106(a)(1) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking the comma before ''for each'';

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''2016, 2017, and 2018;'' and inserting ''and 2016'';

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G); and

(4) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

''(D) $4,999,950 for fiscal year 2017;

''(E) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020;

''(F) $5,233,463 for fiscal year 2021; and''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 53111 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''2016, 2017, and 2018;'' and inserting ''and 2016'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7); and

(3) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) $299,997,000 for fiscal year 2017;

''(5) $300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020;

''(6) $314,007,780 for fiscal year 2021; and''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–290. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, lines 3 through 15, strike paragraphs (5) and (6).

Page 3, line 18, through page 4, line 21, strike section 6.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment removes a new section of the bill added by the Committee on Rules that increases funding for the Maritime Security Program by $500 million. My amendment does not eliminate the program. It simply keeps it at its current authorization level.

Just last week the House passed the conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act. This defense policy bill, negotiated at length between House and Senate conferees, increases the annual subsidy for Maritime Security Program participants from $3.1 million per vessel to $3.5 million per vessel, a 12.9 percent increase. The provision, added quietly by the Committee on Rules, circumvents regular order and increases funding even more.

As amended, H.R. 702 boosts per-vessel payments to $5 million per year, increasing the subsidy by a whopping 42 percent. The proper place for a discussion on funding for the Maritime Security Program is in a defense bill like the NDAA, not as part of a bill that lifts a ban on crude oil exports.

This spending increase is all the more reckless, given our more than $18 trillion national debt. According to the Congressional Budget Office, lifting the export ban will increase receipts from Federal oil and gas leases by $1.4 billion over the next 10 years. We should use those receipts to reduce the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, there are two ways we should amend bills. The first way is to go through the normal committee process, by introducing amendments during a markup. Members have the opportunity to debate and vote on amendments in the committee of jurisdiction. We should respect the work committees do by not altering the bills they report before we even consider the legislation on the House floor.

The second way is to offer an amendment when the bill comes up for debate on the House floor. This gives all Representatives the opportunity to participate in the debate and represent their constituents by voting on the measure. Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules changed this bill behind closed doors late last week.

The Maritime Security Program is a defense-related program that has nothing to do with oil exports or energy production. This provision has no place in H.R. 702, and its eleventh-hour addition by the Committee on Rules is the latest example of our broken legislative process.

Mr. Chairman, we must protect this institution and the legislative process. Adding an unrelated provision to this bill behind closed doors is no way to legislate.

I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on my amendment to remove this unrelated $500 million spending increase so we can consider H.R. 702 as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DOLD). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 702 but, more importantly, to oppose this amendment.

First of all, I would tell the gentleman, this amendment was considered and this provision was considered in the NDAA, and we actually did mark it up.

The second thing is this is vital to the national security of this country to maintain the private sector sealift capacity. Our top military commanders have called MSP a vital element of our military strategic sealift and global response capability, and it is worth noting that 90 percent of all U.S. military cargo moved from Iraq and Afghanistan has been by American-flagged, American-crewed commercial vessels enrolled in the MSP program.

□ 1130

If we were to adopt this amendment, it would basically cost us $13 billion to re-create this. The U.S. Transportation Command has estimated it would cost $52 billion. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it would take us between 42 years and 168 years to recoup our costs.

Let's defeat this amendment and protect the Maritime Security Program.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about process. I recognize the concerns of my colleague. This should be handled in the NDAA or in a defense bill.

I urge all Members to support my amendment eliminating this $500 million increase in spending and reject the Rules Committee's eleventh-hour revision that has nothing to do with crude oil exports.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I join my friend, Mr. FORBES, in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment would harm America's national security. Under the program that it seeks to eliminate, the Pentagon reserves capacity on roughly 60 U.S.-flagged commercial ships to ensure the supply and transport of American troops. It is a program that supports our private sector as well, requiring the Defense Department to contract private commercial ships rather than building their own. So there was not redundancy, but complementary ability.

It is a program that enhances America's national security by ensuring that our military can depend on U.S.-flagged and crewed vessels instead of foreign ones. It is a program that supports important domestic maritime jobs.

In my view, we ought to reject this amendment. This legislation is, obviously, controversial. I hope this amendment is not controversial and that it receives overwhelming bipartisan opposition.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I represent the Port of Houston, and maritime transportation is vital to our success. Last year, the United States imported $2.4 trillion and exported $1.6 trillion in cargo and goods. Much of that cargo came to the United States on foreign-built ships, under foreign flags, and without U.S. citizens on board.

Our maritime industry has been the bedrock of our economy since our founding. More cargo moves through our waterways than any other mode of transportation. We need to protect our domestic maritime industry, and that includes men and women that work on these ships.

I have worked with the maritime unions, including the Seafarers and the Marine Engineers, since my first days in Congress. I want to thank my colleagues for supporting our U.S.-flagged maritime unions. I oppose this amendment because I support any effort to keep these folks working.

I would like to take a minute and acknowledge a recent incident in the Atlantic Ocean. The disappearance of the El Faro resulted in the loss of life. I

want to extend my prayers to the families. Working on these ships is tough and can be hazardous, as we learned last week.

It is my hope that we can defeat this amendment and ensure our economic viability and national security by putting U.S. crews and U.S. flags on more ships.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Michigan's point, this is the process.

I chair the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee. I am also the vice chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee in the Armed Services Committee. Mr. FORBES is the chairman of the subcommittee that handles this stuff. This went through the process. This is the process. This is how it is supposed to work.

There are only—I will say again—79 U.S.-flagged commercial vessels on the ocean today. That is 79 out of about 50,000; 60 of those are used in times of war. It would cost us billions of dollars to create a fleet that sits there mothballing until we go to war and then we get to use it.

This is how the system works. This is the process, and this is how we keep national security strong. Republicans and Democrats realize this is the process. It is the right way to do it, and it shores up the Maritime Security Program for a decade. That is 10 years that we don't have to worry about this, and it is paid for. The gentleman from Michigan would have a point if this were not paid for. It is totally paid for.

This is the right vehicle for it, and I would urge all my colleagues to vote against the gentleman's amendment and support maritime security and national security.

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to Amash amendment that would undermine our domestic maritime industry and its workers.

The Pacific Northwest has a proud maritime tradition that supports quality jobs and keeps our economy moving.

The Maritime Security Program ensures that we have the ships and mariners to support our local, regional, and national economy—to keep folks employed and get goods to market.

Having worked in economic development for a decade I believe the MSP is the kind of program we ought to back, not completely scrap.

Let's not turn our back on the hard-working men and women that are out on the sea.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 15, insert the following:

(7) The United States has reduced its oil consumption over the past decade, and increasing investment in clean energy technology and energy efficiency will lower energy prices, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and increase national security.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, recent data suggests that climate change is accelerating. As a result, the destabilizing effect it has on our environment is worsening. To my mind, this is a clear threat to American prosperity and global stability.

Mr. Chairman, consider the fact that the Governor of the Bank of England in a speech recently said that he is very concerned that unless we respond to climate change, there will be a dramatic reduction in value of carbon assets, which will cause a financial crisis. As a country with the largest financial markets in the world, we should be concerned about that.

Mr. Chairman, consider the fact that Citigroup recently put out a research report that said unless we deal with climate change, the effect on global GDP will be $44 trillion to the negative by 2050. That is twice the size of the U.S. economy.

Mr. Chairman, consider the fact that the U.N. has estimated that unless we deal with climate change, 150 million people will be forced to be relocated by 2050; 20 million, alone, in Bangladesh. Put that in the context of the fact that in Syria we are seeing the effects of 7 million people being forced to be relocated.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is a clear threat to American prosperity, and the bad news is that our environment is worse.

The good news is the technology is better for dealing with this problem. Consider the fact that, as we have doubled the installed base of solar energy in this country, we have reduced the cost of energy by 23 percent. It has happened over the last several cycles of doubling solar, and people expect it to continue. This is occurring because of good old-fashioned American innovation.

And while I believe there should be policy prescriptions from the government that effectively cost and price carbon, at a minimum, Mr. Chairman, we should agree that by investing in clean energy technology, we will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we will lower energy costs for the American public, and we will increase national security. That is what the amendment that I have here today is designed to do.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but only in order to control the time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON. Chairman UPTON and I are prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment, but we do have some Republican speakers who would like to speak in favor of it.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, Mr. Chairman, let me offer my support for the underlying bill, H.R. 702.

Over the August district work period, I had the opportunity to visit an oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico and see firsthand the safety regulations and enhancements that have been put in place by the industry in recent years. Two of the primary topics of discussion during our visit were safety and the environment. I was glad to learn the industry has put a lot of contingencies in place to make sure we can continue drilling for oil in a manner that is safe and responsible.

I have joined my colleagues Mr. DELANEY and Mr. GIBSON in offering this simple amendment that would recognize our country is making progress in becoming more energy efficient; and that is better for the economy and the environment.

It is also very important to note the other forms of energy that are benefiting our country's economy and its national security. Wind, solar, natural gas, and nuclear energy are all contributing greatly to our energy independence, and this amendment before us today acknowledges that we should continue to promote an all-of-the-above energy strategy for this 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DELANEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great city of Kinderhook, New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am honored to be working with my colleagues JOHN DELANEY and CARLOS CURBELO to offer this bipartisan amendment.

This amendment adds another strategic dimension to this bill: support for

clean energy and energy efficiencies. On our way to energy independence, it is critical that we support research and development for clean energy technologies.

In New York, we are doing a lot of this work supporting important programs like the SunShot program, with the ambitious goal of driving down the total cost of photovoltaics to 9 cents per kilowatt hour, which would allow it to compete with any other energy source and democratize energy, transforming the way we produce, convey, and consume energy.

With improved technologies, we will also see more proliferation of wind power, hydroelectric power, and biomass energy complementing all other traditional energy sources, including crude oil, adding up to a stronger America.

Mr. Chairman, this is a country that can do hard things. We have proven that time and again. With the proper focus and investment, we will dominate the clean energy world market. And when we do, we will drive down energy costs; we will grow our economy, strengthen our national security, and conserve our environment.

I urge support of this amendment. Let's take a robust and holistic approach to energy independence.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague and my friend from Texas for accepting this amendment. I want to thank my colleague from New York and my colleague from Florida for their support of their amendment and their insight into this issue.

Again, I urge all my colleagues to support the amendment. It is very simple. It simply says that investing in basic research and investing in American innovation will, in fact, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which it has been proven to do; will, in fact, lower energy costs, which it has been proven to do; and will, in fact, increase national security in this great country.

So, again, I want to I thank my colleagues for their support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 4, insert ''(a) STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE'' before ''Not later than''.

Page 3, after line 10, insert the following:

(b) GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall conduct, and transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the results of, a study on the net greenhouse gas emissions that will result from the repeal of the crude oil export ban under section 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 702. This is the only amendment that the majority would allow in order to help us understand the impacts of lifting the crude oil export ban on greenhouse gas emissions.

Before the Rules Committee, Ranking Member PALLONE and I offered two other amendments that would have more proactively studied the increase in greenhouse gas emissions caused by this bill. Instead, the majority only allowed this amendment, which requires that the Department of Energy do a report on the increasing greenhouse gas emissions caused by the lifting of the crude oil export ban, but still allows the ban to be lifted.

□ 1145

This is what the legislative process has come to, unfortunately, in this Chamber. Instead of analyzing full impacts before voting, the majority has adopted a ''pollute first, ask questions later'' approach. Repeal the restrictions on fossil fuel extraction and production, and then we will figure out the environmental impact later.

Now, lifting this 40-year-old ban on exports could increase oil production by as much as 500,000 barrels a day. That is a significant increase that risks expanding production into sensitive areas off our coasts and our public lands.

According to the Center for American Progress, this surge in production would result in an additional 515 million metric tons of carbon pollution each year. That is the equivalent of an additional 108 million passenger cars on the road or 135 coal-fired power plants put online. That is what this bill could do. That is why over 40 environmental groups are opposing it.

Now, my Republican colleagues might dispute this study. It is the Center for American Progress. And so, when we hear studies from any group that is not funded by the fossil fuel industry, we typically hear them accused of being biased, left-leaning sources, and certainly they are welcome to make that argument.

But doesn't that support the need for an established, nonpartisan source of assessments on the impacts to our environment for bills that this Congress considers?

That is why today, Mr. Chairman, I am also introducing the Carbon Pollution Transparency Act of 2015. This is a bill that would require the CBO to estimate and report on the projected carbon footprint of each bill Congress considers. That way, we know before we vote how a bill would impact our climate and our environment.

Members of Congress already rely on the fiscal impact estimates produced by the nonpartisan CBO to help us make good decisions, make up our minds. But we need to also take into account the environmental consequences of our votes.

The American public has the right to know whether their Representatives in Washington are voting to help harm the environment, to worsen climate change, or whatever the impact may be. That is why my bill ensures that we have a fair judge, the CBO, for each bill that we consider on its environmental impact.

But today we at least have an opportunity to require such a study as part of H.R. 702. It is not enough, but it is a step forward to fully understand the impacts of lifting the crude oil export ban and, potentially, the harm that would result to our environment.

So I urge a ''yes'' vote on my amendment and a ''no'' vote on the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in mild opposition, and I may change my mind, depending on what the gentleman says.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON. I want to make a deal with the gentleman. We want to be open and transparent. We are the open, transparent Congress.

We will accept your amendment if you voice vote it and at least consider voting for the bill. But if you are going to rollcall vote it and vote against the bill, then I will oppose it, and we will defeat you on the rollcall vote.

So I am going to make you a deal. I am not saying you have to vote for the bill. I am just saying I want you to think nice thoughts about the bill and consider voting for the bill, and then we will accept it on a voice vote, but we don't want any rollcall votes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is advised to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BARTON. Well, I hope the Chair was listening.

I yield to my friend from California, if I have time to yield, to see what his thoughts are.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Through the Chair, I would say to my friend, I appreciate the offer, but I don't think there could be anything more transparent than going on record and voting on these.

Mr. BARTON. So the gentleman is going to ask for a rollcall vote?

Mr. HUFFMAN. I am going to ask for a rollcall vote.

Mr. BARTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman's amendment and ask every Member to vote against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are not violently opposed to this. It is a study. I am confident that this bill will on a net basis

reduce greenhouse gases because the oil that would must probably be exported is produced under the strictest environmental regulations in the world.

It also happens to be the easiest oil to refine because it is light sweet, which means it doesn't have a high sulfur content. When you run it through the cracking process, because it is lighter, it tends to separate into the various refined products more easily.

So the gentleman's amendment is benign in nature in the sense that, if we were to conduct the study, I think the results from the study would be positive.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I will be happy yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. To my esteemed colleague and coach of the baseball team, in the spirit of thinking good thoughts, if you will think good thoughts about considering the impacts to our environment and our climate, I will accept your previous offer to voice vote this amendment, and maybe all of this great good thought stuff will get us home faster.

Mr. BARTON. Reclaiming my time, I commend the gentleman for his thoughtful understanding from Mr. PALLONE. And, with that, we accept the gentleman's amendment. I'm going to ask everybody to vote for it on a voice vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 4, insert ''(a) STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE STUDY.—'' before ''Not later than''.

Page 3, after line 10, insert the following:

(b) CRUDE OIL EXPORT STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Commerce, in consultation with the Department of Energy, and other departments as appropriate, shall conduct a study of the State and national implications of lifting the crude oil export ban with respect to consumers and the economy.

(2) CONTENTS.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall include an analysis of—

(A) the economic impact that exporting crude oil will have on the economy of the United States;

(B) the economic impact that exporting crude oil will have on consumers, taking into account impacts on energy prices;

(C) the economic impact that exporting crude oil will have on domestic manufacturing, taking into account impacts on employment; and

(D) the economic impact that exporting crude oil will have on the refining sector, taking into account impacts on employment.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Industry and Security shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would direct the Department of Commerce, in consultation with the Department of Energy and other departments, as needed, to conduct a study.

This study would measure the impact of exporting millions of barrels of domestically produced crude oil on Americans and our economy.

Let's be clear. Lifting the crude oil export ban benefits very few. Let's also be clear about who does not benefit: American consumers and the American economy.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will make the case for lifting the ban on crude oil exports. They will cite reports by the U.S. Department of Energy, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, and various other organizations to support their claims.

Some of the benefits they will list include claims of an increase in crude oil production, additional investment in crude oil production, and an increase in employment along the energy supply chain.

But there is a problem with these claims, that the U.S. crude oil is already at peak production. According to a report by the EIA, production reached 9.7 million barrels 1 day in April of 2015, the highest levels since 1971.

In 2015, production is expected to average 9.2 million barrels a day. We still import 7 million barrels of oil a day. Let's find a way to keep domestically produced crude oil within our borders, which benefits our consumers and the economy in the U.S.

For example, the domestic gas prices are at record low levels due to the surplus of crude oil.

According to the U.S. Federal Highway Administration, Americans drove nearly 2 trillion miles during the first 7 months of 2015, contributing to the high gas consumption and setting a record level.

Lifting the ban now on U.S. crude oil benefits will undoubtedly raise prices. For consumers, these increases will result in higher gas prices at the pump and higher heating costs for families in the winter.

As all of you know, the manufacturing industry is the backbone of Michigan's economy. While the U.S. manufacturing industry has struggled in the past, it has been one of the bright spots in our economy since the recession and remains a vital part of America's economy, as well as our Nation's economy.

Since 2010, over 700,000 manufacturing jobs that were lost during the recession have been recovered. One major reason for this resurgence of the manufacturing sector is low energy prices. Up to one-third of all energy used in the United States goes into the manufacturing sector.

Rushing to lift the ban on crude oil now would only hurt the manufacturing industry and dent its growth. Let us find a way to keep domestically produced crude oil within our own boundaries and allow the consumers and the economy to reap the benefits of lower energy prices.

Let us put together a comprehensive study of the impact of lifting the U.S. crude oil export ban on the consumers and our economy first, before we rush to export millions of barrels of domestically produced crude oil.

For the benefit of all Americans, for the benefit of our economy, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in mild opposition, but I could become a supporter of the amendment under certain conditions.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from Michigan is willing to accept the same deal that the gentleman from California just accepted, we will accept the amendment. We will vote for it on a voice vote, and we will move on down the road to catch my plane at 1:40 from Reagan National Airport.

Does the gentlewoman agree to voice vote it?

Mrs. LAWRENCE. To the Chair, considering all that is happening here, I really need good thoughts, and I want to be part of the process of expanding good thoughts in Congress.

So I will accept, sir.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of the gentlewoman's amendment and ask that it be voted for on a voice vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 15, strike ''or''.

Page 3, line 17, after ''(42 U.S.C. 6271 et seq.)'' insert the following: '', the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 1 et seq.), or any other provision of law that imposes sanctions on a foreign person or foreign government (including any provision of law that prohibits or restricts United States persons from engaging in a transaction with a sanctioned person or government), including a foreign government that is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my colleague and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for his leadership on this important bill, and I am hoping today to join the voice vote kumbaya, if possible.

H.R. 702 is a commonsense legislation that repeals the outdated ban on crude oil exports. This ban was originally implemented when America was going through an energy crisis. I was very young then, but certainly remember the gas lines in the early 1970s.

The truth is things are different today. America is one of the largest oil exporters, thanks to a boom in production all across our country. Gas prices are at historic lows, and refineries are near capacity.

Yet, our laws do not reflect this new reality. Producers are still held captive to the domestic marketplace. It is long past time to modernize.

This bill will pave the way for a new age of energy innovation in America. It will support and create thousands of U.S. jobs, good-paying jobs, and encourage the investment of millions of dollars into our economy.

America now has opportunities that would have seemed unimaginable even a generation ago, potentially even a few years ago.

We could now become a net exporter of energy. Think about that. And when we do, it will jump-start our economy, create thousands of good-paying jobs, and improve our national security and economic security as well.

Now, Mr. Chair, I am offering a bipartisan amendment today that clarifies language in the bill to avoid creating any unintended consequences regarding terrorist enemies of our country.

I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for cosponsoring this amendment and Chairman ROYCE for working with us in crafting the amendment as well.

While we should all want to see crude oil exports expanded, we do not want this bill to inadvertently help our enemies. My amendment very simply clarifies the bill's language to allow the administration to retain its ability to prohibit the export of crude oil to state sponsors of terrorism.

I believe this amendment is consistent with the underlying goals of the bill. I encourage my colleagues to support its adoption.

□ 1200

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MESSER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Chairman UPTON and I strongly support the gentleman from Indiana's amendment. We commend him for offering it. We think it adds to the bill.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in mild opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. I support the amendment but would note that the best way to prevent our Nation's oil resources from falling into the hands of bad actors is to maintain the reasonable, time-tested controls on exports that are currently in place.

If you are concerned about our oil falling into the wrong hands, then you should vote ''no'' on final passage of H.R. 702.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON EXPORTS OF CRUDE OIL, REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS, AND PETROCHEMICAL PRODUCTS TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the export of crude oil, refined petroleum products, and petrochemical products by or through any entity or person, wherever located, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to any entity or person located in, subject to the jurisdiction of, or sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, again, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for his leadership on this important bill and reiterate my support for H.R. 702. This is commonsense legislation that repeals the outdated ban on crude oil exports.

The U.S. is producing more oil today than ever before, and we could literally become a net exporter of energy, something that would have been unimaginable a generation ago and would have incredible results for our economy. The fact that we are the only advanced nation that prohibits the export of domestically produced oil holds us back.

I believe very strongly that we should not empower our enemies unintentionally through this legislation, and this includes the Islamic Republic of Iran. My amendment today prohibits the export of crude oil, refined petroleum products, and petrochemical products to Iran.

Obviously, Iran has oil. It has no need to import it from the United States. But my amendment goes beyond just crude oil. It ensures Iran will not inadvertently have access to other petroleum-based products produced in the U.S.

Refined petroleum and petrochemical products are used to manufacture thousands of goods that we use every day. Things like plastics, asphalt, paints, and cell phones are manufactured in this way.

It was only a few weeks ago in this very Chamber that we discussed the dangers of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, also known as the Iran nuclear deal. Despite being able to enrich uranium and self-police its nuclear facilities, Iran will receive sanctions relief to the tune of $150 billion. That is $150 billion pumped into a $400-billion-a-year national economy. $150 billion of that will, no doubt, be used by Iran to bankroll terrorist organizations, further destabilize the Middle East, and continue their work to wipe Israel off the map.

Things should not be made easier for them. The intent of the underlying bill is not to aid and support Iran. It is to open up the U.S. energy sector, export oil, grow our economy, and create thousands of jobs.

My amendment ensures that the intention of this bill is clear. I believe the amendment is consistent with the underlying goals of the bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MESSER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and myself support your amendment and ask that it be accepted.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in mild opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. However, I would point out that Iran has the fourth largest number of proven oil reserves in the world. In fact, supporters of this bill often state concern over the

market impact of increased Iranian exports on domestic producers.

So while it is hard to understand why we need to worry about our crude oil going to a country that is a major net exporter of oil, I have no objection to adopting this amendment and making really sure Iran doesn't get any of our oil and petroleum products.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 7. PARTNERSHIPS WITH MINORITY SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Energy shall continue to develop and broaden partnerships with minority serving institutions, including Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in the areas of oil and gas exploration, production, midstream, and refining.

(b) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—The Department of Energy shall encourage public Private partnerships between the energy sector and minority serving institutions, including Hispanic Serving Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I am here, of course, to talk about an amendment to H.R. 702, this important legislation before us that will lift this outdated ban on the export of oil, modernize the U.S. energy economy, and create U.S. jobs. The amendment that I bring forward is to help Minority-Serving Institutions grow the leaders of the future in the oil and gas industry.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that Hispanics will account for 74 percent of the growth in the Nation's labor force from 2010 to 2020. This amendment ensures that our Minority-Serving Institutions, such as Hispanic-Serving Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities, can create a competitive and able workforce in our oil and gas industry. This will ensure that our Nation can continue to compete in the global market far into the future. Hispanic-Serving Institutions are about 12 percent of the nonprofit colleges and universities, yet they enroll 59 percent of all Hispanic students.

The other part of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is that it also calls for the Department of Energy to encourage public-private partnerships between the energy sector and Minority-Serving Institutions.

This is an amendment that I think will be good for all workers across the Nation. I ask all Members to vote in favor of this amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I do support the gentleman's amendment. I want to commend him for his leadership on this issue. I hope we will accept it on a voice vote.

I see Mr. RUSH. I am willing to yield to my good friend from Chicago (Mr. RUSH) if he wishes to speak on it. I was told he might.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mr. BARTON. I yield for the 1-minute prayer, not the 5-minute sermon.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully decline the time the gentleman was gracious to give. I really want my own time on the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The time has already been claimed.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), which couldn't exceed 5 minutes because that is all I have.

Mr. RUSH. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I did not come here to Congress to shadowbox with the majority party over jobs and economic opportunities for the intergenerationally and chronically unemployed citizens of my district and similarly situated districts across the country.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which was not allowed by the majority party, would have provided real solutions to real problems. My amendment would have put dollars in the pocketbooks of the unemployed minorities, the unemployed women, and the unemployed veterans of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I must say, this amendment before us is like pouring perfume on an overused pigsty. It provides DOE—and I quote from the amendment, Mr. Chairman—it provides DOE with the authority to continue its ongoing work. In other words, it tells the Department of Energy: Do what you are already doing.

Mr. Chairman, unlike the amendment I offered in the Rules Committee that was drafted with input and collaboration from the various stakeholders who would benefit most had it been adopted, there is no specific initiative, no program, and no objections in the Cuellar amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Rush amendment would have established—not encouraged, but established—partnerships between DOE, Commerce, the Small Business Administration, Minority Business Development Agency, industry, the National Minority Supplier Diversity Council, the Women's Business Enterprise Network Council, and minority chambers of commerce chapters across the Nation.

The Rush amendment would have established programmatic commitments for diversity hiring for vendor and contracting opportunities within the supply chain through contractual obligations, incentives, and other means with a goal of no less than 10 percent participation by minority-owned firms by the year 2020.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would have created regional diversity supply chain specialty centers to develop strategies for minority business contracting and vendor opportunities, and to hold business development sessions in strategic locations where energy development exists or is expanding.

The Rush amendment would have helped minority- and women-owned firms form consortiums and partnerships in order to better meet qualifications and capacities that industry is seeking.

Mr. Chairman, the Rush amendment would have established a program to provide access to capital for loans, financing, and insurance assistance for minority- and women-owned businesses.

Mr. Chairman, the Rush amendment would have established—not just encouraged, but established—public-private partnerships between minority-owned banks and private investors as well as provided grants to Minority-Serving Institutions to help recruit businesses for energy-related supply chain sector activity.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am not here to criticize my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR). I am here to just bring out the differences between what an imaginary amendment would do and what a real amendment would do.

Mr. BARTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Illinois.

I understand the amendment that he was trying to get in. Actually, I was trying to help try to get his amendment accepted, but it is up to the Rules Committee and the democracy there.

This amendment is very simple. It is something that we have added in the

appropriation bill on different agencies. We all have voted for this in the appropriation bills time after time after time, and it is to help the Minority-Serving Institutions.

I ask the gentleman from Texas and Members to please accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 8 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 7. REPORT.

Not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly transmit to Congress a report that reviews the impact of lifting the oil export ban under this Act as it relates to promoting United States energy and national security.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1215

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank Mr. PALLONE and Mr. BARTON for their courtesies and as well the Rules Committee. Let me first of all say there has been a lot of discussion on the floor of the House regarding this bill and different opinions. Might I add that this is an important and vigorous discussion. I think this is the best of what this Congress is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take note of H.R. 702, which many of us know came about because of the gas prices in the 1970s. This bill simply repeals that portion of the legislation that responded to that crisis.

What I like in the bill is, of course, we have in the bill that we, as a Congress, will get a report some 120 days after dealing with the maintenance and the strength of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. That is a very important national security item.

A savings clause indicates, of course, that the President has all of his powers in the light of crisis and other issues to implement any necessary changes or any necessary restrictions on this legislation.

My amendment tracks giving more information. Not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly transmit to Congress a report that reviews the impact of lifting the oil import ban under this act as relates to promoting, supporting, and providing for the United States energy and national security policy.

Our number one responsibility is the American people—I understand that—both environmentally, which reflects to their own energy resources, and certainly with national security. This amendment allows for that report to be on the front side of 10 years. It could be 2 years from now, 3 years from now, and the Congress can dictate that.

U.S. crude production bottomed in 2008 at about 7 million barrels a day. It is now more than 11 million barrels a day, and it is now possible to go up to 18 million barrels a day in 2040 under the strictest environmental concerns.

But right now in my district—right now in my district—they are laying off thousands of people because there is no work. So I would argue to my colleagues that this amendment provides the insight on what is going on.

This bill could provide the GDP would rise by 550 billion to 1.8 trillion between 2015 and 2039. It is estimated in my own congressional job lifting the ban would generate an additional 500 hundred jobs, an additional 270 million in the local economy, and increase government revenues in 227 million.

This 10-year period under that—by the way, it is up to 10 years—is giving long enough time to provide a probative, intelligent assessment of whether there is irreversible damage.

Amendment No. 9 operates as a safety valve and reassures that those who may be skeptical of lifting the export ban get reasonable opportunities to oppose it or get the right information. The same thing with those who may support it. It gives us a basis of empirical data rigorously analyzed.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment can be summed up as follows: For those who are confident in the future, my amendment offers vindication. For those who are skeptical of the new change, my amendment will provide the evidence they need to prove their case.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I would rise in mild opposition, which could turn to support.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Houston for offering it.

Is she willing to do this on a voice vote and consider voting for the bill if we accept it?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Is the gentleman rising to support the gentlewoman's amendment with great enthusiasm?

Mr. BARTON. I will if you rise to voice vote on your amendment. I will make it a package deal. I will give you this amendment and the next amendment double enthusiasm if they are both voice votes and you actually really do vote for the bill or at least start thinking about it strongly.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman surmise that amendments that are passed by voice vote are still strong amendments?

Mr. BARTON. Oh, they are.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And included in the bill?

Mr. BARTON. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. As opposed to being susceptible to being gotten rid of?

Mr. BARTON. No. You have got my word. I will be on the conference committee if we have one. Your amendments will be in the conference report that goes to the President if we get that far.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am always eager to work with my friends on this side of aisle, Mr. PALLONE. I am always eager to work when we are moving forward. And so I would offer my amendment and offer it for a voice vote.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in, as I just said I would, double enthusiastic support of her amendment, but I am going to be looking on that board when it comes time to vote.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me just simply say my amendment answers many of the concerns that have been expressed on the floor of the House by giving empirical data, not 10 years and beyond, but in a period up to 10 years, to let us make further informative decisions to provide for the energy resources of the American people, the national resources, and, of course, being able to provide for the national security.

With that, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, let me express my appreciation to Chairman Emeritus BARTON and Ranking Member PALLONE for their leadership and commitment to American energy independence and economic growth and security.

I also wish to thank Chairman SESSIONS, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER, and the members of the Rules Committee for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 9.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which provides:

Sec. 7. Report. Not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly transmit to Congress a report that reviews the impact of lifting the oil export ban under this Act as it relates to promoting United States energy and national security.

As the Member of Congress from Houston, the energy capital of the nation, I have always

been mindful of the importance and have strongly advocated for national energy policies that will make our nation more energy independent, preserve and create jobs, and keep our nation's economy strong.

The Eighteenth Congressional District, which I am proud to represent is home to Shell Oil, ConocoPhillips, Chevron Phillips, BP Corporation of North America, Marathon Oil, Enterprise Products Partners (Oil and Gas Pipelines), and Halliburton (Oilfield Services), and many others.

I am strongly ''pro-jobs,'' ''pro-growing economy,'' ''pro-sustainable environment and development,'' and for homeland and national security.

Volatile energy prices threaten economic security for millions of middle class Americans and hits consumers hard; rising gas prices strain budgets for millions of American families.

It is a familiar story, but in order to restore lasting security for middle class families we need a smart and reasonable plan for American energy, not false promises or quick fixes.

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

So my constituents have a strong interest in policies that maintain or enhance the competitiveness of American petroleum energy business in the world oil markets.

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

H.R. 702 repeals the law prohibiting the exports of crude oil that has been on the books for more than 40 years, a response to the Arab Oil Embargo led by OPEC in 1973 that sent oil prices soaring and inflicted substantial damage on the American economy.

But much has changed since 1973; America's unconventional oil boom changed everything.

U.S. crude production bottomed in 2008 at about 7 million barrels per day; now it is now more than 11 million barrels per day and according to the U.S. DOE's Energy Information Administration, U.S. output is estimated to top 18 million barrels a day by 2040.

Crude inventories are at an 80-year high, and imports have declined nearly 30% between 2005 and 2013.

Mr. Chair, paradoxically, continuation of the crude oil export ban may pose one of the biggest threats to this U.S. production boom and to the economy.

This is because increased production has led to a substantial decline in oil prices over the past year and the resulting decrease in revenues has forced U.S. producers in my district and elsewhere to slash investment and cancel projects.

Since last autumn the industry has cut more than 125,000 jobs, including many in my district.

I have met and know many of the employers and workers affected by industry job reductions.

Mr. Chair, lifting the crude oil export ban would offer American crude oil producers new markets for their product and would mean fewer layoffs.

Studies by the highly respected Brookings Institution and other organizations suggest that the economic benefits to the nation of repealing the ban on crude oil exports would be substantial: 1. GDP could rise by $550 billion to $1.8 trillion between 2015 and 2039; 2. U.S. oil production could rise by 1.3 million to 2.9 million barrels per day in 2020; 3. 300,000 additional jobs created by 2020; 4. $5.8 billion in estimated reduced consumer fuel costs each year between 2015 and 2035; 5. up to $70 billion in additional investment in U.S. exploration, development, and production of crude oil between 2015 and 2020; 6. $13.5 billion in additional federal, state, and local revenue in 2020; 7. $22 billion reduction in the U.S. trade deficit in 2020; and 8. 100,000 barrels per day increase in refinery throughout between 2015 and 2035.

It is estimated that in my own congressional district, lifting the ban would generate an additional 500 jobs and inject an additional $275 million into the local economy, resulting in an increase in government revenues in the amount of $227.7 million.

Admittedly, these are predictions, projections, and forecasts made on the basis of the best information currently available.

We hope they are accurate but candor requires that we acknowledge that no one can say with certainty they will come to pass.

That is why it is essential that at an appropriate juncture we review and assess the impact on the American petroleum industry, the national economy, and consumers.

And that is the purpose of Jackson Lee Amendment #9, which mandates a comprehensive review of the impact of crude oil export ban repeal after a 10 year period.

This 10 year time period is long enough to accumulate data sufficient and probative enough to assess the impact of H.R. 702, but not so long as to prevent irreversible damage if the evaluation does not approximate the expected benefits reveals unintended adverse consequences.

In sum, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 9 will help ensure that the brave new world of unrestricted crude oil exports by American producers is more than a leap of faith.

Rather, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 9 operates as a safety valve and reassures those who may be skeptical of lifting the export ban that reasonable opportunities will exist to make an informed evaluation of the effect of the ban's repeal on our economy and national security.

And it is important to emphasize Mr. Chair, that this evaluation will be based on empirical data rigorously analyzed.

In short, Mr. Chair, my amendment can be summed up as follows: for those who are confident of the future, my amendment offers vindication.

For those who are skeptical that the new change will work, my amendment will provide the evidence they need to prove their case.

And for those who believe that maintaining the status quo is intolerable, my amendment offers a way forward.

I urge all members to support Jackson Lee Amendment Number 9.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 114–290.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 7. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly transmit to Congress a report analyzing how lifting the ban on crude oil exports will help create opportunities for veterans and women in the United States, while promoting energy and national security.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be considered by my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires within 180 days of enactment the Secretaries of Energy and Commerce submit a report to Congress analyzing how lifting the ban on crude oil, in particular, on exports, will create opportunities for veterans and women.

Mr. Chairman, just a few days ago I went to an initiative called Stand Down. I have gone a number of years. Most military persons will understand it is where you come and stand down from battle.

In this instance, they were veterans, many of them homeless, many of them in great need. Obviously, social services, substance abuse services, and others were offered there. What I heard from these men who wore the uniform in dignity is they want jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this legislation will provide a strong pro-jobs agenda growing the economy. As my previous amendment said, I do not take lightly the impact of lifting the ban; therefore, my previous amendment would provide the insight on whether or not this is a positive impact.

I can tell you that there is a great need, as has been discussed earlier, about collaborating with historically Black colleges and Hispanic-serving colleges.

I have worked on those issues and have certainly seen the leadership of Mr. RUSH and Mr. CUELLAR. But I will tell you that it is indicated that State shale development supports American jobs.

Mr. Chairman, $107,000 is the average salary that is provided by the energy company in energy jobs, 1.7 million employment attributed to upstream, unconventional oil and natural gas. Women fill 40 percent of the vacancies in oil and gas.

Mr. Chairman, I will insert this into the RECORD.

[Apr. 23, 2014]

THE ENERGY REVOLUTION IS CREATING CAREER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES

(By Cheryl Jackson)

Minorities are projected to fill an unprecedented number of jobs in the oil, natural gas and petrochemical industries—increasing from one-quarter of total jobs in 2010 to one-third by 2030—according to a new IHS report sponsored by API.

''The oil and natural gas industry pays wages significantly higher than the national average and can provide tremendous career opportunities for women and minorities,'' said Jack Gerard, API President and CEO. ''To lower unemployment and shrink the income inequality gap without spending a dime of taxpayer money, we encourage President Obama to embrace this pro-development energy opportunity.''

Of up to 1.3 million new job opportunities in the oil, natural gas and petrochemical industries predicted by 2030, almost 408,000 positions—32 percent of the total—are projected to be held by African American and Hispanic workers, according to the report. Women are estimated to fill 185,000 of those jobs, and 63 percent of new job opportunities will be in blue collar professions.

''We have the natural resources and the technology to be a global energy superpower with all the economic and national security benefits that entails,'' Gerard said. ''Smart energy policy will create tremendous opportunity for hundreds of thousands of workers—from those with just a high school diploma and some post-secondary training to those with post-graduate degrees.''

''As the study highlights job opportunities, it signals the tremendous need to prepare African Americans, Hispanics and Women to be ready to fill the workforce gap'', said Paula Jackson, president and CEO of the American Association of Blacks in Energy. ''These jobs in the oil and natural gas industry don't just put people to work, they help to transform communities.''

''This powerful and important report is a road map for workforce development stakeholders to align the content of their training with a sense of urgency to adequately prepare people for energy jobs,'' said José L. Pérez, chairman and CEO Of Hispanics In Energy. ''Energy job replacement and growth is a clear pathway for diverse communities to rise from poverty to middle-class, what a rare opportunity.''

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The government and the administration are working to pair up and find jobs for veterans. The unemployment rate for veterans we have seen has been a constant issue, and it is going down. But we need to provide them with other opportunities. They were higher unemployment, as we can see, than the regular workforce.

So my amendment wants to ensure that, if we lift this ban, women and veterans will benefit. We know, of course, that we have been pushing our educational facilities to engage in STEM, but what we need now is a pipeline for qualified veterans and women looking for jobs right now.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support this Jackson Lee amendment. It causes us to focus on these vulnerable populations—women and veterans—to direct them into the industry.

Might I say to my constituents, the energy companies that I represent, a long list of names that I will not name at this time, that we hope that they are focused as well on expanding opportunities in the energy industry for veterans, returning soldiers, if you will, women, and, of course, across-the-board minorities. This is an industry that is moving and growing, and the opportunities should move and grow as well.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I only would like to say we support the amendment and we will honor the deal we just made on the prior amendment. I ask for a ''yes'' vote on a voice vote on the amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. PALLONE. I hope that our colleagues have heard us to emphasize the creation of jobs along with the environment, national security, and the energy resources of America.

Mr. Chair, again, let me express my appreciation to Chairman Emeritus BARTON and Ranking Member PALLONE for their leadership and commitment to American energy independence, economic growth, national security, and expanding opportunities and diversifying the energy sector workforce.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which provides:

Sec. 7. Report. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly transmit to Congress a report analyzing how lifting the ban on crude oil exports will help create opportunities for veterans and women in the United States, while promoting energy and national security.

I also wish to thank Chairman SESSIONS, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER, and the members of the Rules Committee for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 10.

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

I strongly am "pro-jobs," "pro-growing economy," and "pro-expanding economic opportunities for women, veterans, minorities, and small business!"

That is why I carefully consider each energy legislative proposal brought to the floor on its individual merits and support them when they are sound, balanced, promote the national interest, and expand economic opportunities for everyone, particularly for women, veterans, and members of underrepresented communities.

My constituents have a strong interest in policies that maintain or enhance the competitiveness of American petroleum energy business in the world oil markets.

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

That is why I have offered Jackson Lee Amendment Number 10, which recognizes the fact that veterans, minorities, small businesses and women currently are significantly underrepresented in the oil and gas industries at all levels and severely underrepresented in the senior managerial, professional, board and ownership ranks.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 10 directs the Secretaries of Commerce and Energy to submit a report to Congress within 180 days assessing the beneficial impact, if any, that lifting the crude oil export ban holds for veterans and women.

This report should shed light on any additional measures that should be taken to increase the participation of women and veterans in the petroleum industry as workers, executives, and entrepreneurs.

Nationally, there were 1.2 million people employed in the oil and gas industry in 2010, only 17% of which are women.

Our booming energy sector has been one of the great American success stories over the last decade, and remains a bright spot in our economy as it continues to fuel job creation.

To continue this success and to ensure that opportunities and benefits are shared equitably, it is critical that we have a diverse energy workforce equipped with the skills, knowledge, and experiences needed to compete and win in the global economy.

And there is no better place to look than from our pool of talented veterans and women?

Women make up half our population and are increasing their presence in the STEM fields vital to success in the petroleum energy sector.

Veterans not only have proved their mettle and leadership skills in defense of our country but also are among the most resourceful and resilient members of our society, possessing the mission-critical ethic necessary for success in the workplace.

A pipeline of qualified veterans and women looking for employment could play a key role as the energy industry seeks qualified, motivated, and skilled workers and entrepreneurs.

As a nation, we must remain committed to utilizing the talents of women and veterans if our nation is to meet the challenges and take advantage of the opportunities offered by a dynamic global energy market.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 10 helps us meet this challenge by providing critical information regarding the impact of lifting the crude oil export ban will have on creating opportunities for veterans and women.

I urge all members to support Jackson Lee Amendment Number 10.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will

now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114–290 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. MESSER of Indiana.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. MESSER of Indiana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 109, noes 306, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

AYES—109

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Barr
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fortenberry
Foxx
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Labrador
LaHood
Lamborn
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Salmon
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Tipton
Wagner
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)

NOES—306

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guinta
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Whitfield
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (UT)
Blum
Clyburn
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dingell
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hudson
Kaptur
Kind
Knight
Payne
Sanford
Sinema
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

□ 1251

Messrs. GUINTA, WITTMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Messrs. NADLER and GOODLATTE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BUCSHON, LAMBORN, GOWDY, and DUNCAN of South Carolina changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 545, the Amash Amendment to H.R. 702, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 545, I was unavoidably delayed and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, on rollcall vote 545, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO HONOR THE BRAVE MEN AND WOMEN WHO SERVED ON THE EL FARO

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, last Thursday was a tragic day for the American maritime community and America. *El Faro*, an American flagship en route to Puerto Rico, was lost in Hurricane Joaquin and, with it, its 33 crew, including 28 Americans.

In the hours after we learned *El Faro* was in trouble, the Coast Guard, DOD, and other government and private sector partners mobilized assets with search crews battling treacherous weather conditions in an attempt to find survivors; and we appreciate their efforts.

Mr. Chair, today our thoughts and prayers are with the crewmembers' families and loved ones. I ask that the House observe a moment of silence to honor the brave men and women who served on the *El Faro*.

The Acting CHAIR. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2 minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 414, noes 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

AYES—414

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—1

Speier

NOT VOTING—19

Clyburn
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dingell
Grijalva
Hudson
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Kind
Knight
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Marchant
Nunes
Payne
Sanford
Sinema
Smith (NJ)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1257

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 546 on the Messer of Indiana Part B Amendment No. 5 on H.R. 702. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—419

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke

Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—15

Clyburn
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dingell
Grijalva
Hudson
Kind
Knight
LaMalfa
Payne
Posey
Sanford
Sinema
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1301

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 702) to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions, and, pursuant to House Resolution 466, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Huffman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 702 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 17, insert ''Nothing in this Act prevents the President or any other Federal official from enforcing Federal laws or regulations necessary to protect human health, the environment, or public safety, including the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.), the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Act of 1979 (Pub. L. 96–129), the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–355), the Pipeline Inspection, Protection, Enforcement, and Safety Act of 2006 (Pub. L. 109–468), or the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Pub. L. 112–90).'' after ''prohibit exports.''.

Mr. BARTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to make a point of order against the bill that it is not germane.

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

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. HUFFMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we suspend the reading.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BARTON. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTON. If I make a point of order that the motion to recommit is not germane and it, in fact, is not germane, there is no vote. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not respond to a hypothetical. A point of order has been reserved.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the motion to recommit is not germane. Oh, it is germane. I withdraw the point of order.

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

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin with the usual stipulations. This is the final amendment to the bill. It won't kill the bill or send it back to committee. When this is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended, so there is no procedural reason to oppose this motion to recommit.

Let's talk about the substance. Now, we have heard a lot of debate this morning about the need to give Big Oil—the most profitable industry in the history of the world—yet another advantage. For years, Americans have been told that we have to ''drill, baby, drill.'' The theory that we always hear is that we need to extract every barrel of oil from every acre of American soil to keep gas prices low and to provide ''energy security.''

But as soon as American gas prices started to drop, the curtain was raised, and the truth was revealed. The real reason for ''drill, baby, drill,'' surprise, surprise, was to give Big Oil the chance to maximize their profits on the world market.

It is not enough that they have been able to game the Tax Code for a century with billions of dollars of tax breaks not available to other taxpayers or businesses. It is not enough that they continue to enjoy access to our public lands and waters for oil drilling, even though they are no longer paying into the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the longstanding law that expired at the beginning of this month.

As a reminder, for the past 50 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund was an agreement, a compact between the American people and Big Oil. It said that when we let oil and gas companies drill and profit from drilling in Federal waters, they have to dedicate a fraction of the profits, just a fraction, to protect our great outdoors for future generations. The deal is that they have to dedicate a fraction of those profits to protecting our great outdoors for future generations so that our grandchildren will be able to hike and hunt and fish in our parks and wildlife refuges.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was shamefully allowed to lapse at the beginning of this month, and the majority hasn't scheduled a single vote—or even a hearing—to get it back on the books. No, all of these concessions to the oil and gas industry are not enough for this House.

With today's bill, the House majority is saying that American oil and gas companies can drill more, export more, and realize even greater profits, no matter the environmental consequences, no matter the consequences to health and safety. As presently written, the underlying bill, H.R. 702, would permanently ensure that no export restrictions for any reason could be implemented or enforced in the future. That is what this bill says. That is breathtaking in its devotion to the oil and gas industry's agenda.

Now, my motion to recommit would ensure that the President and Federal

Government agencies charged with protecting human health, the environment, and public safety can continue to do their job that constituents rely on them to do. Specifically, with this amendment, we will ensure that bedrock health and safety laws, like the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act, that laws like that will not be cast aside in favor of Big Oil's desire to sell more crude overseas.

Now, if you think about it, this is a very straightforward motion.

I just want to ask my colleagues a question: Should crude oil exports trump the Safe Drinking Water Act?

Should Big Oil profits trump the need for pipeline safety and pipeline inspection?

Of course not. We need to protect safe drinking water. We need to ensure pipeline safety. So, my colleagues, I urge you to vote ''yes'' on this MTR to improve this bill.

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON. First of all, I want to thank the minority for giving us a one-page motion to recommit that I can actually read and understand. I have read it. I don't like it. It is not necessary. It is redundant. I oppose it. Please vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 242, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

AYES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—13

Clyburn
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dingell
Grijalva
Hudson
Kind
Knight
Payne
Sanford
Shuster
Sinema
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1317

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 159, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—261

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs

Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—159

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Clyburn
DeFazio
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Grijalva
Hudson
Kind
Knight
Payne
Sanford
Sinema
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1324

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 545 regarding "Amash of Michigan Part B Amendment No. 1" (H.R. 702). Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

I missed rollcall vote No. 546 regarding "Messer of Indiana Part B Amendment No. 5" (H.R. 702). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

I missed rollcall vote No. 547 regarding "Messer of Indiana Part B Amendment No. 6" (H.R. 702). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

I missed rollcall vote No. 548 regarding "On Motion to Recommit with Instructions" (H.R. 702). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

I missed rollcall vote No. 549 regarding "On Passage" (H.R. 702). Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 2015, I returned to Oregon to attend to various matters in my District. Had I been present, I would have voted on the following:

On agreeing to the Amash amendment to H.R. 702, I would have voted "no."

On agreeing to the Messer/Lowenthal amendment to H.R. 702, I would have voted "aye."

On agreeing to the Messer amendment Number 2 to H.R. 702, I would have voted "aye."

On passage of the Democratic Motion to Recommit to H.R. 702, I would have voted "aye."

On final passage of H.R. 702, I would have voted "no."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Budget may, at any time before 6 p.m. on Friday, October 16, 2015, file a privileged report to accompany a message to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

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

There was no objection.

LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women of Little Rock Air Force Base and the surrounding communities for their 60 years of dedicated service and sacrifice to the defense of our Nation.

In its long history, it has had many important missions, including reconnaissance and bombing missions, and it is now known as the C–130 capital of the world.

Little Rock Air Force Base is one of the most technologically advanced and well-run military installations in the entire country. It is the tactical airlift ''Center of Excellence.'' The base builds the foundation of America's combat airlift capability and trains the world's best airlifters to ''fly, fight, and win.''

From providing lifesaving humanitarian aid to the Yazidis in Sinjar to delivering our men and women and their supplies, Little Rock Air Force Base defends freedom.

□ 1330

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE CREW OF THE EL FARO

(Ms. PINGREE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I am here today to honor the memory of the crew of *El Faro*, lost in a hurricane in the Bahamas last week.

Four people from my State, the State of Maine, were aboard the *El Faro*: Michael Holland, of North Wilton; Dylan Meklin, of Rockland; Danielle Randolph, of Rockland; and the captain, a man of great experience, Mike Davidson, of Windham.