Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3606, the Jumpstart Our Business Startups, JOBS, Act.

Many of us agree with the general principle that we should modernize the financial system to help small businesses raise capital, attract investors, and contribute to our economic recovery. However, this must be done in a balanced way that also protects those investors and the public interest. I had hoped that the Senate would have an opportunity to bolster the bill with key consumer- and investor-rights provisions—provisions that had no chance of passage in this House. While the Senate certainly strengthened the proposal, the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3606 does not go far enough to ensure that investors will be protected from unscrupulous actors.

Since the bill was introduced, numerous experts and organizations, including the current and former chairmen of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Americans for Financial Reform, AARP, and the Consumer Federation of America, have raised significant concerns about this legislation. According to the New York Times, many fear the bill will allow companies to raise money without having to follow rules on disclosure, accounting, auditing and other regulatory mainstays. The deregulation measures in this bill could actually raise the cost of capital by harming investors and impairing markets, making it harder for legitimate companies to thrive. In addition, the bill will allow certain companies to ignore, for the first five years that they are public, certain regulations, such as the requirement to hire an independent outside auditor to attest to a company's internal financial controls. Also, recent experience clearly shows that arguments that the market will have sufficient incentive to police itself have led to disaster in the recent past and cannot be relied upon in the future. We should have all learned a lesson when it comes to hasty deregulation of financial markets. Even if there is a short term gain to be had, the long term consequences can be quite costly.

In light of the fact that the Senate has not been able to add adequate consumer and investor protections, and the growing information about the potential long-term harm of these provisions, I must vote "No."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3606.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REQUESTING RETURN OF OFFICIAL PAPERS ON H.R. 5

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 596

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives request the Senate to return to the House the bill (H.R. 5) entitled "An Act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3309, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 595 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 595

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3309) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period from March 29, 2012, through April 16, 2012, as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

□ 1310

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WEBSTER. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 595 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3309, the Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act of 2012.

The rule makes 10 of the 11 amendments submitted to the committee in order. Of these, eight are Democrat-sponsored amendments and two are Republican-sponsored amendments.

As noted by the subcommittee ranking member, Ms. ESHOO, during the Rules Committee meeting on this last night, H.R. 3309 has come to the floor under regular order. The Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held an oversight hearing and subsequently a legislative hearing on Federal Communications Commission process reform.

The subcommittee then circulated a discussion draft before holding an open markup and favorably reporting the bill to the full committee on November 16, 2011. On March 6, 2012, the full committee ordered the bill favorably reported to the House.

In 2010, the communications and technology industry invested $66 billion to deploy broadband infrastructure, $3 billion more than in 2009. New products and services are innovated by this sector on an almost daily basis. With the innovation come high-quality jobs and marked improvements for every American's quality of life.

As a result, all efforts should be made to avoid stalling this important economic engine. The FCC should strive to be the most open and transparent agency in the Federal Government, and any intervention into the marketplace should be the result of rigorous analysis demonstrating the need for government regulation.

The Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act would change the process the FCC must follow in issuing regulations and limit the

agency's ability to set conditions on transactions relating to corporate mergers and acquisitions.

The legislation would require the FCC to be more transparent and methodical in determining whether to intervene in the communications marketplace in dealing with customers and regulated parties, and in reviewing transactions.

Customers, small businesses, and outside-the-beltway stakeholders, in particular, do not have the regulatory lawyers needed for rush review of proceedings. The only way to get their input is to give them time to provide feedback on well-delineated proposals.

Before it starts intervening, the FCC should make sure it has a full understanding of the state of competition and current technologies. By requiring the FCC to be more transparent, to find a market failure before proposing regulations, and to conduct cost-benefit analyses before adopting rules, H.R. 3309 helps promote jobs, investment, and innovation in one of the few sectors still firing on all cylinders in this economy.

In particular, the bill prohibits the FCC from coercing parties to accept concessions, such as network neutrality obligations, as a condition of approving their mergers. Such conditions are typically unrelated to the specifics of the transaction and involve requirements the FCC otherwise lacks the policy justification or legal authority to impose. They also chill transactions that might otherwise advance the economy, and impose unnecessary costs on businesses.

The bill requires the FCC to survey the marketplace through a notice of inquiry before proposing new rules that would increase costs for customers and businesses; to establish the specific text of proposed rules before their consideration so the public and industry know what is being considered and have adequate information to provide input, much as House leadership has adopted in the layover requirement for the bills that we now hear on the floor; to identify a market failure or customer harm and conduct a cost-effective analysis before adopting economically significant rules that cost more than $100 million; to set the shot clock and schedules for issuing decisions and to report to Congress on how well it is abiding by them so the public and industry know when issues will be resolved; and to create performance measures to evaluate the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of a program that costs more than $100 million.

These proposed process reforms are not radical, nor are they an attempt to cripple the FCC, as some opponents of the legislation have claimed. Instead, this legislation seeks to pull back the curtain on bureaucratic regulation of a sector of our economy that has provided high-tech innovation and investment, and the high-quality jobs that come with it, despite the economic downturn.

So, once again, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding the time to me, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3309, the Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act. There may be beneficial provisions in the underlying legislation to make the FCC's processes more transparent and more efficient.

I do suggest that the FCC has made great strides in this regard under the leadership of Chairman Genachowski, and certainly more can be done. But the fact remains that my friends on the other side of the aisle have squandered important opportunities in this process to walk the walk and talk the talk.

Now, last night an amendment was offered by my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, to require FCC disclosure of spending on political advertisements, which was opposed in committee but made in order to go forward today.

Recent Supreme Court rulings, especially the Citizens United case, have opened the door for unlimited spending by wealthy entities aiming to influence the electoral process. These individuals, organizations, and corporations have the financial resources to reach millions of Americans through cable, broadcast television, the radio, and other media.

Unfortunately, Americans do not yet have the right to know who is paying for these efforts. Under current law, Americans have no way of knowing whether an advertisement urging them to vote for a certain candidate or support certain legislation is being done at the behest of someone who stands to make a lot of money from that candidate or the bill.

That's no way to run a country. That's no way to hold an election. And that's no way to run a government.

Since Citizens United, our government is less like a democracy and more like a mystery. I firmly support the Eshoo amendment and ask all of our colleagues to do so. It aims to provide some clues by requiring the disclosure of any individual or corporation that contributes $10,000 or more for the purpose of airing political programming in an election cycle.

□ 1320

This amendment is modeled after the DISCLOSE Act, sponsored by my friend and colleague, Congressman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, of which I am a proud cosponsor. Both these measures educate voters by disclosing who is donating money to influence the electoral process. It is as simple as that: transparency, accountability, and democracy.

Yet some of my Republican colleague friends continue to be baffled as to why the American people will want to know who is trying to influence them. Last night in the Rules Committee, my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) was indicating his motions regarding this; and I said to him what I say to all of our colleagues and to all Americans, that the day somebody shows up with $500, you would be interested to know, if they are opposed to you, who they are.

So the question remains: Why do some Republicans oppose these efforts now?

Madam Speaker, we know full well about some of the biases that some Republicans have in favor of the wealthiest Americans. When they're not trying to eviscerate social safety net programs—as I suggested in the Rules Committee, and in 40 minutes we will be taking up the proposed budget that does just that—to make room for tax cuts for the well off in our society, it appears that Republicans are eager to allow the richest Americans to hijack the electoral process. Because that is what is about to happen, and it is and will be a hijacking.

When vast sums of money are used to influence the democratic process, the voices of those who do not have such resources get drowned out. When that influence is allowed to remain in the shadows, suddenly we find that the wealthiest interests in this country are the ones driving the bus, the train, the plane, and the rest of us do not know where the stops are.

This amendment, along with the DISCLOSE Act and similar efforts, aims to provide Americans with the basics of who is spending how much on what. It does not impose any new obligations on broadcasters or providers; it does not hold broadcasters or providers liable for inaccurate information; and it does not take action with respect to posting this information online. This is a simple disclosure requirement. It benefits all Americans. It is good for our democracy.

Quite frankly, I think that a commendable thing occurs when many of the amendments are made in order. In this particular instance, I'm especially pleased that my colleagues made the Eshoo amendment in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to urge Members to vote against the previous question.

Now, why would we do that?

Because we need to invest in America's crumbling infrastructure, and the Republicans are totally incapable of producing a transportation bill.

Here's a little bit of review of history.

February 8, 2011, Chairman MICA: We will have a bill by August.

Then we skip forward a little bit, August, Chairman MICA: I will agree to one additional highway program extension—meaning they didn't get the bill done by August.

Then we fast-forward to November, Speaker BOEHNER: House to pass highway bill this year.

That was, of course, November 2011. It's 2012. Now the Republicans are saying they need another 90 days to get agreement in their own caucus. They're never going to get agreement. There are 80 Members of the Republican caucus who believe that there is no Federal interest—get this—no Federal interest in the national transportation system. It should devolve to the 50 States, back to the good ol' days when Kansas built the turnpike and Oklahoma didn't, and the cars were launched off the end of the turnpike into a farmer's field for another 5 years until Kansas finally got around to it. Let's go back to those good old days.

They also say they don't want to create jobs. This won't create jobs, the Speaker has said. Well, guess what? Transportation investment is the best way to create made-in-America jobs: transit equipment made in America, steel made in America, construction jobs by Americans for Americans for our future. They can't get it done. No more 90-day extensions or whatever they're dithering around now. They've got the throttle on the floor and they're spinning doughnuts, but they've run out of gas.

So it's time to act. What we need to do is defeat the previous question, bring up the bipartisan, Senate-passed transportation bill, which half of the Republican Senators—some of the members of the Flat Earth Society even voted for. Bring that bill up here—we can get the votes on this side of the aisle—and pass it and put Americans back to work.

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I'd like to inquire if the gentleman from Florida has any more speakers because I am prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I appreciate my colleague for asking. I was hoping that Mr. BISHOP from New York would be here, but in light of the fact that he is not, I'm prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. If Mr. BISHOP does arrive, then perhaps I would use some of my time to yield to him.

We all know that this legislation is never going to pass the Senate, and so this exercise remains just that, an exercise.

Republicans claim to be in favor of reducing the size of government, but this bill will require the FCC to hire 20 additional staff at a cost of $26 million over 5 years just to handle all the additional work created.

Rather than focus on stimulating the economy, funding infrastructure investments, and improving our democracy, my friends on the other side insist on devoting time and energy in a pursuit that is never going to go beyond this Chamber.

Rather than support transparency and our democratic process, my friends on the other side want to shield the best off in our society and corporations from having to disclose their financial influence on the political process. And rather than work with Democrats to craft comprehensive, bipartisan legislation that can pass the House and Senate, Republicans would rather see their partisan bills die than allow a compromise measure to live. I would say that I'm appalled, Madam Speaker, but this kind of thing seems to happen all the time around here.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that, immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 14, the House companion to the bipartisan Senate transportation bill and to discuss our proposal, but before that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding, and I apologize for my tardy arrival on the floor.

As Yogi Berra once said, it's déjà vu all over again. Here we are a week later and we still have not addressed the imminent expiration of our highway programs.

As we witnessed with the implosion of H.R. 7 six weeks ago, we once again saw last night the inevitable result of the Republican mantra: My way or the highway. Last night, House Republicans were forced to remove from floor consideration their short-term extension bill, in part because they absolutely refused to reach out to their Democratic colleagues to get anything done. Meanwhile, I have sponsored the Senate bill, MAP–21—now called H.R. 14 here in the House—a bipartisan path forward that makes meaningful reforms and provides certainty to States.

I'm proud to be offering this bipartisan legislation to refocus the discussion on jobs and economic opportunities rather than the Republican message this week of tearing down Medicare and protecting the 1 percent at the expense of middle class families.

□ 1330

As of today, House Republicans have yet to put forward a credible highway reauthorization that puts Americans back to work. Their only attempt, H.R. 7, which is the Boehner-Mica authorization, was called the worst highway bill ever by United States Department of Transportation Secretary LaHood, who is a former Republican Member of this body. It was drafted in the dark of night without Democratic input. It removed transit, the transit guarantee, from the highway trust fund, and it couldn't attract a single Democratic vote nor even a majority of Republican votes.

MAP–21 passed overwhelmingly in the Senate with a bipartisan majority, a vote of 74–22, and it is fully paid for—something House Republicans seem unable to come close to. MAP–21 pay-fors are less controversial than the House Republican bill. The Senate has estimated that MAP–21 will save 1.8 million jobs and will create up to 1 million more jobs. During a weak economic recovery that's looking for a jump-start, this is the kind of bill we need to be passing and passing as quickly as we possibly can.

Is MAP–21 the silver bullet to our surface transportation needs? No, but there is no silver bullet when it comes to our infrastructure needs.

We all would prefer a 5-year bill, but we need to get a bill passed. MAP–21, H.R. 14, is the path forward. I would urge my Republican colleagues to bring that bill to the floor so that we can vote for it in a bipartisan fashion and send it to the President.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and to defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. I yield myself the balance of my time, and will get back to the issue at hand.

This is not necessarily a highway bill, but it does talk about a highway, one which is much faster than the ones we drive on. It is hard to imagine a world without a high-speed wireless Internet service. It is hard to imagine staffers walking down the hallways without some sort of wireless devices that they're communicating with others on, and usually their hands are glued to them.

Communications and technology innovations over the past several years have made us a more connected world. In some instances, the new global connectedness has brought us even closer together, allowing us to share in similarities and differences between our peers in distant cultures. It has given us a chance to marvel at the world's best athletes on the grandest stages, and in some cases it has exposed the atrocities of war, intolerance, and disregard for human life. We want our innovations to continue and our inventors to keep inventing. In the communications and technology fields they have, and they continue to amaze us with new breakthroughs every day.

This bill simply pulls back the curtain on the FCC, the agency charged with regulating the communications sector. It asks them to institute commonsense reforms to better keep the public informed on their actions. It requires the Commission to rigorously

examine the marketplace before intervening; to give increased time for public input and comment; and to increase transparency while approving new rules and amendments. These process reforms are simply good government, and they should be embraced in a nonpartisan fashion.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 595 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of a bill consisting of the text of the bill (H.R. 14) to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 595, if ordered; suspension of the rules with regard to H.R. 3606; and suspension of the rules with regard to H.R. 3298, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—236

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

NAYS—182

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney

Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Akin
Engel
Flores
Jackson (IL)
Landry
Lewis (GA)
Mack
Marchant
Neal
Rangel
Watt
Wilson (FL)
Woodall

□ 1401

Messrs. SCHRADER, SARBANES, SIRES, CHANDLER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. BLUMENAUER, HONDA, and KEATING changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. POSEY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 130, had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3309, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 177, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

AYES—242

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
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
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—177

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Blumenauer
Engel
Flores
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Landry
Lewis (GA)
Mack
Marchant
Neal
Rangel

□ 1410

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUMPSTART OUR BUSINESS STARTUPS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The unfinished business is