

That's what they did, and now we have the bust in real estate values and almost 40 percent of Americans are technically insolvent. That's why this bill starts to turn around that maldistribution of this Nation's wealth and income. That's why it should be supported today.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT IN BIPARTISAN FASHION TO ADDRESS OUR NATION'S ECONOMIC RECESSION

(Ms. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple weeks House committees, including Transportation and Infrastructure, on which I serve, have worked hard to craft an economic recovery package that would address the deep recession problems that we have. Likewise, over the last couple of months, we've worked with President Obama, and we have listened to economists, over 10 of them, all who say action needs to happen now.

Today, President Obama will meet with my colleagues, congressional Republicans, in a bipartisan fashion to really explain why this package is the best way to move forward and to turn this economy around. Conservative economic policies have not worked. In fact, we haven't produced jobs, and there has not been a production of economic prosperity.

The American people demanded change in November. The Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Package strives to do just that, helping to bring American jobs and providing 90 percent of middle Americans an immediate tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, if congressional Republicans really listen to President Obama today, they will support the legislation, and they will join us for change.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY PACKAGE INVESTS IN THOSE HARDEST HIT BY ECONOMY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, as the economic recession worsens, millions of Americans are in financial trouble and looking for some immediate assistance, but help is on the way. Tomorrow this House will vote on the Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act that will provide 3 to 4 million jobs here in America.

Those hit hardest by the economic crisis are the ones we need to help first, and we are doing that by extending unemployment benefits to people in America, millions who are still looking for jobs. It is difficult to find a job when thousands are being cut. Yesterday a record number of jobs were cut.

Economists say one of the best ways to stimulate the economy is to put the

money in the hands of people who will spend it immediately, spend it on necessities, and that's people who are out of work. That's something we are going to do.

It's also critical to give those people health insurance, and we will provide the States with money so that they can continue to provide Medicaid to those people who need that assistance. There are nearly 7 million unemployed Americans who need health insurance through COBRA. That will also be extended.

Mr. Speaker, this economic recession has hurt millions. This Congress will respond and provide assistance.

PUERTO RICO AND TERRITORIES DESERVE TO BENEFIT FULLY FROM ONGOING EFFORTS TO REVITALIZE ECONOMY

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

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1. As the Congressional Budget Office has just confirmed, the bill will have a very positive impact on our Nation's economy.

I am particularly grateful for the inclusion of Puerto Rico and the other U.S. territories in most of the bill's provisions. The territories are an integral part of the United States and thus deserve to benefit fully from our ongoing efforts to revitalize the economy.

As the final version of this bill is worked out, I will continue to seek more equitable treatment for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico in those few areas where I believe improvements should still be made.

For example, I will continue to make the case that Puerto Rico should receive an increase in Medicaid funding that better reflects the island's legitimate needs and does more to address the negative impact that the current spending cap is having on the Commonwealth's finances.

SUPPORT THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with America's economy in deep trouble. Families from Hobbs to Silver City and across the country are struggling. They are wondering if they will be able to make ends meet.

We must act now to help those families. I know that we won't all agree with every little part of the economic recovery bill that we are considering. I have some concerns myself, but I intend to support the package, not because it's perfect, but because it will create jobs and get our economy going. After all, that's what the people sent us here to do. If this bill passes, 684,000 New Mexicans will get a tax break and over \$400 million will go into infra-

structure and investments to create jobs and support economic development.

I am also pleased that the bill includes language from two bills that I introduced as a stimulus package for southern New Mexico to create green jobs and give families with kids a tax break. I urge my colleagues to pass this stimulus legislation so we can put America back on track and back to work.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 181, LILLY LEDBETTER FAIR PAY ACT OF 2009

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 87 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 87

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 181) to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and to modify the operation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to commit.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 87.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 87 provides for consideration of S. 181, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009. This measure is identical to the version of the bill that was passed by this House on January 9 of this year by a significant vote of 247-171. The bill is also virtually identical to the version adopted in the 110th Congress.

It is well past time to get this legislation to the President for his signature. Today, we plan to do just that. After this bill is passed by the House later today, it will go directly to the White House and on President Obama's desk.

First, I want to commend Chairman MILLER for his leadership and his tireless efforts that have brought us so far. As my colleague, Chairwoman DELAURO, said during her eloquent remarks when this body first took up the bill 2 weeks ago, "We are here today because Lilly Ledbetter got short-changed—short-changed by her employer, the perpetrator of consistent pay discrimination lasting years, and short-changed again by the Supreme Court." And so now we are here today to fight for the final passage of this essential legislation.

As a mother of two daughters, a woman who has owned her own business myself much of my adult life, and as a newly elected Member of this body, I was proud to cast one of my first votes in favor of the Lilly Ledbetter Act, and I am proud that both Chambers have already made a strong commitment to protect workers against pay discrimination in the workplace.

This important legislation is long overdue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the underlying bill, S. 181, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I'd like to thank my friend the distinguished gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) for the time.

I wish to welcome my distinguished colleague to the Rules Committee. She is a very important addition to the Rules Committee, and all of us have had the privilege of welcoming her in the last days. She stated in her statement that she is a new Member. She's also a new member of our committee, and obviously we are very pleased that she is.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule that, once again, clearly contradicts the majority's pledge to the American people to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Today, the majority proceeds to consider this legislation here on the floor of the House under a closed rule. That means, Mr. Speaker, that if this rule is passed and this legislation is brought to the floor under it, every Member of this House will be forbidden from offering any amendments to it. And what makes this act even more unfortunate is that this bill did not make its way through the committee process during this Congress, thereby abandoning the critical committee vetting and amendment process. In effect, what the majority is doing is sidelining the legislative process.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, may say that

they would refute that claim because this legislation was considered in the previous Congress and should be passed quickly. But I bring to my colleagues' attention that we have dozens of new Members who were not here in the last Congress and are now not given the opportunity to participate in the usual and proper legislative process. So, something that truly concerns me is that this closed rule may, in effect, foreshadow how the majority will continue to run this House.

Considering the fact that we are only in the fourth week of the 111th Congress, and that when we take into account this rule, we count this rule, the majority has already considered four pieces of legislation under closed rules, I am quite concerned that the future will bring closed rule after closed rule to this floor.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question is obvious. Will the majority continue its current path of blocking a bipartisan legislative process? Will they break their record of offering 64 bills, as they did under closed rules in the 110th Congress? Or will they change their behavior and open up this legislative process?

The majority promised that it would when it achieved the majority 2 years ago, but it has not done so. In fact, as I stated, in the last Congress, 64 bills—breaking all records of all prior Congresses—64 bills were brought to this floor under closed rules that do not permit any Members in this House to have their ideas considered in the form of amendments. So the facts do not lead to optimism.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee for his kind welcome to a new Member.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a new Member, and my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. I'd like to thank the gentlewoman from Maine for the time. First, on the rule, before I get into the merits of the issue, which is a very important issue we all care about, with regard to the rule on this item, we did discuss it and debate it as part of the initial rules for the House of Representatives which we put in place. So this was discussed both within caucus and debated before the House as a whole.

I heard many objections from my colleagues on the other side, perhaps including the gentleman from Florida, with regard to the rules package, around the recommit issue, around the terms limit issue. I did not hear at that point extensive disagreement about the rules for this particular item, which were included in that initial package.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER for his leadership on this issue of equality and fairness in the workplace and Representative DELAURO for her continued work on this issue. This bill restores and clarifies important protections that are a long time coming. This

bill corrects a wrong that has cost our working women more than just the dollars they have earned. Today's bill ensures that every worker, whether male or female, is given equal opportunity to fight against discrimination in the workplace.

When someone's pay is based not only their ability, not on their creativity, not on their personal drive, not on the value they create in the economy, but rather on their chromosomes, we cheat ourselves and we cheat our entire economy and all American families. Pay discrimination, whether based on gender or any nonperformance factor, means the best and the brightest within our society are being held back.

Discrimination is a cancer of economic inefficiency that eats away at American prosperity. When we fail to promote those who show leadership, we stifle the innovation and progress that make our country great. And while our country has made great strides, tremendous strides towards equality, we have a long way to go, and particularly women still continue to suffer for less pay for the same work than men across our Nation.

Pay discrimination furthers inequalities. And that is why I strongly support the Lilly Ledbetter Act. It gives women the legal hammer they need to continue to break the glass ceiling.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would remind my distinguished friend that we did make known our protest with regard to the fact that this legislation was in the list of bills that the majority on the first day of this Congress made clear would be brought to the floor without the possibility of amendments.

But it's interesting. When the Senate considered this legislation, the Senate did authorize and have debate on amendments. And so the question really, I think, is begged. What is the harm in allowing Members of this House to bring forth their ideas and letting this House work its way via the majority, the majority decide, and that way vet the ideas, discuss, debate, and decide which ideas brought forth by colleagues are appropriate and should be adopted. There's no harm in that, Mr. Speaker. There's no harm.

But, unfortunately, the pattern is continuing. The record was broken in the last Congress with regard to the number of closed rules, with regard to the number of pieces of legislation that were brought to this floor under a structure that did not allow any amendments to be proposed and debated by Members of either party. And that trend continues.

So we saw it not only on the first day of this Congress, but we see it today. Already, four bills, in the few days that this Congress has met, the 111th Congress has met already, we have seen four bills brought forth under these structures known as closed rules that do not allow Members of either party

from proposing ideas to improve any of the pieces of legislation that have been brought to the floor. I think that's the most unfortunate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank my colleague for yielding to me, and I welcome her to the Rules Committee. This is going to be an exciting year.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. This is a great day, this is an important day, because at long last we have a Congress and a President of the United States who not only believes in equal pay for equal work, but are willing to stand up and fight for equal pay for equal work.

Mr. Speaker, last year, we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. We sent it to the United States Senate, and the Republicans in the United States Senate led a filibuster to block progress on this bill. And if we could overcome that filibuster, we have got a President of the United States named George Bush who said he would veto the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

□ 1230

Well, times have changed. We passed the bill again here in the House by a large margin, the Senate has passed it, and we are now accepting the Senate version.

My colleague from Florida says, well, what harm is it to open all this up again? The harm is, if you add or change this bill that we are voting on today, it will go back to the United States Senate; it will delay this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is wrong in any form, discrimination in the workplace. Paying a woman less than a man for equal work is wrong. It is something that is intolerable. And the important thing about this bill is it will move us closer to equality in the workforce. We still have a long way to go.

Mr. Speaker, on average, women earn just 78 cents for every dollar earned by a man. The Institute of Women's Policy Research has found that this wage disparity costs women anywhere from \$400,000 to \$2 million in lost wages over a lifetime. And equal pay, Mr. Speaker, is not simply a women's issue; it is a family issue.

People should be paid for the quality of their work. They should not be discriminated against because of their gender. This vote is about ending discrimination. It is not about process, it is not about anything else. It is about whether at long last the United States Congress and the President of the United States are going to stand up for equal pay for equal work, and I think that this is an important step in the right direction.

I want to congratulate GEORGE MILLER, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, as well as ROB

ANDREWS, my colleague, for his incredible work on this. But we have waited long enough. George Bush and the Republicans have thrown enough roadblocks in our way. We have removed them. We are moving forward. We are moving toward equality. We are moving to end discrimination. And I am proud to stand on the floor and support the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that every piece of legislation brought to this floor is preceded by a debate on the terms of debate. In other words, the rule that we are now considering as a resolution sets the framework for how the underlying piece of legislation can be debated; and, if you will, it does set the process, the parameters for the process of the debate. It establishes the resolution, the rule that is debated and voted on before the underlying legislation can be considered, sets forth, determines if amendments are authorized; and, if so, what amendments are authorized. And so it is process that is debated by the rule, resolution commonly known as the rule, that is brought to the floor before legislation is considered. And that is what we are on right now. That is what we are discussing right now, the resolution, the rule to set the terms of debate.

What I am pointing out and will reiterate now is that it is most unfortunate and unnecessary, totally unnecessary, for the majority to bring forth legislation that will have the support of the majority on the floor when it is considered, the underlying legislation, to bring it forth with a rule that prohibits debate, that shuts out debate, that does not allow any amendments from any Member, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, on the underlying piece of legislation. That is what I am trying to point out, and I thought it was pretty clear.

Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentlelady from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) and welcome her. Thank you for your leadership as well. It is my pleasure to be able to thank Chairman MILLER and also my friend from New Jersey, Congressman ANDREWS, for his work. And let me thank Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO for her collective effort, and the Senate for moving forward.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, 70,000 Americans lost their jobs. I would suspect, as we work on the Economic Stimulus Package and TARP, that, unfortunately, we are going to see a constant march of those losing their jobs.

So why is it absolutely urgent and imperative that we move forward on the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act? Because this is a deterrent. When people are losing their jobs, 70,000 to 100,000 jobs a day, then there are normally one bread winner per family, man or

woman. How shameful it would be if that bread winner happens to be a woman and she is subjected to the unfair, disparate treatment of not being able to be paid equally in the workplace for her work.

It is well known that women are still earning 78 percent for every dollar earned by a man, and the Institute of Women's Policy Research has found that this wage disparity costs women anywhere from \$400,000 to \$2 million in lost wages of a lifetime. Families of America cannot tolerate that now. The children of America cannot tolerate that now. When a woman rises to the occasion or she is already in the workplace, we must pay her fair wages, and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act allows any discrimination to be petitioned in the court, unlike Lilly Ledbetter, who was stymied by statutory process because she did not know.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the underlying rule and this bill, for as we move towards stimulating the economy and bringing jobs back to America, there is no way that this body, this Constitutional body, this country that believes in equality and justice for all can allow the constant discrimination in pay against women, for our children will suffer and our children's children will suffer. This bill is a necessity, because it is time now to eradicate the vestiges of discrimination on the basis of gender.

I ask my colleagues to support this rule, support this legislation, and to thank those who have been part of sponsoring this, and recognizing that in the 18th of congressional district where women go out to work every day, where they are providing the economic engine not only for our communities but for their families, must be treated fairly. 70,000 jobs lost yesterday. How many today? We must eradicate the unfair treatment of women in the workplace as relates to wages.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the Education and Labor Committee that did such great work on this bill, Mr. ANDREWS.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate her for stewarding through in her first effort as a member of the Rules Committee this very historic piece of legislation. I think it is fitting that the gentlelady from Maine, who has excelled as a businessperson, as a State legislator, and now as a legislator here, has left her very considerable imprint on this process and I congratulate her.

The process has afforded under the rules of the House, both in committee and here on this floor, the opportunity for competing views to be heard about

this idea. I know, Mr. Speaker, we will hear frequently this afternoon that no one in the House supports discrimination on the basis of gender, and I believe that is true. The issue is not what we say, though, it is what we do. And we have a chance to take a step against discrimination on the basis of gender, but I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there will be those who say this is the wrong time and the wrong step. I respectfully disagree.

There are those who say this is the wrong time to take this step because there will not be any statute of limitations; that is to say, people can sue forever if they have been the victim of employment discrimination. That is not accurate. You have 180 days in most States and a few more days in other States to file a claim once an act of discrimination has occurred. If a plaintiff does not file his or her claim by that time, the claim expires. This has been the law in a majority of circuits for a very long time. The U.S. Supreme Court disrupted that law. We are restoring it.

We expect to hear that there will be a flood of litigation, that the courthouses will be filled with people filing discrimination claims once this bill becomes law. That is not the case. Again, this bill restores the law as was understood by a majority of the circuits until the Supreme Court gave its ill-founded decision in the Ledbetter case. There was no flood of litigation under the prior understanding of the statute, and I do not believe there will be a flood of litigation now.

We will hear that this should apply only to intentional discrimination against women or others on the basis of gender. You know, if you are hit by a truck, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter if the truck driver intended to hit you or simply did so carelessly; if you are injured, you are injured. And if a person can show discrimination on the basis of any of the suspect categories under title VII under the law, they should be compensated, whether or not they can prove the discrimination was intentional. If there is a pattern and practice of discrimination because an employee is a woman, it should be remedied, and limiting this to intentional discrimination makes no sense.

We expect to hear that employees will sit on their rights; that they will have an opportunity to sue and wait for a very long time to do so. There is simply no evidence that people did that under the prior law as understood by the circuits. And, frankly, it would be a very ill-founded plaintiff who would do such a thing since it would cost them money to do so, reminding you that the burden of proof would fall upon the plaintiff to come up with the evidence of discrimination that took place a long time ago. So she or he has no incentive to sit on their rights and have to bear that burden of proof.

Finally, we will hear that employees will sit on their rights because somehow it makes economic sense to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it simply doesn't. The statute limits someone to go back 2 years backwards, for back pay, from the point at which discrimination took place. It would be a very irrational plaintiff who would wait a very long time to wait and go back those 2 years. The longer you wait, the more it costs you as a plaintiff.

So these arguments have been fully aired. I respectfully would argue they are all wrong. The time is right for us to stand up and not simply say we are against discrimination, but vote against discrimination, and pass this bill this afternoon.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is that there is no need to close off debate; that this legislation could very easily have been debated openly; that Members on both sides of the aisle could have been given the opportunity to bring forth amendments as they were able to in the Senate, and that this legislation would move forward. It is not only unfortunate but unnecessary for the majority to close off debate. And, as I stated previously, there is a pattern.

In the last Congress, despite having promised the most open and the most transparent, the most fair Congress in history, the reality was exactly the opposite: More pieces of legislation were brought to this floor under closed rules that did not allow any amendments during the last Congress, the first Congress where our friends on the other side of the aisle had the majority in many years. More pieces of legislation were brought to the floor with closed rules prohibiting all amendments than in history, in all of history before in the history of Republic. So that is unfortunate.

But we are seeing the pattern continue. It has continued in these weeks in the beginning of the 111th Congress, and already this is the fourth bill, the fourth piece of legislation brought to the floor under a structure that does not permit any amendments under closed rules. That is what we are saying, it is uncalled for, it is unfortunate. And we hope, I guess because hope springs eternal, that our friends on the other side of the aisle will open the process up and will allow Members from both sides of the aisle to introduce amendments and have them debated and have the majority work its will.

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

□ 1245

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to lead this bill today as a newly elected Member and a new member of the Rules Committee, and I appreciate working alongside my new colleague on the Rules Committee. And I'm sure we will have a busy afternoon together.

We have heard several arguments and supportive thoughts from many of my distinguished colleagues from this side

of the aisle. And I appreciate their thoughts and their very hard work that it has taken to bring this bill to the floor and the momentous occasion we will have today when we are able to take this vote. I have also heard several arguments from my esteemed colleague from Florida. And I just want to remind him that when this bill was debated during the last session of Congress in the Education and Labor Committee where there were ample opportunities to bring amendments, those people in opposition only brought two amendments. So this is not a bill where there is tremendous disagreement. And in fact, the fact that there were no speakers virtually in opposition to this bill shows us what an important piece of legislation we are dealing with today, and in fact only were the discussion around the process taken up today. And I feel that since we have already debated this bill in the House and the Senate when it was last here, we passed it by an overwhelming margin of 247-171. It was passed by a bipartisan vote in the Senate of 61-36.

I am confident that this bill will receive very strong support today and want to say that I'm proud to be a Member of this body when this is happening. I do want to remind my colleagues that this legislation simply restores prior law. It is so important. And by passing it, we are making great strides in protecting workers by reversing the Supreme Court's Ledbetter decision as we have been eloquently described to today. We owe it to all American workers to strengthen, not weaken, nondiscrimination charges based on gender, race and religion.

It has passed the House, and it has passed the Senate previously. Today we are here to send it on to President Obama for what will be his first signature of any bill.

I urge my colleagues to support workers everywhere and vote "yes" on the underlying bill. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.