

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-install 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.

#### HOUR 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