

Thornberry	Visclosky	Westmoreland
Tiahrt	Walden	Whitfield
Tiberi	Walz	Wilson (OH)
Titus	Wasserman	Wilson (SC)
Tonko	Schultz	Wittman
Towns	Waters	Wolf
Tsongas	Watson	Woolsey
Turner	Watt	Wu
Upton	Waxman	Yarmuth
Van Hollen	Weiner	Young (AK)
Velázquez	Welch	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Barrett (SC)	Giffords	Rush
Berman	Higgins	Salazar
Braley (IA)	Hodes	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Hoekstra	Skelton
Clyburn	Lee (NY)	Slaughter
Cole	Moore (KS)	Teague
Cuellar	Nadler (NY)	Tierney
Davis (AL)	Possey	Wamp
Doyle	Quigley	
Eshoo	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1311

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I regret missing floor votes on Thursday, May 13, 2010. If I were present, I would have voted: "Yea" on rollcall 271, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 1338—Recognizing the significant accomplishments of AmeriCorps; "yea" on rollcall 272, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 1337—Expressing the sympathy and condolences of the House of Representatives to those people affected by the flooding in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Mississippi in May, 2010.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business and missed rollcall vote Nos. 267, 268, 269, 270, 271 and 272. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 267, 268, 269, 271, and 272 and would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 270.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO HIT POLICY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 13101 of the HITECH Act (P.L. 111-5), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member to the HIT Policy Committee for a term of 3 years:

Mr. Paul Egerman, Weston, Massachusetts.

□ 1315

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider Senate amendments to H.R. 4213, the American Jobs Closing Tax Loopholes and Preventing Outsourcing Act.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, given the fact that he has announced only one rule bill for next week, I would ask the gentleman if he expects the House to be in session next Friday, and I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to tell the gentleman, although I announced only the American Jobs Bill Closing Tax Loopholes and Preventing Outsourcing Act, my expectation is we will also deal with the COMPETES Act next week as well. That bill, we believe, is a very important bill. We think it's very important for jobs. We think it's very important for investing in our future, and we intend to bring that bill to the floor as well next week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the gentleman's announcement about next week's floor schedule, I'd also like to announce an additional item that we Republicans would like to see and will bring up for a vote on the House floor next week.

Yesterday, House Republicans announced an unprecedented online effort called YouCut, and this can be found at republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut. This program allows the public to vote on wasteful programs they'd like to see the House cut. Over 70,000 Americans have thus far voted in the program called YouCut.

I'd say, Mr. Speaker, we will announce the public's choice this coming Monday and then provide for debate on the cut of their choosing during our first rule bill of the week, which, as the gentleman has indicated, is the tax extenders.

And, Mr. Speaker, therefore I would say to the Members that in addition to the majority leader's announced schedule, there will also be a vote on the consideration of one of five possible savings proposals.

The first is to eliminate the Presidential Election Fund, and that would amount to a \$260 million saving. The

next could be the elimination of the taxpayers' subsidized union activities, a \$600 million savings to the taxpayer. Next could be the elimination of a HUD program that funds doctoral dissertations. That is a \$1 million tax savings for the taxpayers. Also, we could see the people of this country vote for the elimination of new nonreform welfare programs that could save the public \$3.5 billion. Also, Mr. Speaker, among the items that the American public is opining on right now online is a proposal to eliminate wealthy communities from the CDBG program. That would offer a \$2.6 billion savings to the taxpayers.

So I'd say, Mr. Speaker, we on the Republican side of the aisle, as I have told the gentleman before, stand ready to work with the majority in hopes of trying to encourage legislation that would reflect these cuts, encourage the majority to bring those to the floor. But having not received any bit of cooperation or at least recognition that we need to do something like that, we intend to bring those votes forward on these items and whichever items the American people vote on first to the floor next week.

Mr. Speaker, moving on to the gentleman's announced schedule. I notice that the majority leader did not indicate whether we would consider a budget next week. It's now been 4 weeks since the April 15 deadline for completing a budget, and I'd ask the gentleman, does he still think that the House will consider a budget prior to Memorial Day, as he stated before?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I am certainly hopeful that we will deal with the issue of spending levels by the time we bring appropriation bills to the floor. We are working on that.

I will say to my friend who has just given us an exposition on his new program—and he gave the Web site address, I think—that, first of all, let me say that we welcome the interest in the Republican Party in cutting spending. Of course, spending was substantially increased when you had the Presidency and the House and the Senate, very substantially, as you know, at twice the rate it was increased during the Clinton administration. We also believe that we are sure that many citizens have some very useful suggestions.

I would also urge them to make their suggestions to the commission which the President has appointed to get a handle on not 16/100 of spending but on the real dollars that confront us and which the American public are very concerned about.

The commission that the President appointed is to look at how we can bring spending down, how we can address the deficit, and how we can get back to the place where we were at the end of 2000, at the end of the Clinton

administration when we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Unfortunately, that surplus was turned into this administration inheriting about a \$5 trillion deficit while your party was in total control of the House, the Senate, and the administration.

But we certainly look forward to the suggestions that you have or anybody has in the public as to how we can bring spending under control.

Your party has talked a lot about earmarks. As the gentleman well knows, in 1994 there were some 4,000 earmarks between our 50 States and 435 districts. That was escalated under Republicans to 15,000—quadrupled the number of earmarks. Now the gentleman is against earmarks, at least wants a suspension of those. We think that that is, perhaps, progress.

But I want to tell the gentleman that we hope you will cooperate with us in the findings of the commission. You have three very outstanding Members that have been appointed from this House. Hopefully they will make substantive suggestions to get the budget deficit under control as was done in the 1990s when, for the first time in your lifetime and in mine—and I have a lot more lifetime to tout than you do—we had a balanced budget for 4 years in a row. That's never happened in your lifetime or in mine other than during the Clinton administration. That was important.

Unfortunately, in the following decade that we have just been through, again the deficit was exploded. But certainly any efforts to get suggestions from anybody, including the American public, of how they think that we can reduce spending, bring the deficit under control, is welcome, and we look forward to hearing suggestions.

But I want to say that while some of the programs you have mentioned, I have one of those programs being a \$200,000 program. You say it's a \$1 million program. In either event, it's certainly worth looking at to see whether it has value to invest dollars in.

But you and I both know that in a \$3.56 trillion budget deficit that we have to look at the big numbers where we're spending money and what policies we have adopted in order to get to where I think all of us want to be, and that's back to where we were in fiscal year 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000.

I yield.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for his sentiments.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that first of all, if we can't start here and instead have to wait until after the upcoming election, what does that say to the American people?

I also have noted that the gentleman has issued statements about the relative size of the proposed options online under the YouCut program. And nowhere else, nowhere else but Washington could these cuts be deemed to not be significant. Just because they are less than 1 percent of the Federal budget doesn't mean we ought not at

least start there rather than kick the can down the road like Washington has under both parties' leadership. And the gentleman knows I am the first to admit that our party was fired in 2006 much on account of the runaway spending. But we have an opportunity to work together to actually begin some progress rather than continue to say let's shift the responsibility outside to a commission that the President has created.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, we've considered 63 resolutions naming post offices this year, 62 resolutions congratulating sports teams, and we've even supported the designation of Pi Day. Yet you don't think, and I really can't imagine why, we wouldn't have time to debate proposals regarding the types of savings that I enumerated.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, if he doesn't want to engage in the votes that we are going to present next week, why can't we have a bill brought to the floor with these measures? He and I can sit here and debate in a colloquy, but I think the American people would like to see the House actually engage in these debates.

So I, again, appreciate the gentleman's indication that he wants to work with us, but time and again we see ourselves here on this House floor taking up resolutions naming post offices instead of trying to do the people's business, emphasizing their priority, which is let's do something to cut the debt that is being imposed on our kids and their kids once and for all.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. We've done some very substantive things, most of which your party has opposed. We passed last year the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act which you voted against and which your party voted, to a person, against. I don't know whether you happened to see that, as a result of that act, people last year paid the lowest tax rates that they have paid since 1950. We reduced over \$300 billion in taxes for individuals and small business.

Now, you can make fun of the resolutions that your party introduces and my party congratulating people for things or noting that post offices are being renamed or things of that nature, but that's a ruse. That's not the substance of what we do here. Members want to acknowledge their hometown folks. I've been in the legislature for a long period of time. They did that in the State senate. They do it here. And sometimes it's easy to make fun of.

But we've done some very substantive things. The gentleman knows that. This is one of the most productive Congresses that I've served in over the last 30 years in terms of very important pieces of legislation. Your party has voted, in many instances, against that legislation.

The proof of the pudding, of course, is in its eating. You didn't ask me where

the jobs are this time as you usually do. There were 290,000 new jobs created, 230,000 jobs the month before that, and an average of 100,000 jobs have been created per month over the last 4 months.

The gentleman, over the last 4 months, hasn't mentioned jobs, apparently because he thinks perhaps we found them where, frankly, the previous administration lost them wherever they were lost. We need to bring them back.

We are investing in bills to get jobs back. We're investing in making sure that people who have lost their jobs have some sustenance to support themselves and their families. We don't think that's de minimis legislation. We think it's critically important.

□ 1330

We are passing legislation to make sure that people have health care; that when they lose their job, they lose their insurance, they get sick, that they have a COBRA coverage that they can count on. We don't think that is de minimis. We are working on legislation to make sure that doctors get reimbursed at appropriate levels so they will continue to serve the seniors of America under Medicare. We don't think that is de minimis action.

Now, I could go on and on, as I am sure you know and probably my colleagues know; but we believe we are passing a lot of legislation to respond to a deep crisis of economic depths, unknown since 75 years ago in the Great Depression, that we inherited and we are trying to respond to. And we are now creating jobs. We are now expanding the economy.

Somebody that you may agree with most of the time, Larry Kudlow, said, you ought to stop talking down the economy. The facts speak for themselves. GDP growth for three quarters in a row, jobs being created, stock market up. It has been down and up in little glitches, but it is up some 70 percent on the Dow, 80 percent on the S&P, and almost 100 percent on the NASDAQ. None of that we think is de minimis, I tell my friend.

Both sides, by the way, do what you just did. We did it to you and we made fun of these little resolutions that don't take much time but are meaningful to the constituencies that hear about them and appreciate the fact that their efforts throughout the country were acknowledged in one way or another, or that somebody that has great respect in their community was honored. Many soldiers and sailors and airmen and marines are being honored by having post offices named for them in their communities. Others are being honored.

So I tell my friend, we need to be serious. We have a critical deficit confronting us. We have a critical long-term deficit confronting us. We have a critical problem of an unsustainable entitlement regime confronting us. The Peterson Institute is running hearings

all over this country to say, Americans, tell us what you think. I don't think your idea is a bad idea of asking Americans. We all want to ask Americans: What do you think? So we can come together to solve what we both agree is a very serious economic ditch into which we have fallen. We need to get out of it. We need to work together to do that. The American public expects us to do that.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, first of all, I think the gentleman knows I have never, never rooted against this economy or this country. In fact, I have gone out of my way to make public statements when we have positive job growth to say, when we see jobs growing, it is a good thing. Period. I have been consistent in that message.

So I just wanted to speak to that and correct the gentleman's assertion that somehow I am not giving credit for job growth. But I would say we do have much work to be done.

He indicates that somehow this last year was a year that Americans paid lower taxes than ever before in recent memory. I would say they paid lower taxes because we have a progressive tax system; and the fact that the recession reduced income by over \$200 billion last year versus 2008. That is the reality. If you want to get serious, that is the reality. Not some fantasy that we have somehow lowered tax rates, when we know good and well at the end of this year tax rates are expected to skyrocket again on top of what we have just done with the new entitlement bill and the health care bill.

So I would say to the gentleman, I am not questioning his intentions. I am not saying that there haven't been substantive proposals brought to the floor. I am saying there have been a disproportionate number of times we have been on the floor doing things that we could have been spending time on others to do more productive things for the people of this country.

I agree; the gentleman says we are at a crossroads. Yes, we are. The problem is, the substance and the policy proposals that the gentleman and his party have been bringing to the floor over the last year and a half have serious consequences, and they are aggravating the future prospects for growth in this country.

He just indicated, Mr. Speaker, that entitlements, if we don't get a handle on entitlements, we could see our standard of living go down. Well, you are absolutely right. The gentleman is correct on that. But what did we just pass a few months ago? The largest entitlement ever.

So, again, we can say things and we can have good intentions; but when they are matched with the deeds, something just doesn't add up.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, the issue is about spending. It is about the debt we are amassing. So when the gentleman points out that they have brought to the floor the stimulus bill

of 800-some billion dollars, that has proven not to be a good, quote-unquote, investment and in fact has now saddled our kids and their kids with even more debt, and sent a signal to the global investment community that America may have trouble paying its bills.

That is why we are intent on trying to bring forward the You Cut proposals to begin changing the culture here in this town, in this body, to begin to save taxpayer dollars, not with an emphasis on spending.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Maybe the public gets tired of this back and forth. But the gentleman talks in ways that indicate that all of a sudden, in 2009, January, when President Obama took office, somehow the world fell apart. In point of fact, as the gentleman knows, in the last year of the Clinton administration, we gained 1.9 million new jobs. In the last year of the Bush administration, under the policies that the gentleman supported and his party was very enthusiastic about, we lost 3.8 million jobs. That is a 5.7 million job turnaround.

Yes, we were in dire straits. And conservative economists, Republican economists, Mr. Zandi and others, as well as progressive economists, liberal economists, call them what you will, all said: If you do not invest in this economy, if you do not invest in stabilizing this economy, very frankly, you are going to lose 800,000 in additional revenues. Which meant that you would be in the same debt position whether you invested that money or didn't.

Now, in investing that money, I say to my friend, with all but maybe 2 months over the last 15 months we have had a straight line out of the almost 800,000 jobs that under your policies were lost in the last month of the Bush administration. Almost 800,000 jobs. We have been on a straight line to now where 5 of the last 6 months, we have had positive job growth.

Is it enough? It is not. Should we do more? We should. Should we cooperate in doing that? Absolutely. That is what the American public expects us to do. But don't forget the fact of how we got here. Don't forget the fact that an awful lot of economists on your other side of the aisle said we needed to invest or the economy was going to fall even further, and we wouldn't have that straight line out of the depths of loss of jobs into the positive numbers of creating jobs.

Let me also say to you, you mentioned taxes, and you mentioned the fact that somehow it was because incomes fell. Incomes did fall, and that was unfortunate. They fell because, we believe—we don't agree on this—it was because of the economic policies that were pursued. We think our facts are valid.

I would remind you, 216,000 jobs per month for 96 months under the Clinton administration, average, 216,000; 21

months of over 400,000 jobs. The Bush administration had 5 of those months, and the Bush administration's average job creation over 96 months was 11,000 jobs; 216,000 versus 11,000 jobs.

So the economy was in great distress. Yes, we had to invest. Yes, we had to borrow. Because, if we didn't, our grandchildren—and I have grandchildren. I have a great grandchild. I am very worried about what they are going to inherit, and I knew that we could not allow the economy to fall through the floor.

But let me say this. This is from USA Today, from an article that appeared: Taxes Paid Have Fallen Much Faster Than Income in This Recession. Your proposition was taxes fell because income fell. Personal income fell 2 percent last year. That is 2 percent too much. Actually, it is about 10 percent too much, because we would have hoped they would have gone up 5 percent or 6 percent or 7 percent.

But listen to this next sentence. I know you will want to get this next sentence: "Taxes paid dropped 23 percent. The BEA classified Social Security taxes as insurance payments."

So I tell my friend, we inherited a terrible economy from the Bush administration, and we have been working very hard to bring it back. And almost every indication indicates that in fact it is coming back. We invested in trying to keep the automobile companies employing people, and they are doing that.

So I tell my friend that I did not, as you recall, imply that you had talked down the economy. What I said was Larry Kudlow, talking to his fellow conservatives, said, Don't do it, because the facts don't warrant that kind of attack.

So we are going to continue to work. I want to work with you. We want to get this economy moving. We want to create jobs. You will have legislation on the floor next week, hopefully you will work with us, that we think will do that. It will create summer jobs. It will invest in infrastructure with the America Bonds program. So there are a number of things that you will have an opportunity to vote on next week, I hope you will join us, which are going to continue to stabilize those who don't have jobs and to create jobs for them in the new economy.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I know that the gentleman knows, having quoted the article that he did, in that same article the writer gives a lot of credit to the impact of the so-called Bush tax cuts as being economically generative, causing some of the positive results.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will just yield on that, are you referring to the paragraph that says: "Presidents Clinton and Bush pushed through a series of tax changes, credits, lower rates, higher exemptions that slashed income taxes for poor and middle-class families"?

Mr. CANTOR. That is correct, I would say to the gentleman. I am referring to that.

And so while we are on that subject, we know very well there has been no indication whatsoever that the ability for entrepreneurs to continue to experience an atmosphere that is conducive to their investment and assumption of risk will continue, because we are facing the largest tax hike in American history at the end of this year and the majority has been unwilling to say that is not coming. That is hanging over this economy as a veil of uncertainty.

And I would say to the gentleman, if he is so excited about the positive results that he indicates, largely due to the fiscal policies in place that will be not in place after the end of this year, I would say that maybe we should consider extending the rate cuts and cap gains and dividends and marginal rate reductions that are in place now.

I would also say to the gentleman, listen, we have been now for weeks and months through this: Your fault, our fault. Your fault, our fault. The public and the American people are upset. They don't want blame games anymore; they want to stop the spending. And just next week, the gentleman is talking again about bringing more spending. He indicates that all economists supported the stimulus bill. He knows that is not true. But, like a good lawyer, he is going to present his case. But what I would say to the gentleman, let's stop the spending now.

That is why we have started and launched the You Cut program. And, if he alleges incremental modest steps, fine. Join us in that. But let's stop the spending, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to get too personal on this, but what do you think about cutting the spending for the high-speed rail between Richmond and Washington?

Mr. CANTOR. Well, I would say to the gentleman, I have always, way before we have even encountered that stimulus bill, supported job-generating projects. The studies in the metropolitan area from which I come and represent indicate that Virginia could grow 165,000 jobs with that kind of investment.

Mr. HOYER. Is that a "no"?

Mr. CANTOR. That has always been my position.

But when we are looking at some of the items that we are discussing here on the You Cut options, these are items that are niceties. They may be well-intentioned; but if we are worried about job creation and we are worried about deficits growing, we ought to begin to take action now.

I would ask the gentleman, he mentioned the tax extenders bill for next week, and I wonder if he could tell us the content of that bill. Will there be a markup on the bill? Reports have indicated, and perhaps the gentleman has said, that the bill will be nearly \$200 billion. And what kind of rule, whether it be open or not, would he expect?

Mr. HOYER. I don't think I mentioned a figure on the extenders. I am pretty sure I did not, not today or, frankly, any other day, because it hasn't been finally completed by the Ways and Means Committee. As you know, they are working with the Senate Finance Committee as well, and working with Republicans. As you know, this was a bipartisan bill when it came from the Senate, Republicans supported it, and we hope it is a bipartisan bill as it leaves here.

But let me say the fact is what the Senate sent us, we are working on. The process that we will consider it has not yet been finally determined, so I can't tell the gentleman exactly what that will be. But some of the things I have already mentioned will be in it, UI and COBRA, FMAP, Build America Bonds for local infrastructure programs, summer jobs programs so we can get young people to work this summer so that they will have some livelihood and can help their families who are in distress.

□ 1345

We also, as I said, are going to deal with the SGR to ensure seniors can keep their doctors. We'll conclude provisions to close tax loopholes, crack down on outsourcing of jobs overseas and protect American jobs here at home. Those are all the things that I think will be in it. That's not necessarily an exclusive list, but that is certainly a bill that we think will be pro-business, and confirming many of the tax benefits that are given to businesses, as you well know, that we regulate, continue, including the investment tax credit so that we can encourage businesses to grow and invest and to create jobs.

So that is an outline of it. This process has not yet been decided. I'm sure there will be discussions about that tomorrow with our Rules Committee chair and with the committee. Perhaps we can know at a later date.

Mr. CANTOR. Again, just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, does that mean that the bill will not go through committee?

Mr. HOYER. I think, as you know, there was a bill over from the Senate, which was bipartisan in nature, and I think that we need to move this bill before Memorial Day. I think that the committee is going to have to decide how to get that done in the fastest way possible so that many of the expiring issues do not expire, which would be very detrimental to docs and to many other people.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I have been working together for some months now on the Iran sanctions bill. And also crucial to the national security of this country is the war supplemental. He has indicated before that the Iran sanctions conference report and the war supplemental will be coming to the House floor prior to the Memorial Day recess. I'd ask whether that still is the case.

Mr. HOYER. I'm sure everybody listening now will be glad to hear that

there is some cooperation and agreement. The gentleman and I are both strong supporters of the Iran sanction legislation. We believe that not only is the Middle East region at risk, but the international community is at risk as long as Iran is pursuing its intent to arm itself with nuclear weapons.

I tell the gentleman that I have been working very closely with Mr. BERMAN, and it is my hope and expectation that this conference report will be reported back to us before the Memorial Day break, and it is my intention to work towards having that sent to the President before we leave here for the Memorial Day break.

Mr. CANTOR. And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, would the same be for the supplemental as well—before the Memorial Day recess?

Mr. HOYER. I don't think the same would be because of both the Senate and the House. I'm hopeful that we will pass the supplemental through the House, but it won't be in the same position because we haven't had a conference on the supplemental. The Senate is working on a bill, as the gentleman knows. We're working on a bill. I have talked to the chairman, and he is trying to get the matter together for the committee. And I am hopeful that we will pass it through the House. My urging is that we pass it through the House prior to the Memorial Day break. But, obviously, the gentleman knows we will not have effected a conference by that time. But we want to do so very shortly because, clearly, we need to make sure the resources are available for our men and women in harm's way in both Iraq and Afghanistan and in other troubled spots of the world.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman in a fiscally responsible manner, which starts with passing a budget blueprint for this year, just like American families have to do.

I thank the gentleman once again for his time, and I yield back.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, MAY 20, 2010, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY FELIPE CALDERON HINOJOSA, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, May 20, 2010, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of the United Mexican States.

The Speaker pro Tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.