

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3585, SOLAR TECHNOLOGY ROADMAP ACT

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 846 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 846

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3585) to guide and provide for United States research, development, and demonstration of solar energy technologies, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Science and Technology or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative

days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 846 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3585, the Solar Technology Roadmap Act. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI and provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Science and Technology Committee. It provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Science and Technology Committee shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read.

The rule waives all points of order against the substitute except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI.

The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Such amendments may be offered only in the order printed in the report and shall be offered by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI.

The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The Chair may entertain a motion to rise only if offered by the Chair of the Committee on Science and Technology, and the Chair may not entertain motions to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 weeks right down the street on the National Mall, 20 teams of university students competed in the biannual Department of Energy's solar decathlon. These teams competed not just for victory but for innovation and public awareness as well.

Every 2 years, teams from all over the globe prove unequivocally, either rain or shine, under the all-too-frequently cloudy skies of Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, that solar power is not only here for the future, but is here and ready to go today. These teams showcase both cutting-edge technology and technology that has been around for decades. Technology that creates jobs, promotes energy independence, combats climate change just simply isn't getting the attention it deserves from several blocks away here on the Hill.

The solar decathlon itself is noticing an interesting trend that speaks to what's occurring on a global scale. Teams like the two-time winners from my congressional district, the University of Colorado, unfortunately aren't finding the support that they need, and

the University of Colorado had to cancel their program to compete this year, while teams from Europe and elsewhere continue to find the budget to compete and to win.

Right now because of the policies we have and have not passed, our country is starting to lose the innovation race in technology. Europe, China, and other countries are leapfrogging us in the race to refine the technology that will power our future.

This past Monday, The Wall Street Journal's "Power Plays" section highlighted America's competitiveness problem, which has been seen and felt by the many solar and clean-tech companies in my district for years.

Our technology is draining away to countries who know how to support and foster its growth. The Wall Street Journal highlighted how China is taking the lead in solar energy investment and drastically cutting the price of the technology and its development, making it harder for U.S. companies to compete.

Mr. Speaker, up until now Congress' attitude towards renewable energy and solar has been wanting. We failed time after time to support the small businesses, the technology, and the policies that could have and should have changed our Nation's energy outlook years ago.

American solar businesses have had to deal with the uncertainty of not knowing what government policies will be in place from one year to the next; production in investment tax credits have ebbed and flowed with no real consistency.

As someone with a background in business, I know this simply just doesn't work. Whether you're figuring out your payroll or trying to secure investments, without long-term certainty with regard to the playing fields, you have a hard time accomplishing either. Our policies towards solar research have been equally sporadic with no real directive to lead our research or investment.

We desperately need to focus our research and focus our investments, and this legislation will do that.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, this bill is a game changer. This bill is the focus, this bill is the directive that we as a Nation need in order to realize the great potential that solar energy has had for decades and will have for our future. By creating this road map, we will have the foremost experts in the world focusing our research, focusing our policies, and focusing our vision on what is possible and what will be achieved; and in doing so, we will encourage investment by providing the long-term assurance that the market is so desperately looking for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule before us today. The underlying legislation is being brought to

the floor under yet another structured rule that does not allow for many of the amendments my colleagues on both sides of the aisle presented during the Rules Committee hearing. This is especially wrong when debating one of the important issues of our time, our Nation's energy policy. By choosing to operate in this way, the majority has cut off the minority and their own colleagues from having any input in the legislative process.

My assumption is that, along with me, all other Members want to see more solar power used in this country; but the Democrats in charge are limiting what ideas can be debated on the floor and what constituents can be adequately represented in the House.

Our constituents in both Republican and Democrat districts are struggling to make ends meet, are facing unemployment, and yet are simultaneously being shut out of participating in debate over how their hard-earned taxpayer dollars are being spent by the Federal Government.

Why is the majority blocking debate on such important legislation? Are they afraid of debate? Are they protecting their Members from tough votes? Are they afraid of the democratic process?

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico, a member of the Committee on Science and Technology, Mr. LUJÁN.

Mr. LUJÁN. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I speak today in support of H.R. 3585, in support of the rule in support of the Solar Technology Roadmap Act, a bill that I cosponsored and supported proudly during the committee process. And I commend Congresswoman GIFFORDS for her work on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I come from a State that has over 300 days of sunshine, a State that has abundant solar resources, a State that recognizes that we have to get out in front of this. But as we talk about the Southwest and where we have a lot of sunshine, we cannot lose sight that countries like Germany, that don't have the abundant solar resources that we do here in the United States, but especially in the Southwest, are still ahead of us. They're outproducing us, they're generating more power from the sun. We have to get out in front of this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Solar energy production will support economic growth by creating jobs and opportunities for a clean energy workplace.

You know, as we talk about this issue, we see and we remember that this technology, solar technology, was invented and developed right here in the United States, right here in America; yet we're falling further and further behind. We talk about the need for more jobs, for making sure that we're getting ahead of this important energy

issue. There is no reason that solar energy can't be and should not be—and it must be—a big part of the solar mix of the energy mix that we have right here in the United States.

When we talk about the investment in education, the emphasis with technology, engineering, mathematics, and science, making sure that we're building up that young group, those talented young people that will solve tomorrow's problems, investment in solar technology in developing a road map that will be essential in fully deploying and developing this technology is critically important. Our national laboratories at the forefront here are our colleges and universities. We have to invest in our engineers, our scientists, our researchers to provide this path forward.

The solar technology road map lays out a clear path for identifying our country's solar technologies, development needs and staying on track to address its importance. It lets us get back in the front on this issue, Mr. Speaker. The Solar Technology Roadmap Act will provide resources to our academic institutions, our national laboratories for research and development, and a demonstration of advanced techniques and manufacturing a variety of solar energy products.

Mr. Speaker, we can't wait any more. We all need to come together when we talk about the future of our energy needs in our country, solving our dependence on foreign sources of energy, getting back out in front of this very important issue.

This piece of legislation will allow us to get there and allow us to pave the way and, once again, Mr. Speaker, allow America, allow the United States, allow our scientists our entrepreneurs, our business people to use their hands, use their minds, use their hearts and their souls to get back out in front of this issue.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and support this legislation that will set our country on a path to be a leader in solar energy.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank very much the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to the underlying bill; and to explain why, I would like to walk through a little history and a little math.

Let's begin with history and two very important dates: 1978 and 1839. In 1978, *The Wall Street Journal* carried this headline: "Solar Power Seen Meeting 20 Percent of Needs By 2000; Carter May Seek Outlay Boost."

Well, oddly the same paper carried a headline in 2006 making the same promise, this time for all renewable fuels, only this time by 2025, but I disagree.

Billions of dollars were poured into research and development for solar technology as a result of that, and an

entire solar industry solely supported by NASA subsidies arose in order to grab those dollars. And what was the result of all of this plunder of taxpayers and rate payers? More than 30 years after that promise was made in 1978, solar power accounts for just one percent of electricity generation. That's not for lack of subsidies; it's because despite all of the billions of dollars of subsidies, the technology remains immensely inefficient and expensive.

□ 1045

And that brings me to the second year, 1839. This is not a new technology. Photovoltaic electricity was first discovered by French physicist Alexandre Edmond Becquerel in the year 1839. This technology has existed for 170 years, and in those 170 years of scientific discovery and progress and despite billions of dollars of subsidies to the solar industry, we have yet to discover a more expensive way of producing electricity.

When the State of California was squandering its wealth on subsidizing this industry a few years ago, I asked the California Energy Commission: what is the price range of all of the various forms of electricity generation that we can choose from?

Here is what they reported: the cheapest form of electricity generation is hydroelectric. It ranges from a quarter of a cent to 2.7 cents per kilowatt hour, so the mid-range average is around 1.5 cents. Then comes nuclear power, with a mid-range of around 1.7 cents. After that is coal at about 1.9 cents, then wind at 4.6 cents, and gas at 10.6 cents. Finally, we get to the most expensive way to produce electricity, solar, which is between a low of 13.5 cents and a high of 42.7 cents per kilowatt hour, with a mid-range of about 28.1 cents. But it gets worse.

In a day, a solid acre of state-of-the-art solar panels can produce 2.2 megawatt hours of electricity, assuming an average of 5 hours of peak sunlight—2.2 megawatt hours per day. Now compare that to the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant that produces 49,000 megawatt hours of electricity each day. In order to duplicate that single nuclear power plant, it would require 22,000 acres of solid solar panels—34 square miles of solid solar panels. By comparison, the Diablo Canyon power site sits on just 1 square mile.

So this technology, after 170 years and after countless billions of dollars of research and development, is roughly 17 times more expensive than nuclear power, and it consumes 32 times the land area of a comparable nuclear facility. But don't worry, say the proponents, we just need a few billion dollars more to become competitive. Well, I'm sorry, but we have heard that song before. I suppose hope springs eternal.

For decades, the Federal Government and gullible States like California have kept the solar industry afloat by pumping billions of dollars into subsidized

loans, by crediting consumers who buy solar panels and, of course, through research and development—\$166 million last year and \$175 million this year by the Department of Energy alone.

This is an industry that exists solely of the dole, by the dole and for the dole, and it is now clamoring for billions of dollars more. If this rule is passed and if the bill is taken up, they are going to get it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. If they get this rule and get this bill, they are going to get those billions of dollars more taken directly out of the shrinking bank accounts of American taxpayers. This is called the Solar Technology Roadmap Act. We have heard of the "bridge to nowhere." This is the road map that's going to get us there.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, which makes in order the manager's amendment, which includes a provision that I drafted to require that one of the demonstration projects in the bill be on organic solar technology.

Organic solar technology turns solar cells into high-tech ink that can be printed or sprayed onto surfaces using the same general idea as a common ink-jet printer. This technological leap allows us to turn lightweight, flexible films into solar receptors, which opens the door to using solar power for items like cell phones, laptops and even military equipment that can recharge in the field. Additionally, this technology could potentially cost less than silicon solar technology because it's easier to process and because it makes solar technology more attainable for all Americans.

Organic solar cells would potentially be better for the environment than would traditional silicon solar technology. Not only does organic solar technology use less energy in production because it requires less processing, but the cells can more easily be recycled. Two of the biggest barriers to organic solar technology are how long the cells last in the field and how efficiently they convert sunlight into electrical energy.

My provision in the manager's amendment would ensure the opportunity for a demonstration project to pursue bringing organic solar technology to market. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I support the rule and that I ask my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying multi-

billion-dollar waste that the rule brings to the floor.

Later today, I am sure the House will approve overwhelmingly this very wasteful \$2.2 billion subsidy for the solar power industry and for the solar bureaucracy, but we should be remembering that our national debt will soon pass \$12 trillion in just a few days. Solar energy has received massive subsidies, with very little progress, ever since the Carter administration. In fact, it has turned into little more than a jobs boondoggle for bureaucrats as the gentleman from California just showed us in a story from *The Wall Street Journal* where, in 1978, there was a claim that solar energy by the year 2000 would make up 20 percent of our energy needs.

After all of this time and after all of this money, however, solar energy makes up far less than 1 percent of the total of U.S. energy. In fact, it is just 1 percent of the 7 percent that renewable energy provides this country. That is such a small figure that I can't even figure out exactly what 1 percent of 7 percent is. It's hard to get that small. The Department of Energy has received at least \$1.2 billion for this research just since fiscal 2000, not counting what other departments and agencies have spent on this.

I am not against solar energy in any way, but it is way past time for this industry to stand on its own. The demand for solar energy will go up much faster if the industry is weaned off of Federal money and if it is forced to put out a better, more efficient and less expensive product. This is called free enterprise. Some people may have heard of it. The taxpayers simply cannot afford to keep funding a very wasteful program just because it is politically correct or fashionable to do so. This is a multibillion-dollar waste, and it should be defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DUNCAN. This bill should be defeated, but it will not be. As someone told me last week, it is easy to run as Santa Claus, but it is almost impossible to run against Santa Claus.

I urge the defeat of this legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the House has an opportunity today to do something in a very fair and correct way and that is very important.

I do want the record to reflect the degree of inclusion that Chairman GORDON and the members of his committee have put forth in this bill.

By my count, there were 29 suggestions made by the minority which are

included in this underlying legislation. One was made at the subcommittee level and was accepted, and three were made at the full committee level and were accepted. The gentlewoman from Arizona has a manager's amendment which will be considered by the House later today. My understanding is it includes 25 suggestions from the minority. The minority had some input, so the idea that this is a one-sided discussion, I think, is simply not accurate. More importantly, the discussion takes us in a direction that our country very badly needs to go.

My friend from Tennessee just talked about the importance of paying down the national debt, and he sure is right. There is a best way to pay down the national debt, in my view, and two of the best ways are included in this bill. The first is to stop spending hundreds of billions of dollars a year overseas to buy energy from countries that are not terribly friendly to us. The second way is to put Americans to work. So, instead of consuming public resources in the welfare, Medicaid or food stamp systems, they're paying more taxes because they're making more money, and they're contributing to the Treasury in that way.

This bill puts us on a path that leads to those two directions. It is a road map. It suggests ways that innovative strategies can be used to increase the amount of energy that we derive from the sun.

Now, my friend from New Mexico could have talked about how solar energy is prominent in his State because they do have a lot of sunshine there. I'm from New Jersey. We have a fair degree of sunshine but certainly not to the degree that they have in New Mexico. However, New Jersey is now second in the Nation in the number of kilowatt hours that we produce from solar energy. So our State is living proof of the fact that you do not have to be in a warmer, sunny-all-the-time climate in order to achieve progress in this way. Those are the kinds of strategies that we will see investigated and encouraged as a result of this bill.

You know, this is a matter of energy, environment and security. The energy aspects are obvious. The more energy we derive from the sun, the less we buy from the Middle East and the less vulnerable we are. Second, it's a matter of the environment. The emission of greenhouse gases is a serious and growing problem in our ecosystem, and this bill would reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that we emit into the environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. Finally, it's a matter of national security. Many of the problems that vex us today in the international situation are precisely because we put ourselves in a position of disadvantage by buying so much necessary energy from overseas, often

from countries who do not share our human rights or international agenda.

This has been a very fair and open process. It's a very wise and forward-looking bill, and I would encourage Members of both the majority and minority to support this rule and to support the underlying bill later this afternoon.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I need to point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the manager's amendment incorporated 10 majority amendments. The only amendments that came in from the Republicans were put in in the names of the majority. There was only one Republican amendment made in order for today under the rule.

I would like now to recognize for 3 minutes my colleague from Nebraska, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today thankful we're talking about energy. Far too often, it seems, Washington is working on efforts to stop energy development right here in America. This bill at least makes an effort to tap into our domestic energy potential. However, I am concerned about the cost, and I am concerned the bill actually doesn't go far enough.

As a member of the Science Committee, I am familiar with the efforts to spur energy research, and as a member of the Natural Resources Committee, I am familiar with the rich resources our Nation has to generate more domestic energy. At a time when we are facing an annual deficit which is larger than the deficits from the last 4 years combined, we are here today to spend another \$2 billion without any way to pay for it.

Energy policy is about choices, and the leadership of this Congress and of this new administration has made the choice not to promote the most economic and energy-rich forms of domestic energy resources, including oil and gas. In contrast, Republicans have chosen to support American energy production through an all-of-the-above energy plan. We support the development of solar energy all across America, and we also support wind, nuclear, hydropower, biofuels, and oil and gas development—domestic sources of energy.

America does not need just one choice on energy. We need access to all of the domestic energy resources we can develop. The American Energy Act would clean up the environment, lower energy costs, and create more American jobs than the bill before us today. In fact, the American Energy Act has four main objectives:

Increasing the production of American-made energy in an environmentally responsible and sound manner; promoting new, clean and renewable sources of energy such as nuclear, hydropower, clean-coal technology, wind and solar energy; encouraging greater efficiency and conservation by extending tax incentives for energy efficiency and rewarding development of greater conservation techniques and new energy resources; and cutting red tape and reducing frivolous litigation.

America needs energy development, and America needs jobs. While today's bill will promote some energy development and some new jobs, it's only one piece of the puzzle. America needs an all-of-the-above energy policy to develop many new energy resources and to create a lot of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans stand ready to help you promote increased domestic energy development. It's time that Congress not pick winners and losers in energy. It's time for all of the above.

□ 1100

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 3585, the Solar Technology Roadmap Act of 2010.

It is critical that we promote the development of solar energy technology in order to expand our national energy profile. Such advancements are also important in helping us achieve our goal of energy independence.

Colorado, in particular, has great potential for the generation and use of solar energy. Ten miles west of the Great Sand Dunes National Park in Alamosa County, Colorado, sits an 8.2 megawatt photovoltaic plant, one of the largest solar farms in the Nation. With 1 megawatt having the capacity to power 800 homes, enough energy is produced at the Alamosa plant to power over 6,500 homes. The facility is expected to add 250 megawatts of solar power by 2015.

Earlier this year, the Bureau of Land Management identified southern Colorado as a solar energy study area for concentrated solar energy production. The two dozen areas currently being evaluated by the Bureau of Land Management could produce as much as 100,000 megawatts of solar electricity. As a rancher, I am confident that the positive environmental impact, economic development, and cost savings yielded by the access to solar energy would benefit rural communities across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that we promote the use of technologies such as solar as part of our energy mix. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give this bill their full support. Investment in advanced technologies will ensure that America remains on the cutting edge, secures our standing as a leader on the alternative energy front, and brings us one step closer to energy independence.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves the emperor's new clothes award. We all, again, want to see improved and increased use of solar energy in our country, but this rule and this bill are not going to do it.

The bill before us authorizes \$2.25 billion in borrowed money for the creation of a new committee which would devise a solar technology road map or

plan. This wasteful spending does not reflect the hard economic times our country and our constituents are experiencing right now and, instead, is spending borrowed money that we do not have.

Whenever I am home in North Carolina, which is every weekend, I hear from numerous constituents their concerns that the Federal Government in Washington is borrowing and spending too much. The American people know that in these tough economic times that they should save, not spend money. However, the Federal Government does not reflect the common sense I see throughout my district. Instead, the Democrats in charge here continue to borrow more and spend more, increasing our Federal deficit on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

The money that Speaker PELOSI and the Obama administration want to authorize today is all borrowed money. We cannot say that often enough. We do not have this money. Our constituents do not have this money and the Federal Government does not have this money. The Democrats in charge have made the irresponsible decision to borrow it in order to spend it at their whim.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. national debt is currently \$11.5 trillion. With over 300 million people in the United States today, each citizen's share of this debt right now is \$38.8 thousand. This bill will increase the deficit even more by borrowing and spending money we don't have. We can no longer blame the deficit and economic difficulties today on the previous administration.

Those in charge have shown they don't care about the deficit by continuing to dig America into a deeper and deeper hole with more reckless spending. This borrowed money is all being spent by Speaker PELOSI and the Obama administration. As a result, the unemployment rate continues to rise and the deficit continues to rise also.

Since the Democrats took control of Congress on January 4, 2007, the national debt has increased by \$3.282 trillion. Since President Obama was inaugurated just months ago in January, the national debt has increased by \$1.325 trillion. The Department of the Treasury has reported that under the Democrats' control, 2009 is the worst fiscal year in this Nation's history. The results get more disastrous with each passing day.

Mr. Speaker, the debt limit has been raised at least three times since 2008. A debt limit increase was included in H.R. 3221, the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008. H.R. 1424, the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 raised the debt limit again.

The Democrats in charge raised the debt limit yet again less than a year later with passage of H.R. 1, the quote, stimulus, in February of this year. That bill raised the debt limit to \$12.104 trillion, where it now stands. As if that weren't enough, the fiscal year

2010 budget resolution adopted on April 29, 2009, triggered the automatic passage of a separate measure, House Joint Resolution 45, to raise the debt limit to \$13.029 trillion, which was then sent to the Senate.

We will soon be asked to raise the debt limit again just as soon as the majority can find a way to do it and hide it in some other bill so that the American people hopefully are fooled by what they are doing. They are not going to be fooled because they are paying attention to what's going on here in the Congress.

I have opposed all these efforts to raise the debt limit. According to an analysis by The Heritage Foundation, the White House projects \$10.6 trillion in new deficits over the next decade. This is nearly \$80,000 per household in new borrowing. It's beyond time to stop digging.

The new budget estimates, including an estimated total national debt of \$24.5 trillion in 2019 under President Obama's budget, are alarming and unsustainable. The result will be the highest level of spending and debt in American history. This is an irresponsible lack of fiscal restraint carried on the backs of our children and grandchildren. My constituents at home and Americans across the Nation are not operating their family budgets as recklessly as this Congress is spending their taxpayer dollars.

On top of all this, the President and Congress' shameless proposals to create a \$1 trillion health care entitlement are careless and unaffordable. We should be focusing on capping Federal spending, restraining entitlements, and eliminating wasteful programs. When will the Democrats learn that out-of-control spending will not solve our Nation's problems?

Last week, a group of us had the great opportunity to hear Mr. John Allison, who is chairman of the board of Branch Banking and Trust Company in North Carolina, one of the most successful banks in the United States. He told us then that we are on an unsustainable course in terms of accruing debt.

He said if we do not stop this almost immediately, we have fewer than 25 years left as a great Nation, that within 25 years we will become a Third World country similar to other Third World countries, particularly in South America. We cannot sustain this. We owe our children and grandchildren a better future. We need alternatives.

But what the Democrats in charge are doing is shutting off our opportunity to use alternative sources of energy that we have available to us in this country. We have plenty of oil, plenty of gas, plenty of coal. We could be using all of those sources of energy, but they are shutting us out. We should be utilizing those and not doing what our colleague from California showed, and that is wasting money on setting up committees to devise road maps to bridges to nowhere, when we could be

developing the resources that we have, allowing the private sector to do it, and not having government involvement.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Committee on Science and Technology, Mr. TONKO.

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

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3585, the Solar Technology Roadmap Act of 2010.

As a Representative and certainly as an engineer, I wholeheartedly embrace the soundness of planning. The road map here represents planning that provides for the most effective use of taxpayer and consumer dollars and also provides for the most commonsense approach to a situation that has really caused a great interest in America.

The previous administration spent down a surplus while it could have been investing in a sound energy plan. We now have no choice but to enter this clean energy race, which is global in nature. America will fall into deeper deficit in tougher times if it does not participate in the innovation economy driven by energy and environment reform.

This bill will unleash the potential of the American solar tech industry and boost our economy by creating jobs in this expanding new sector. It requires the Department of Energy to establish a solar road map committee to write and oversee a solar technology road map. The solar technology road map will lay out a detailed plan for solar tech research and development, help improve the performance and reliability of solar technology, and decrease the cost of solar for consumers and businesses.

Research and development funding will not only stimulate our economy and be the wave of energy innovation for the future, but it is also through R&D that we will be able to solve environmental issues, ensure the next wave of energy innovations occur right here in America, and provide those all-important American jobs to grow our economy and assist and relieve our American working families.

Solar has the potential to shave overall electricity prices for consumers as well as enhance capacity. This bill is crucial to catalyze both of these activities. In fact, this body previously passed a similar piece of legislation that I sponsored, H.R. 3165, the Wind Energy Research and Development Act. That bill looked at improving and making more efficient the materials used for construction of wind turbines.

In my district alone, there are numerous businesses and academic institutions such as the College of Nanoscale and Science Engineering at the University of Albany, which I

toured this just this week, where thin film improvements are greatly enhancing and improving the opportunity for market penetration of many nanoscale applications such as solar energy. We will advance with this legislation and grow jobs and grow our economy and not reject the innovation that was rejected in the previous administration.

As the vice Chair of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, or SEEK, which is newly formed this year, we recognize that H.R. 3585 is an important bill and is therefore a legislative priority. As such, I want to thank the gentlelady from Arizona for developing such a great bill, one that speaks volumes to bettering our Nation's economy, speaking to our energy policy and our environment.

I encourage a strong vote in favor of its passage.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while solar energy is an important resource and worthy of support, there are many flaws in this legislation and in the rule. This is not the right policy to advance our Nation's energy needs.

As usual, the Democrats' approach to another problem is to take money from hardworking citizens to use for their pet projects and their supporters. This approach fails to incorporate creative solutions that do not rely on ever increasing the size of the Federal Government.

According to the Science and Technology Committee, solar energy has been on the forefront for over 30 years, and yet it still makes up only 1 percent of the 7 percent of renewable energy consumed in the United States. Because there is no silver bullet, our Nation's energy policy must encompass many energy alternative solutions.

Mr. Speaker, if the Democrats in charge were serious about achieving energy independence and freeing our Nation from the grip of foreign oil, they would bring legislation to the floor that invests in several energy initiatives, not just one.

□ 1115

Republicans have alternatives. We have alternatives to everything that they have been presenting. We've introduced legislation that would encompass a multitude of energy initiatives, including solar technology, H.R. 2846, the American Energy Act, of which I'm a cosponsor, is a comprehensive energy solutions plan that would create jobs, make energy more affordable, diversify our energy sources, and help the U.S. become more energy independent.

The American Energy Act would increase both the supply of American-made energy in environmentally sound ways and achieve the goal of energy independence for our Nation. Instead of investing billions in taxpayer dollars we don't have for one energy resource, the American Energy Act would establish a renewable energy trust fund using revenues generated by exploration in the deep ocean and on the

Arctic coastal plain. It would permanently extend the tax credit for alternative energy production, including wind, solar and hydrogen; and it would eliminate barriers to the expansion of emission-free nuclear power production. The comprehensive strategy is budget neutral, without tax increases, and would make independence achievable without wasting billions of our constituents' dollars.

But instead of taking real action, this bill places restrictions on solar technology research and development by requiring that the Secretary of Energy allocate at least 75 percent of funding to those solar R&D projects directed under the committee's road map. This leaves little flexibility for innovations that may be feasible and yet were not included in the road map.

When Speaker PELOSI took office, she promised the Nation that this Congress would be the most open and honest in history. This bill works against that objective. At least one-third of the road map committee created by this bill is made up of industry officials who are explicitly exempted from the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which is intended to provide an open and transparent process. The Democrats in charge could have ensured the road map committee was open and transparent, but curiously they chose not to.

When it comes to solar technology research and development, we must have the collaboration of the Department of Energy, universities and industries. However, this bill would create a committee, half of which could be industry, telling DOE where to direct taxpayer money into research and development that could benefit their companies while not having to answer to anyone or defend their recommendations. This is not a responsible policy when billions of taxpayer dollars are on the line.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 900, of which I'm a cosponsor, would liberate energy companies from being suffocated by extreme environmental litigation and allow them to move forward and get approval to implement energy products.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is wrong. This bill is a bad bill.

Since 2005, more than 200 applications have been submitted to the Bureau of Land Management for permission to build solar power projects on federally controlled land. To date, the Bureau of Land Management hasn't approved a single one of them. Mr. ROHR-ABACHER has introduced H.R. 964, the Emergency Solar Power Permit Act, of which I am a cosponsor, to exempt solar energy projects from costly and prolonged environmental impact statement requirements. Enacting this legislation would do more to expedite solar energy than the underlying bill.

Even though the public has repeatedly demanded to take advantage of the resources we have here at home, attempts to develop these resources are consistently and adamantly opposed by radical environmentalists who claim to be in favor of domestic develop-

ment of renewable energy. The American people are suffering the consequences.

The Democrats' radical environmentalist friends and campaign donors continue to block domestic energy development by imposing excessive environmental litigation on energy companies. This excessive litigation prevents our country from moving forward to implement policies that will develop renewable technology and free us from the grip of foreign oil.

H.R. 900, of which I am a cosponsor, would liberate energy companies from being suffocated by extreme environmental litigation and allow them to move forward and get approval to implement energy projects. However, the Democrats in charge will not allow this bill to come to the floor for debate because they have more allegiance towards their radical environmentalist friends than towards the American people.

Mr. Speaker, amendments to reduce the authorization, give the Secretary of DOE discretion as to how much funding should go to the Roadmap recommendations, and sunset the Roadmap Committee in 2015 were all voted down in the hearing on this legislation.

Amendments to protect small businesses, veteran-owned businesses, and fund this bill through unspent funds authorized under the "stimulus" earlier this year were blocked by the Democrats on the Rules Committee so we will not be debating them in order to improve this flawed legislation. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, by creating a solar technology road map committee made up of experts representing a variety of perspectives from the private industry, the solar technology industry, from the national laboratories, one of which borders my district, the National Energy Laboratory in Golden, Colorado, from academia and from the relevant Federal, State, as well as local agencies, we can ensure that we have all the stakeholders on board with a forward-thinking strategic plan for using our Federal solar energy research, rolling out development and demonstration, and making sure that funds are spent effectively and efficiently.

The road map that this bill will create is a model that's tried and true. This bill's road map is modeled on the successful National Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors which has been instrumental in helping the semiconductor industry and semiconductor technology advance rapidly over the past two decades. The progress in the semiconductor industry has helped make the technology exponentially more cost competitive and has grown the industry to help establish America as the international leader in semiconductors, just as we have the opportunity to be the true international leader in solar technology.

Like solar technology, the semiconductor industry at one point in time also needed focus. It needed a road map to point it in the right direction, a road map to ensure that its investments were being used wisely and efficiently, allowing us to compete with

other countries. This bill will do the same for the solar industry.

Mr. Speaker, the Solar Technology Roadmap Act has gained a wide variety of bipartisan support, support from institutions and organizations from many different perspectives on the energy issue.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, if I can inquire of the gentleman from Colorado if he is prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. I have no additional speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers, and I will make my closing speech now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so an amendment can be added to the rule. The amendment to the rule would provide for separate consideration of H. Res. 554, a resolution to require that legislation and conference reports be posted on the Internet for 72 hours prior to consideration by the House. It does not affect the bill made in order by the rule.

The amendment to the rule provides the House will debate the issue of reading the bill within 3 legislative days. It does not disrupt the schedule.

The bill currently has 164 cosponsors. The discharge petition has 182 names, including five Democrats. This bill has gained support of an overwhelming majority of Americans and is widely respected by government watchdogs.

The existing House rule, that committee reports be available for 3 days prior to floor consideration, has been repeatedly waived by Republicans and Democrats alike. This is not a partisan measure. As Members of Congress, we ought to agree that regardless of the legislation brought before us, we should always have the opportunity to read and understand the legislation before we vote.

The American public agrees with this commonsense position. A recent survey by Rasmussen Reports found that 83 percent of Americans say legislation should be posted online and available for everyone to read before Congress votes on it. The poll also found that this is not a partisan issue: 85 percent of Republicans, 76 percent of Democrats, and 92 percent of unaffiliated voters favor posting legislation online prior to its being voted on.

In the beginning of the year, Democrat Members of this Congress voted to spend almost \$790 billion in taxpayer dollars on a stimulus package that most Members did not even read. All Republicans voted "no." The 1,073-page document wasn't posted on the government's Web site until after 10 p.m. the day before the vote to pass it was taken.

Furthermore, before debate on the cap-and-tax bill offered last summer, the House was presented with a 300-plus-page amendment at 3 a.m. for debate the following morning and a vote

the following afternoon. This was unacceptable and further demonstrated the need to read the bill and the amendments.

Mr. Speaker, we are elected to Congress to represent our constituents. How are we supposed to determine what is right for our fellow Americans if we have to vote on something before we even have time to read it? We need to have this debate. If people oppose having the text of bills available to read, they should make their case. This amendment to the rule allows them to do just that.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can have this debate and do the right thing for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and the rule and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from North Carolina earlier alluded to her concern that, if we passed this bill and others, our economy will begin to resemble the Third World. She particularly cited, she said, the Third World, particularly South American countries. I would like to remind my colleague that South American countries, in particular Argentina and Brazil, have been on a tear of growth. They have had economic growth. Their currencies have gained value against the dollar. And I hope that our country can enjoy the same kinds of economic growth that in particular Brazil and Argentina have enjoyed this last year. And certainly the technology industry, in having a road map for our solar industry, can be an important part of that economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a responsible and well thought out and proven approach to moving our Nation away from its addiction on fossil fuels and towards independence. This is a mission that will help us address some of the largest challenges we face, reducing our dangerous dependence on foreign oil and cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

Time and time again, it has been shown that solar energy is a tremendous win in terms of national security, lessening our reliance on foreign oil. Whether having emergency response centers powered individually during disasters or having additional solar supplying the grid during blackouts, we are learning that energy security means homegrown renewable energy.

What good does it do for us to be dependent on Europe or China for our energy in the future just as we are today on Saudi Arabia? I think not. We can

change our future and take ownership of our future here today. The unfortunate truth of the matter is right now Europe and China are winning the technology wars to dominate our renewable energy future; and this will become worse with every day that we fail to act.

Today, Congress can take action to change our future and take ownership of our future for America. We need to realize that the technological gains of China and Europe are a good thing, but not if they are to the detriment of our own small businesses, our own investment, and our own jobs.

There is one factor that every place with a booming clean energy industry has in common. It's not just the sun, which we have in our country, it's not just the wind, which we have, it's not just the biomass, which we have in spades; but it is the policies, the policies that underlie creating a playing field that enables the growth of the solar technology industry.

You may think that California and Colorado are the number one and number three, respectively, renewable energy States in the country because they are sunny or windy. But, in fact, we in Colorado, and the State of California is number one, are in their place because they have the right policies, the right policies to attract investors, the right policies to grow clean energy jobs, friendly State leadership from the Governor to the State legislature, to counties. To prove this point, coming in at number two is actually the somewhat cloudy State of New Jersey, due to their State leadership of embracing a renewable energy economy.

In Colorado, this fact has been known for years. Our State and my hometown of Boulder know the benefits of policies that attract technological advancement, support small businesses and create jobs all because they promote investments in renewable energy.

In fact, today the American Solar Energy Society will unveil a new national report that shows the economic and employment boom that clean energy could provide if only we enact the right policies, which we can through the road map that we have contained in this bill. Policies like net metering, interconnection standards, Property Assessed Clean Energy Bonds and the expansion of distributed generation are the next steps of policies that will give our Nation the benefits that clean energy has given to places like Colorado.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, this bill has been officially endorsed by business groups across the board, like the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Solar Energy Industries Association, and the National Semiconductor Association.

In passing the Solar Technology Roadmap Act, we are passing on confidence to investors that our support will be around for the long haul. It is predictable. We are saying to small clean energy businesses that you can

hire more employees, and we are saying to researchers that without a doubt you will be inventing technologies that will make our country cleaner and will make our Nation stronger in the world.

Establishing a research road map and prioritizing Federal funding for solar research will help commercialize new solar technologies and make clean, renewable energy sources more affordable and accessible for all Americans. Solar technology offers tremendous opportunity for America, the potential to create tens of thousands of good, high-paying, clean energy jobs that we are currently losing to overseas companies as we build our energy independence future.

The U.S. has some of the best solar resources of any industrialized nation in the world, both intellectual as well as geophysical. Yet while America is currently a leader in solar technology development, other countries, like Spain, Germany and China, are devoting much more of a concerted effort and attention to deployment, putting the U.S. competitive position in jeopardy.

□ 1130

The Solar Technology Roadmap Act has diverse and bipartisan support.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Chairman GORDON of the Science and Technology Committee for his commitment to this important issue, and my friend from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) for her hard work championing this legislation to ensure that America retains and grows its position as a leader in solar technology and job creation for the future.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 846

OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

At the end of the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 554) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that legislation and conference reports be available on the Internet for 72 hours before consideration by the House, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; (2) an amendment, if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee and if printed in that portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII at least one legislative day prior to its consideration, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and

an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit which shall not contain instructions. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 554.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 846, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 797, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 798]

YEAS—239

Ackerman	Etheridge	Marshall
Adler (NJ)	Farr	Massa
Altmire	Fattah	Matheson
Andrews	Filner	Matsui
Arcuri	Foster	McCarthy (NY)
Baca	Frank (MA)	McCullum
Baldwin	Fudge	McDermott
Barrow	Giffords	McGovern
Becerra	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Berkley	Gordon (TN)	McMahon
Berman	Grayson	McNerney
Berry	Green, Al	Meek (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Melancon
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	Michaud
Boccheri	Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)
Boren	Halvorson	Miller, George
Boswell	Hare	Mitchell
Boucher	Harman	Mollohan
Boyd	Hastings (FL)	Moore (KS)
Brady (PA)	Heinrich	Moore (WI)
Bralley (IA)	Herseth Sandlin	Moran (VA)
Brown, Corrine	Higgins	Murphy (CT)
Butterfield	Himes	Murphy (NY)
Capps	Hinchey	Murphy, Patrick
Capuano	Hirono	Murtha
Cardoza	Hodes	Nadler (NY)
Carmahan	Holden	Napolitano
Carson (IN)	Holt	Neal (MA)
Castor (FL)	Honda	Nye
Chandler	Hoyer	Oberstar
Chu	Inslee	Olver
Clarke	Israel	Ortiz
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Pascarell
Clyburn	(TX)	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Conyers	Kagen	Perriello
Cooper	Kanjorski	Peters
Costa	Kaptur	Peterson
Costello	Kennedy	Pingree (ME)
Courtney	Kildee	Pollis (CO)
Crowley	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pomeroy
Cuellar	Kilroy	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kind	Quigley
Dahlkemper	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Klein (FL)	Reyes
Davis (TN)	Kosmas	Rodriguez
DeFazio	Kucinich	Ross
DeGette	Langevin	Rothman (NJ)
Delahunt	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Lee (CA)	Rush
Dingell	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Salazar
Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Loeb sack	T.
Driehaus	Lowe y	Sanchez, Loretta
Edwards (MD)	Luján	Sarbanes
Edwards (TX)	Lynch	Schakowsky
Ellison	Maffei	Schauer
Ellsworth	Maloney	Schiff
Engel	Markey (CO)	Schrader
Eshoo	Markey (MA)	Schwartz

Scott (GA)	Stark	Walz
Scott (VA)	Stupak	Wasserman
Serrano	Sutton	Schultz
Sestak	Tanner	Waters
Shea-Porter	Teague	Watson
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Watt
Shuler	Thompson (MS)	Waxman
Sires	Tierney	Weiner
Skelton	Titus	Welch
Slaughter	Tonko	Wexler
Smith (WA)	Towns	Wilson (OH)
Snyder	Tsongas	Woolsey
Space	Van Hollen	Wu
Speier	Velázquez	Yarmuth
Spratt	Visclosky	

NAYS—176

Aderholt	Foxx	Miller (MI)
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Minnick
Austria	Gallely	Moran (KS)
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Tim
Bachus	Gerlach	Myrick
Baird	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Bartlett	Granger	Nunes
Barton (TX)	Graves	Olson
Biggart	Griffith	Paul
Bilbray	Guthrie	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Petri
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Blunt	Heller	Platts
Boehner	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Bonner	Herger	Posey
Bono Mack	Hill	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hoekstra	Putnam
Boustany	Hunter	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Inglis	Reichert
Bright	Issa	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Jones	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Jordan (OH)	Rooney
Burgess	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	King (NY)	Roskam
Buyer	Kingston	Royce
Calvert	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Camp	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Campbell	Kratovil	Schmidt
Cantor	Lamborn	Schock
Cao	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Latham	Sessions
Carter	LaTourette	Shadegg
Cassidy	Latta	Shimkus
Castle	Lee (NY)	Shuster
Chaffetz	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Childers	Linder	Smith (NE)
Coble	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Coffman (CO)	Lucas	Souder
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Stearns
Crenshaw	Lummis	Sullivan
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Taylor
Davis (KY)	E.	Terry
Deal (GA)	Mack	Thompson (PA)
Dent	Manzullo	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Dreier	McCaul	Turner
Duncan	McClintock	Upton
Ehlers	McCotter	Westmoreland
Emerson	McHenry	Whitfield
Fallin	McKeon	Wilson (SC)
Flake	McMorris	Wittman
Fleming	Rodgers	Wolf
Forbes	Mica	Young (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	

NOT VOTING—17

Abercrombie	Gingrey (GA)	Richardson
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Smith (TX)
Bean	Hinojosa	Walden
Carney	Lofgren, Zoe	Wamp
Cole	Obey	Young (AK)
Davis (AL)	Radanovich	

□ 1204

Mr. CHILDERS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 178, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 799]

YEAS—241

Ackerman	Hall (NY)	Obey
Adler (NJ)	Halvorson	Olver
Altmire	Hare	Ortiz
Andrews	Harman	Pallone
Arcuri	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Baca	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Baird	Herseth Sandlin	Payne
Baldwin	Higgins	Perlmutter
Barrow	Himes	Perrillo
Becerra	Hinchev	Peters
Berkley	Hirono	Peterson
Berman	Hodes	Pingree (ME)
Berry	Holden	Polis (CO)
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Pomeroy
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Quigley
Bocchieri	Insee	Rahall
Boren	Israel	Rangel
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Boyd	(TX)	Ross
Brady (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Rothman (NJ)
Braley (IA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Brown, Corrine	Jones	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Kagen	Rush
Capps	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kaptur	Salazar
Cardoza	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan	Kildee	T.
Carson (IN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Kilroy	Sarbanes
Chandler	Kind	Schakowsky
Chu	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schauer
Clarke	Kissell	Schiff
Clay	Klein (FL)	Schrader
Cleaver	Kosmas	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kucinich	Scott (GA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sestak
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Shea-Porter
Costa	Levin	Sherman
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Shuler
Courtney	Lipinski	Sires
Crowley	Loebsock	Skelton
Cuellar	Lujan	Slaughter
Cummings	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Dahlkemper	Maffei	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Space
Davis (IL)	Markey (CO)	Speier
Davis (TN)	Markey (MA)	Spratt
DeFazio	Marshall	Stark
DeGette	Massa	Stupak
Delahunt	Matheson	Sutton
DeLauro	Matsui	Tanner
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Teague
Dingell	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Donnelly (IN)	Doyle	Tierney
Doyle	McGovern	Titus
Driehaus	McIntyre	Tonko
Edwards (MD)	McMahon	Towns
Edwards (TX)	McNerney	Tsongas
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Ellsworth	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Engel	Melancon	Visclosky
Eshoo	Michaud	Walz
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Farr	Miller, George	Schultz
Fattah	Mitchell	Waters
Filner	Mollohan	Watson
Foster	Moore (WI)	Watt
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Waxman
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Weiner
Giffords	Murphy (NY)	Welch
Gonzalez	Murphy, Patrick	Wexler
Gordon (TN)	Murtha	Wilson (OH)
Grayson	Nadler (NY)	Woolsey
Green, Al	Napolitano	Wu
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Nye	
Gutierrez	Oberstar	

NAYS—178

Aderholt	Alexander	Bachmann
Akin	Austria	Bachus

Bartlett	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Barton (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy, Tim
Biggert	Goodlatte	Murphy, Tim
Bilbray	Granger	Myrick
Bilirakis	Graves	Neugebauer
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Nunes
Blackburn	Guthrie	Olson
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Paul
Boehner	Harper	Paulsen
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Bono Mack	Heller	Petri
Boozman	Hensarling	Pitts
Boustany	Herger	Platts
Brady (TX)	Hill	Poe (TX)
Bright	Hoekstra	Posey
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Price (GA)
Brown (SC)	Inglis	Putnam
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Rehberg
Ginny	Jenkins	Reichert
Buchanan	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Burton (IN)	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Buyer	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Camp	Kingston	Rooney
Campbell	Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Roskam
Cao	Kratovil	Royce
Capito	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Lance	Scalise
Cassidy	Latham	Schmidt
Castle	LaTourette	Schock
Chaffetz	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Childers	Lee (NY)	Sessions
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Coffman (CO)	Linder	Shimkus
Cole	LoBiondo	Shuster
Conaway	Lucas	Simpson
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	Davis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	E.	Souder
Dent	Mack	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Taylor
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Duncan	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Ehlers	McClintock	Thornberry
Emerson	McCotter	Tiahrt
Fallin	McHenry	Tiberi
Flake	McKeon	Turner
Fleming	McMorris	Upton
Forbes	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Mica	Whitfield
Fox	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Galleghy	Minnick	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Moore (KS)	

NOT VOTING—13

Abercrombie	Gohmert	Walden
Barrett (SC)	Hinojosa	Wamp
Bean	Lofgren, Zoe	Young (AK)
Carney	Radanovich	
Davis (AL)	Richardson	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1212

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING AWARENESS AND ENHANCING THE STATE OF CYBER SECURITY IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 797.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr.

GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 797.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 415, noes 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 800]

AYES—415

Ackerman	Clay	Green, Gene
Aderholt	Cleaver	Griffith
Roskam	Clyburn	Grijalva
Adler (NJ)	Coble	Guthrie
Akin	Coffman (CO)	Gutierrez
Alexander	Altmire	Hall (NY)
Altmire	Cohen	Hall (TX)
Andrews	Cole	Halvorson
Arcuri	Conaway	Hare
Austria	Connolly (VA)	Harman
Baca	Conyers	Harper
Bachmann	Cooper	Hastings (FL)
Bachus	Costa	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Costello	Heinrich
Baldwin	Courtney	Heller
Barrow	Crenshaw	Hensarling
Bartlett	Crowley	Herger
Barton (TX)	Cuellar	Herseth Sandlin
Becerra	Culberson	Higgins
Berkley	Cummings	Hill
Berman	Dahlkemper	Himes
Berry	Davis (CA)	Hinchev
Biggert	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Bilbray	Davis (KY)	Hodes
Bilirakis	Davis (TN)	Hoekstra
Bishop (GA)	Deal (GA)	Holden
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Holt
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Honda
Blackburn	Delahunt	Hoyer
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hunter
Blunt	Dent	Inglis
Bocchieri	Diaz-Balart, L.	Insee
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Israel
Bonner	Dicks	Issa
Bono Mack	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Boozman	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Boren	Donnelly (IN)	(TX)
Boswell	Doyle	Jenkins
Boucher	Dreier	Johnson (GA)
Boustany	Driehaus	Johnson (IL)
Boyd	Duncan	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Edwards (MD)	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	Edwards (TX)	Jones
Braley (IA)	Ehlers	Jordan (OH)
Bright	Ellison	Kagen
Broun (GA)	Ellsworth	Kanjorski
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Kaptur
Brown, Corrine	Engel	Kennedy
Brown-Waite,	Eshoo	Kildee
Ginny	Etheridge	Kilpatrick (MI)
Buchanan	Fallin	Kilroy
Burgess	Farr	Kind
Burton (IN)	Fattah	King (IA)
Butterfield	Filner	King (NY)
Buyer	Flake	Kingston
Calvert	Fleming	Kirk
Camp	Forbes	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Campbell	Fortenberry	Kissell
Cantor	Foster	Klein (FL)
Cao	Fox	Kline (MN)
Capito	Frank (MA)	Kosmas
Capps	Franks (AZ)	Kratovil
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Cardoza	Fudge	Lamborn
Carnahan	Galleghy	Lance
Carney	Garrett (NJ)	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Gerlach	Larsen (WA)
Carter	Giffords	Larson (CT)
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	Latham
Castle	Gonzalez	Latta
Castor (FL)	Goodlatte	LaTourette
Chaffetz	Gordon (TN)	Latta
Chandler	Granger	Lee (CA)
Childers	Graves	Lee (NY)
Chu	Grayson	Levin
Clarke	Green, Al	Lewis (CA)