

and FATTAH changed their vote from “nay” to yea.”

Mr. KISSELL changed his vote from “present” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 19, 2009, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 143 in order to attend an event with the President in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1586—Additional tax on bonuses received from certain TARP recipients. We must protect taxpayers’ money and ensure TARP funds are not being abused by executives. Executives of TARP funded companies should not receive bonuses for the work they have done that has caused us to arrive at our current economic situation.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BONUSES PAID BY AIG AND OTHER COMPANIES RECEIVING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 76, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 76.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 255, nays 160, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—255

Abercrombie	Capps	Dingell
Ackerman	Capuano	Doggett
Adler (NJ)	Cardoza	Donnelly (IN)
Altmire	Carnahan	Driehaus
Andrews	Carney	Edwards (MD)
Arcuri	Carson (IN)	Edwards (TX)
Baca	Castor (FL)	Ellison
Baird	Chandler	Ellsworth
Baldwin	Childers	Engel
Barrow	Clarke	Eshoo
Bean	Clay	Etheridge
Becerra	Cleaver	Farr
Berkley	Clyburn	Fattah
Berman	Cohen	Filner
Berry	Connolly (VA)	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Fudge
Blumenauer	Costa	Gallely
Bocieri	Costello	Giffords
Boren	Courtney	Gonzalez
Boswell	Crowley	Gordon (TN)
Boucher	Cuellar	Grayson
Boyd	Cummings	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Dahlkemper	Green, Gene
Braley (IA)	Davis (AL)	Griffith
Bright	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Brown, Corrine	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Buchanan	DeFazio	Hall (NY)
Butterfield	DeGette	Halvorson
Cantor	DeLauro	Hare
Cao	Dicks	Harman

Hastings (FL)	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda
Heinrich	Matsui	T.
Herseeth Sandlin	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Higgins	McCollum	Sarbanes
Hill	McDermott	Schakowsky
Himes	McGovern	Schauer
Hinojosa	McIntyre	Schiff
Hirono	McMahon	Schrader
Hodes	Meek (FL)	Schwartz
Holden	Meeks (NY)	Scott (GA)
Holt	Melancon	Scott (VA)
Honda	Michaud	Serrano
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Sestak
Inslee	Miller, George	Shea-Porter
Israel	Minnick	Sherman
Jackson (IL)	Mitchell	Shuler
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Simpson
(TX)	Moore (KS)	Sires
Johnson (GA)	Moore (WI)	Skelton
Johnson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (CT)	Snyder
Jones	Murphy, Patrick	Space
Kagen	Murtha	Speier
Kanjorski	Nadler (NY)	Spratt
Kaptur	Neal (MA)	Stark
Kennedy	Nye	Stupak
Kildee	Oberstar	Sutton
Kilpatrick (MI)	Obey	Tanner
Kilroy	Olver	Tauscher
Kind	Ortiz	Teague
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Kissell	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (MS)
Klein (FL)	Payne	Tierney
Kosmas	Perlmutter	Titus
Kratovil	Perriello	Tonko
Kucinich	Peters	Towns
Langevin	Peterson	Tsongas
Larsen (WA)	Pingree (ME)	Van Hollen
Larson (CT)	Polis (CO)	Velázquez
Lee (CA)	Pomeroy	Visclosky
Levin	Price (NC)	Walden
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Walz
Lipinski	Rangel	Waters
Loeb sack	Reyes	Watson
Lofgren, Zoe	Richardson	Watt
Lowe y	Rodriguez	Waxman
Luján	Rohrabacher	Weiner
Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen	Welch
Maffei	Ross	Wexler
Maloney	Rothman (NJ)	Wilson (OH)
Manzullo	Roybal-Allard	Wittman
Markey (CO)	Ruppersberger	Woolsey
Markey (MA)	Rush	Wu
Marshall	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
Massa	Salazar	

NAYS—160

Aderholt	Dent	Lance
Akin	Diaz-Balart, L.	Latham
Alexander	Diaz-Balart, M.	LaTourette
Austria	Dreier	Latta
Bachmann	Duncan	Lee (NY)
Bachus	Ehlers	Lewis (CA)
Barrett (SC)	Emerson	LoBiondo
Bartlett	Fallin	Lucas
Barton (TX)	Flake	Luetkemeyer
Biggett	Fleming	Lummis
Bilbray	Forbes	Lungren, Daniel
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	E.
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Mack
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)	McCauley
Bonner	Gerlach	McClintock
Bono Mack	Gingrey (GA)	McCotter
Boozman	Gohmert	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McHugh
Broun (GA)	Granger	McKeon
Brown (SC)	Graves	McMorris
Brown-Waite,	Guthrie	Rodgers
Ginny	Hall (TX)	Mica
Burgess	Harper	Miller (FL)
Burton (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)
Buyer	Heller	Moran (KS)
Calvert	Hensarling	Murphy, Tim
Camp	Herger	Myrick
Campbell	Hoekstra	Neugebauer
Capito	Hunter	Nunes
Carter	Inglis	Paul
Cassidy	Issa	Paulsen
Castle	Jenkins	Pence
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Petri
Coble	Jordan (OH)	Pitts
Coffman (CO)	King (IA)	Platts
Cole	King (NY)	Poe (TX)
Conaway	Kingston	Posey
Crenshaw	Kirk	Price (GA)
Davis (KY)	Kline (MN)	Putnam
Deal (GA)	Lamborn	Rehberg

NOT VOTING—16

Boustany	Linder	Radanovich
Culberson	McNerney	Slaughter
Davis (TN)	Miller, Gary	Souder
Delahunt	Napolitano	Wasserman
Doyle	Olson	Schultz
Hinchey	Pascarell	

□ 1453

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, March 19, 2009, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 144 in order to attend an event with the President in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 76—Expressing the sense of the Congress regarding executive and employee bonuses paid by AIG and other companies assisted with taxpayer funds provided under the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP) of the Secretary of the Treasury. It is absurd that AIG has received \$180 billion in TARP assistance while giving \$165 million in bonuses to the very people who have brought us to our current economic state. We cannot allow the executives of these companies to benefit at the taxpayers’ expense.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today my vote in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 76, which was rollcall No. 144, was not properly recorded due to an electronic error. I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted “yea” on this resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 143 and 144, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

LANCE CORPORAL MATTHEW P. PATHENOS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAS-
TOR of Arizona). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1216.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1216.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

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 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday no votes are expected.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions, as is the tradition, will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, we will consider Senate amendments to H.R. 146, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 and H.R. 1404, the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask the gentleman that, in reference to his mention of the public lands omnibus bill, and that will be coming back to the floor, I would like to ask the gentleman, will our side, the Republicans, be given a motion to recommit or an opportunity to amend this bill?

Mr. HOYER. The bill comes back, of course, it is a House bill being returned with amendments as the gentleman, I'm sure, knows, and under those circumstances, of course, we consider that there is not a motion to recommit on that kind of a procedure. So the answer there would be it would not be a motion to recommit. As the gentleman also knows, this bill came two votes short of a two-thirds majority with very significant Republican and Democratic support of the bill. This bill has been hanging around for a long period of time. It is composed largely, although not exclusively, of bills that have passed the House largely on suspension.

So the answer to the gentleman's question is we believe there has been demonstrated overwhelming support for the substance of this bill. It has been hanging around a long time. We want to see it get passed. And the answer is probably not.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, certainly there are procedures in place to waive the rules so that we can, on the minority side, have a voice in the passage of this legislation consistent with what President Obama has continued to say, which is that we should change the way this town works and continue to allow all sides to have a voice in what Congress does. I think, as we saw over the last week, evidence or results of rush-

ing things through the House and disallowing our side to have a say in legislation may very well end up with wrong results. So I am saddened to hear that we will not be having an opportunity to offer an amendment to that bill.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that point?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. As the gentleman, I'm sure, knows, many, many of the provisions, I don't know that I have the specific count, are Republican-sponsored bills in this, what the Senate packaged, as you know, so that a large percentage, I don't know exactly what the percentage is, whether it is 30 percent or 35 percent, are Republican-sponsored pieces of legislation.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I think that the percentage would probably be reflected in the fact that there may be 17 or so Republican provisions in the bill out of 140 or so. So I wouldn't necessarily say, Mr. Speaker, that that would reflect what our side would amend or hope to amend the bill with. But I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that last week he was on the floor and he mentioned that a stem-cell bill will be coming to the floor prior to recess. And since the gentleman has not noticed the bill for next week, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman tell us if he expects it on the floor the following week?

Mr. HOYER. It is possible. I wouldn't send out an expectation. It is being worked on. There is a strong feeling by the sponsors of the legislation, as you know, that passed in the last Congress through this House, handily, that I think in agreement with the administration that, in addition to the administration's Executive Order, legislation is necessary to give certainty to what can and cannot be done by researchers. And we obviously want to make sure that researchers understand what the law is, what the opportunities are, and what the prohibitions are so that legislation is possible. But I want to tell my friend that I did not announce it for next week. I don't expect legislation next week. I think it is possible for the week following, but I don't want to go beyond that. We will certainly let the gentleman know as soon as I know.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask further questions of the gentleman, as we have been told that the budget will be marked up next week, and I am wondering from the gentleman, number one, if he expects the budget on the floor the following week? In addition to that, I am curious, as are the Members on our side of the aisle, about the subject of your discussions with Chairman SPRATT as to the direction of the budget. There has been a lot of discussion publicly as well as in these halls, about the proposed cap-and-tax proposal, where some economists, those from MIT and others, predict that if we are to provide for the cap-and-tax proposal, that it will cost American families at

least \$3,100 every year. That, to me, is a great cause for alarm, especially given the economic times and the struggle that the working families of this country are encountering.

It was also revealed this week that the number provided for in the proposed budget has underestimated the real cost of cap-and-tax. And if that is the case, that is even more alarming given the fact that if we are looking at an over \$3,000 per family tax, what is it that we are doing if we are putting that cost on anybody who pays an electric bill, anyone who pays a gas bill, anyone who buys anything manufactured in this country? So I ask the gentleman if he is contemplating that the budget proposal that will come to the floor will have that in it.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My presumption is that you have now come up with a new phrase on your side of the aisle. I do know about cap-and-trade. It is talked about regularly. But maybe that is not as politically salient as "cap-and-tax." It seems innovative. But if the gentleman, as I presume he is, is referring to what is commonly known by everybody else as "cap-and-trade," let me say this: The Budget Committee obviously will mark up on the 25th, that is next Wednesday, we expect to bring the budget bill to the floor the following week, the last week before the Easter break. My expectation is there will be provisions in there for energy and global warming consideration. But my further expectation is it will not adopt a premise of one alternative over another, that that will be subject to the legislative process, and that one will not be chosen in the budget itself, so that voting on the budget would not be giving precedent to one alternative over another.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask whether the gentleman can tell us as to the prospect for reconciliation instructions to be included in the budget. We have heard this week that the White House has told leaders on your side of the aisle to pursue health reform through reconciliation as well. And to us, this seems like a straight-up partisan approach, something I don't think that the American people are looking for right now, especially when it comes to items such as taxes and items like health care that everyone is concerned with. There is no distinction made between hardship on health care between Republican and Democrat.

So I would like to ask the gentleman, will the budget be coming through with reconciliation instructions?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, the gentleman indicated that "we have been told by the White House." I had some comments on how the Republican majority responded, from my perspective, without fail to