

Royce	Smith (NE)	Upton	Flores	Lankford	Rogers (AL)	Pastor (AZ)	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)
Runyan	Smith (NJ)	Walberg	Forbes	Latham	Rogers (KY)	Pelosi	T. Tierney	
Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Walden	Fox	Latta	Rogers (MI)	Peters	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Scalise	Southerland	Webster	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher	Peterson	Sarbanes	Towns
Schilling	Stearns	West	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Rokita	Pingree (ME)	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Schmidt	Stivers	Westmoreland	Gallegly	Loeb	Rooney	Polis	Schiff	Van Hollen
Schock	Stutzman	Whitfield	Garamendi	Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Price (NC)	Schrader	Velázquez
Schweikert	Sullivan	Wilson (SC)	Gardner	Lucas	Roskam	Quigley	Schwartz	Visclosky
Scott (SC)	Terry	Wittman	Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Ross (AR)	Rahall	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Wolf	Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel	Ross (FL)	Reyes	Scott, David	Schultz
Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Womack	Gibbs	E.	Royce	Ribble	Serrano	Watt
Sessions	Tiberi	Woodall	Gibson	Mack	Runyan	Richardson	Sewell	Waters
Shimkus	Tipton	Yoder	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant	Ruppersberger	Richmond	Sherman	Waxman
Shuster	Turner (NY)	Young (AK)	Gohmert	Matheson	Ryan (WI)	Richmond	Shuler	Welch
Simpson	Turner (OH)	Young (IN)	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise	Rothman (NJ)	Sires	Wilson (FL)
			Gowdy	McCaul	Schilling	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Woodall
			Granger	McCotter	Schmidt	Rush	Speier	Woodley
			Graves (GA)	McHenry	Schock	Ryan (OH)	Stark	Yarmuth
			Graves (MO)	McIntyre	Schweikert			
			Griffin (AR)	McKeon	Scott (SC)			
			Griffith (VA)	McKinley	Scott, Austin			
			Grimm	McMorris	Sensenbrenner			
			Guthrie	Rodgers	Sessions			
			Hall	Meehan	Shimkus			
			Hanna	Mica	Shuster			
			Harper	Miller (FL)	Simpson			
			Harris	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)			
			Hartzler	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)			
			Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)			
			Hayworth	Myrick	Southerland			
			Heck	Neugebauer	Stearns			
			Hensarling	Noem	Stivers			
			Herger	Nugent	Stutzman			
			Herrera Beutler	Nunnelee	Sullivan			
			Hochul	Olson	Sutton			
			Huelskamp	Owens	Terry			
			Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)			
			Hultgren	Paulsen	Thornberry			
			Hunter	Pearce	Tiberi			
			Hurt	Pence	Tipton			
			Issa	Petri	Turner (NY)			
			Jenkins	Pitts	Turner (OH)			
			Johnson (IL)	Platts	Upton			
			Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Walberg			
			Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Walden			
			Jones	Price (GA)	Walsh (MN)			
			Jordan	Quayle	Webster			
			Kelly	Reed	West			
			King (IA)	Rehberg	Westmoreland			
			King (NY)	Reichert	Whitfield			
			Kingston	Renacci	Wilson (SC)			
			Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell	Wittman			
			Kissell	Rivera	Womack			
			Kline	Roby	Yoder			
			Lamborn	Roe (TN)	Young (AK)			
			Lance		Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—23

Bass (NH)	Green, Gene	Rangel
Bishop (UT)	Guinta	Sewell
Braley (IA)	Landry	Sherman
Burton (IN)	Manzullo	Slaughter
Clyburn	Marino	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Napolitano	Walsh (IL)
Flake	Nunes	Young (FL)
Gosar	Paul	

□ 1345

Mrs. EMERSON changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 19, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 176 due a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on the Motion to Recommit to H.R. 9, Small Business Tax Cut Act.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 176, the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 9, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 176, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 173, answered “present” 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—235

Adams	Boswell	Cravaack
Aderholt	Boustany	Crawford
Akin	Brady (TX)	Crenshaw
Alexander	Brooks	Cuellar
Amodei	Buchanan	Culberson
Austria	Bucshon	Davis (KY)
Bachmann	Buerkle	Denham
Bachus	Burgess	Dent
Barletta	Calvert	DesJarlais
Barrow	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Bartlett	Campbell	Dold
Barton (TX)	Canseco	Donnelly (IN)
Benishek	Cantor	Dreier
Berg	Capito	Duffy
Biggert	Carter	Duncan (SC)
Bilbray	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Bilirakis	Chabot	Ellmers
Bishop (NY)	Chaffetz	Emerson
Black	Chandler	Farenthold
Blackburn	Coble	Fincher
Bonner	Coffman (CO)	Fitzpatrick
Bono Mack	Cole	Fleischmann
Boren	Conaway	Fleming

Graves (GA)	McHenry	McIntyre
Graves (MO)	McKeon	McKinley
Griffin (AR)	McKinley	McMorris
Griffith (VA)	McMorris	Rodgers
Grimm	Rodgers	
Guthrie		
Hall	Meehan	
Hanna	Mica	
Harper	Miller (FL)	
Harris	Miller (MI)	
Hartzler	Miller, Gary	
Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)	
Hayworth	Myrick	
Heck	Neugebauer	
Hensarling	Noem	
Herger	Nugent	
Herrera Beutler	Nunnelee	
Hochul	Olson	
Huelskamp	Owens	
Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	
Hultgren	Paulsen	
Hunter	Pearce	
Hurt	Pence	
Issa	Petri	
Jenkins	Pitts	
Johnson (IL)	Platts	
Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	
Jones	Price (GA)	
Jordan	Quayle	
Kelly	Reed	
King (IA)	Rehberg	
King (NY)	Reichert	
Kingston	Renacci	
Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell	
Kissell	Rivera	
Kline	Roby	
Lamborn	Roe (TN)	
Lance		

NAYS—173

Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Kaptur
Altmire	DeFazio	Keating
Amash	DeGette	Kildee
Andrews	DeLauro	Kind
Baca	Deutch	Kucinich
Baldwin	Dicks	Labrador
Bass (CA)	Dingell	Langevin
Becerra	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Berkley	Doyle	Larson (CT)
Berman	Edwards	LaTourette
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Lee (CA)
Blumenauer	Engel	Levin
Bonamici	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Brady (PA)	Farr	Lipinski
Brown (GA)	Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe
Brown (FL)	Fortenberry	Lowey
Butterfield	Frank (MA)	Luján
Capps	Fudge	Lummis
Capuano	Gonzalez	Lynch
Cardoza	Green, Al	Maloney
Carnahan	Grijalva	Markey
Carney	Gutierrez	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Hahn	McCarthy (NY)
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	McClintock
Chu	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Cicilline	Heinrich	McDermott
Clarke (MI)	Higgins	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Himes	McNerney
Clay	Hinchee	Meeks
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Michaud
Cohen	Hirono	Miller (NC)
Connolly (VA)	Holden	Miller, George
Conyers	Holt	Moore
Cooper	Honda	Moran
Costa	Hoyer	Mulvaney
Costello	Israel	Murphy (CT)
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Nadler
Critz	Jackson Lee	Neal
Crowley	(TX)	Olver
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

NOT VOTING—22

Bass (NH)	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Bishop (UT)	Guinta	Rangel
Braley (IA)	Landry	Slaughter
Burton (IN)	Manzullo	Thompson (MS)
Clyburn	Marino	Walsh (IL)
Filner	Napolitano	Young (FL)
Flake	Nunes	
Gosar	Paul	

WOLF

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1355

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 177, final passage of H.R. 9, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 19, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 177 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on final passage of H.R. 9, Small Business Tax Cut Act.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 177, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes today to attend to official government business in Illinois. If I had been here, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 172; “yea” on rollcall No. 173; “yea” on rollcall No. 174; “no” on rollcall No. 175; “no” on rollcall No. 176; and “yea” on rollcall No. 177.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2341

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2341.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1400

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman

from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

Among next week's suspensions will be a noteworthy bill, H.R. 2146, authored by Congressman DARRELL ISSA and known as the DATA Act. This is an important step in our continuing effort to make government more accountable, accessible, and transparent, especially when it comes to the expenditure of taxpayer dollars.

It is also possible that the House will consider a motion to go to conference and motion to instruct conferees on the surface transportation authorization bill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we expect a full debate next week on the importance of our Nation's cybersecurity. The House will consider a number of bipartisan bills to reduce obstacles to voluntary information sharing between the private sector and government, secure our Nation's infrastructure, better protect government systems and combat foreign threats.

A number of committees have been involved in this effort, Mr. Speaker, including the Intelligence Committee, Homeland Security, Oversight and Government Reform, Science, Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

Of the bills coming to the floor, we will consider H.R. 3523, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, under a rule. This important legislation is authored by Chairman MIKE ROGERS and cosponsored by Ranking Member DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

The gentleman, in his comments, indicates that we might go to conference on the surface transportation bill. As the gentleman knows, the Senate surface transportation bill passed overwhelmingly and with a very substantial bipartisan vote and a vote led by Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma. There were 22 Republican Senators. About half of the Republican Senators voted for it, and so it passed overwhelmingly.

I am wondering, given the timeframe in which we are dealing, whether or not the gentleman feels comfortable with

some assurance that we are going to move to go to conference so that we can get a conference under way. I know the majority indicated it wanted a bill so that it could, in fact, go to conference. I have had discussions with, I think, you but I know Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker, and Mr. MCCARTHY, that that was the intent to go to conference.

What would preclude us, I suppose would be the better way to phrase the question, from having a motion to go to conference next week? As the gentleman knows, we are going to be out the week following so that we will not be back until May, into May; and to the extent that we delay going to conference, we are going to delay the resolution of what I think is a very, very important bill. I know the gentleman does as well. We believe this is a real job creator.

As you know, Mr. LaHood is the Secretary of Transportation, your former colleague on your side of the aisle. He has made it very clear that this is a very substantial jobs bill. To the extent that we could move quickly, I think it would be in the best interests of our country, of infrastructure investment, and the creation of jobs.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman we have every intention of going forward, and, at this point, I don't know what could come up and preclude us from doing so. But we look forward to working with the gentleman over the course of the next two-plus months to come to resolution so that we can provide some certainty to States, industries, private sector, public, and the rest with regard to our transportation infrastructure.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And in light of the fact that he looks forward to my help, I want to tell him that if he brings a motion to go to conference next week, I will bring the overwhelming majority of my caucus to a vote with that motion to go to conference so that we can get that done. I will be glad to help in that respect.

Will that help him?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't know whether those votes would help you get the job done that I think needs to be done. I don't say that facetiously. I think we want to go to conference. I have been told you want to go to conference, and I would hope we could move forward on that. As a matter of fact, the chairman of your committee, Representative MICA, said yesterday we should go to conference immediately, and we would be very interested in helping you towards that process.

Mr. Leader, the Appropriations Committee has started to mark up its bills and has dealt with the reconciliation instructions. My understanding is the reconciliation instructions, the result of those instructions will be coming to the floor probably the first month, the month of May.

Is that accurate?

Mr. CANTOR. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. With respect to the appropriations bills, much was made of the fact that you wanted to bring appropriations bills to the floor one at a time and under open rules. I think that's a good practice. Frankly, I would have liked to have done that when we were in charge, and we didn't get that done. I said then that I didn't think it was good for the institution for the consideration of appropriation bills, and you, I think, rightfully criticized us for that—not you, personally, but the Republican side of the aisle.

Is it your intention to bring the appropriations bills to the floor singly, individually, with an open rule as Speaker BOEHNER indicated would be the case, and, if so, when will that occur?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that, as he knows, working through the committee at this point are the CJS bill and the energy and water bill. It is our intention to bring one of those forward the week that he indicates, May 7, to be debated.

The Speaker has consistently come down on the side of wanting there to be an open process. I think that, given the House's track record on appropriations bills and the debates surrounding them, we are hoping that we can have a deliberate debate around the substance and policy of the issues and set as a model for going forward.

But I would say to the gentleman, as far as we go right now, we are looking at May 7 to be the time in which we bring one of those bills to the floor for deliberation and a vote.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I make the additional observation that we passed a budget. Many of us voted against that budget, as you know, that passed. We voted for our alternative. But the American people, I think, have an interest and, frankly, a right to know what the ramifications of that budget that was passed are; and obviously they will find that out as the appropriation bills move forward, are considered on this floor, open to debate and open to amendment. That will educate the American people on what the consequences are of passing budget A over budget B, your budget, our budget, or an alternative budget.

It's really in the appropriations bill. The budget doesn't really do anything, as we all know, other than set a 302(a) allocation. That is the amount of discretionary dollars that can be applied in the appropriations process. What that means is that the only thing it does is set that limit and does not apportion resources to particular objectives in the appropriations bill or, for that matter, in the Ways and Means Committee bill in terms of actions that might occur with reference to taxes and revenues.

□ 1410

So I say to my friend that the importance of bringing the appropriation bills to the floor is to give that transparency to the American public so they can make a judgment on which priorities they support. We think it's going to be very difficult, frankly, to bring appropriation bills to the floor under the constraints that have been imposed. And we regret, as the gentleman knows, very much that we did not follow the agreement that was reached when we precluded the country's going into default. We agreed on a figure of \$1.048 trillion to be the figure that the Appropriations Committee would mark to.

I don't know whether the gentleman had an opportunity to see, but 12 out of the 14 Senators on the Appropriations Committee voted to honor the agreement that was reached today, including Senator MCCONNELL. Regrettably, we did not do that in the House. We reduced that figure very substantially, and we also shifted some of the resources from one object—nondefense to defense—which cuts even further the nondefense portion of the budget by about \$8 billion.

So I ask the gentleman, in that context, is the committee going to mark to the House-passed budget, which we have deemed adopted? Notwithstanding the fact it has not been adopted, is the House going to mark to those figures, and will it mark to those figures knowing full well what dollars are left for bills that are to follow? In other words, are you going to front-load and make those appropriation bills sweeter? That will then not leave resources for bills that will come after.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, first of all, the gentleman knows that we did pass a budget in the House. We didn't have a conference committee report to vote on because the Senate did not pass a budget, which has then forced us to have to deem what the House passed—again, the Senate having gone way past a thousand days without a budget.

So I would say to the gentleman it is our perception that what the deal was in August, the BCA, was a ceiling. And that we want to try in every way we can to save taxpayer dollars, and that is a rule which we're continuing to follow. The Appropriations Committee has taken up its obligations and is working on the bills, and we will be bringing up those bills consistent with that rule.

Again, I say to the gentleman, we look forward to a robust, policy-oriented debate on the spending issues facing this country throughout the appropriations process and look forward to a deliberative civil process so that we can get our work done and deliver on what the people expect—and that is to begin to shave the spending that has gotten out of control in Washington over the last several decades.

Mr. HOYER. I know the gentleman doesn't like to relitigate history, but

when he says spending got out of control over the last two decades, I may agree with him on the last decade we went deeply into debt, but certainly the decade preceding that my friend surely remembers that we ran 4 years of surplus and a net surplus over 8 years during the Clinton administration. A \$62.9 billion net surplus after 8 years. And we had 4 years of surplus. Two of those were actual surpluses—and we counted Social Security's revenues, which obviously were borrowed money from the Social Security trust fund. So we swapped Social Security money for IOUs. But 2 of those years of actual balance.

So I would agree with him on the last decade, but I would not agree with him on the decade before that because, frankly, working from both sides of the aisle and an exploding economy, we created those deficits essentially together.

I want to say to my friend that in that context, yes, the American people want to see us use their money wisely. We all agree on that. They need to know how we intend to use their money. And if they don't have appropriation bills on the floor—because the gentleman talks about the fact that the Senate hasn't passed a budget in a thousand days. It has had no effect, none, zero on what we are doing. Why? Because all the budget does, as the gentleman well knows, is not allocate money. It sets a ceiling—as the gentleman likes, apparently, ceilings and not agreements—a ceiling on what discretionary spending will be. Other than that, it doesn't do anything. Therefore, it sets forth a plan.

But the key is going to be how you carry out that plan and let the American people know how you're going to carry it out. We do that in appropriation bills and the Ways and Means tax bills.

Does the gentleman have an idea of when a Ways and Means tax bill carrying out the budget might come to the floor?

Mr. CANTOR. As the gentleman knows, Ways and Means is continuing in their mission to conduct hearings as far as tax reform is concerned. They just had a hearing on retirement provisions and what comprehensive tax reform means when it comes to retirement provisions.

The gentleman knows that tax reform doesn't come easy in this town. And we are all, I think, bound by the commitment to try and simplify the code with the differences that we have. And we're going to continue to look to see what Chairman CAMP and the committee's work produces. But with maintaining our commitment that we believe, as you do—Mr. Speaker, I would say the gentleman joins me in wanting to simplify the code, bring down rates, get rid of loopholes, and the rest.

Again, I would say we're looking to our committees to continuing their work. They're doing good work toward

that end exposing the issues and identifying them so that we can get this in a way that is responding to what the public really wants to see, which is a simplified Tax Code and a much fairer way.

Mr. HOYER. We passed—if I can go to another subject briefly—we passed a bill today which the gentleman was a principle advocate of which cost \$46 billion in terms of revenues in effect forgone, if you will, that otherwise were being expected, if that bill passes. Does the gentleman believe that if that bill passes and is signed by the President, that in light of the fact it's a 1-year bill, does the gentleman believe that it will be only 1 year or does the gentleman intend, if his party happens to be in charge in the next Congress, to see that lapse and that tax increased again on small businesses? What is the gentleman's thought on that? I ask him that question, if I might, in light of The Wall Street Journal's observation today that certainly this did not give small businesses much certainty.

Mr. CANTOR. First of all, I'd say the gentleman has a very interesting question if we're talking about the scheduling of the floor and how we're going forward, but I'll be delighted to answer the question.

The bill that we passed today in a bipartisan way is a bill that responds to the urgency that small business is feeling and, frankly, the people of this country are feeling that the economy is not growing quickly enough.

Is it a panacea? No. Do we want to see comprehensive overall tax reform? Absolutely. But as the gentleman knows, our side and his have big differences when it comes to tax reform.

Unfortunately, the discussions that ensued last year were hung up on the notion that your side really, really continues to advocate higher taxes. You want to start with a baseline that's just higher than ours. We don't believe right now that we ought to assume Washington has a revenue problem. Instead, we ought to fix the spending problem before you start jacking up more taxes, if at all.

So this measure that we passed is something that is a first start towards a pro-growth outlook to empower businesses and allow men and women who are out there taking risks starting businesses and creating jobs a little easier time in doing so, allowing them to keep more of the money to put back into their business and allocate the capital the best way they see of doing so, not Washington.

Again, I know the gentleman knows we have a difference of opinion when it comes to that. But, again, it is a small step in a bridge toward what we all would like to see but are unable to accomplish right now, which is overall tax reform.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and he is correct, we do have a very substantial difference of opinion. The indication is this is a start. Frankly, we were told it was a start in 2001. We

were told it was a start in 2003 when we cut taxes very substantially. Unfortunately, we didn't cut revenues very substantially. And when you don't cut revenues after you cut taxes, what happens is you have deficit. And that's why we went from a \$5.6 trillion projected surplus after the Clinton administration, projected by the Bush administration, to an \$11 trillion deficit at the end of the Bush administration—because we cut revenues and we increased spending.

□ 1420

We were not in charge for 75 percent of that time. In fact, we weren't in charge of ultimately passing legislation any of that time because the President, of course, had an 8-year term. So I say to my friend, we dug another \$46 billion hole.

My belief is that your side of the aisle will not want to reinstate that tax next year no matter what the economy is doing, no matter how good the economy is. That's my suspicion. But it's based upon 30 years of experience, I tell my friend. And if that's the case, then we're not talking about \$46 billion, we're talking about a half trillion dollars, which is \$46 billion times 10 with escalation for inflation, so about a half-a-trillion-dollar additional hole in the deficit unless the gentleman is prepared to say, look, if the economy recovers, we're going to reinstate that revenue.

The difference between us is you want to talk about tax increases, and I want to talk about paying our bills. And I believe that if we don't want to buy, then we don't have to tax. But if we buy, we have a moral responsibility to have the courage to ask people to pay for it.

Very frankly, I think you've taken the discipline out of the system. I think supply-side economics takes the discipline out of the system. What supply-side economics does is, we can cut revenues but don't have to cut spending because magically we're going to get more revenues.

Very frankly, Mr. Greenspan thought for a while that that worked. He said 3 years ago, no, he was wrong. I think he was right the second time. He was demonstrably, graphically not right the first time when he rationalized the 2001 and 2003. We cut revenues, they did not raise sufficient additional dollars and growth in the economy.

As a matter of fact, whether there was a direct result, we had the worst economy I've experienced in my adult lifetime at the end of the Bush term and at the beginning of the Obama term as responsibility for the economy went over to President Obama.

Now, there's a lot of debate during this bill about how we've lost jobs. That's true. Those jobs were lost in the early part of the Obama administration. As the gentleman knows, over the last 24 months, we've had 4 million new jobs created, 10 quarters of economic growth in our country, and the Dow

has doubled. The Dow has doubled since March of 2009. It's hard for me to see how that was a failure. It certainly hasn't been the success we'd like, but not a failure.

I tell my friend that, yes, we have a difference, and the public needs to come to grips with that difference and that debate, and that is whether or not we're going to pay for things we buy. And if we don't want to buy them, we won't have to pay for them, and we can cut taxes.

Unless the gentleman wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
APRIL 23, 2012

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE GSA SCANDAL

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the recently discovered GSA spending scandal is a prime example why Americans have lost faith in their government.

This week, I questioned GSA officials about the now infamous conference hosted in Las Vegas. This one lavish conference left American taxpayers with an \$822,000 tab.

Let me list just a few of the expense items from Las Vegas that are sure to enrage the American taxpayers: \$75,000 was spent on a bicycle-building exercise to encourage team building; \$3,200 was spent on mind readers to entertain the attendees. Guess what I'm thinking now. The average cost for breakfast per attendee, \$44—that's \$44 per person per day. And I save the worse for last, a \$30,000 pool party.

Adding insult to injury, the chief organizer of the 2010 Las Vegas conference was approved for a bonus by senior Obama officials for his work in organizing the conference.

Officials who organize and authorize wasteful spending must be held responsible. This body must work to end the culture of waste at GSA and other government agencies and ensure that taxpayer dollars are respected.

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the National Day of Silence, which is tomorrow. This is the

15th year we've commemorated the National Day of Silence, a time when students across the country remain silent for the whole day to draw attention to discrimination toward their LGBT peers.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning youth and their allies face verbal and physical bullying on a daily basis just for being who they are.

In a time when these teens are at a greater risk of suicide and self-harm, we cannot afford to be silent.

I'm proud to say that in my district, queer youth and allies work together to make life better. Many of our middle schools and high schools in my district host student-run gay-straight alliances which create a supportive space so that queer youth do not feel isolated.

I'm proud of my constituents for calling for a stop to harassment of GLBT individuals, and I encourage all Americans to do the same.

I am particularly proud of two high school seniors from my district:

Joaquin Garcia, from Pacific Collegiate School, and Lucy Walters, from Harbor High School, are two of 14 recipients of eQuality Scholarships in honor of their service and leadership within the LGBT community. Joaquin and Lucy are already making a difference in their communities, and I know they will continue making a difference at college.

Though many lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender youth advocates and their straight allies are silent tomorrow, we in Congress must never be silent. It is our job to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

SMALL BUSINESSES CREATE NEW JOBS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past two decades, our Nation's small businesses have generated 65 percent of new jobs. According to a recent small business survey from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, today 64 percent of small businesses stand idle at current staffing levels, with 52 percent not hiring because they aren't confident in our Nation's recovery, and another 33 percent pointing to uncertainty driven by Washington.

These concerns are justifiable, Mr. Speaker, with the Senate continually choosing to ignore our jobs crisis in favor of advancing an agenda that will only grow government, not our economy.

The latest proposal surely wasn't about economic growth, for it takes private investment away from small businesses and turns it over to bureaucracies. It wasn't even about fairness, because it was fair to no one—not to the wealthy who pay even more taxes instead of investing in our economy, and not to the rest of us who need jobs, growth, and greater opportunity.

With economic uncertainty still pervasive, every decision made by government must pass the simple test of