

subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 1 p.m. in pro forma session. No votes are expected. 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 few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, the House will consider H.R. 7, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act of 2012. The House may also consider legislation relating to H.R. 3630, the Temporary Payroll Tax Cut Continuation Act.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information with respect to the two pieces of legislation and the suspension bills.

If I might inquire, Mr. Leader, of the timing. The conference committee has met, as all of us know, a few times since being appointed on December 23. They were supposed to have a meeting today, but apparently that meeting was cancelled. We adopted a motion to instruct conferees on January 18, with only 16 Republicans opposing and just a few Republicans opposing this time on a similar motion to instruct, urging the conferees to report back by February 17.

You know as well as anybody, we will be off for the President's week work period, and we will not be back until the night of the 27th, which only gives us the 2 days and that evening to pass this bill if we do not pass it before the 17th.

In December, we almost, as you well know, did not extend the payroll tax holiday or the unemployment or the SGR package. That would have resulted, as the gentleman knows, in 160 million Americans having a tax increase, benefits lost for many unemployed Americans—almost 2.3 over the next 3 months—and we only have 3 full days left before the February break. Of course, the gentleman, Mr. CAMP, the

chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, chairs that conference.

Can the gentleman tell us whether or not there is a reasonable expectation that we will be able to act on this bill and have the conference committee report on the House floor?

Mr. CANTOR. I will say to the gentleman, as I said before and as reflected by the vote that just occurred on the motion to instruct conferees, we, too, desire a resolution of this issue next week. I think the gentleman knows that we've been on this floor before in the same discussion where it is imperative for us to send a signal to the hardworking taxpayers of this country that they're not going to have their taxes go up. So it is my hope that we're going to see some productivity out of the conference committee.

I think the gentleman knows my position as to why there has been no productivity. Frankly, last week, I urged the gentleman to point his ire to the other side of the Capitol because it is that side of the Capitol and Leader REID who have been unwilling to come forward with a resolution to this issue.

□ 1050

As the gentleman knows, the House has taken its position. We believe we ought to extend the payroll tax holiday for a year and do so in a responsible manner so as not to raid the Social Security trust fund. But there's been no willingness on the part of Leader REID and his conferees to even offer a suggestion as to how to resolve this impasse.

So, again, I say to the gentleman, we are committed to making sure taxes don't go up on hardworking people in these economic times.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am pleased to hear that.

As the gentleman knows, Mark Zandi just a few days ago said that failure to extend the payroll tax and the unemployment insurance benefits "would deliver a significant blow" to our fragile economic recovery and could cost our economy 500,000 jobs and raise the unemployment rate by at least three-tenths of a point and lower economic growth by seven-tenths of a point.

Now I'm pleased to hear what the majority leader has said, but of course we still have some concern. Representative PAUL BROWN, one of your Members from Georgia said, This payroll tax holiday is just a gimmick to try to get Obama reelected. This is bad policy. Representative CHAFFETZ from Utah, one of your colleagues, said, Tax holidays just are bad policy. A year is pretty short. The chairman of your campaign committee, PETE SESSIONS, was quoted in the L.A. Times. Representative PETE SESSIONS of Texas, who heads the House Republican campaign committee, called Obama's plan—that is, the extension of the payroll tax—"a horrible idea." He said GOP candidates would have no difficulty explaining to voters why they

want to let the tax break expire. And then, of course, the chairman of the conference committee, my good friend, for whom I have a great deal of respect, apparently does not agree with what the majority leader just said in wanting to extend this tax cut, because he said, I'm not in favor of that. I don't think that's a good idea.

Now that was, admittedly, back in August, so it was some months ago when he said that. But it gives us some concern that the leadership of the conference committee, Mr. CAMP and others, are in the position where they don't really think, as seemed to be reflected in the last year, that this tax cut ought to be extended. They do, however, believe—very strongly, as I understand it—that the tax cut for the wealthiest in America, the Bush tax cuts, ought to be extended, and they ought to be extended without paying for it. And, in fact, you provided in your rule that you adopted in this Congress that they could be extended without paying for them.

I don't think that's your position, as I understand it, with respect to tax cuts for middle class Americans. Would the gentleman like to comment on those observations?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, really it's not productive to engage in politics and division. We ought to be about multiplication here. We ought to be about growing the economy. We ought not be talking in the way that the gentleman suggests, that somehow we Republicans prefer one group of people over another. That's not true. We're here fighting for the hardworking taxpayers.

I just said, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman, that we, as Republicans in this House, do not support taxes going up on anybody. We believe that Washington spends too much money. We don't believe you ought to tax anybody, especially the job creators, the small businessmen and women who we're relying on to create jobs and get this economy back to where it needs to be, in a growth mode.

So the gentleman knows very well my position, and it is the position of our conference. We do not want to see taxes going up on hardworking taxpayers. I said it before, and I will say it again: We hope that the conferees can produce something for us to vote on, but we are not in any way, shape, or form advocating for taxes to go up on hardworking people. No. We are for making sure that doesn't happen. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many times I can say that to underscore our commitment.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his recommitment to that proposition.

Let me ask the gentleman, therefore, given the fact, am I correct that you do not believe the extension of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts need to be paid for? Is that still your position?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, again, the question has to do with the gentleman and his side's and the President's insistence that somehow the math requires us to raise taxes on small businessmen and women. We don't believe that. We don't believe that we ought to let tax rates go up and create a tax hike on the small business people of this country because, number one, that exacerbates the challenge that we're already dealing with in trying to get this economy growing. And number two, it will put more money into the hands of Washington to begin spending that money without paying down the debt.

The gentleman knows very well our commitment to making sure we get the fiscal house in order. He knows very well that we believe you've got to fix the problem and not go in and ask the small businessmen and women to pay more taxes to dig a hole deeper. We believe you ought to fix the problem, stop taking small business money away from the men and women who make it, and let them continue to put it back into their enterprises and create jobs. That's what we're trying to do. And I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure we accomplish that end.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's answer. It doesn't surprise me, but he didn't answer my question.

My question was: you amended your rules in this House so that the extension of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts did not have to be paid for. I'm asking, is that the gentleman's position now? It's a very simple question. Yes or no? It is, or it is not.

Mr. CANTOR. If I could, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does he think that the payroll tax holiday extension for the year needs to be paid for?

Mr. HOYER. I don't necessarily think it needs to be paid for for exactly the reason you pointed out. What you pointed out was, you don't want to depress—either by increasing the taxes on small business, as you point out—we're not for increasing taxes on small business. We are for asking those who have made the best in our society over the last 10 years, make the most, make \$1 million or more, we do believe, yes, a greater contribution is in order because our country has a challenged situation that we need to respond to.

Having said that, I believe that it ought to be consistent, in terms of your application of not paying for tax cuts, for it to be also applicable to middle income, hardworking Americans who find themselves in a real pinch in this present economy, that we would take a similar position.

All I'm asking the gentleman, is your position on the middle class tax cut, which we are talking about, and it is in conference, the same as it is on the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003? That's all I'm asking.

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

I would ask in response to that, does he not agree that there is a difference between the nature of the tax relief in the payroll tax and the nature of existing tax rates on the marginal level as well as capital gains? And along those lines, would he not, then, be advocating a position that would say, it's okay to raid the Social Security trust fund if you're not going to pay for the extension of the payroll tax holiday?

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman goes off in about seven directions on that question, in my view. What I believe is that it ought to be a consistent policy, as it relates to keeping taxes down on hardworking Americans, that we apply to the wealthiest in America. Now whether they're temporary or permanent, it makes an economic difference to the people in question. And hardworking Americans—160 million of them—are hoping that their taxes will not go up on March 1. The only way they're going to not go up on March 1 is if we pass—as we had a great struggle doing in December—if we pass a conference report that will be reported out of the conference committee headed up by Mr. CAMP which in fact makes sure that those taxes don't increase.

You say you don't want them to increase. I say we don't want them to increase. We seem to have an agreement on that rhetorically, although I have quoted a number of your leaders who say they think it's a bad idea.

But having said that, my question to you is: is your position consistent with both the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts and these tax cuts? That's all I'm asking.

□ 1100

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I respond to the gentleman, I was not in seven different directions. It's very simple. I asked the gentleman: Are you okay with raiding the Social Security trust fund? Because your response to my question indicated to me that it's fine for you and your side to say: Let's just raid the Social Security trust fund, extend the payroll tax holiday without any pay-fors; is that okay?

Mr. HOYER. Your President, who you supported very strongly, of course, as I recall, when he wanted to raid the Social Security trust fund said there was no trust fund. Now, I believe there is a trust fund, and I think we have a moral responsibility to make sure that that trust fund is kept whole. And, in fact, as you well know, we will keep it whole. We will sign the proper IOUs so that that trust fund is intact. There will be no reduction in the Social Security tax, and the gentleman knows it. The gentleman knows that that trust fund will be as secure tomorrow as it is today, and I presume that both of us have a commitment to that end. Yes, we will have to make whole the trust fund money that does not come in on the tax cut, just as we had to make money for the war, for the prescription drug bill, and the Bush tax cuts whole by borrowing from somebody, usually China and other nations around the world.

We went from a \$5.6 trillion surplus to a \$10-plus trillion deficit. Why? Because we did things and didn't pay for them. So if the gentleman is asking me do I believe the Social Security trust fund ought to be kept whole, the answer is an emphatic, absolute yes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I'd say to the gentleman, he has answered the same question in two different ways. And he's also gone off not in seven different directions but nine or ten when he starts talking about the former President George Bush. George Bush has nothing to do with this debate, has nothing to do with the issue before it.

What I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, is, number one: Does he not agree that if we pay for the extension of the Federal tax holiday, we are making sure that we attempt to address the raid on the Social Security trust fund? And is that not different than talking about marginal rates on small business men and women? Is that not different than talking about keeping the capital gain rates the same on investors and entrepreneurs in America? We need to put investment capital back into the economy, the private economy. And so my point was not seven different directions, my point is just that.

Again, I would say to the gentleman that it bothers me to hear that the gentleman just wants to rely on an IOU. The public is tired of saying, yes, we'll owe it. We'll owe it. We'll pay it later. What we're saying is let's make sure that we don't dig the hole any deeper. Let's make sure we don't raid the Social Security trust fund. That's why we are saying let's pay for it.

But again, to the gentleman's point about trying to expedite things so we can have a result out of the conference committee, there has been no activity, no activity on the part of the Senate. They're not serious. They're not serious on wanting to address the issue—at least, they've not been thus far—and we're running out of time.

So again, I guess the gentleman's solution is go ahead and raid the Social Security trust fund and let's extend the payroll tax holiday. And if that's the gentleman's position, then we know the position I would imagine of the minority on this position.

Mr. HOYER. Well, the gentleman has talked a lot but hasn't answered my question. And the question was a simple one: Do you believe the same principle applies to the '01-'03 tax cuts as applied to the middle income working people's tax cut that we're talking about?

And I'll tell you this, my friend, if we were talking about the taxes that you're talking about, they would go through like greased lightning and there would be no question but, oh, of course, we've got to continue those tax cuts. But when it comes to average working Americans, and the only way we can get them a tax cut—this is the first time we've really talked about real tax cuts for middle-income working Americans. It has got a logjam that

has hit. It hit in December, and we came that close to not having that tax cut, and we're about to come that close again. I'm just telling the gentleman that if he applies the same principle, we could get this done.

Now I'm for paying for, frankly, the middle-income tax cut. I'm for paying for it, as the gentleman well knows, by a surtax on those who have done the best, not because I want to penalize them, but because all of us in this room, maybe not all of us, but most of us in this room, have done pretty well. There are some people in this country who haven't done pretty well. And as Clint Eastwood walked down that road that we saw during the Super Bowl, he said at half time, "We can do better." And I'll tell you what they said in the locker room: Every one of us, according to our ability to get it done, needs to get it done. That's what I'm saying to my friend.

I think the position you would be taking would be radically different and that that conference committee would have had a report out on this floor if we were talking about tax cuts for millionaires that would have passed like that. Absolutely, that's my position. I believe it. And, very frankly, I think the American people believe it.

I yield to my friend if he would like to comment on that, and then we will go to the infrastructure bill, which I know you'd like to talk about as well.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'll just wrap it up by saying I don't think there was anybody, any working American that did not benefit from the '01-'03 tax relief. So again, the gentleman's attempt to divide this country, saying that some benefit from this and others benefited from that, it's not the way that I think most Americans look at it. We're all in this together, okay.

So again, we're trying to make sure that taxes don't go up on anybody. We're trying to do it responsibly. And the gentleman does, and acknowledges, that the payroll tax holiday involves a tax that is dedicated to the viability of the Social Security trust fund. And the gentleman knows that if we pass that bill because of his insistence and the insistence of the leader on the Democratic side of the aisle in the Senate, the majority leader in the Senate, that if we have to go ahead and just do it unpaid for, then we have created more of a problem and raided the Social Security trust fund.

So again, if that's the choice, if the gentleman is saying that his side is not going to support an extension of the Federal tax holiday unless it's unpaid for, then I guess we know where we stand, and the American people know where we stand, because they'll force a raid on the Social Security trust fund.

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

The gentleman has a habit that, frankly, disturbs me, I'll tell my friend. I didn't say that at all. As a matter of fact, my last comment was I think it ought to be paid for. Now, let me explain what that means.

I think it ought to be paid for. I have been consistent on that position. Frankly, I was consistent on that position on all of the bills that we passed through this House, including your two tax bills of '01 and '03. I thought they ought to be paid. You thought they ought not be paid for. And the gentleman talks about looking at the past; they didn't work out so well. They were supposed to grow our economy. They were supposed to explode jobs. We lost jobs in the private sector. The only reason we had a plus 1 million over 8 years was because we grew in the public sector. We lost jobs in the private sector on that economic program. It didn't work, in my opinion. Paid for or not paid for, it did not work. But it did blow a hole in the deficit.

What I'm saying and will say again, yes, I think it ought to be paid for. What I think it ought not be paid for with is by taking it out of the hide of average working people in this country, which is part of the way you want to pay for it. I don't think that is good policy because I think that will further depress the economy and take dollars out of the hands of hardworking people.

Yes, I think it ought to be paid for, and paying for things is tough. And we didn't pay for things in the last decade, and that's why we dug this deep, deep hole we're in.

Now, if we want to go on to the infrastructure bill, I'd like to do that unless the gentleman wants to make an additional comment.

On the infrastructure bill, you indicate that it may come to the floor. Can you tell me under what kind of a rule that will come to the floor? Will it be an open rule, as has been projected?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman, the Rules Committee has announced that there is an amendment deadline for Members to get their amendments in by Monday morning, and it will then proceed in the normal process to vote on a rule to govern the debate on the American Energy Infrastructure Jobs Act.

Mr. HOYER. It's my understanding, Mr. Leader, this bill is over 1,000 pages long. It was marked up just shortly after it was introduced and finalized. Is the gentleman concerned by the length of that bill and the short time that Members have to review it? And the very short time that the public, which will essentially have almost no opportunity to review it, is the gentleman concerned about that?

□ 1110

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, maybe the gentleman is confusing this majority with the one he was the leader in, because we have now seen all the committees, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, mark up and consider amendments from both sides. H.R. 7, in its entirety, was posted

at approximately noon yesterday, February 8. At noon yesterday, it was on line for everyone to see. The vote is scheduled for next Friday, February 17.

Given the process of all the committees and all of the markups and the willingness to entertain amendments from both sides and now posting yesterday, Wednesday, when the vote is next Friday, I think that we are providing and living up to the commitment we've made, that we're going to have a much more open process, that the public is going to be able to enjoy its right to know what we're doing, and Members and their staffs, as well, can do what they need to do to prepare for their amendments and their votes on this bill.

Mr. HOYER. What I was confusing was your rhetoric now and your rhetoric as it related to a bill that was longer in pages but had 10 times a greater period of time for debate and discussion, considered by an extraordinarily large number of committees in both the Senate and the House, town meetings all over this country about that bill. What I'm confusing is your rhetoric as it related to the Affordable Care Act and your rhetoric related to the transportation bill, which has had probably one-twentieth or one-thirtieth of the time to be considered by the public. I don't know that anybody has had a town meeting or had the opportunity for the public to have input on this bill as it is now written. Very frankly, I may be confusing it with the bill that we just adopted on suspension of the calendar without any opportunity to amend it, which was filed less than 24 hours ago.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows where I'm going on that last comment, because I will just point out the fact that, when he was the majority leader, that bill, the STOCK Act, had sat dormant, and he refused as the majority leader to pick up the bill and bring it to the floor of the House.

Given the vote that we just saw, I think that there was probably legitimate work to improve and strengthen the bill, which indicated and was reflected in the vote that we just had on the STOCK Act. As for the gentleman's suggestion that somehow I'm confusing this bill with others and his reference to the Affordable Care Act, the public doesn't like that bill; right? It doesn't. I'm thinking that perhaps the gentleman is confusing this bill with one that came up during his term as majority leader when the cap-and-trade bill was filed at 2 a.m. and then we were asked to vote on it at 10 o'clock the next morning.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that we have provided for over a week's time and then some for Members to take a look at the full version and to give Members time to prepare their amendments until next Monday so that we can have a full and robust debate on this bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman says full time, but very frankly there wasn't participation

by everybody in this full discussion. In fact, as I said last week and I will reiterate this week, because he hasn't changed his position, Ray LaHood, Republican, former chief of staff to the Republican leader in this House, former chairman of an appropriations subcommittee on the Republican side of the aisle, says:

This is the most partisan transportation bill I've ever seen, and it is almost the most antisafety bill I've ever seen. It hollows out our number one priority, which is safety; and, frankly, it hollows out the guts of the transportation efforts that we have been about for the last 3 years. It is the worst transportation bill I've ever seen during 35 years of public service.

Ray LaHood, Republican, Secretary of Transportation.

Whatever time the gentleman has spent that he thinks exposing this bill, he didn't expose it on our side and he apparently didn't expose it in a way that reached bipartisan agreement from the Secretary of Transportation.

I will tell you, I lament the fact, Mr. Leader, when I was the majority leader—the gentleman likes to refer to that—the transportation bill passed with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote. Every transportation bill that I've seen in the 30 years I've been in the Congress of the United States has passed on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, and it came out of committee almost unanimously. This bill, as the gentleman knows, came out on a purely partisan vote. Actually, it was a bipartisan opposition because Mr. PETRI, long-time member of the Transportation Committee, and, of course, Mr. LATOURETTE are not too happy with the bill either, as the gentleman knows, who is a senior Member on your side, one of your leaders on your side of the aisle. So I will tell my friend that unfortunately we have a situation where you're going to bring a bill up next week which clearly is a partisan bill, which does not enjoy bipartisan support, contrary to every transportation bill that I think we've passed in this House in the 30 years I've been here.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I am just marveling at the fact that I don't understand what the gentleman is seeing here. The Washington Post has just done extensive coverage and a story on that transportation bill and the 5,000-plus earmarks that were involved in the bill that he is bragging about.

We're in a new day here. We're shining the light of day. We're saying no more earmarks. We're not doing things the way we used to do them, and that is exactly what the people want. They want a reformed Congress that belongs to them, that works for them, and not the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I look forward to his amendments that he submits for Monday to be considered by the Rules Committee so that we can proceed, as we have on so many bills, in an open debate on the floor of this House, unlike

we ever experienced in majorities past. I would say to the gentleman, let's really try and agree. We have to reform this system. We are standing up for reform, whether it be no more earmarks, whether it be continued positing of positions online so that Members have enough time to review, with an open announcement of how long the amendment deadline is, with a continued pattern of allowing for debate on amendments on both sides of the floor. We're trying to change this institution so it can actually live up to what the people are expecting and for us to be able to abide by their trust.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment.

I think the American people apparently don't think we're accomplishing that objective that you want to accomplish by virtue of their response to the polls about what they think of the job that we've done over the last year.

Let me say in addition to that, the bills I was referring to, my friend—yes, while I was the majority leader, we had the House and the Senate. I said 30 years. Of the 12 years that your party had the chairmanship of the Transportation Committee, we passed bills on a bipartisan basis, and we respected transparency.

As the gentleman knows on earmarks, you quadrupled the number of earmarks under your leadership—not your personal leadership, but under Republican control of the House of Representatives. When we came in, what we did was said they all had to be online. Members had to put them on their Web site, and committees had to identify where those came from. Now, personally, we made them very transparent. You've eliminated them temporarily. We'll see whether that holds.

But we will move on to the question of whether or not, when you say we're going to have open amendments, whether or not the amendments that are germane will be made in order so that, in fact, we can impact on the bill.

The gentleman says he is interested in seeing my amendments. I think most of the amendments will come from our committee members. They are the ones that are struggling to find out exactly what this bill does. And we don't believe it is paid for, by the way, as I think the gentleman probably has seen in the CBO report.

Let me ask you this: do you believe this bill is a jobs bill?

Mr. CANTOR. I believe that what is needed, Mr. Speaker, is some certainty so that the agencies at the State level can operate with their plans going forward for infrastructure needs. I believe that the private sector that is heavily involved with the infrastructure industry can know how to plan so they can make investments necessary so that we can see the maintenance, repair, and expansion of our infrastructure system in this country.

We're about trying to say let's grow. Let's grow. Let's try and work together so we can grow this economy. The

economy is dependent upon an infrastructure future that is certain.

□ 1120

The gentleman also knows that we have in the bill a pay-for that is derived from the expansion of the ability to explore in the deep ocean off our coasts because it's an energy resource that we should be utilizing. That, as well, holds a potential for thousands of new jobs.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are all about job creation. And I hope that the gentleman can join us in what is titled the American Energy Infrastructure Jobs Act.

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

Am I to take it, therefore, he disagrees with Speaker BOEHNER when Speaker BOEHNER said, just a few days ago, We're not making the claim that spending taxpayer money on transportation projects creates jobs. We don't make that claim.

So, this would not be a jobs bill from that standpoint; am I correct?

Mr. CANTOR. Again, the gentleman, if he wants to play gotcha—

Mr. HOYER. I'm not playing gotcha. I want to figure out whether this is a jobs bill. We haven't had a jobs bill in over 400 days.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just heard what I said: we can create jobs if we open up the ability for more energy exploration. We can create jobs if we provide some certainty to the industries and the State agencies—as well as the Federal agencies—that are involved in planning and charting the course for infrastructure maintenance, repair and expansion in this country.

Growth requires infrastructure that is at top notch, and we know we're a far cry from that in this country. So the gentleman understands my point: growth comes from better infrastructure; growth comes from expanding the ability to explore our natural resources off our coast, something that, unfortunately, most Members on his side of the aisle have not been supportive of in terms of charting a more certain and responsible energy future.

Does the gentleman have any more scheduling questions?

Mr. HOYER. These are all scheduling questions. These are scheduling questions as to whether or not we're going to have legislation on the floor that can get us from where we are to where we want to be.

The gentleman knows that the Senate has passed a bipartisan bill out of committee with Senator INHOFE, a Republican, and Senator BOXER—not exactly ideological soul mates—coming together and agreeing on infrastructure. Why? Because they believe it creates jobs.

What I'm trying to figure out from you, you go from other aspects of the bill that create jobs, and you say infrastructure is necessary for growth. My

reading of that is, as the President's pointed out, investing in infrastructure does, in fact, grow jobs.

To the extent that we can pass a bill, scheduling a bill that has bipartisan support here and bipartisan support there, and the support of the President of the United States, is what we ought to be doing. Doing it in a partisan fashion undercuts our scheduling of moving that forward. That's my point. I think the gentleman understands that point.

But I would hope that, as we work on this bill, we could do what the Senate's done, which they don't do very often, and come together in a bipartisan way, as we have historically done in this House on Transportation and Infrastructure bills, so important for the growth of our country and the creation of jobs and the moving forward—as you say, and I believe as well, we ought to come together and accomplish.

Unless the gentleman has anything further, I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

**ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY,
FEBRUARY 9, 2012 TO MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 13, 2012**

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Monday, February 13, 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

REMEMBERING KELSEY LOMISON

(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, Kelsey Lomison, 77, of Orviston, Pennsylvania, from the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, died on Monday, February 6, of this week.

Centre and Clinton Counties lost a great friend. Kelsey Lomison lived his 77 years serving and making a difference in the lives of individuals, families, and communities. He was an extraordinary caring leader in many facets of life, from singing for area churches, organizing benefits for persons and families in need, and serving Curtin Township and his home community of Orviston.

As a community leader, Kelsey demonstrated a deep commitment to serving his neighbors. His leadership within the Howard Area Lions Club and the Clinton County Fair represents just two of the countless efforts he performed.

He touched many lives and provided an excellent example to all who knew him. His determination, bright outlook on life, and phenomenal voice will be remembered.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Barb, sons Wes and Dave, and their entire family.

Kelsey Lomison's kindness, professionalism, talent and unselfish service will be missed. Rest with the Lord, my friend.

STOCK ACT SOLD SHORT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, what the public saw today in the House of Representatives was a STOCK Act sold short. Unfortunately, what could have been an outstanding bill was changed by the Republican leadership by taking the two most important aspects put in the Senate bill out. One was a public corruption provision that would have allowed prosecutors to prosecute, from the courthouse to the Capitol, public corruption. This was something Senator LEAHY had, and in the House it was Representative SENSENBRENNER, a Republican, passed unanimously by the Judiciary Committee. But for some reason unbeknownst to me, it was stripped by the leadership of the Republican side out of the bill. Democrats didn't have an opportunity to participate in the drafting of the bill, and what was the work of LOUISE SLAUGHTER and TIM WALZ was hijacked from them.

Another important provision was the political intelligence provision. It was taken out by K Street lobbyists working with the leadership—late. That should not have been taken out.

The two best parts of the STOCK Act were sold short, and the American public should have had better today. We passed something, but not what we should have done.

LINE-ITEM VETO

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, because government has spent money we don't have and borrowed money we can't pay back, our national debt now stands at \$15 trillion. My daughter, Sarah, who is 2 years old, now has \$50,000 as her share of the national debt.

Congress and the President have an obligation to make the tough decisions to reduce spending so we can provide a brighter future for our kids. That's why I was proud to support the Expedited Legislative Line-Item Veto and Rescissions Act this week. The bipartisan legislation provides a constitutional line-item veto solution and creates more checks and balances against runaway spending.

Alone it won't solve our problems; however, combined with a biennial budget and a balanced-budget amendment, it can deliver our children, like Sarah, from a future of debt to one of opportunity.

VISA WAIVER PROGRAM

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, Nevadans are struggling. That's why we in Washington should be focusing on creating good-paying, middle class jobs. Unfortunately, Washington Republicans are focused on a divisive, ideological agenda.

Our jobs crisis cannot be fixed by restricting access to mammograms for women. It's not going to be fixed by killing Medicare, by turning it over to private insurance companies. And it cannot be fixed by protecting taxpayer giveaways to Big Oil companies.

Our jobs crisis can be fixed by getting real about job creation. We can do that right now by passing legislation expanding our Visa Waiver Program, which allows tourists from certain countries up to 90 days of visa-free travel in the U.S.

In 2010, nearly 18 million people visited our country due to this program. What will happen if we expand it? The answer for tourism-dependent States like Nevada is simple: it will put people back to work.

I urge my Republican colleagues in the House and the Senate to drop their ideological agenda and join me in making job creation our top priority.

**CARDIAC ARREST SURVIVAL ACT
AND SAVE A LIFE DAY**

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, February is Heart Month. I rise today to recognize Save a Life Community Heart Training Day. This is an effort by the American Red Cross, the Texas Arrhythmia Institute, and the Methodist DeBakey Heart and Vascular Center in Houston, Texas, to raise awareness about the importance of adult CPR and AED use.

Sudden cardiac arrest, also known as SCA, is the leading cause of death in the United States, with roughly 300,000 Americans dying from SCAs every year. Both of my grandfathers died of SCA before I was born. I always dreamed of what it would be like to go fishing with Grandpa.

The best chance for survival is defibrillation—delivery of an electric pulse shock to the heart. An SCA victim has a 50-75 percent chance of survival if a shock is administered to the heart within 5 minutes of collapse. Awareness and training are critical to saving and enhancing lives.

Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of legislation designed to encourage Good Samaritans to use AEDs to save lives, I'm proud to recognize Save a Life Day. Get trained, so a young boy can go fishing with Grandpa.