

why these projects need government loan guarantees.

Now, the Republicans say, this is so terrible. We should never have had this program to start with. They're not going to allow another Solyndra. But they don't end the program. If you wanted to terminate the loan guarantee program, this bill's not for you.

□ 1020

Despite their rhetoric, this bill does not end, phase out, or defund the loan guarantee program. Under this legislation, the Department of Energy can use its existing authority, up to \$34 billion in additional loan guarantees, in the years to come without any limit. The only limit they have is that no new applicants can come in and ask for funds, only those applicants that have had their applications submitted by the end of last year.

The gentleman from Kentucky said, well, that's only fair. But why is that fair? This is supposed to be a program that's going to invest in clean energy to enhance our international competitiveness and address the challenges of energy security and climate change. Instead, this bill prevents new, innovative projects from competing for loan guarantees. And, as Mr. MARKEY from Massachusetts pointed out, most of those that are pending now are nuclear projects, so they create a winners list of about 50 projects that would be eligible for loan guarantees.

If you wanted to end the loan project, the whole loan legislation, just do it. But they don't do it. That's why Taxpayers for Common Sense opposes the bill. The Heritage Foundation, National Taxpayers Union, the Competitive Enterprise Institute—all conservative groups—have raised serious concerns about this legislation.

The whole point of a loan guarantee program is supposed to be to support innovative technologies, and we need to support innovative technologies or other countries will be way ahead of us in the development of these technologies. The market will not fund these technologies because they are not proven yet, and that's why we need government backing for them.

This bill doesn't move us forward on clean energy in this country. We shouldn't create a list of winners and then ignore all of the other potential clean energy projects. We do not have time, Mr. Chairman, for phony political messaging bills. We have real problems to solve.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

We should be spending this time extending the tax credits for wind power. That would save tens of thousands of clean energy jobs. We should be spending this time developing responsible policies to reduce carbon emissions that are contributing to the record droughts, wildfires, storms, and floods that have been linked to climate

change. But this bill is just more of the same: more political rhetoric, more bad policy, but no real solutions to the problems we face. We should reject this flawed legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill and agreed to a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3552. An act to reauthorize the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 44, joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the State and Province Emergency Management Assistance Memorandum of Understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NO MORE SOLYNDRAS ACT

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I'd just remind my friend from California that the Department of Justice tells us that there is still an active criminal investigation as to the Solyndra matter.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), a member of the committee.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to come down to support this piece of legislation. It's important to America and to the taxpayers to protect them. I want to thank Chairman STEARNS and Chairman UPTON for letting me participate in this important investigation.

Just yesterday, two facts that I think support us completely in passing this legislation. Yesterday, that conservative jewel, The New York Times, reported that Mr. Spinner, who was critical to pushing this loan guarantee through when the Obama administration was inclined to reject it but kept pushing and whose wife was counsel to the company, was reported by The New York Times to be the number 10 bundler for this administration.

Also yesterday, we had a hearing in which we saw that America has the opportunity to become energy independent within the next decade if the Federal Government will just get out of the way and stop picking winners and losers as we have done with these Department of Energy loan guarantees for far too long. I'm confident that we can move away from this program. I'd urge all of my colleagues to support it.

The conservative groups of the American Conservative Union, AFP, Americans for Tax Reform, Heritage Action, Let Freedom Ring, and the National Taxpayers Union have all submitted letters in support of this legislation.

It's time to end this loan guarantee program, and we should do it today.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time each side has on the debate?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 16¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I will yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Science Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I, of course, rise in support of H.R. 6213.

This bill makes more important changes to better protect taxpayer funds spent under the Department of Energy's title XVII loan guarantee authority. I thank Chairman UPTON for his good work and his committee.

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has jurisdiction over the commercial application of energy technology. One purpose of the title XVII loan guarantee program is to move energy technologies from research and development to commercial application. As part of our oversight responsibility for this program, we examined it on numerous occasions, including earlier this year as part of a hearing in which we received testimony from Energy Secretary Steven Chu. The poster child for this poor judgment is Solyndra, which President Obama famously touted as a "true engine of economic growth" for the United States.

Most Americans are familiar with Solyndra's story, in which the Department of Energy gambled half a billion taxpayer dollars to support a failing solar company whose leading investors, I'm sorry to say, were major fundraisers and supporters of our President. Less well known is that the DOE made 25 other gambles under the program's section 1705 authority, staking a total of approximately \$16 billion of American taxpayer money on what they call green energy companies with risky business models similar to that of Solyndra. I am also sorry to say that many of these companies also have ties to the current administration through investors that are major donors, bundlers, and advocates.

If more of these companies fail, the Department of Energy made clear that it could restructure loan agreements in the same manner that it handled Solyndra, placing political supporters and private investors at the front of the line while leaving taxpayers holding the bag. This legislation would absolutely prevent that from happening again by requiring that taxpayer dollars are not subordinate to private finance should more bankruptcies result from this program.

Further, the bill seeks to limit taxpayer risk by prohibiting DOE from making new loan guarantee awards for projects from applications submitted after December 31, 2011.

These are necessary fixes to a troubled program, and I urge Members to support the underlying legislation.

I appreciate the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for working with the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology to further improve the bill in advance of it being brought to the floor.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire through the Chair how many speakers there are on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. UPTON. We have two speakers that are here, and we've got a couple that are in the queue that may or may not make it.

Mr. WAXMAN. I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady, my good friend from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Chairman UPTON, for yielding me time and bringing this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the Obama administration has failed the American people by squandering half a billion of our hard-earned tax dollars on costly, unproven projects. This legislation puts the brakes on the Obama administration's habit of trying to play the role of venture capitalist with the taxpayers' money.

We need to stop the inept largesse of Big Government bureaucrats that prompted Solyndra's ex-CEO, Chris Gronet, to write that "The Bank of Washington continues to help us." That outrageous statement serves as a shining example of the disregard Solyndra had for American taxpayers and the fact that they believed our government would let them get away with it.

This legislation is needed to protect against the politically charged, reckless spending binges that stream from this administration. The record-breaking spending and historical deficits that will burden future generations courtesy of this administration need to end in order to strengthen our economy and build for a brighter future.

We need an all-of-the-above energy policy to achieve energy security, but it needs to be a responsible plan, a plan that keeps our fiscal priorities in order and provides free market solutions without unnecessary, job-killing government burdens.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1030

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I first want to commend Chairman UPTON and especially my longtime friend, Chairman STEARNS, for bringing this important legislation to the floor this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I have read and heard for many years that almost 80 percent of small businesses fail within the first

5 years. Thousands of small businesses, many thousands, have failed over the last 10 or 20 years. Many of those would have made it if government had given them \$100,000. Most of them would have succeeded or survived if the government had given them \$1 million.

The government gave Solyndra \$535 million, over half a billion dollars, and yet, they squandered it and failed, as we've heard today, in about 2 years. What a ridiculous scandal this is. And I'm grateful to Chairman STEARNS for shedding so much light on this. And yet, unfortunately, it's only the tip of a very big iceberg.

Our friends on the other side frequently attack the oil industry on their subsidies; yet no industry in this Nation has received nearly as many subsidies, loans, or tax breaks as has the solar energy over the years. And yet the solar energy provides, even after all of these massive subsidies and loans and tax breaks, a little less than one percent of our total energy.

The government should not be picking winners and losers. I have nothing against solar energy if it can stand on its own feet, but it certainly cannot do so at this time. And so I rise in strong support for this legislation.

But I rise mainly to commend Chairman STEARNS, with whom I've served for so many years. Unfortunately, he will not be returning in the next Congress, and I think this is a tremendous loss for this Nation. I've worked with him on many things. I have not seen any Member or known any Member of this Congress who has been more conscientious, who has worked harder, and who has tried to study legislation any more than he has. And I want to especially commend him.

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

I want to point out, as I speak under our time, that the way I heard the last speaker, he can't be accurate in his statement that we have spent more money on wind and solar than any other source of energy. When you look at the tax breaks that the oil companies have been getting for year after year after year, we spend far more money through the tax system for the oil industry than we are for wind and solar.

In 2005, the Congress adopted the loan guarantee program—2005. That was when President Bush was president. And this loan guarantee program was supposed to be there to help energy projects. Most of the loan guarantees people were thinking about at that time were the nuclear energy loans to help those projects.

When President Obama took office, he wanted to accomplish two goals. He wanted us to move in a different direction to level the playing field, not just put more money in the hands of the oil and coal companies, but to give an incentive for the state-of-the-art projects in the area of wind and solar and other renewable sources of energy so that we could have a more diverse portfolio of

sources of energy so that we wouldn't have all of our eggs in the basket of the oil and coal industries, and especially in the area of oil where we're so dependent on other countries to give us that oil. We're so dependent on oil that we're adding to the greenhouse gas emissions that cause climate change.

So, in the stimulus bill, in 2009, President Obama wanted to use this loan guarantee program and enhance it to move in a different direction in the energy area. But he also wanted to create new jobs. That was what the stimulus bill was all about, creating jobs for people right away.

Let me point out that the projects being built as a result of this legislation, are state-of-the-art, groundbreaking projects that would not be built without this program. And I want to give a good example.

The Ivanpah concentrated solar power facility is being completed in the California desert. It will be the largest facility of its kind in the world. When complete, it will have three, 450-foot towers that collect solar energy from tens of thousands of mirrors called heliostats. In a matter of months, this facility will begin sending clean, renewable power to the electric grid. It is an amazing achievement.

The Republicans keep saying that this whole program has created just 1,100 jobs. And then they take that 1,100, and they talk about how much money has been spent, and then they say it's X number of dollars per job. But this one project puts the lie to that statement because it's employing not 1,100, but 2,100 construction workers.

Don't construction worker jobs count? We need more of them.

As a CEO who invested \$300 million in the project put it:

This project never would have happened without the Federal Government's support. There's just no private sector financing for a cutting-edge technology project. There are other solar thermal projects out there, but none of this magnitude, and this would be considered first of a kind in the financing world.

Now, let's look at this jobs claim that the Republicans have been throwing around. They talk about how this is not creating jobs, but they're ignoring 13,000 construction jobs, pretending that providing a loan to a company is the same thing as just spending the money. And then we lose it forever.

But, you know, these are loans. They don't take into consideration the fact that loans get paid back, and most of the money has been used for successful programs. They are working on absurd assumptions.

Independent experts reviewing the loan portfolio have made it clear that DOE is likely to be repaid the vast majority of the funds it has loaned out. So I support the loan guarantee program.

I don't support this bill because I don't think we ought to end it. But this bill does not end the loan guarantee program. It continues it for 30-some-billion dollars—\$34 billion. \$34

billion. They want to continue the program because they will then have a choice, through this program, to fund those solar energy projects and other projects that already have applications. But they won't be able to consider anything else that might produce new breakthroughs, might produce more jobs, might produce the future for this country in the energy area, which is the future for our economy.

So I just want people to understand: this is all a sham. The Republicans are just trying to put out propaganda using Solyndra. They've been dancing on the grave of Solyndra for so long. Enough is enough. Our country needs to move forward in this area.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 6213, the No More Solyndras Act. I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill, which will protect American taxpayers from losses under failed, unaccountable Federal loan guarantee programs.

The bill will end the controversial loan program created in the failed stimulus bill, under which the Obama administration provided an ill-advised \$535 million loan guarantee to the solar company Solyndra, which subsequently went bankrupt.

The legislation would also enforce new accountability standards for applications that have already been accepted under the program.

□ 1040

I understand the desire to do something to help American businesses succeed, but allowing freewheeling, government-knows-best bureaucrats to put billions of taxpayer dollars at risk with no accountability is not the way to do it.

Let's be clear, Mr. Chairman. The government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. It's time to end wasteful government spending, to protect taxpayer dollars, and to empower the private sector over government. With that, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I might just say we are prepared to close. If the gentleman from California is going to be the final speaker and is prepared to close, we can get to the amendments.

Mr. WAXMAN. I have another speaker.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California should be made aware that he has 3 minutes total remaining in his time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), a very important member of our committee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank our ranking member for allowing me to speak.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, I have been involved in the investigation of the Solyndra loan for several months.

During the investigation, I learned that the Department of Energy made a mistake, and I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in expressing my frustration that such a mistake could have happened. I was angered even more to find out that the taxpayers' investment would be paid back after the investments of outside investors. I believed we explicitly outlawed this in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The Department of Energy did what other administrations have done—they went lawyer shopping to find a legal opinion that allowed them to do what they wanted.

This shouldn't have happened. Early on, it appeared the best way to make sure there would be no more Solyndras was to close this loophole, something I believed there would have been bipartisan support to do. Instead, my Republican friends—smelling blood in the water—decided to take a different approach. They are pursuing more political theater, virtually ensuring that the loan guarantee program will continue to be broken. Worse yet, the bill doesn't even accomplish what they want to do, so their allies, like the Heritage Foundation, oppose it.

When we go home this weekend, we will once again be confronted with frustrated constituents who will be asking us, Why can't you work together in Washington? After seeing this bill pass on a mostly party-line vote, what are we supposed to tell them—that we were faced with the opportunity to cut government waste, to close a loophole and to protect the interest of the taxpayers but that we didn't do it?

We are passing a bill that will never become law. The problems we identified in the Solyndra investigation will continue to exist, and we will be leaving our constituents on the hook for future Solyndras. I urge my colleagues to vote against the bill. It is bad policy and undoes a bipartisan compromise from 2005. Instead, let's work together to find common ground and pass a bill that will fix the problems without the politics.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UPTON. How much time do I have remaining on this side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time that I control to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, in a recent editorial by The Wall Street Journal, dated September 11, 2012, entitled, "China's Solyndra Economy," the owner of a solar panel company in China was unable to repay \$3 billion in a bank loan that was guar-

anteed for his solar panel company. Do you know what happened? He leaped from a sixth floor building because he couldn't repay it.

This editorial outlines an unflinching description of all of these different solar panel companies in China that could not repay their loan guarantees. In fact, this summer, the New York Stock Exchange-listed company LDK Solar, which is the world's second largest polysilicon solar wafer producer, defaulted on \$95 million owed to over 20 suppliers. The company lost \$600 million in just the fourth quarter of 2011 and another \$200 million in the first quarter of 2012, and it has already shed 10,000 jobs.

It goes on in this article to point out that the Chinese are doing the wrong thing—they're picking winners and losers—and these people who are losing are the people who can't pay back their loan guarantees. Some people in Washington seem to feel that we should compete with China. We have this China envy. In fact, this is what the President said:

I will not cede the wind or solar or battery industry to China because we refuse to make the same commitment here.

Now, given what this editorial says and what happened in China, I would think the President of the United States would have to rethink his position. So many in Washington have developed this serious case of China envy, seeing it as an exemplar case of how to run an economy. In fact, the Chinese, the Beijing mandarins, are no better at picking winners and losers, and are just as prone to blowing money as we are here in the United States with these beltway boondoggles. So, if people are concerned about this program and don't think this legislation is necessary, just take a few moments to read this editorial, which outlines the problems with solar panels in China.

I would say to my distinguished ranking member from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) that she and I both know the mission of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee is to extirpate—to root out—waste, fraud, and abuse. If it happens anywhere, we should step forward, and that's what we did in the Solyndra investigation. We attempted to understand what the problem was in order to come to grips with what happened. It took us 18 months. It took us almost 8 months to get back the emails from our subpoenas back in November. We were systematic, and we tried to do it without a huge amount of political rhetoric, and I think we accomplished that. The ultimate result of this investigation is the No More Solyndras Act, H.R. 6213. What this bill does is to basically answer some fundamental questions, and it takes the lessons that we learned from this investigation and puts them into this bill.

I reach out to my Democrat colleagues on this. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) was on the floor just recently, and he indicated he also agreed with us about the subordination. If I understood what he said, he

said it was wrong for the administration to subordinate in violation of the law. In fact, I thought I'd take a few moments and, perhaps, actually read what the law says in dealing with subordination. It's section 1702, Terms and Conditions, in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. These are the exact words that, I believe, Mr. GREEN, Democrat from Texas, agrees with, that the administration should not have subordinated taxpayer money.

In the paragraph dealing with subordination—these are the exact words, and I'll read this carefully—"the obligation shall be subject to the condition that the obligation is not subordinate to other financing." That seems crystal clear. Yet, the Department of Energy, after talking to lawyers outside of the DOE who indicated they couldn't subordinate, still parsed the legal language so that they could.

It's very disturbing—and I say this honestly—that David Frantz, the executive director of the loan guarantee program, under oath, said he wanted to continue to subordinate loan guarantees. Now, that's an absolute fact—under oath. The DOE still has a senior loan officer who wants to subordinate. So how in the world could we not pass this legislation and allow the DOE to continue to subordinate and push taxpayers behind—what?—hedge funds? What financial instruments are they going to allow them to subordinate to? He wouldn't elucidate.

So the bottom line here is that the administration still wants to subordinate. That's why I tell everybody on the Democrats' side that you have to—and should—vote for this bill because, in the end, you're going to support David Frantz, the executive director of the loan guarantee program, who wants to continue to subordinate.

Now, here are the key lessons learned—and I'm going to do a colloquy with myself, Mr. Chairman. I think they'll answer the questions the way I want, but I'll answer them the right way.

□ 1050

Did the administration ignore several red flags raised by the Department of Energy and OMB about Solyndra's financial condition in the market for products? Yes.

Did the Department of Energy fail to consult with Treasury prior to issuing a conditional commitment to Solyndra as required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005? Yes.

Did the administration's desire to highlight the stimulus result in DOE pushing the Solyndra loan guarantee out the door? Yes.

Did the Department of Energy fail to adequately monitor the loan guarantee as Solyndra's financial condition simply deteriorated in 2010? Absolutely, yes.

Did the DOE subordinate its interest in the loan guarantee to two Solyndra investors, which was contrary to the Energy Policy Act prohibition on subordination? Absolutely, yes.

Did Treasury play any role in reviewing the restructuring when DOE was moving forward on Solyndra? The answer to that is "no." Definitely no. They did not. In fact, numerous times through email, Treasury showed that they wanted to consult with DOE.

Did DOE consult with the Department of Justice about the subordination? You would think if they were going to parse the legal language on something that was in violation of the Energy Policy Act, section 1702, Terms and Conditions, you'd think they would go to the Department of Justice and say, "What do you think of our parsed language?" No, they didn't. They decided not to consult with Justice.

In the end, the items that I mention, the key lessons I learned from this investigation show demonstratively that this bill is absolutely required. Each of the seven areas I outlined and gave you definitive answers, each of these answers is included in this bill. And based upon what we see in China and what we see happening in the solar industry, we should not risk taxpayers' loans for any more of these loan guarantees if it's going to endanger taxpayers' money.

I'll just conclude by again reminding my colleagues of the mismanagement and the poor executive oversight by Secretary Chu back in 2011. He said, "We are confident we can repay the loans." He was wrong, and that's why this bill is needed.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 11, 2012]

CHINA'S SOLYNDRA ECONOMY (By Patrick Chovanec)

On Aug. 3, the owner of Chengxing Solar Company leapt from the sixth floor of his office building in Jinhua, China. Li Fei killed himself after his company was unable to repay a \$3 million bank loan it had guaranteed for another Chinese solar company that defaulted. One local financial newspaper called Li's suicide "a sign of the imminent collapse facing the Chinese photovoltaic industry" due to overcapacity and mounting debts.

President Barack Obama has held up China's investments in green energy and high-speed rail as examples of the kind of state-led industrial policy that America should be emulating. The real lesson is precisely the opposite. State subsidies have spawned dozens of Chinese Solyndras that are now on the verge of collapse.

Unveiled in 2010, Beijing's 12th Five-Year Plan identified solar and wind power and electric automobiles as "strategic emerging industries" that would receive substantial state support. Investors piled into the favored sectors, confident the government's backing would guarantee success. Barely two years later, all three industries are in dire straits.

This summer, the NYSE-listed LDK Solar, the world's second largest polysilicon solar wafer producer, defaulted on \$95 billion owed to over 20 suppliers. The company lost \$589 million in the fourth quarter of 2011 and another \$185 million in the first quarter of 2012, and has shed nearly 10,000 jobs. The government in LDK's home province of Jiangxi scrambled to pledge \$315 million in public bailout funds, terrified that any further de-

faults could pull down hundreds of local companies.

Chinese solar companies blame many of their woes on the antidumping tariffs recently imposed by the U.S. and Europe. The real problem, however, is rampant overinvestment driven largely by subsidies. Since 2010, the price of polysilicon wafers used to make solar cells has dropped 73%, according to Maxim Group, while the price of solar cells has fallen 68% and the price of solar modules 57%. At these prices, even low-cost Chinese producers are finding it impossible to break even.

Wind power is seeing similar overcapacity. China's top wind turbine manufacturers, Goldwind and Sinovel, saw their earnings plummet by 83% and 96% respectively in the first half of 2012, year-on-year. Domestic wind farm operators Huaneng and Datang saw profits plunge 63% and 76%, respectively, due to low capacity utilization. China's national electricity regulator, SERC, reported that 53% of the wind power generated in Inner Mongolia province in the first half of this year was wasted. One analyst told China Securities Journal that "40-50% of wind power projects are left idle," with many not even connected to the grid.

A few years ago, Shenzhen-based BYD (short for "Build Your Dreams") was a media darling that brought in Warren Buffett as an investor. It was going to make China the dominant player in electric automobiles. Despite gorging on green energy subsidies, BYD sold barely 8,000 hybrids and 400 fully electric cars last year, while hemorrhaging cash on an ill-fated solar venture. Company profits for the first half of 2012 plunged 94% year-on-year.

China's high-speed rail ambitions put the Ministry of Railways so deeply in debt that by the end of last year it was forced to halt all construction and ask Beijing for a \$126 billion bailout. Central authorities agreed to give it \$31.5 billion to pay its state-owned suppliers and avoid an outright default, and had to issue a blanket guarantee on its bonds to help it raise more. While a handful of high-traffic lines, such as the Shanghai-Beijing route, have some prospect of breaking even, Prof. Zhao Jian of Beijing Jiaotong University compared the rest of the network to "a 160-story luxury hotel where only 11 stories are used and the occupancy rate of those floors is below 50%."

China's Railway Ministry racked up \$1.4 billion in losses for the first six months of this year, and an internal audit has uncovered dangerous defects due to lax construction on 12 new lines, which will have to be repaired at the cost of billions more. Minister Liu Zhijun, the architect of China's high-speed rail system, was fired in February 2011 and will soon be prosecuted on corruption charges that reportedly include embezzling some \$120 million. One of his lieutenants, the deputy chief engineer, is alleged to have funneled \$2.8 billion into an offshore bank account.

Many in Washington have developed a serious case of China-envy, seeing it as an exemplar of how to run an economy. In fact, Beijing's mandarins are no better at picking winners, and just as prone to blow money on boondoggles, as their Beltway counterparts.

In his State of the Union address earlier this year, President Obama declared, "I will not cede the wind or solar or battery industry to China. . . because we refuse to make the same commitment here." Given what's really happening in China, he may want to think again.

Ms. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chair, here we go again! Republicans have spent 18 months and millions of taxpayer dollars looking into the Obama Administration's energy loan guarantee to Solyndra. The Oversight Subcommittee has held 7 hearings on Solyndra in

2011. And now they propose another Anti-Obama bill, based not on facts but on politics.

These are the facts:

The energy loan program was created under the Bush administration, and President Bush's Department of Energy invited Solyndra to fully apply for a loan guarantee.

Solyndra was praised as a successful, innovative company both before and after it received the loan guarantee.

Solyndra was just one of 30 companies in a portfolio that was expected to support more than 60,000 jobs.

After more than a year of costly investigations, House Republicans have "turned up no evidence of wrong doing."

President Obama's investment in clean energy is paying off, creating jobs around the country.

Despite these facts, the Republicans are determined to waste taxpayers' money on bad bills that will set bad precedents. No one has refuted that there are needed improvements to the program. Independent findings have stated that DOE is already implementing recommendations to improve the program. Introducing legislation like the "No More Solyndra Act" is unnecessary and it not only penalizes potentially good programs because of one bad incident, it can kill the kind of innovation in energy that we need. This is especially true for districts like mine with one of the highest if not the highest energy costs at 45 cents per kilowatt. We need the innovation that the DOE program provides and this bill would kill.

It is important that the federal government play a prominent role in promoting energy efficiency. This bill which restricts the ability of the Department of Energy to provide competitive loan guarantees to alternative energy businesses to support innovation is not a solution to challenges DOE has had with the energy loan guarantee but another attack on the administration. These loan guarantees are important to the development of a strong clean energy industry and jobs it would create.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, today, I am voting in favor of H.R. 6213. First and foremost, the American taxpayer should not take a backseat to venture capitalists. This bill ensures that any loan default falls first on the company's investors and remaining assets instead of on the taxpayer.

The Department of Energy's loan guarantee program needs better oversight to protect taxpayers from the financial risks of emerging technologies in a competitive and volatile energy market.

I am also concerned that the loan guarantee program, which was created under the Bush administration in 2005, heavily favors thermal industries—including coal. This money would be better spent on innovative, cutting-edge technologies that will reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, cut greenhouse gases responsible for global warming, and make the United States more energy independent.

Limited federal dollars should go to creating high-wage, high-tech jobs that can't be exported—they should not be used to subsidize the largest energy companies that have benefited from billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies and decades of federal support.

That's why I am also voting for Representative WAXMAN's amendment. H.R. 6213 allows DOE to use its existing authority to award \$34 billion in loan guarantees to projects on the

Republican-deemed "winners' list." This is a list of 50 or so applications that were submitted to DOE prior to the end of 2011. More than three-quarters of the applications are from the nuclear and coal industries.

By voting in favor of Representative WAXMAN's amendment, I support allowing DOE to consider new applications until the remaining loan guarantee dollars are exhausted. This will create a level playing field for all technologies including renewables like wind, solar, and biomass.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6213, the "No More Solyndras Act." This hyper-partisan legislation would prevent Department of Energy loan guarantees for the most promising energy technologies and commit our country to the technologies of the past.

American renewable energy is thriving, with many success stories demonstrating the value of continuing the Loan Guarantee Program.

One example is Prologis, a company that received a partial loan guarantee of \$1.4 billion through the 1705 program to complete Project Amp, an effort to install solar panels at 750 buildings across the country which will add reliable energy to our electric grid. The project will employ more than 1,000 workers nationwide, including in my home state of Illinois, and have the capacity to power 90,000 homes once completed.

Another promising example is First Solar, an Arizona-based company that has partnered with leading private investors—including Berkshire Hathaway—to finance and build a 290-MW solar power plant. That project is supported by a DOE loan guarantee and will soon be providing clean, renewable electricity for the taxpayers who helped fund it.

All told, the DOE's existing loan guarantees will put 60,000 Americans to work and will prevent millions of tons of CO₂ from being emitted into our air. H.R. 6213 could prevent the next Prologis or First Solar from taking off, and it would put our country at an incredible disadvantage compared to China, Germany, and a number of other countries that are making substantial investments in clean energy.

Solyndra has been used as a red herring to attack DOE loan guarantees and thus undermine America's commitment to clean energy. But H.R. 6213 would not end the DOE Loan Guarantee Program. It would restrict DOE loan guarantees to proposals submitted before 2012. That would not save taxpayers a dime, but it would prevent the most promising technological advances from receiving consideration for DOE loan guarantees.

There is of course a trade-off in investing in nascent technologies. Sometimes it won't work out. But as the demand for energy rises, emerging technologies in the United States will need our support to compete with China, whose solar industry received \$30 billion in government subsidies in 2010. Because of the Loan Guarantee Programs, U.S. investment in clean energy edged China last year, but if we abandon our commitment to investment in the most promising renewable energy technologies, we will again fall behind. That would be a reckless and irreversible decision.

We owe it to the next generation to foster the investment that will make American energy production the envy of the world over the next century. We will not accomplish that goal by clinging to the technologies of the past. We must dedicate ourselves to the goal of energy

independence, which is impossible without our support of emerging energy technologies.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chair, the bill before the House is not a serious effort at legislating. Instead, once again, the Republican Majority is using Floor time to try and score political points.

Let's be honest about what's going on here. The legislation should include a disclaimer: "This bill supports the partisan, political interests of House Republicans, who approve this message."

Seldom has the nation faced such a backlog of serious problems, yet the Republican Leadership squanders time on political messaging bills like this one.

Double standard. Every year the taxpayers shell out \$4 billion in unjustified subsidies to the Big 5 oil companies. Two years ago, BP's Deep Water Horizon well spilled millions of barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. Do Republicans come to the Floor with a "No More BP Spills" bill? Do they take away the unjustified subsidies to Big Oil? No.

Two years ago in my home state of Michigan, the Embridge oil pipeline spilled 800,000 gallons of heavy crude and fouled the Kalamazoo River. Do House Republicans come to the Floor with a "No More Embridge Pipeline Spills" bill? No. Instead they work to rush through the permitting on the Keystone pipeline.

Hypocrisy. Republicans like to decry clean energy grants and loan guarantee programs when many House Republicans, including several Committee Chairmen and their party's nominee for vice president, have themselves written to the Obama Administration to express support for taxpayer support for projects that benefit companies in their states.

Let's be clear. The bill before the House is not about improving U.S. energy policy or creating jobs.

Instead of wasting time on a bill that will never become law, we need to invest in renewable energy, and take the steps necessary to allow United States companies to compete with those in China and other nations to supply the world's growing demand for wind turbines, solar panels, and advanced batteries.

We should renew and expand the 48C Advanced Energy Manufacturing Tax Credit that supports American-made clean energy manufacturing. By any measure, 48C was wildly successful. Republicans should join us in extending it.

We should also renew without delay the Renewable Energy Production Tax Credit, which has spurred clean, renewable, domestically-produced wind energy across the country—and the jobs that go with it. American jobs are on the line here. 37,000 jobs will be lost next year if the credit is allowed to expire.

It is time for congressional Republicans to stop their political games and get to work on legislation to spur investment, expand clean energy manufacturing, and put Americans back to work.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 6213, the No More Solyndras Act, as I believe it serves as a critical step in correcting the glaring missteps of the Department of Energy's failed loan guarantee program. Through a lack of due diligence, and apparent political pressure, the Obama Administration risked tax dollars in companies whose failures should have been foreseeable. Congress must learn from these

mistakes and ensure that future tax dollars are not wasted.

I am greatly troubled that several of the initial recipients of the section 1705 loan guarantee program have declared bankruptcy. The most high profile of these was Solyndra, the California solar company that received \$535 million in loan guarantees, but DOE also bet wrong by supporting Beacon Power, Ener 1, and Abound Solar. After Solyndra's failure, Congress investigated how DOE was awarding its money. We found that DOE ignored obvious deficiencies in these companies' business structures and rushed much of the decision making process in the name of political expedience. To put it bluntly, DOE attempted to pick winners and losers and it failed miserably.

When news of this reckless use of tax dollars became public, my constituents were rightfully outraged. In a time of record debt, DOE's gambling with tax dollars on shaky companies is indefensible. The American people expect more from their government. However, in an apparent disregard for its history of failures, DOE is insisting that it will continue to consider loan guarantees, putting millions more tax dollars at risk.

The No More Solyndras Act takes the necessary steps to protect the American taxpayer. By sunseting DOE's loan guarantee authority, we are shielding taxpayers from future losses associated with these risky loans. Further, greater transparency and ensuring no subordination of tax dollars are important to providing taxpayer protection. While I would like for more aggressive legislation that would end the loan guarantee program altogether, I believe the No More Solyndras Act is needed to begin correcting the flaws of the DOE program.

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 112-31. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 6213

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No More Solyndras Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) President Obama took office amidst a weak economy and high unemployment, yet he remained committed to advancing an expansive "green jobs" agenda that received substantial funding with the passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, commonly known as the stimulus package.

(2) The stimulus package allocated \$90 billion to various green energy programs, and related appropriations provided \$47 billion for loan guarantees authorized under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16511 et seq.).

(3) Such title XVII authorized the Secretary of Energy to issue loan guarantees for projects that avoid, reduce, or sequester air pollutants or greenhouse gases and employ new or significantly improved technologies compared with commercial technologies in service at the time the guarantee is issued.

(4) Loan guarantees issued under such title XVII were required to provide a reasonable prospect of repayment and were expressly required to be subject to the condition that the obligation is not subordinate to other financing.

(5) The stimulus package expanded such title XVII by adding section 1705 to include projects that use commercial technology for renewable energy systems, electric power transmission systems, and leading-edge biofuels projects and by appropriating \$6,000,000,000 in funding to pay the credit subsidy costs for section 1705 loan guarantees for projects that commence construction no later than September 30, 2011.

(6) The Department of Energy, since the enactment of the stimulus package, has issued loan guarantees under such title XVII for 28 projects totaling \$15,100,000,000 under the section 1705 program, and, according to the Government Accountability Office, issued conditional loan guarantees for four projects totaling \$4,400,000,000 under the section 1705 program and four projects totaling \$10,600,000,000 under the section 1703 program.

(7) Three of the first five companies that received section 1705 loan guarantees for their projects, Solyndra, Inc., Beacon Power Corporation, and Abound Solar, Inc., have declared bankruptcy.

(8) The bankruptcy of the first section 1705 loan guarantee recipient, Solyndra, Inc., could result in a loss to taxpayers of over \$530,000,000.

(9) The investigation of the Solyndra loan guarantee by the Committee on Energy and Commerce has demonstrated that the review in 2009 of the Solyndra application by the Department of Energy and the Office of Management and Budget was driven by politics and ideology and divorced from economic reality where the Department of Energy ignored concerns about the company's financial condition and market for its products.

(10) Despite an express provision in such title XVII prohibiting subordination of the United States taxpayers' financial interest, the Department of Energy restructured the Solyndra loan guarantee in February 2011, resulting in the taxpayers losing priority to Solyndra's investors in the event of a default.

(11) The Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury concluded that it was unclear whether the Department of Energy's consultation requirement with the Secretary of the Treasury on the Solyndra loan guarantee was met; that the consultation that did occur was rushed with the Department of the Treasury expressing that "the train really has left the station on this deal"; and that no documentation was retained as to how the Department of the Treasury's serious concerns with the loan guarantee were addressed.

(12) The Government Accountability Office concluded that the Department of Energy Loan Guarantee Program under title XVII has treated applicants inconsistently; that the Department of Energy did not follow its own process for reviewing applications and documenting its analysis and decisions, increasing the likelihood of taxpayer exposure to financial risk from a default; and that the Department of Energy's absence of adequate documentation made it difficult for the Department to defend its decisions on loan guarantees as sound and fair.

(13) A memorandum prepared for the President dated October 25, 2010, from Carol Browner, Ron Klain, and Larry Summers, principal advisors to the President, noted the risk presented by loan guarantee projects because most of the projects had little "skin in the game" from private investors.

(14) A January 2012 report conducted at the request of the Chief of Staff to the President

concluded that the portfolio of projects the Department of Energy included in the loan program were higher risk investments that private capital markets do not generally invest in.

(15) The Department of Energy's section 1705 program has expired but the Department of Energy has announced that it will continue to consider applications for loan guarantees under the section 1703 program.

(16) The Department of Energy has approximately \$34,000,000,000 in remaining lending authority to issue new loan guarantees under the section 1703 program.

SEC. 3. SUNSET.

(a) NO NEW APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary of Energy shall not issue any new loan guarantee pursuant to title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16511 et seq.) for any application submitted to the Department of Energy after December 31, 2011.

(b) PENDING APPLICATIONS.—With respect to any application submitted pursuant to section 1703 or 1705 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 before December 31, 2011:

(1) No guarantee shall be made until the Secretary of the Treasury has provided to the Secretary of Energy a written analysis of the financial terms and conditions of the proposed loan guarantee, pursuant to section 1702(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16512(a)).

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit the written analysis required under paragraph (1) to the Secretary of Energy not later than 30 days after receiving the proposal from the Secretary of Energy.

(3) Before making a guarantee under such title XVII, the Secretary of Energy shall take into consideration the written analysis made by the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (1).

(4) If the Secretary of Energy makes a guarantee that is not consistent with the written analysis provided by the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (1), not later than 30 days after making such guarantee the Secretary of Energy shall transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a written explanation of any material inconsistencies.

(c) TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after making a guarantee as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Energy shall transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that includes information regarding—

(A) the review and decisionmaking process utilized by the Secretary in making the guarantee;

(B) the terms of the guarantee;

(C) the recipient; and

(D) the technology and project for which the loan guarantee will be used.

(2) PROTECTING CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION.—A report under paragraph (1) shall provide all relevant information, but the Secretary shall take all necessary steps to protect confidential business information with respect to the recipient of the loan guarantee and the technology used.

SEC. 4. RESTRUCTURING OF LOAN GUARANTEES.

With respect to any restructuring of the terms of a loan guarantee issued pursuant to title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Secretary of Energy shall consult with the Secretary of the Treasury regarding any restructuring of the terms and conditions of the loan guarantee, including any deviations from the financial terms of the loan guarantee.

SEC. 5. RESTATING THE PROHIBITION ON SUBORDINATION.

Section 1702(d)(3) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16512(d)(3)) is amended by striking "is not subordinate" and inserting "including any reorganization, restructuring, or termination thereof, shall not at any time be subordinate".

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS AND CIVIL PENALTIES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Any Federal official who is responsible for the issuance of a loan guarantee under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 in a manner that violates the requirements of such title or of this Act shall be—

(1) subject to appropriate administrative discipline provided for under title 5 of the United States Code, or any other applicable Federal law, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and

(2) personally liable for a civil penalty in an amount of at least \$10,000 but not more than \$50,000 for each violation.

(b) *DEFINITION.*—For purposes of this section, the term "Federal official" means—

(1) an individual serving in a position in level I, II, III, IV, or V of the Executive Schedule, as provided in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) an individual serving in a Senior Executive Service position, as provided in subchapter II of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 7. GAO STUDY OF FEDERAL SUBSIDIES IN ENERGY MARKETS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of the Federal subsidies in energy markets provided from fiscal year 2003 through fiscal year 2012.

(b) *FOCUS.*—The study required under subsection (a) shall have particular focus on Federal subsidies in energy markets provided in support of—

(1) electricity production, transmission, and consumption;

(2) transportation fuels and infrastructure;

(3) energy-related research and development; and

(4) facilities that manufacture energy-related components.

(c) *REPORT.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including an identification and quantification of—

(1) costs to the United States Treasury;

(2) impacts on United States energy security;

(3) impacts on electricity prices, including any potential negative pricing impact on wholesale electricity markets;

(4) impacts on transportation fuel prices;

(5) impacts on private energy-related industries not benefitting from Federal subsidies in energy markets;

(6) any Federal subsidies in energy markets that are provided to foreign persons or corporations; and

(7) subsidies and direct financial interest any of the 15 foreign countries with the largest gross domestic product are providing to support energy markets in their respective countries.

(d) *DEFINITION.*—For purposes of this section, the term "Federal subsidies" means Federal grants, direct loans, loan guarantees, and tax credits, and other programmatic activities targeted at energy markets and related sectors, relating to specific energy technologies.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112-668. 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 MS. DEGETTE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112-668.

Ms. DEGETTE. 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, after line 21, insert the following new paragraph:

(6) The Department of Energy estimates that projects funded under the title XVII program are expected to create 60,000 jobs.

Page 3, lines 13 through 21, amend paragraph (9) to read as follows:

(9) An investigation by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives determined that the Solyndra loan determination was based on the best professional judgment of career Department of Energy and Office of Management and Budget officials, without political or ideological interference from Obama Administration political appointees or career officials.

Page 3, lines 22 through 24, strike "Despite an express" and all that follows through "financial interest," and insert "Title XVII provides that taxpayer interests cannot be subordinated in the origination of a loan, but does not state whether subordination is allowed during restructuring of a loan. The Department of Energy General Counsel determined that in such cases subordination was allowed under the law, and".

Page 4, after line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

(12) Department of the Treasury officials testified before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives on October 14, 2011, and stated that their consultation on the Solyndra loan guarantee was not rushed. In interviews conducted by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, Office of Management and Budget officials indicated that their review of the Solyndra loan, and the review of Department of Energy officials, was thorough, complete, and fair, and based on reasonable economic assumptions about the company's future.

Page 5, line 12, insert "This report found that the portfolio of projects under title XVII was strong, performing within the risk confines established by the Congress, and would cost the Government \$2,000,000,000 less than initially expected." after "generally invest in."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, sadly, this deeply flawed legislation we are considering today is the result of a political investigation, not a fact-based investigation. The majority has ig-

nored the benefits of the DOE loan program and has consistently ignored evidence uncovered in the investigation that contradicts their predetermined view of events. All you have to do is look at the six pages of partisan findings at the beginning of the bill as proof that this is really just a witch hunt.

What my amendment does is it at least attempts to fix the most egregious parts of the false and misleading legislative findings so that at least the record will attempt to be clear and honest.

The first findings I deal with in my amendment are these findings in paragraph 9 that say:

The review in 2009 of the Solyndra application by the Department of Energy and OMB was "driven by politics and ideology, and divorced from economic reality where the Department of Energy ignored concerns about the company's financial condition and market for its products."

That is so blatantly partisan. Our committee's oversight work found that the Solyndra loan determination was based on thorough, unbiased, and fair analysis of DOE and OMB officials without political or ideological influence from Obama administration political appointees or from career officials.

These findings also ignore the fact that each and every one of the 20 witnesses we questioned in interviews and in hearings told us unequivocally there was no political influence on this loan guarantee, that no corners were cut in the review, and that all decisions were made purely on the merits. Shame on the majority for just putting this blatantly false allegation in these findings.

Mr. Chairman, there are also other findings in the legislation that are inaccurate and should be removed. The findings state that the DOE acted illegally in subordinating the Solyndra loan, and Chairman STEARNS talked quite a bit about this in his closing remarks on the substance of the bill. But when looking at the facts, this is simply not the case. What the law says is in the initial granting of the loan guarantee, the government position shall not be subordinated, but DOE's general counsel carefully analyzed the law and determined that subordination in the restructuring would be allowed legally. This opinion was supported by others in the administration, and by outside experts consulted as part of the committee investigation.

Chairman STEARNS talks about talking to independent lawyers who said that the subordination was not legal. Sadly, he refused to call any of those lawyers to testify before our committee. Furthermore, he refused to call the lawyers at the Department of Energy or DOJ who had said subordination was legal, despite repeated requests by myself and Chairman WAXMAN that they should come in.

Here's my question: If subordination was already illegal as the majority claims, why are we considering legislation that makes it illegal? Why doesn't

the Department of Justice just go and prosecute these people? It just doesn't make sense. That's why my amendment also replaces the misleading findings about subordination with an honest set of facts.

Mr. Chairman, the findings also ignore the important successes of title XVII and the ATVM loan programs. In total, the DOE loan programs are creating 60,000 jobs and saving nearly 300 million gallons of gasoline a year. The title XVII and ATVM programs have supported six power generation projects that are already complete and nine projects that are sending power to the electricity grid. The program is funding one of the world's largest wind farms; the world's largest concentrated solar generation project; the world's largest photovoltaic solar power plant, as we heard from Mr. WAXMAN; and the Nation's first two all-electric vehicle manufacturing facilities. The programs have allowed private investors to come off the sidelines to invest tens of billions of dollars and create thousands of jobs.

Now, several of my friends on the other side of the aisle, including Chairman STEARNS, and my dear friend from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), said we should just cede leadership in this to other countries. If other countries like China are investing money, well, too bad for us; we should cede the leadership in solar to them.

I do not think this is the right place for the U.S. to go. For that reason, I believe my amendment should be adopted. Let's have the findings of fact be accurate. Vote "yes" on the DeGette amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, there are three components to her amendment. The first one is so surprising that she would make this claim that the title XVII program created 60,000 new jobs. Of course, if you go to the Department of Energy's own Web site and you add up the actual number of the permanent jobs in that program, the number is 1,174, according to DOE's own Web site.

□ 1100

How could she possibly come down here and say 60,000 jobs because she includes the ATVM program, which is not part of title XVII, the Advanced Technology Vehicle Program.

First of all, anybody that votes for her amendment supports voting for something that is patently false, patently wrong.

The second portion of her amendment is based upon the fact that she thinks that the decision to loan Solyndra taxpayer money was based upon personal judgment. But throughout all of the emails we received, we show, whether it was OMB or Depart-

ment of Treasury or even the Department of Energy, they all showed that this program was not going to make it.

Then the last portion of her amendment, which is really the heart, I think, of what her amendment is trying to do, she is saying that the counsel for the Department of Energy determined it was satisfactory to subordinate taxpayers. This is contrary to what I read earlier, Mr. Chairman, which clearly shows it's in violation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. You cannot subordinate taxpayers.

In fact, even while they were doing this—I want to read you an email between OMB staff regarding Solyndra and this shows the optics of the whole thing. This email is between OMB staff regarding Solyndra:

While the company may avoid default with restructuring—vis-à-vis subordination—there's also a good chance it will not. At that point additional funds will have been put at risk. Recoveries may be lower and questions will be asked.

So, the bottom line is even after they parsed the language illegally, it was clear from the OMB that they weren't going to make it. So the Department of Energy's legal analysis was a post facto to try to subordinate to make this survive for political reasons.

Why did they want to make Solyndra succeed? Because it was a poster child. It was the one that the President has touted, Vice President BIDEN touted. They went out there and said we have to make this continue to work, all the while the subordination was illegal.

Now, OMB's Treasury staff believed the DOE had stretched the language of the Energy Policy Act beyond the limits when it agreed to subordinate it. The email I read to you and also further emails I could elicit, which we don't have time for, will show that OMB and Treasury believed that the Department of Energy was wrong in parsing the language to do this. DOE made a questionable, tortured determination of the law in order to justify a decision they had already made.

We want to stop that. That's why this No More Solyndras bill is required. They say that the Treasury consultation was not rushed.

The Treasury Department's own inspector general found that the consultation was rushed, and the cause was a press release that DOE wanted to issue to tout the Solyndra loan guarantee. We don't want that to happen again. Treasury wasn't brought in; a collapse of the credit committee and credit review board that had approved the conditional amendment. Treasury was given 1 day to review the deal, subordination of \$535 million. Treasury own's emails that were produced to the committee said that the staff felt jammed.

Mr. Chairman, I think the long and short of it is when you look at the DeGette amendment, it's clear that this has been repudiated by the 18-month investigation. It shows the in-

formation that she has in here is incorrect, is patently wrong.

I would say in conclusion to all my colleagues who are listening, subordination of taxpayers' money should stop. If we don't pass this bill, David Frantz, senior loan officer at the Department of Energy, will continue to subordinate.

If you believe in subordination, then you vote against this bill. But if you believe the taxpayers should be protected and taxpayers should not be put at risk, and if they are at risk, they should have the first opportunity to get their money back in a bankruptcy, then you should vote for our bill, No More Solyndras, and you should vote against the DeGette amendment.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 10 seconds remaining.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112-668.

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 5, line 23, through page 6, line 2, strike subsection (a) (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, House Republicans have repeatedly claimed that this bill will terminate the Loan Guarantee Program. No more Solyndras, no more loan guarantees, but that's not true.

Let's be clear. This bill does not terminate the Loan Guarantee Program. It doesn't phase it out, it doesn't end it, it doesn't sunset it, it leaves it in place. It allows the Department of Energy to use its existing authority to issue \$34 billion in new loan guarantees.

DOE could issue those loans tomorrow, they can do it next year, they can do it 20 years from now. This bill creates no end date for this program.

After lambasting this Bush-era program for more than a year, House Republicans are leaving it in place to

issue tens of billions of dollars more in loan guarantees, and that's a fact. Here's what the Republican bill actually does. It arbitrarily picks winners and losers by prohibiting DOE from considering any application for a loan guarantee submitted after December 31, 2011. When you say those are the only guarantees that can be considered, it creates winners, and anything else is a loser, because it can't even be considered.

There are 50 projects that are eligible for loan guarantees. Everyone else, no matter how groundbreaking or promising the technology, loses.

Under the Republican bill, we're still going to have a loan guarantee program issuing tens of billions of dollars of guarantees. The only question is whether the latest technologies can be considered.

Under the Republican bill, no breakthrough technologies can be looked at to compete with the older technologies that submitted applications by the end of September 2011.

That makes no sense. Does anyone believe that there are no new ideas out there that would be worth considering in the years to come? Of course not. Let's allow the best projects to compete for the funding.

Now, one of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle said, well, it's only fair to let those applications that are pending be considered. Why is it only fair? We don't owe them any money. We don't owe them a loan guarantee.

If you wanted to end the loan guarantee program, you should end the loan guarantee program. What is unfair is to say that those are the only ones that can be considered.

Renewable energy is a critical part what we need to reduce our carbon pollution and prevent unchecked climate change and the disasters that come with it. Breakthroughs in renewable energy are occurring on a steady basis. These breakthroughs promise greater efficiency at lower prices, and yet this legislation walks away from technological breakthroughs in renewable energy by prohibiting DOE from even considering them.

Suppose the technological breakthrough is not in renewables. Suppose the application is for a coal plant with carbon capture and storage. What a breakthrough that would be? Coal could be continued to be used without further concern about harm to the environment. Coal is ubiquitous. It's already available, and we could use it without harm.

Yet, a loan guarantee for such a possible technology would not be able to be considered. Suppose it was for a next-generation nuclear plant, and they wanted to submit an application. They can't under the Republican bill.

□ 1110

So my amendment eliminates the arbitrary provision that prevents DOE from considering any application sub-

mitted after 2011. It keeps all the other provisions of the bill, even ones I disagree with; but it would ensure the DOE can use its remaining funds to provide loan guarantees to the best, most innovative energy projects.

I want to be clear. My amendment does not increase or decrease the amount of loan guarantees that can be awarded under this program. If my amendment fails, DOE will still have \$34 billion to award in loan guarantees, should it choose to. If my amendment passes, it will still be the same amount of money.

I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. My colleagues, this amendment would allow the title XVII loan guarantee program to go on, continue indefinitely. The committee's 18-month investigation made one thing, I think, absolutely clear: the title XVII loan guarantee program must be eliminated. The No More Solyndras Act accomplishes this goal. It's wholly supported by the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee and by the full committee. We support an all-of-the-above national energy policy that embraces a diverse range of traditional and alternative energy resources, but we don't support the Federal Government playing venture capitalist with taxpayer money.

The gentleman from California mentions innovation. I would submit to him that the iPhone, the iPad, and the iPod all came without the government picking winners and losers. The government has a role in fostering the development of new energy technologies, but primarily through research and development. The committee's investigation made clear that the government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. And like the editorial that I put into the RECORD earlier from The Wall Street Journal, China is in the same fix as we are, and a lot of their solar panel companies are going bankrupt. The government needs to get out of the loan guarantee business altogether, and that's why we need to pass this bill.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. White House adviser Larry Summers said it best. When one of Solyndra's own investors was astonished to learn his startup firm qualified for this massive DOE earmark, Summers replied the government is a "crappy venture capitalist." Nearly 3 years later and \$1 billion in losses to taxpayers later, isn't it clear the Department of Energy loan program has failed?

Many of us want our country to implement a comprehensive, successful energy-independence strategy that uses clean coal, nuclear, clean natural gas, and other sources. That's why Chair-

ment I authored to have the GAO examine the kind of subsidies and assistance foreign governments give to their energy companies. But after an 18-month investigation by the committee, the truth is the current loan program, as it stands, cannot be salvaged. We found that the loopholes created in this program by thwarting the letter and spirit of the law have shaken its foundation.

Solyndra was rushed, reckless, and political. It was rushed because the entire stimulus loan program was built to get money out the door quickly. The law originally said they had to pay it back, complete the projects, and the taxpayers had to be paid back first. These taxpayer safety nets were removed. Second, it was reckless. Officials at OMB, DOE, Treasury, and outside investment professionals all warned that Solyndra was doomed to fail. Even Solyndra employees questioned its longevity. Finally, it was political. Campaign bundler George Kaiser made 16 visits to the White House about Solyndra. This committee uncovered emails between Kaiser and White House officials on Solyndra. There were internal deliberations about how the White House could mask the bad news of Solyndra's bankruptcy.

Those are the facts. It's time to turn out the lights on Solyndra and this DOE loan guarantee program. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment and support for the bill.

Mr. STEARNS. How much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEARNS. In an ideal world, the government would never really have gone down this road to create these loan guarantee programs in the first place. I think all of us realize that. While eliminating the program outright is admittedly appealing, and I think a lot of us on this side of the aisle want to do that, we must be mindful of the fact that applicants in the queue have already invested significant time and financial resources towards simply securing their loan guarantee, and they have really narrowed their financing options also in reliance of the existence of this program.

So the question would be, when we thought about this: Is it fair to change the rules in the middle of the game? We're the United States Government. We hear all the time that the government changes the rules. We should be striving to reduce risk caused by the Federal Government, not create it. That's why I said in my statement here that we have to be mindful of the fact so many applicants have already committed themselves and put their time in.

But I think we can learn from this Solyndra debacle. And based upon this amendment by Mr. WAXMAN, I think we realize that in the end that the No More Solyndras Act tackles all the points that he's concerned about.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on the Waxman amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-668 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. DEGETTE of Colorado.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

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 MS. DEGETTE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 238, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

AYES—169

Andrews	Costa	Hastings (FL)
Baca	Costello	Higgins
Baldwin	Courtney	Himes
Barber	Critz	Hinchey
Bass (CA)	Crowley	Hinojosa
Becerra	Cuellar	Hirono
Berkley	Cummings	Holden
Berman	Davis (CA)	Holt
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Honda
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Hoyer
Bonamici	DeGette	Israel
Boswell	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Brady (PA)	Deutch	(TX)
Braley (IA)	Dicks	Johnson (GA)
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Kaptur
Butterfield	Doggett	Keating
Capps	Doyle	Kildee
Capuano	Edwards	Kind
Carnahan	Ellison	Kissell
Carney	Engel	Kucinich
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Langevin
Castor (FL)	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Chu	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Ciilline	Filner	Lee (CA)
Clarke (MI)	Frank (MA)	Levin
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Garamendi	Loebsack
Cleaver	Gonzalez	Lofgren, Zoe
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lowe
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lujan
Connolly (VA)	Grijalva	Maloney
Conyers	Hahn	Markey
Cooper	Hanabusa	Matsui

McCarthy (NY)	Polis	Sires
McCollum	Price (NC)	Slaughter
McDermott	Quigley	Smith (WA)
McGovern	Rahall	Stark
McIntyre	Rangel	Sutton
McNerney	Richardson	Thompson (CA)
Meeks	Ryan	Thompson (MS)
Michaud	Richmond	Tierney
Miller (NC)	Rothman (NJ)	Tonko
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Moore	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Moran	Rush	Velázquez
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Walz (MN)
Napolitano	T.	Wasserman
Neal	Sarbanes	Schultz
Oliver	Schakowsky	Waters
Owens	Schiff	Schwartz
Pallone	Schrader	Watt
Pascarella	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, David	Welch
Pelosi	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Perlmutter	Sewell	Woolsey
Peters	Sherman	Yarmuth
Pingree (ME)	Shuler	

NOES—238

Adams	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Alexander	Gallegly	McHenry
Altmire	Gardner	McKeon
Amash	Garrett	McKinley
Amodei	Gerlach	McMorris
Austria	Gibbs	Rodgers
Bachmann	Gibson	Meehan
Bachus	Gingrey (GA)	Mica
Barletta	Gohmert	Miller (FL)
Barrow	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Bartlett	Gosar	Miller, Gary
Barton (TX)	Gowdy	Mulvaney
Bass (NH)	Granger	Murphy (PA)
Benishke	Graves (GA)	Myrick
Berg	Graves (MO)	Neugebauer
Biggert	Griffin (AR)	Noem
Bilbray	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Bilirakis	Grimm	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Guinta	Nunnelee
Black	Guthrie	Olson
Bonner	Hall	Palazzo
Bono Mack	Hanna	Paul
Boren	Harper	Paulsen
Boustany	Harris	Pearce
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Pence
Brooks	Hastings (WA)	Peterson
Buchanan	Hayworth	Petri
Bucshon	Heck	Pitts
Buerkle	Hensarling	Platts
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo
Burton (IN)	Hochul	Posey
Calvert	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Quayle
Campbell	Hultgren	Reed
Canseco	Hunter	Rehberg
Cantor	Hurt	Reichert
Capito	Issa	Renacci
Carter	Jenkins	Ribble
Cassidy	Johnson (IL)	Rigell
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rivera
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Chandler	Jones	Roe (TN)
Coffman (CO)	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Kelly	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Cravaack	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Kingston	Rokita
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney
Culberson	Kline	Roskam
Denham	Labrador	Ross (FL)
Dent	Lamborn	Royce
DesJarlais	Lance	Ryunan
Diaz-Balart	Landry	Scalise
Dold	Lankford	Schilling
Donnelly (IN)	Latham	Schmidt
Dreier	Latta	Schock
Duffy	Lewis (CA)	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Lipinski	Scott (SC)
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	Long	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Lucas	Sessions
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Fincher	Lummis	Shuster
Fitzpatrick	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Flake	E.	Smith (NE)
Fleischmann	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Fleming	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Flores	Marchant	Southerland
Forbes	Marino	Stearns
Fortenberry	Matheson	Stivers
Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman

Terry	Walberg	Wittman
Thompson (PA)	Walden	Wolf
Thornberry	Walsh (IL)	Womack
Tiberi	Webster	Woodall
Tipton	West	Yoder
Turner (NY)	Westmoreland	Young (AK)
Turner (OH)	Whitfield	Young (FL)
Upton	Wilson (SC)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Herger	Ross (AR)
Akin	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Blackburn	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Blumenauer	LaTourette	Speier
Broun (GA)	Mack	Sullivan
Coble	Poe (TX)	Towns
Gutierrez	Reyes	
Heinrich	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1139

Messrs. CAMPBELL and WEBSTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. SHULER and OWENS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 231, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

AYES—170

Altmire	Cuellar	Israel
Andrews	Cummings	Jackson Lee
Baca	Davis (CA)	(TX)
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Johnson (GA)
Barber	DeFazio	Kaptur
Bass (CA)	DeGette	Keating
Bass (NH)	DeLauro	Kildee
Becerra	Deutch	Kind
Berkley	Dicks	Kissell
Berman	Dingell	Kucinich
Bilbray	Doggett	Lamborn
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Langevin
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Larsen (WA)
Bonamici	Edwards	Larson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Lee (CA)
Braley (IA)	Engel	Levin
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Butterfield	Farr	Lipinski
Capps	Fattah	Loebsack
Capuano	Filner	Lofgren, Zoe
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Lowe
Carney	Fudge	Lujan
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Gibson	Maloney
Chu	Gonzalez	Markey
Ciilline	Green, Al	Matsui
Clarke (MI)	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	McCollum
Clay	Hahn	McDermott
Cleaver	Hanabusa	McGovern
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Cohen	Higgins	Meeks
Connolly (VA)	Himes	Michaud
Conyers	Hinchey	Miller (NC)
Cooper	Hinojosa	Miller, George
	Costa	Moore
	Costello	Moran
	Courtney	Murphy (CT)
	Critz	Nadler
	Crowley	Neal

Oliver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush

Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—28

Ackerman
Akin
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Broun (GA)
Coble
Gerlach
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Heinrich
Herger
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Latham
LaTourette
Mack
Napolitano
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Speier
Sullivan
Townes

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1143

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, 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. 6213) to limit further taxpayer exposure from the loan guarantee program established under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and, pursuant to House Resolution 779, 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.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARKEY. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Markey moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6213 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 7, after line 6, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) BUY AMERICA REQUIREMENT TO CREATE JOBS.—No guarantee shall be made pursuant to an application unless the applicant certifies to the Secretary of Energy that—

(A) at least 75 percent of the materials and components required for construction, manufacturing, or operations to be carried out under the part of the project for which the guarantee is applicable will be produced in the United States, unless the Secretary has waived the applicability of this subparagraph

based on a determination that it is not feasible to source specific components domestically; and

(B) any project for which the guarantee is applicable will be located in the United States.

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

SEC. 8. CREATING AMERICAN JOBS WITH THE WIND ENERGY PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.

Section 3(a) shall only have the force and effect of law for such period of time as the credit allowed under section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is in effect for facilities described in subsection (d)(1) of such section 45.

□ 1150

Mr. MARKEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to level the playing field for wind energy and for the guarantee of American jobs coming out of this No More Solyndras Act. This is the final amendment to this bill. It will not kill the bill. It will not send the bill back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My motion will ensure that we will only give tens of billions of dollars worth of loan guarantees that are authorized under this No More Solyndras Act as long as we will also avoid raising taxes on the wind industry by \$4 billion a year, which is what is going to happen if we allow the production tax credit to expire at the end of this year.

What is already happening in the wind industry? Well, ladies and gentlemen, the wind industry says that we are going to lose 40,000 jobs next year in the wind industry. What has already happened in the last 2 months? Jobs are already being lost in this country because the Republicans are allowing the production tax credit for wind to expire even as they authorize these tens of billions of dollars of new projects for nuclear, for coal. We're not saying that wind should be treated separately, specially. All we want is equal treatment for wind—equal treatment.

What's happening in Iowa? Last month, Clipper Wind Company lost 174 jobs in Iowa—gone. Last week, Gamesa, with 165 jobs in Pennsylvania—gone. This past Tuesday, Molded Fiber Glass in South Dakota, with 92 jobs in the wind industry—gone. By this time next year, 40,000 jobs in the wind industry—gone. There are 1,700 jobs already gone, and we are on our way to 40,000 jobs lost in the wind industry. That's part one of this amendment.

What is the second part of the amendment? The second part says, if the Republicans are going to authorize

NOES—231

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodi
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishke
Berg
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens

Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

these tens of billions of loan guarantees in this No More Solyndras Act, then 75 percent of all of the equipment made under these loan guarantees is to be made here in America and with American workers making that equipment under their bill. If we are going to be doing this, make it in America, and 75 percent of all the equipment should come from our country.

Why is this amendment even necessary? Well, when the Ryan budget came out here on the House floor in February of 2011, one month after they took over, the Ryan budget cut clean energy by 90 percent. What happened in April out here on the House floor? They cut wind and solar by \$17 billion and kept in all of the money for nuclear and coal. That's not a level playing field. That's going after wind. That's going after solar. In this bill, what do they do? Basically, what they say is they can keep in \$88.5 billion for nuclear and for coal loan guarantees, but for wind and solar, we're sorry.

What we are saying in this amendment is let's have a level playing field. Let's make sure that wind is given the opportunity to flourish in the marketplace. Let's not tilt the playing field so that wind is a guaranteed loser in Iowa, in Pennsylvania, in Colorado, in States all across this country which are right now facing a 40,000 job loss. That's what this is all about. Don't give \$4 billion a year to the oil industry and say that it can't be touched and at the same time cut \$4 billion from the wind industry, which is an industry that created 12,000 new megawatts of electricity in our country this year.

So this amendment is very simple. It says keep the \$4 billion for the wind industry so that we don't lose 40,000 wind jobs in the next 6 months in State after State after State in our country—States that are already beginning to see those losses—and let's make sure that 75 percent of all of the equipment that's made under this loan guarantee program is made by American workers here in the United States. Vote “yes” for this recommendational motion. Make it here in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. I will be brief.

I would just note that the projects contemplated under title XVII aren't your usual run-of-the-mill, brick and mortar construction projects. Usually, they are advanced energy projects that require highly specialized equipment, complex components, and they aren't always available domestically. Extending the wind tax credit will be, in fact, part of the larger debate that the House will have as we look at all of the expiring tax provisions, and I certainly look for Mr. MARKEY's support as we look to extend all of those later on,

particularly for his good folks in the State of Massachusetts.

This has been a very long and extensive investigation, and I will tell you that CLIFF STEARNS, the chairman of our Oversight Subcommittee, has done a very good job as we have tried to get to the very bottom of this mess. It is our job—that of every one of us here—to look wherever we can to find fraud and abuse and mismanagement in any Federal program, to identify it, and then come back and fix it so that it cannot happen again. No more Solyndras. That's what this bill does. It is a credit to the investigatory team and to Mr. STEARNS' leadership. We need to defeat this motion to recommit and pass the bill.

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. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 234, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—175

Altmire	Davis (CA)	Keating
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Kildee
Baca	DeFazio	Kind
Baldwin	DeGette	Kissell
Barber	DeLauro	Kucinich
Bass (CA)	Deutch	Langevin
Becerra	Dicks	Larsen (WA)
Berkley	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Berman	Doggett	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly (IN)	Levin
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Lewis (GA)
Bonamici	Edwards	Lipinski
Boren	Ellison	Loebuck
Boswell	Engel	Loftgren, Zoe
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Lowey
Braley (IA)	Farr	Lujan
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Lynch
Butterfield	Filner	Maloney
Capps	Frank (MA)	Markey
Capuano	Fudge	Matsui
Carnahan	Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)
Carney	Gonzalez	McCollum
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	McDermott
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	McGovern
Chandler	Grijalva	McIntyre
Chu	Gutierrez	McNerney
Cicilline	Hahn	Meeks
Clarke (MI)	Hanabusa	Michaud
Clarke (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Clay	Higgins	Miller, George
Cleaver	Himes	Moore
Clyburn	Hinche	Moran
Cohen	Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)
Connolly (VA)	Hirono	Nadler
Conyers	Holden	Napolitano
Cooper	Holt	Neal
Costa	Honda	Oliver
Costello	Hoyer	Pallone
Courtney	Israel	Pascarelli
Critz	Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	(TX)	Pelosi
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Cummings	Kaptur	Peters

Peterson	Schakowsky	Tonko
Pingree (ME)	Schiff	Tsongas
Price (NC)	Schrader	Van Hollen
Quigley	Schwartz	Velázquez
Rahall	Scott (VA)	Vislosky
Rangel	Scott, David	Walz (MN)
Reyes	Serrano	Wasserman
Richardson	Sewell	Schultz
Richmond	Sherman	Waters
Rothman (NJ)	Sires	Watt
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter	Waxman
Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Welch
Rush	Stark	Wilson (FL)
Ryan (OH)	Sutton	Woolsey
Sánchez, Linda T.	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	
	Tierney	

NOES—234

Adams	Gowdy	Palazzo
Aderholt	Granger	Paul
Alexander	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Amash	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Austria	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Bachmann	Grimm	Pitts
Bachus	Guinta	Platts
Barletta	Guthrie	Polis
Barrow	Hall	Pompeo
Bartlett	Hanna	Posey
Barton (TX)	Harper	Price (GA)
Bass (NH)	Harris	Quayle
Benishke	Hartzler	Reed
Berg	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Biggert	Hayworth	Reichert
Bilbray	Heck	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Black	Hochul	Rivera
Bonner	Huelskamp	Roby
Bono Mack	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brooks	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Issa	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rokita
Buerkle	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Calvert	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Camp	Kelly	Royce
Campbell	King (IA)	Runyan
Canseco	King (NY)	Scalise
Cantor	Kingston	Schilling
Capito	Kinzinger (IL)	Schmidt
Carter	Kline	Schock
Cassidy	Labrador	Schweikert
Chabot	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Chaffetz	Lance	Scott, Austin
Coffman (CO)	Landry	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Lankford	Sessions
Conaway	Latham	Shimkus
Cravaack	Latta	Shuler
Crawford	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Simpson
Culberson	Long	Smith (NE)
Denham	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Lummis	Southerland
Diaz-Balart	Lungren, Daniel E.	Stearns
Dold		Stivers
Dreier	Manzullo	Stutzman
Duffy	Marchant	Sullivan
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Terry
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Emerson	McCaul	Tiberti
Farenthold	McClintock	Tipton
Fincher	McHenry	Turner (NY)
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Turner (OH)
Flake	McKinley	Upton
Fleischmann	McMorris	Walberg
Fleming	Rodgers	Walden
Flores	Meehan	Walsh (IL)
Forbes	Mica	Webster
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	West
Fox	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gallegly	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gardner	Myrick	Wolf
Garrett	Neugebauer	Womack
Gerlach	Noem	Woodall
Gibbs	Nugent	Yoder
Gibson	Nunes	Young (AK)
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Young (FL)
Gohmert	Olson	Young (IN)
Gosar	Owens	

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman	Heinrich	Poe (TX)
Akin	Herger	Ross (AR)
Blackburn	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Blumenauer	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Broun (GA)	Jones	Speier
Coble	LaTourette	Towns
Goodlatte	Mack	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1212

Messrs. CONYERS and MEEKS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” 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. MARKEY. 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 245, noes 161, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

AYES—245

Adams	DesJarlais	Hurt
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Alexander	Donnelly (IN)	Jenkins
Amash	Dreier	Johnson (IL)
Amodei	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Austria	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Bachus	Ellmers	Kelly
Barletta	Emerson	King (IA)
Barrow	Farenthold	King (NY)
Bartlett	Fincher	Kingston
Barton (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Benishiek	Flake	Kissell
Berg	Fleischmann	Kline
Biggert	Fleming	Labrador
Bilirakis	Flores	Lamborn
Bishop (GA)	Forbes	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	Landry
Black	Fox	Lankford
Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Bono Mack	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Boren	Galleghy	Lewis (CA)
Boswell	Garamendi	Lipinski
Boustany	Gardner	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Loeb
Brooks	Gerlach	Long
Buchanan	Gibbs	Lucas
Bucshon	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Buerkle	Gohmert	Lummis
Burgess	Gosar	Lungren, Daniel
Burton (IN)	Gowdy	E.
Calvert	Granger	Lynch
Camp	Graves (GA)	Manzullo
Campbell	Griffin (AR)	Marchant
Canseco	Griffith (VA)	Marino
Cantor	Grimm	Matheson
Capito	Guinta	McCarthy (CA)
Carter	Guthrie	McCaul
Cassidy	Hall	McClintock
Chabot	Hanna	McHenry
Chaffetz	Harper	McIntyre
Chandler	Harris	McKeon
Coffman (CO)	Hartzler	McKinley
Cole	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Conaway	Hayworth	Rodgers
Cravack	Heck	McNerney
Crawford	Hensarling	Meehan
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Critz	Hochul	Miller (FL)
Culberson	Huelskamp	Miller (MI)
DeFazio	Huizenga (MI)	Miller, Gary
Denham	Hultgren	Mulvaney
Dent	Hunter	Murphy (PA)

Myrick	Roe (TN)
Neugebauer	Rogers (AL)
Noem	Rogers (KY)
Nugent	Rogers (MI)
Nunes	Rohrabacher
Nunnelee	Rokita
Olson	Rooney
Owens	Ros-Lehtinen
Palazzo	Roskam
Paul	Ross (FL)
Paulsen	Royce
Pearce	Runyan
Pence	Scalise
Peterson	Schilling
Petri	Schmidt
Pitts	Schock
Platts	Schweikert
Pompeo	Scott (SC)
Posey	Scott, Austin
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Quayle	Sessions
Rahall	Shimkus
Reed	Shuler
Rehberg	Shuster
Reichert	Simpson
Renacci	Smith (NE)
Ribble	Smith (NJ)
Rigell	Smith (TX)
Rivera	Southerland
Roby	Stearns

NOES—161

Altmire	Fattah	Olver
Andrews	Filner	Pallone
Baca	Frank (MA)	Pascarell
Baldwin	Fudge	Pastor (AZ)
Barber	Gibson	Pelosi
Bass (CA)	Gonzalez	Perlmutter
Bass (NH)	Green, Al	Peters
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Grijalva	Polis
Berman	Gutierrez	Price (NC)
Bilbray	Hahn	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Rangel
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Himes	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Hinchey	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Hirono	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Holden	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Holt	Rush
Carnahan	Honda	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Hoyer	Sanchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Israel	T.
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Sarbanes
Chu	(TX)	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Schiff
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Schwartz
Clay	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Kind	Scott, David
Clyburn	Kucinich	Serrano
Cohen	Langevin	Sewell
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sires
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Slaughter
Costa	Levin	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Courtney	Loftgren, Zoe	Sutton
Crowley	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
Cuellar	Lujan	Thompson (MS)
Cummings	Maloney	Tierney
Davis (CA)	Markey	Tonko
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Tsongas
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Van Hollen
DeLauro	McCollum	Velázquez
Dicks	McDermott	Visclosky
Dingell	McGovern	Wasserman
Doggett	Michaud	Schultz
Dold	Miller (NC)	Waters
Doyle	Miller, George	Watt
Edwards	Moore	Waxman
Ellison	Moran	Welch
Engel	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Eshoo	Nadler	Woolsey
Farr	Napolitano	Yarmuth
	Neal	

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman	Heinrich	Meeks
Akin	Herger	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Higgins	Ross (AR)
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Broun (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Coble	Jones	Speier
Goodlatte	LaTourette	Towns
Graves (MO)	Mack	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1219

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 584, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chair, earlier today I missed rollcall vote 584, on final passage of H.R. 6213. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 583 and 584, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on the Motion to Recommit and “aye” on final passage of H.R. 6213.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 13th, 2012 and Friday, September 14th, I was not present for rollcall votes 572–584.

Had I been present for rollcall 572, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall 573, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall 574, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 575, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 576, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall 577, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall 578, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 579, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 580, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 581, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall 582, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for rollcall 583, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for rollcall 584, I would have voted “aye.”

PESTICIDE REGISTRATION IMPROVEMENT EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3552) to reauthorize the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?