

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 32 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 32, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 658, FAA REAUTHORIZATION AND RE- FORM ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 658) to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 169, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—248

Adams	Costello	Hayworth
Aderholt	Cravaack	Heck
Akin	Crawford	Hensarling
Alexander	Crenshaw	Herger
Amodel	Cuellar	Herrera Beutler
Austria	Culberson	Hirono
Bachmann	Davis (CA)	Huelskamp
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Huizenga (MI)
Barletta	Denham	Hultgren
Barrow	Dent	Hunter
Bartlett	DesJarlais	Hurt
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins
Bass (NH)	Dold	Johnson (IL)
Benish	Dreier	Johnson (OH)
Berg	Duffy	Johnson, E. B.
Berkley	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Biggart	Ellmers	Jones
Bilbray	Emerson	Jordan
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Kelly
Bishop (GA)	Fincher	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Black	Flake	Kingston
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Kinzing (IL)
Bonner	Fleming	Kline
Bono Mack	Flores	Lance
Boren	Forbes	Landry
Boswell	Fox	Lankford
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Brady (TX)	Gallely	LaTourette
Brooks	Gardner	Latta
Buchanan	Garrett	Lewis (CA)
Bucshon	Gerlach	Lipinski
Buerkle	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Burgess	Gibson	Long
Burton (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Calvert	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Camp	Gosar	Lummis
Campbell	Granger	Lungren, Daniel
Canseco	Graves (GA)	E.
Cantor	Graves (MO)	Manzullo
Capito	Griffin (AR)	Marchant
Carnahan	Griffith (VA)	Marino
Carter	Grimm	Matheson
Cassidy	Guinta	McCarthy (CA)
Chabot	Guthrie	McCaul
Chaffetz	Hall	McClintock
Coble	Hanabusa	McCotter
Coffman (CO)	Hanna	McHenry
Cole	Harper	McIntyre
Conaway	Harris	McKeon
Cooper	Hartzler	McKinley
Costa	Hastings (WA)	

McMorris	Rehberg	Simpson
Rodgers	Reichert	Smith (NE)
Meehan	Renacci	Smith (NJ)
Mica	Ribble	Smith (TX)
Miller (FL)	Rigell	Southerland
Miller (MI)	Rivera	Stearns
Miller, Gary	Roby	Stivers
Murphy (PA)	Roe (TN)	Sullivan
Myrick	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Neugebauer	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Noem	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Nugent	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Nunes	Rokita	Tipton
Nunnelee	Rooney	Turner (NY)
Olson	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Palazzo	Roskam	Walberg
Paulsen	Ross (AR)	Walden
Pearce	Ross (FL)	Walsh (IL)
Pence	Royce	Webster
Perlmutter	Runyan	West
Petri	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
Pitts	Scalise	Whitfield
Platts	Schilling	Wilson (SC)
Poe (TX)	Schmidt	Wittman
Polis	Schock	Wolf
Pompeo	Schrader	Womack
Posey	Schweikert	Woodall
Price (GA)	Scott, Austin	Yoder
Quayle	Scott, David	Young (AK)
Quigley	Sessions	Young (FL)
Rahall	Shinkus	Young (IN)
Reed	Shuster	

NAYS—169

Ackerman	Gowdy	Owens
Altmire	Green, Al	Pallone
Amash	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Andrews	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Gutierrez	Payne
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Peters
Becerra	Himes	Peterson
Berman	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hochul	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Holden	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Holt	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Richardson
Brown (GA)	Inslee	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Capuano	(TX)	Rush
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Keating	T.
Chu	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kind	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kissell	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Schiff
Clay	Labrador	Schwartz
Cleaver	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Critz	Loebach	Slaughter
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lowey	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lujan	Stutzman
DeFazio	Lynch	Sutton
DeGette	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Matsui	Tierney
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Dingell	McCollum	Towns
Doggett	McDermott	Tsongas
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Van Hollen
Doyle	McNerney	Velázquez
Duncan (SC)	Meeks	Visclosky
Edwards	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Engel	Miller, George	Schultz
Eshoo	Moore	Waters
Farr	Moran	Watt
Fattah	Mulvaney	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Welch
Franks (AZ)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Napolitano	Woolsey
Garamendi	Neal	Yarmuth
Gohmert	Oliver	
Gonzalez		

NOT VOTING—15

Cardoza	Heinrich	Paul
Carson (IN)	Hinchey	Shuler
Finler	Honda	Sires
Fortenberry	Issa	Speier
Hahn	Mack	Turner (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1142

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 33, 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. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently not recorded on rollcall 33, on the Conference Report on H.R. 658, the FAA Reauthorization Act. I intended to vote “no” on the conference report because of the provisions it contains that would be devastating to workers’ rights and labor relations. These provisions take away the right for a secret ballot and codify minority-rule elections, as well as allowing for wholesale decertification of a whole host of unions.

I do not believe that a conference report on an aviation safety bill is the place to rewrite longstanding labor laws and impose unrelated and controversial labor provisions that will ultimately serve to harm both airline and railroad workers, and so I intended to vote “no” on rollcall 33.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1734, CIVILIAN PROPERTY REALIGNMENT ACT

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–385) on the resolution (H. Res. 537) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1734) to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, selling, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come, I am pleased to yield to my friend from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, 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 Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On

Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes for the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, which will be announced by the close of business today.

Building upon our legislative agenda this week, the House will consider two more bills next week aimed at reforming the Federal budget process, including H.R. 3521, the Expedited Legislative Line-Item Veto and Rescissions Act, a bipartisan bill sponsored by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN and cosponsored by Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, as well as H.R. 3581, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act, sponsored by Congressman SCOTT GARRETT.

In addition, the House will act on legislation passed in the Senate yesterday, commonly referred to as the STOCK Act.

Finally, the House may consider H.R. 1734, the Civilian Property Realignment Act, sponsored by Congressman JEFF DENHAM.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information and would ask him on the timing.

The conference committee has met twice on the payroll tax cut, the unemployment insurance, and the so-called "doc fix," or to ensure the fact that doctors are compensated and will be available for Medicare patients. The conference committee, Mr. Leader, has met twice since December 23. We adopted a motion to instruct, overwhelmingly, through the House to make sure that they reported back by February 17.

□ 1150

I think you may have read my comments in the press that if we do not do it by the 17th, then we're off for a week and we will be back the 27th, 28th, and 29th, come back the night of the 27th, and we'll be jammed at the end on Wednesday, the 29th. We only have 6 full days left before the February break. Now, that does not include our 6:30 start times.

House Democrats, Mr. Leader, stand ready to, frankly, I think, work through the weekend if that were necessary. But I'm very concerned that something that we all want to get done—and I've made the suggestion to my Democratic conferees, and they were equally amused as you are. I understand that.

I will tell you that I have great concerns that we're going to get to the 27th, 28th, and 29th and be in the same kind of confrontation and debacle that we found ourselves in in December. That's not good for your party. In my opinion, it's not good for our party. It's not good for the House and Senate; but it is certainly not good for the 160 million people who are going to be concerned about whether or not, in fact, their tax cut is going to continue, or the Medicare people who are going to

be concerned about whether their doc is going to be available, or the unemployed who are going to be concerned.

Now, of course, for the unemployed, we had some very good news. You didn't mention it in your opening comments, but I'm sure you were as excited as I was about the 257,000 new private sector jobs that were created last month; showed real progress.

But I will tell you that I'm very concerned about the timing and would be delighted to hear the gentleman's thoughts on the success and the progress of the conference committee.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, what I would say is the Republicans on the House side, led by Chairman CAMP, have been and are ready to make sure we resolve the issue of the payroll tax holiday extension right now. The issue has been the reluctance on the gentleman's side of the aisle on the other side of the Capitol. So if I thought that working 7 days a week, through weekends and all hours of the day and night would make a difference, I would be all for that as well.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this House continues to act. This House passed a yearlong extension that also did not have the effect of raiding the Social Security trust fund, something that the gentleman and I both want to make sure happens, that we restore the integrity of that fund for the people who are counting on it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say the House also, this week, acted on several measures that, frankly, are very relevant to the work of the conference committee, but yet no action by the Senate. One of those things, as the gentleman knows, was passed out of the House this week. It was a measure calling for a pay freeze at the Federal level for Federal employees, including Members of the House and Senate. This was a bipartisan vote; 309 Members voted for that. It allowed for about \$26 billion in savings that could be easily included in the conference committee deliberations, something that our side continues to want to include, but yet no answer from the Senate majority leader and his conferees.

So, again, I would tell the gentleman, please, we are as anxious as you are to try and resolve these issues.

We had another vote this week, Mr. Speaker, which garnered 400 votes in the House—a bipartisan bill—which called for some necessary reforms to the TANF program. These were reforms which preclude the use of the monies that beneficiaries receive for purchases of services at casinos and other types of establishments, that perhaps those monies could be better spent not in those places; but again, no response from the Senate.

And I would ask the gentleman if he could please direct his urgency towards the majority leader in the Senate to see if we can get this off the dime and resolve the issue of the payroll tax so we can, as the gentleman suggests,

send a very certain signal to the people who are struggling out there, working day in and day out, that their taxes will not go up.

As for the gentleman's suggestion about the job numbers, I don't know if he saw my public statement this morning, but I said that was welcome news, that when you have job creation like that, welcome news, but I also think we can do a lot better.

I was pleased to see that the President came out this week and said he now, too, wants to be a champion of small business; and we say we are happy to work with this White House so that we can provide the help to small businesses. We will be bringing to the floor, before tax day, a small business tax cut bill that goes right at the issue of helping small business people, allowing them more incentive to invest their capital so they can create jobs and we can see this economy really take off.

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

Of course we have long been a supporter of small business. We believe small business is the engine of our economy. We believe we need to grow entrepreneurs. We need to expand, frankly, small business and the middle class.

It was interesting what the gentleman referred to in response to my question. Yes, we understand that cutting the pay of average working Americans—who happen to be Federal employees, but they're average working Americans—is the way you want to pay for what we do. We, of course, want to pay for it with some of the wealthiest people in our country just contributing a little bit more as opposed to average working people who are struggling by. And, by the way, the sponsor of that piece of legislation to which you referred indicated he was having a tough time getting by supporting his family on the salary that he makes here in Congress.

Now, frankly, we offered, as you know, to have a vote on freezing Members of Congress' salary straight up—not hidden in another bill, but straight up—which I would have supported and my side would have supported overwhelmingly. I presume your side would have supported overwhelmingly. We, of course, didn't get that opportunity because, frankly, our priorities do, in fact, differ.

Average working people as opposed to the best off in America, that's the choice in this conference committee, apparently; because you want to pay for it with average working people taking a hit, and we want to pay for it by just asking just a little more from the wealthiest in America to help us through this tough patch that we're in.

Things are getting better. The gentleman—I haven't seen his release, but I will certainly look at his release. He says we ought to do better. I will tell the gentleman we're doing a lot better.

The gentleman knows that during the last 5 months of the Bush administration, we lost 3,192,000 jobs. The gentleman smiles because, oh, that's history. Well, it is history, and we ought to learn from it because we were following the economic policies the gentleman still continues to press upon the American people. We lost 3,192,000 jobs in 5 months. In the last 5 months, however, we have gained now over 1 million jobs. That's progress. In fact, over the last 22 months, we've gained over 3 million jobs so that we are making significant progress. Not enough. We dug a very, very deep hole and we're trying to get out of it, but the fact of the matter is losing 3 million jobs in 5 months and gaining 1 million jobs in 5 months is about a 4 million job difference.

So I tell my friend both in terms of who ought to pay for the investments that we have agreed we need to make. We don't want to raise taxes on these folks as the economy is still coming back, obviously showing great progress, but we don't want to pay for it with average working people having to pay the price.

□ 1200

I will tell my friend, I was disappointed that we didn't have a separate vote so that Members of Congress could vote straight up on their being frozen. And I will tell my friend that I will work with him, perhaps towards that end.

Now having said that, I am sure the gentleman has been in conversations with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP). Is the gentleman expecting a relatively early report back from the conference committee, hopefully prior to the 18th of February when we might be voting on this?

Mr. CANTOR. Let me respond, if you will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield, certainly.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, first of all, I do hope that we can act in an expeditious manner to accomplish the same goal that he's stated. That I agree with. We need to let the people of this country out there who are working so hard know that they are not going to have their taxes go up on them and that we should allow that certainty for a full year, the position this House has taken from the very beginning.

I would say to the gentleman about his assertions of our policies and those under the last President and perhaps their effect on job creation or job loss, the issue is right now—and my question to the gentleman is, as far as that's concerned: Doesn't he agree that we could be doing better?

And that's my point, Mr. Speaker: we can do better. We can do better by focusing on the private sector small businessmen and -women so that we can empower them to begin to invest and create jobs again. We can do better. That is what we intend to do straight up through policies that affect reduc-

tion of red tape in this town to make it easier for small businessmen and -women to operate; as I indicated before, a bill to be brought forward to provide for a 20 percent tax cut for small businesses.

And I hope if the gentleman says he's for small businesses that he'll join us in a bipartisan way to support a bill that provides for a 20 percent tax cut for small businesses.

Now, I would ask the gentleman as well, he continues to advocate higher taxes for people, higher taxes. That's what we hear: higher taxes on people who make a lot of money. Well, the fact is, the result of that is putting more money into this town, putting more money into the hands of Washington so that Washington can decide where people's money is spent.

We all know we've got a spending problem, and we all know that raising taxes does not dig us out of the hole. So I would just ask the gentleman, Does he think that's going to fix the problem? It's not as if we're saying we don't want to help the people who are out there struggling. That's what we're trying to do. So I'm looking forward to working with him in a bipartisan way to see if we can get resolution on these issues.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. And we all look forward to working together in a bipartisan way. We sure have found great difficulty doing it, however, because we have trouble having a meeting of the minds.

I will tell my friend that what I advocate over and over and over again is paying for what we buy. That's what I advocate. And if you don't want it, don't buy it.

You controlled this town for 8 years from an economic-policy standpoint. I know we were in charge of the Congress for the last 2 years. We couldn't pass anything over George Bush's veto. You and I both know that. So for 8 years, we didn't pay for what we bought; and we went from surplus to deficit. We went from a debt of \$5.6 trillion to a debt of almost \$11 trillion.

Have we added to the debt? Yes, we did. Why? Because we went into the deepest depression, starting in '07, that this country has been in in your lifetime and my lifetime; and I'm a lot older than you. So that's what I advocate: paying for what we buy and having the courage to make decisions on doing exactly that. And very frankly, on your side of the aisle, when you go and say, look, we need to pay for elections, who do you go to? You go to your Members, and you go to people who have some resources that they can contribute to an effort you think is very important.

I think America's efforts are very important. And I think those of us who have done better ought to pay a little more than those who are struggling, as the gentleman refers to. Yes, that's the difference. I believe it's the difference, and I will continue to advocate paying for what we buy. That's why I was for

statutory PAYGO, which George Bush abandoned and which essentially is not being followed today, as I think all of us should do.

So I will tell my friend that I think we ought to do better. I agree with him. And we did do better. We did do better under policies that I supported. We grew 22 million jobs in the nineties. We lost jobs in the 2000s. We went backwards. And the stock market went up 216 percent in the nineties. Under George Bush, it went down 26 percent. Yes, I think we can do better, and we ought to do better. And we ought to do better by investing.

Let me talk a little bit about the bill that the Speaker's talked about, you've talked about, it's been in the news: infrastructure and jobs. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee marked up a controversial highway bill—the gentleman says we want to work together. I agree with that. He and I try to do that. We don't always succeed, but we try to do it. They marked up the bill yesterday for 17 hours and finished around 3 a.m.

I don't know whether the gentleman knows this, but at the start of that debate, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member, asked all the members of the Transportation Committee, when the bill was put on, to raise their hand if they had read the bill. You know how many people raised their hand—that's a rhetorical question because I think the gentleman probably hasn't inquired of this—none. On an 800-page bill, not one person raised their hand that they had read the bill. There was a lot of discussion about reading the bill.

There was, of course, as you know, a bipartisan "no" vote. One of the senior members voted against it. This is in stark contrast to the unanimous vote that occurred in the United States Senate on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources also completed a controversial markup on opening ANWR to drilling—as I understand it, you are going to put that in the infrastructure bill—with the clear knowledge that that is a very controversial item that will not pass the United States Senate. You may have the votes here. That is similar to what happened on the payroll tax cut just last December.

If you are going to work on a bipartisan basis, we ought to understand that we are going to have to not try to push on one party or the other things that are unacceptable and won't pass and don't have the votes.

The reason that George Bush signed so many bills that we passed in the Congress in '07 and '08 was because we worked with the administration, and we worked with the Senate. The Senate and the House were controlled by Democrats; President Bush was in office. He signed more than twice as many bills that we passed. Why? Because we worked with him. We would urge you to do the same.

Is the gentleman planning to bring up the infrastructure bill to the floor

soon? And can he tell the Members if it will be considered under an open process? Furthermore, is the majority leader expecting there to be bipartisan cooperation on the infrastructure package so that we do not have to go up against another deadline? As the gentleman knows, on March 31 the highway authorization bill ends. We temporarily included it.

And let me end with this before you answer your question, because Ray LaHood was a leader in this Congress. Ray LaHood was a leader on your side of the aisle. Ray LaHood and I served together for a long time. I don't know whether you've seen his quote, but I think it bears consideration by your side of the aisle of a Republican from middle America—Peoria, Illinois—who your minority leader, Bob Michel, had as his chief of staff.

Here is what he said about the infrastructure bill that was marked up: "This is the most partisan transportation bill that I have ever seen, and it is also the most anti-safety bill I have ever seen." This is a direct quote from Ray LaHood, Republican, former Member of this House for many years, and former chief of staff to the minority leader Bob Michel. "It hollows out our number one priority, which is safety; and frankly, it hollows out the guts of the transportation efforts that we've been about for the last 3 years. It's the worst transportation bill I've ever seen during 35 years in public service," Ray LaHood, *Politico*, February 3. That's today. He said it today, in real time. This is real breaking news from the Transportation Secretary: the worst transportation bill he has seen in 35 years.

□ 1210

That does not, I tell my friend, bode well for bipartisan cooperation on a piece of legislation that nobody in the committee had read. So I'd ask my friend, do we expect to bring that bill up under those conditions in the near term?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, we expect to vote on the bill the week of the 13th. I think there will be adequate time for Members to review the bill and the text, to the gentleman's concern about Mr. RAHALL's inquiry last night in the committee. That is exactly why we are allowing for the time, so that Members can review such a big bill, a bill that means so many jobs to so many Americans.

I hope that the gentleman will be true to his nature, which is bipartisan, and to work with us, because this American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act is just that; it's a jobs bill. It is a bill that can provide some certainty to our contractors, some certainty to our communities so that we can start to grow again and see jobs proliferate.

But I find it ironic that the gentleman complains about paying for it, because he talks about our wanting to

open up our resources, our resources offshore, our resources in ANWR as, number one, an attempt to allow America to develop finally a national energy policy, but to also promote jobs.

The gentleman knows, as I do, the energy sector provides an awful lot of jobs in plenty parts of this country, and can do a lot more, and is willing. Private capital, willing to deploy to create jobs.

But I find it also ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman complains that there's no bipartisanship because somehow we're not working with the administration. Well, the administration's been absent on all of this. They're not interested in working with us to create a product where we can see jobs created.

As you can see, the Secretary sits in his office and opines and attacks the bill, saying it is all the negative things that he said. Now, that's not a way to collaborate and work together. And the gentleman knows that as well. The gentleman knows that that is certainly not how things have worked in this town if you want to produce a result.

So the gentleman can claim the mantle of wanting to work together and that the administration is being trampled by some action here. He knows good and well, Mr. Speaker, that this administration has been absent in so many of the discussions on so many important issues. And the fact that we differ on policy, yes. But I think the gentleman also knows that reasonable people can disagree, but that doesn't mean that we can't work together to find some things that we agree on.

Certainly, we agree on jobs. The gentleman says we agree on small business. I'm looking for his support of that small business tax credit bill. And we agree on infrastructure spending being an important part of our economy. So I'm looking forward to the next week or so, as the bill works its way to the floor, to hopefully garner his support.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Wonderful, wonderful logic. A Republican leader in this House is appointed to include bipartisan—and the Secretary of Transportation, who was a leader in this House, and the chief of staff of the minority leader of this House, says that the bill you have drafted, that your Members didn't read before they passed it out of committee—and the public, I'm sure, is glad that at least we're going to read it before we pass it. I hope that's the case. I've heard a lot of talk about reading the bills. Nobody read it before they passed it out of committee. And the Republican Secretary of Transportation, former chief of staff of the minority leader, says, my friend, it's the most partisan bill he has ever seen in 35 years.

And then you say, well, I know we passed the most partisan bill in 35 years, but, gee, the administration won't work with us. You don't accept

that premise. I understand that. But it's ironic that you say the administration won't work with you.

You and I both know Ray LaHood happens to be one of the more bipartisan people with whom you and I have served. I've worked frequently with Congressman LaHood when he represented Peoria, as a Republican in the House of Representatives. He and I worked together on a lot of issues. Why? Because he wanted to get things done. He wasn't just simply interested in making political points.

Now, you bring up ANWR in terms of pay-for. I'm for paying this. You didn't hear me say anything about offshore drilling, this and that. I did about ANWR because you and I both know, in a bipartisan way, many of your Members have voted against opening up ANWR, and we have, as the gentleman knows, millions of acres, millions of acres currently available for drilling in Alaska right now as we speak.

So we want to have a bipartisan—but putting an 800-page bill on the table, no chance to read it, passing it in a 17-hour marathon session, and then having clearly no—having not worked at all with Ray LaHood, and if you're telling me that Ray LaHood won't work with Republicans, I simply do not accept that premise. I think that's a disservice to Ray LaHood if that's what you are saying. He is the Secretary of Transportation. And there is no doubt in my mind, none, zero, that if Mr. MICA wants to work with Ray LaHood on a bipartisan bill, Ray LaHood will be here as many hours, days, and weeks as Mr. MICA needs him here, and I think you would, hopefully, agree with that proposition.

Ray LaHood is a Republican, but he is a bipartisan American who wants to get things done for our country and create those jobs of which you speak, which all of us want to do.

We have a jobs bill, by the way, that you have not brought to the floor. What's one of the aspects of that jobs bill? Infrastructure, investing in infrastructure. That bill has languished for 5 months now, not brought to the floor by the majority leader, who has the authority to bring it to the floor, and I've, of course, been urging him to do so.

Now, if he'd like to comment—I have another point, but if he wants to comment on what I have said, I yield.

Mr. CANTOR. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. I join the gentleman in thinking Secretary LaHood is a fine gentleman, but all I can say is actions speak louder than words.

What I would say to the gentleman about his request for the President's jobs bill and whether we're bringing the whole bill up for a vote, I'd ask the gentleman, How many Members on his side of the aisle have actually sponsored that bill?

I think that there are certainly many elements of that bill that we can all agree on, and, in fact, we have voted on four separate elements, big elements,

of the President's small business agenda that he announced this week that were part of that bill: crowd funding, many offerings to help small business access financing; a bill to provide for 100 percent depreciation; the provisions that will allow for more ability for small business to see money go to the bottom line so they can grow; and a bill that we passed out of this House to eliminate country caps for immigration for highly skilled workers. All these are part of the President's proposals. All these the House has passed, and they sit, and they sit on the other side of the Capitol.

So I would say to the gentleman, he knows, as well as I do, that more stimulus spending as a part of that, the President's proposal, is something we don't accept, but there's plenty in there that we can agree on.

Back to the notion of bipartisanship. Let's set aside differences and find where we can agree. These are areas that we can agree on. So I would say to the gentleman, please work with us. Please point the ire to the majority leader on the other side of the Capitol and say, bring these bills up. These are jobs bills. The President said so this week.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman knows that a number of those proposals had bipartisan support in this House, I think have bipartisan support over in the Senate. But they need to be paid for, and that's where the contention comes, as the gentleman knows.

Let me ask you, on another subject, if I might, the STOCK Act.

Yet, before I do that, I appreciate the gentleman's observation with respect to those bills that the President has suggested we do that we have done.

Mr. CANTOR. If the gentleman could yield just for a correction. There's no need for pay-fors on these bills. These bills are something that were cleared out of the House in a revenue neutral way.

Mr. HOYER. The individual bills. You're right.

Mr. CANTOR. Right. So, again, the gentleman is correct in saying there is bipartisan support for these bills. The President supports them. Where's the problem? It's across the hallway here, and if we could actually get the majority there to help move these bills, we could make some progress.

Mr. HOYER. We could make some progress if, frankly, the majority leader could get 60 votes to enact the legislation and transact business on the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately, as the gentleman very well knows, the majority leader, HARRY REID, has had very great difficulty getting 60 votes to proceed with business on the floor of the House of the United States Senate. I think that's unfortunate.

But let me move on because the gentleman went from an infrastructure bill, which, as Secretary LaHood said, was the most partisan bill he's seen in 35 years, and shifted to the jobs, on which we agree. The fact of the matter

is that I want to talk about another piece of legislation that the Senate has worked on. We have a bill here. We've asked that it be taken from the floor, from the desk and put on the floor, and that's the STOCK Act. The gentleman has expressed support for the STOCK Act. I'm hopeful that we can pass a House bill and then go to conference with the Senate on a bill in the near future.

Would the gentleman comment on that.

□ 1220

Mr. CANTOR. It has always been my intention to try and act with dispatch on this very important issue and to get the President a bill that he can sign as quickly as possible.

Again, the underlying notion is, as the gentleman believes, we need to make sure that the people that send us here know that we are acting and abiding by the trust that they place in us. That's what the STOCK Act is about. So what we're going to do next week, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, is we are going to act with dispatch. We are going to take up the Senate bill. We are currently reviewing the actions the Senate took on that bill, and we intend to strengthen that bill, again, to do so in a way that can get a bill to the President's desk as quickly as possible so that there is no misunderstanding on the part of the people that sent us here that they can have trust in this institution and the Members, and there is no perception whatsoever that anyone here misuses information that they gain in the performance of their duties for their own personal benefit.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response, and he says the earliest day possible. I tell my friend that TIM WALZ of Minnesota has had a bill, as the gentleman probably knows, of the STOCK Act—also, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, ranking member of the Rules Committee, has worked on for literally a decade or more—so we have legislation which is available to take, frankly, from the desk, pass that, and go immediately to conference with the Senate.

The gentleman indicates he wants to change the Senate bill. I think that that may be appropriate; but if he does, we're going to have to go to conference in any event. So my suggestion is you take TIM WALZ's bill, act on that, a House bill, and we go to conference on that bill. That seems to me that's the most expeditious way to accomplish what the gentleman says he wants to accomplish in a very quick fashion.

I think TIM WALZ of Minnesota would be happy to hear that and available to work towards that end, along with LOUISE SLAUGHTER.

Mr. CANTOR. I say to the gentleman, first of all, I know the gentleman likes to talk about past Congresses. When he was House majority leader, he did not bring this STOCK Act to the floor, and it was a submitted bill. So let's set the record straight. This majority leader is

going to bring a STOCK Act bill to the floor next week.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. WALZ's bill actually would weaken the Senate bill; and it is our intention to pass and get to the President a workable, strong bill that makes sure that we're delivering on the promise that we made to the people that sent us here. I hope the gentleman—I know he wants to join me in the effort to re-instill the confidence of the public that we are abiding by that trust.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us, hopefully, agree with what the leader has just said. We clearly want to make sure the American public has confidence and trust in the actions we take in that they are not driven by personal interests but by public interests, by a concern for the welfare of the people we represent in our country.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian E. Pate, one of his secretaries.

HOURLY OF MEETING

Mr. CANTOR. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Iran is rapidly building a nuclear weapon. Recent reports reveal that Israel may be preparing to attack Iran. Some critics, including the United States, say that Israel should not attack because it would derail the sanctions process; but sanctions are not fully accomplishing their objective. Russia, China, India, and even Japan all continue to buy Iranian oil.

For Israel, a nuclear-armed Iran threatens its very existence. Ahmadinejad, the little fellow from the desert, says he wants to wipe Israel off the map. Experts agree that Iran soon will have the power to do just that.

Israel has the right to defend itself, the right to be left alone, and the right to prevent its annihilation. Iran cannot get nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest hope for the world is a regime change from within by the people of Iran. The United States should verbally support