

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF PI DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 224, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 224.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 10, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—391

Abercrombie	Carter	Gerlach
Aderholt	Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Castle	Gohmert
Akin	Chandler	Gonzalez
Alexander	Childers	Goodlatte
Altmire	Clarke	Gordon (TN)
Andrews	Clay	Granger
Arcuri	Cleaver	Graves
Austria	Clyburn	Grayson
Baca	Coble	Green, Al
Bachmann	Coffman (CO)	Green, Gene
Bachus	Cohen	Griffith
Baird	Cole	Grijalva
Baldwin	Conaway	Hill
Barrett (SC)	Connolly (VA)	Himes
Barrow	Cooper	Guthrie
Bartlett	Costa	Gutierrez
Barton (TX)	Costello	Hall (NY)
Bean	Courtney	Hall (TX)
Becerra	Crenshaw	Halvorson
Berkley	Cuellar	Hare
Berman	Culberson	Harman
Berry	Cummings	Harper
Biggert	Dahlkemper	Hastings (FL)
Bilbray	Davis (AL)	Heinrich
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Herger
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Bishop (UT)	Davis (KY)	Hill
Blackburn	Davis (TN)	Hinchee
Blumenauer	Deal (GA)	Hinojosa
Blunt	DeFazio	Mitchell
Boccieri	DeGette	Mollohan
Boehner	Delahunt	Moore (KS)
Bonner	DeLauro	Moore (WI)
Bono Mack	Dent	Moran (KS)
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Chaffetz
Boren	Diaz-Balart, M.	Flake
Boswell	Dicks	Heller
Boucher	Doggett	Hollman (IL)
Boustany	Donnelly (IN)	Inslie
Boyd	Dreier	Issa
Brady (PA)	Driehaus	Jackson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Braley (IA)	Edwards (MD)	(TX)
Broun (GA)	Edwards (TX)	Jenkins
Brown (SC)	Ehlers	Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Brown-Waite,	Ellsworth	Johnson, Sam
Ginny	Emerson	Jones
Buchanan	Engel	Jordan (OH)
Burgess	Eshoo	Kagen
Burton (IN)	Fallin	Kanjorski
Butterfield	Farr	Kaptur
Buyer	Fattah	Kennedy
Calvert	Filmer	Kildee
Camp	Fleming	Kilpatrick (MI)
Campbell	Forbes	Kilroy
Cantor	Fortenberry	Kind
Cao	Foster	King (IA)
Capito	Foxo	King (NY)
Capps	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Capuano	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Cardoza	Frelinghuysen	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Carnahan	Fudge	Kissell
Carney	Gallegly	Klein (FL)
Carson (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Kline (MN)
		Kosmas

Kratovil	Moran (VA)	Schwartz
Kucinich	Murphy (CT)	Scott (GA)
Lamborn	Murphy, Patrick	Scott (VA)
Lance	Murphy, Tim	Sensenbrenner
Langevin	Murtha	Serrano
Larsen (WA)	Nyrick	Sessions
Latham	Nadler (NY)	Shadegg
LaTourette	Napolitano	Shea-Porter
Latta	Neal (MA)	Sherman
Lee (CA)	Nunes	Shimkus
Lee (NY)	Nye	Shuler
Levin	Oberstar	Simpson
Lewis (CA)	Obey	Sires
Lewis (GA)	Oliver	Skelton
Lipinski	Ortiz	Smith (NE)
LoBiondo	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Loeback	Pascarell	Smith (TX)
Lofgren, Zoe	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Lowey	Paulsen	Snyder
Lucas	Payne	Souder
Luetkemeyer	Perrillo	Space
Lujan	Peters	Spratt
Lummis	Peterson	Stark
Lungren, Daniel	Petri	Stearns
E.	Pingree (ME)	Stupak
Lynch	Pitts	Sullivan
Mack	Platts	Sutton
Maloney	Polis (CO)	Tauscher
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Taylor
Marchant	Posey	Teague
Markey (CO)	Price (GA)	Terry
Markey (MA)	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Marshall	Putnam	Thompson (PA)
Massa	Rahall	Thornberry
Matheson	Rehberg	Tiahrt
Matsui	Reichert	Tiberi
McCarthy (CA)	Reyes	Tierney
McCarthy (NY)	Richardson	Titus
McCaul	Rodriguez	Tonko
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Towns
McCollum	Rogers (AL)	Tsongas
McCotter	Rogers (KY)	Turner
McDermott	Rogers (MI)	Upton
McGovern	Rohrabacher	Van Hollen
McHenry	Rooney	Velázquez
McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
McIntyre	Roskam	Walden
McKeon	Ross	Walz
McMahon	Rothman (NJ)	Wamp
McMorris	Royce	Waters
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Watson
McNerney	Rush	Watt
Meek (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Meeks (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Weiner
Melancon	Salazar	Westmoreland
Mica	Sánchez, Linda	Wexler
Michaud	T.	Whitfield
Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (OH)
Miller (NC)	Sarbanes	Wilson (SC)
Miller, George	Scalise	Wittman
Minnick	Schakowsky	Wolf
Mitchell	Schauer	Woolsey
Mollohan	Schiff	Wu
Moore (KS)	Schmidt	Yarmuth
Moore (WI)	Schock	Young (AK)
Moran (KS)	Schrader	Young (FL)

NAYS—10

Chaffetz	Miller (FL)	Poe (TX)
Flake	Neugebauer	Shuster
Heller	Paul	
Johnson (IL)	Pence	

NOT VOTING—30

Ackerman	Hensarling	Roybal-Allard
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Sestak
Bright	Israel	Slaughter
Castor (FL)	Larson (CT)	Speier
Conyers	Linder	Tanner
Crowley	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Miller, Gary	Wasserman
Doyle	Olson	Schultz
Etheridge	Perlmuttch	Welch
Giffords	Radanovich	
Hastings (WA)	Rangel	

□ 1430

Mr. PENCE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, due to events in my congressional district, I was unable to vote today. If I were present, I would vote “yea” to H.R. 1262, the Water Quality Investment Act of 2009, and “nay” to Representative MACK’s amendment. Furthermore, I would vote “yea” to H. Res. 224.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was ill today and was not present for votes on the Mack amendment to H.R. 1262 (rollcall 122), final passage of H.R. 1262 (rollcall 123), and passage of H.R. 224 (rollcall 124). Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Mack amendment, and “yea” on final passage of H.R. 1262 and H.R. 224.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 31

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representative MANZULLO’s name as cosponsor of H.R. 31.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week’s schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the minority whip for yielding.

On Monday the House will meet at 12:20 p.m. for morning hour and 2:00 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday no votes are expected in the House, which is a change from the previously announced schedule.

We will consider several bills under suspension of rules. A complete list of suspension bills, as is the custom, will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, we will consider H.R. 1388, the Generations Invigorating Volunteerism and Education Act, also known as the national service legislation.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, there are 3 weeks remaining prior to the 2-week Easter recess. Since the last recess, this House and Congress have sent a \$410 billion spending bill to the President. We have passed a bill imposing housing cramdown, and we just voted on a water quality bill, as well as one celebrating Pi Day.

I would ask the gentleman if he intends to use the next 3 weeks to try and focus on the fear that exists out

there on the part of so many Americans about their jobs, and whether we can commit to focusing on preserving, protecting and creating jobs over the next 3 weeks?

I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In fact, we are going to continue, as we have been doing for every week that we have been in session in this Congress, to focus on jobs, focus on job creation.

In fact, I would say to the gentleman, the three bills you mentioned, other than the Pi Day bill, were focused on jobs, focused on investing in our economy, in clean water, in education, in the safety of our public streets, keeping cops on the beat.

So I say to my friend, the answer to your question is, we are going to continue to focus on jobs during the next 3 weeks as well. We think we have been doing that.

We have had some disagreements on whether that was the way to do it, I understand that, but there is no doubt that we are going to continue to focus on jobs. One of those will be at some point in time before we leave for the Easter break. As the gentleman knows, it's our intention to bring up the budget as well.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would ask the gentleman, given this budget that he intends to bring to the floor, and the fact that, frankly, we feel that budget has an Achilles' heel, which is it increases taxes on the primary job creators in the country, which is small business. Can the gentleman tell us if there are other bills that are specifically focused on helping small business people get back into the game, so that instead of just raising taxes, redistributing wealth, we can actually focus on job creation, wealth creation, and get back on the road to prosperity?

Mr. HOYER. One of the things I want to say in response to the gentleman's first question, in response to what he referred to as the cramdown, as the gentleman knows, there were three very important provisions which were not controversial, which is perhaps why I didn't mention them, notwithstanding the fact that many voted against the bill to help homeowners, to help those who were either at risk or may be at risk of losing their homes.

The bankruptcy provision was to try to facilitate, in league with the very substantial reform proposals proposed by the administration, which would be under Fannie Mae and the Treasury Department, and under Sheila Baird's aegis, trying to help homeowners. So that bill, we think, was a very important part of the comprehensive homeowners affordability plan announced by the administration.

With respect to helping small business, as the gentleman knows, we passed the Recovery and Reinvestment Act. As the gentleman also knows, notwithstanding the fact that that was

not supported by any on your side of the aisle, it had very substantial tax cuts in there for exactly the people you are talking about. That is, small businesses.

So we think that, as you do, that small businesses are a vitally important part of creating jobs and creating economic opportunity in this country, and we have been supporting policies to assist them.

The gentleman and I were at the fiscal summit together, we went down to the health summit. We weren't in the same breakout group, but one of the things we are looking at, as you know, is trying to help small business with health care costs. That's a major challenge confronting the small business community.

Our friends at NFIB, as you know, have shared that interest. Now we haven't gotten to a specific proposal, so we will have to see what happens when we get there. We certainly share your concern, but we also believe we have been acting toward the end the gentleman suggests, and that is assisting small businesses to grow and to create jobs and to stay in business.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the gentleman's attention to several news reports lately that have alluded to Chairman OBEY and others in the majority caucus preparing a second stimulus bill.

I know the chairman was quoted in CongressDaily this morning as saying that it is spectacularly unreasonable to expect to see the stimulus package that we passed produce any action any time soon.

Further, we see that the economist, Paul Krugman, thought and has written that the first stimulus bill that passed has failed because it didn't spend enough.

Now we know that the economist, Mark Zandi, has met with the Majority Caucus this week and said that the stimulus that passed would fall short of the goals that were originally put out there to create 3.5 million jobs.

So I have asked the gentleman, should we expect in the House for there to be another stimulus bill and, if so, would you include some of the Republican proposals that were in our plan that were focused on job creators, focused on small businesses, entrepreneurs and the self-employed?

I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I presume the gentleman is referring to the job creators that we had in our bill.

As you know, we believe that the substitute that was offered to the recovery and reinvestment package that was defeated in a bipartisan way created—and there is a difference in this—our perception of this is 2 million less jobs than the bill that we offered and that was passed, which we think either created or saved 3.5 million jobs.

Having said that, you asked about an additional relief package. I note you quoted the newspapers as talking about

Mr. Zandi, who was one of Mr. MCCAIN's advisors during the course of the last campaign.

But I also noted in the paper that you are also quoted as saying, House Minority Whip ERIC CANTOR didn't rule out the idea of a second stimulus package and said Wednesday he would be willing to sit down with the White House and congressional Democrats to discuss any new emergency spending proposals.

I appreciate that offer, and I want to show the gentleman that when and if—and I have no reason to believe, by the way, that Mr. OBEY is doing anything as reported in the paper that he might be doing, I have no reason to believe he is doing that—but I want you to know that in light of your interest in sitting down, that I share that interest, and we will do that.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, for the record, set it straight. My comments were that if we are going to get serious about focusing on job creation, yes, I would support a bill that would provide relief to the small business people of this country, so we can get the entrepreneurs back into the game of putting capital to work so we can not only save the jobs that we have got, we can begin to create new ones for our families and our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he would respond to some of the reports that there may be a bill dealing with stem cell research coming to the floor next week, and whether he could confirm that and, if so, what is the substance of that bill.

I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

First, in a very short response to your question, I do not expect the legislation dealing with stem cells to be coming to the floor next week.

I do, however, respond to the gentleman that we are considering bringing to the floor legislation, similar, in terms of specifics, very similar, if not the same, as the bill that passed this House on a bipartisan vote in the last Congress.

We believe that that will be consistent with the President's action this week dealing with the executive order on stem-cell research.

We believe this research provides real hope for some of mankind's most difficult diseases and afflictions and challenges. We think the research is promising.

On the other hand, we want to make sure that it does, in fact, do what we say we want to do. As you know, when we passed legislation like that before, we made it very clear that human cloning was not something that the Congress supported and that we were specifically prohibiting that.

So in answer to your question, I would think the legislation would be very much along those same lines. But we do not expect it to be here this week. I want to tell the gentleman it may be, however, on the floor prior to our leaving for the recess.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman is aware, as all of us are, about the tremendous job losses that we have experienced in America of late, 650,000 plus jobs just last month.

There is an announcement yesterday that we all read about, that the card check bill was introduced. Along with that introduction, there was a new nonpartisan study that was published that predicts that passage of card check legislation will result in the immediate loss of 600,000 jobs.

So I would ask the gentleman, number one, when he expects to bring that card check bill to the floor, and if, in the interim, if he is considering that if the Senate is to act, and we are to act in these economic times, why would we be doing that if we know, through nonpartisan studies issued, that it's a job killer? Why would we be bringing that to the floor?

I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, let me respond. We don't know that. Somebody reported that. We don't know that at all and, very frankly, we don't accept that figure. We don't accept the figure that we will, in fact, lose jobs.

We on this side of the aisle feel very strongly that the working men and women in this country have the right under law to organize and to bargain collectively for wages and benefits and working conditions. We think that is inherent in the rights, in the free market.

Very frankly, I would tell my friend that I have traveled, as he has, in many parts of the world, and rarely have I seen a successful democracy that didn't have a free trade union movement. So we feel very strongly about that. We feel very strongly about the right to organize, and that means that it is the employee's choice of how to organize.

Now, having said all that, let me also say that we have observed that there has been, in many ways, a relationship between the decline in union membership and a decline in the buying power of the American worker.

And the greatest disparity between what average workers make and what the bosses make now exist in our country to a greater extent than any other place in the world. We think that's a problem.

Consumerism is what drives this economy. Consumerism is down, incomes have been frozen, and you see, in my opinion, some of that result.

I don't, by any stretch of the imagination, want to say that the reason that we are in the decline that we are in today, and facing the challenge that we are today, is a direct result of the fact that union membership is down.

But, certainly, I believe that one of the results is the reduction in the buying power of average Americans in this country.

Now, having said that, we passed this bill. We passed it pretty handily. We

passed it in the last Congress, and it's our expectation that the Senate is going to be dealing with this legislation. They have not yet considered it; and it is my belief that we want to see whether they can pass it. We believe they can.

□ 1445

We are going to be interested in what action they take.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

For the record, any democracy has also in it the elections that afford one the right to a private or secret ballot, which this bill completely takes away from the workers of this country.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. Not yet, Mr. Speaker. I would say again that our economy is not just built on consumerism, our economy is built on investments and, frankly, the rebuilding of this economy will take place with job creation. And if we know that card check is a job-killer, folks across this country have got to be scratching their heads right now, wondering what in the world is Washington doing passing a piece of legislation that has been proven to kill jobs, not promote jobs.

Mr. HOYER. Let me say that, as I said before, we don't believe it's a job-killer, number one. But, number two, the gentleman and I have a disagreement factually as to what the bill does. We don't believe this kills the right of the employees to have a free election at all. Period.

We believe in fact the employee has that choice. The employee has the absolute right to respond, "No, I don't want to sign your card. Let's have an election. And I will sign it for that purpose, and that purpose only, to give you the 30 percent you need to get the election."

I think I'm right on 30 percent. But, in any event, we believe this is the employees' choice of how they want to organize, not the employer's choice.

So we are not and did not by passage of this legislation take away from the employees the right to have an election if they so choose.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

One remaining question, Mr. Speaker. Can the gentleman inform us as to whether the public lands bill will be brought back up under a rule in this House.

Mr. HOYER. We think the public lands bill that failed just by two votes yesterday is a very good bill. Overwhelming support. Essentially two-thirds of this House supported it. Two-thirds of the Senate supported it. Actually, I think it was probably even more than that.

In any event, we believe that bill is a very, very good bill. We are hopeful that a number of your members will conclude that maybe they should have voted for it. We will see on that.

So the answer to your question is that we may bring it up either by rule or by suspension, but we want to see

this bill pass. Having said that, let me say that Leader REID, the senior leader of the Senate, has indicated that he is going to file for cloture on that bill in the Senate tomorrow. So they may well move on it as well.

There are a number of options for us to pursue. As you will not be surprised, we are going to pursue the one we think is most successful.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 16, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

TRACKING THE TARP FUNDS

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Yesterday, our Domestic Policy Subcommittee held a hearing about how the Treasury Department has accounted for TARP funds. The taxpayers of the United States have already paid \$700 billion of their tax money into this bailout program. We found out that the Department of Treasury doesn't track the funds after they give them to the banks and, as a result, we have seen that, of these funds that were supposed to go to help the U.S. economy, \$8 billion has gone through Citigroup to Dubai; \$7 billion through Bank of America to China; \$1 billion through JPMorgan Chase to India.

I want the American taxpayers to think about that because with all the pressing needs we have here with the people who are starved for credit—businesses are dying because they can't get loans from banks—banks are taking our tax dollars and they're shipping them abroad.

It's time that we started to take care of things here at home. It's time that we started to ask the Treasury Department to keep track of these TARP funds and make sure that they're intended for the purpose that the American people want them to be spent for, and that is revive our American economy.

TRIBUTE TO LEE ANNENBERG

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to share with my colleagues the news of the passing earlier this morning of a very