

Ryan (WI)	Smith (NE)	Tsongas
Salazar	Smith (NJ)	Turner
Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (TX)	Upton
Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Van Hollen
Scalise	Snyder	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Space	Visclosky
Schauer	Speier	Walden
Schiff	Spratt	Walz
Schmidt	Stark	Wasserman
Schock	Stearns	Schultz
Schrader	Stupak	Waters
Scott (GA)	Sullivan	Watson
Scott (VA)	Sutton	Watt
Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Waxman
Serrano	Taylor	Weiner
Sessions	Teague	Welch
Sestak	Terry	Westmoreland
Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (OH)
Sherman	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wittman
Shuler	Tiahrt	Wolf
Shuster	Tiberi	Woolsey
Simpson	Tierney	Wu
Sires	Titus	Yarmuth
Skelton	Tonko	Young (FL)
Slaughter	Towns	

## NOES—1

Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—21

Bachus	Garamendi	Moore (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Moran (KS)
Billray	Hinojosa	Sánchez, Linda
Bonner	Hoekstra	T.
Braley (IA)	Jackson Lee	Schwartz
Burgess	(TX)	Souder
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, M.	Miller (NC)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1623

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the United States Department of the Interior Building in Washington, District of Columbia, as the 'Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 290 taken today, H.R. 5128, to designate the Department of the Interior Building in Washington, DC, as the "Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building", had I not had a family emergency which required my return to California, I would have proudly voted "yes."

## NATIONAL CHILDHOOD OBESITY AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 996, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 996, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution expressing support for the designation of September as National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

5-STAR GENERALS  
COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1177, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1177, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1339.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1339.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO  
CHINA FOR TRAGIC EARTH-  
QUAKE IN QINGHAI PROVINCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1324.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McMAHON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1324.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## 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 (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader, for the purposes of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

On Monday, 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 Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business. Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and on Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules, as is usual. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider Senate amendments to H.R. 4213, the American Jobs Closing Tax Loopholes and Preventing Outsourcing Act, and H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2011. And we will take further action on the America COMPETES legislation to make our economy more vibrant.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask, with the Memorial Day recess beginning the week after next, does the gentleman expect the House to be in session next Friday. I yield.

□ 1630

Mr. HOYER. I expect us to reserve that day for session. I have urged Members, and I would urge Members on both sides of the aisle, to reserve that day, not to plan for that day. Clearly, if we can complete the week's business then we will not have to meet.

But I remind the gentleman, as I am sure he knows, there are a number of items that have expiration dates either on the 31st of May or the 1st of June: unemployment insurance, COBRA health insurance, the sustainable growth rate for doctors' reimbursement for services, and other items that are critical to continue. So that I do not want to give away Friday because it is the last day we will be here for 10 days, and therefore we need to address those issues.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman indicated, the Defense authorization bill is coming to the floor next week. Usually, I think Members expect several days' worth of debate on a variety of amendments. Typically, there are a large number of amendments made in order.

I would ask the gentleman, does he expect the House to follow that general precedent on the Defense authorization and the lengthy number of amendments and discussion on the House floor next week?

Mr. HOYER. We expect to take such time as is necessary to complete the appropriate debate on that bill. If we can do it in 1 day, we will do it in 1

day. If it takes more than that, we will allot more time.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items the gentleman did not mention for next week's schedule, including a budget resolution as well as a troop funding supplemental. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, whether he expects either of these two items to come to the floor next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question and for yielding. With respect to the budget, as the gentleman knows, I personally want to see a budget move forward. Mr. SPRATT has been working very hard to try to see if we can reach consensus on the parameters of such a budget. He continues to do that. I frankly want to tell the gentleman honestly that my assessment is that that probably will not be done by Thursday or Wednesday of next week, and therefore even if it were completed Wednesday, not appropriate time for notice to be given. So that my expectation is that will not be done next week, but my expectation is that we will continue to work on that, and hopefully do that shortly after our return.

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

Mr. HOYER. You asked another question I didn't answer. I apologize. On the war supplemental, very important bill that I know the gentleman and I are very interested in. As you know, the Senate has marked up its supplemental in committee. Chairman OBEY I know is working to get a bill ready for committee consideration. It is possible that we would consider that next week if, in fact, Mr. OBEY and the committee are ready to report that out.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the House voted today on the first YouCut proposal. It was a spending cut selected by the American people. Unfortunately, only nine Members from the gentleman's side of the aisle joined with all Republicans in voting to save the taxpayers \$2.5 billion. I wish more Members of the Democratic Caucus had voted with Republicans.

The good news is Members will have the opportunity to vote on another cut again next week. Right now as we speak, Mr. Speaker, Americans are casting their votes at [Republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut](http://Republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut) for what they would like the House to cut next week.

So, in keeping with the gentleman's announcement about next week's floor schedule, I would like to announce that the House will vote on one of these five spending cut proposals next week: first, to eliminate the Byrd Honor Scholarship Program, a \$420 million item for savings; second, stop the proposed Federal employee pay raise next year, a potential \$30 billion worth of savings; third, to suspend the Federal land purchases, a \$2.6 billion potential savings, Mr. Speaker; fourth, an ability to terminate U.S. funding for UNESCO, a potential item for \$810 million worth of

savings to the taxpayers; or fifth, a move to eliminate mohair subsidies, something that would save the taxpayers \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would say again, the gentleman knows about this program. It is nothing but an attempt for us to try and change the culture here in Washington towards one of saving taxpayer dollars. Reducing the budget deficit should be a bipartisan effort, and we would hope that the gentleman and his colleagues could join with us as we bring up the next YouCut proposal next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. BOEHNER and I did attempt to pursue some meaningful restraints last week, and unfortunately, we couldn't get agreement to do so on your side of the aisle. Having said that, we certainly agree that we need to get a handle on the extraordinary deficit picture that confronts us.

I know I am repetitive, but in 2001, President Bush came before the Congress and said we have a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Unfortunately, that \$5.6 trillion surplus was eliminated, and in fact, \$5 trillion of additional deficit was incurred, giving us a \$10 trillion deficit when this administration took over. That's unfortunate.

I will tell the gentleman, as he knows, he and others have voted for trillions, that's with a T, of dollars of unfunded liabilities for the Federal Government, either reduction in revenues, which of course you say will grow the economy—unfortunately, it did not—or a prescription drug bill which was not paid for which was hundreds of billions of dollars, not minimal dollars. But I will tell the gentleman that we are interested in working with you in a meaningful way, not in procedural vote ways, but in meaningful ways to reduce the deficit that confronts us, including reducing areas of spending, which we think is appropriate.

With respect to the motion that you made today, a procedural motion, if it hadn't been a procedural motion, maybe a real motion—and of course many of those programs were in existence for the 12 years that you controlled the Congress of the United States, as the gentleman well knows. The motion today, of course, would have affected a program which is going to create, we believe, 185,000 jobs. We think that's important in an economy that is still struggling to get jobs back. But we applaud the efforts to bring forward meaningful, important ideas. Unfortunately, that has not always been our experience.

I am sure you read there have been a lot of motions to recommit that have been made. Now we are onto previous questions now, but motions to recommit. Norm Ornstein wrote an article about those just the other day in which he said, The unfortunate fact is that the motion to recommit with instructions has for more than a decade become a hollow vehicle and farce. Now, the American people don't want to see us participate in hollow vehicles and

farces. What they want to see is us work together in real ways to effect the kind of fiscal responsibility that we had in the nineties, and unfortunately we did not have in the last decade. We need to return to that.

We have, as you know, taken very substantive steps. One was to pay for what we buy—not a previous question—legislation on this floor which said we are going to pay for what we buy. That was in place in the nineties, put in place in a bipartisan way with Mr. Bush and Mr. Gephardt leading the way and others. Again adopted in a bipartisan way with Mr. Gingrich and President Clinton working together. And then of course jettisoned under not your personal leadership, but under the leadership of the Republican Party in 2001, 2002, 2003, formally jettisoned in 2003, in which we said, no, we don't believe that paying for what we buy is the policy that we are going to pursue. And in fact you didn't pursue it. You created large deficits every year that you controlled the Congress: the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. Every year without fail.

So I tell my friend that we want to join together in real efforts. We are sorry that in a partisan way PAYGO was jettisoned. We are also sorry that the commission that the President established by Executive order didn't pass because so many of your colleagues in the Senate who said they were for the idea of setting up a commission to propose real restraint in spending, not only in terms of discretionary dollars but in terms of entitlement dollars, that so many of your colleagues in the Senate opposed that, and as result we don't have a statutory commission, we have a Presidentially appointed commission.

I am hopeful that they will make substantive recommendations. I am hopeful that our Members and your Members will join together in making recommendations to us. And as you know, both Mr. REID, the leader in the Senate, and Speaker PELOSI have indicated that we will put their recommendations on the floor. If the Senate passes them, we will put them on the floor here. Hopefully, we can work together toward the end that I think we both seek even though there may be disagreement on the process that is being pursued.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman loves to talk about spending under the Bush years and under the years that our party controlled Congress. But I find it somewhat ironic at this point to go on talking about the inability to control spending when it is his party and the majority currently that is unable to produce a budget. He and I have had discussions again about the inability of this House to do its work, and in fact, I know the gentleman recalls, because it has been reported before that he himself says that when we are unable to pass a budget, and I quote, "it is failing to meet the most basic responsibility of governing, that is enacting a budget."

In the same way, the gentleman's chairman of the Budget Committee from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) said, quote, "If you can't budget, you can't govern. In a parliamentary system it's more than an adage."

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I was just going to say that I still agree with both of those statements, Mr. SPRATT's and my own.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate that. I would say instead of casting stones and pointing blame and saying you too did this, I believe that it is most important for us to recognize now the failure of this body to do what the American people expect us to do to control spending, and that is to produce a budget.

Mr. Speaker, I go on to say the gentleman was quick to, if I could say, malign the attempt to reduce the \$2.4 billion program under the expanded welfare program under the stimulus bill that we just had a vote on. But I would point out that there were nine Members on his side of the aisle—Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. TAYLOR—these individual Members felt that perhaps we were and did have a valid point to make, that we ought to be cutting spending right now.

I would say to the gentleman, perhaps he is suggesting that these individuals voted to kill 185,000 jobs. I wouldn't say that those Members tried to do that in that vote. Again, I would just ask the gentleman whether that was his intention. I would probably think he wouldn't think his Members would vote to kill jobs.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think there is a lot of concern, not necessarily on these Members' parts, and we all know this, about 30-second simplistic "gotcha" ads on television which don't discuss the substance of the ramifications of actions. The bill that passed passed overwhelmingly. The previous question would have stopped that bill going forward. Obviously, when you were in control you wanted the previous question passed so you could move your substantive legislation forward. There is no difference over here. But the "gotcha" ads certainly are something that in the minds of everybody on both sides of the aisle—

Mr. CANTOR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, there are no "gotcha" ads here. There was a statement made by the gentleman that said that the program that we were attempting to cut was a program that could create or has created 185,000 jobs. I just say to the gentleman, nine of his Members voted with us on that vote, and I would ask the gentleman does he think those nine Members voted to kill 185,000 jobs the way he in his statement sort of implied that Republicans intended to do?

□ 1645

Mr. HOYER. Well, first of all, we don't believe this is a real vote. Our Members don't believe it's a real vote. Our Members are cognizant of why it's being done. But the 185,000 jobs, clearly, those nine Members that you referenced did not vote to eliminate 185,000 jobs. But all your Members did. The difference is because you are not going to run ads against your Members.

The fact of the matter is that if you want to do real things to create real jobs, we're prepared to work with you. We believe the program you wanted to eliminate does in fact score at creating 185,000 jobs. You call it welfare. We call it work. We think it was an appropriate expenditure. As a matter of fact, as the gentleman may know, we have that expenditure in our jobs bill. Why? Because it's scored to create 185,000 jobs, put people to work, allow them to support their families, allow them to live with some degree of dignity. And we think that's appropriate in a very, very strained economy to this date.

We're coming back, but as we've seen lately, it is fragile and this gum, grease, and oil has caused us problems in terms of confidence. And we need to keep confidence up and not make the mistakes that have been made in the past.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman that obviously we have a real difference and the program we propose to cut is number one. The kind of debate that we're having should be the kind of debate we are having on this floor every day—not voting for post offices and naming Federal buildings.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that particular point?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. As you know, I schedule the legislation. Are you asking me not to schedule the 40 percent of those post office bills that your Members are requesting? Because if you are, I will not schedule them.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, what I am asking the gentleman to do is to work with us in bringing to the floor and scheduling bills that actually reduce spending here in Washington because the gentleman indicated that he knows why all of this is being done, and I think that perhaps maybe he's thinking it's being done under the old construct.

Where we are now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is that the American people expect some accountability here in Washington. They want us to stop spending money we don't have. The reason we launched the YouCut program is, number one, we want to say to the American people, we're listening, that we're not setting aside their wishes and their desires, that we care about what they think. That's what YouCut is all about. It's about empowering folks to go online and to tell us what they think, given the options presented to cut the Federal budget deficit. That's why we're doing this program,

Mr. Speaker, and that's what YouCut is all about.

I would say to the gentleman, not one bill on the floor this week cut a single dollar from the Federal deficit. That's why we brought this proposal up.

Now, as to why we chose the PQ, I think the gentleman knows that the rules put in place and make it so that the minority has no other way to posit their alternatives or posit wishes that we may have other than to use a PQ, and that's why we elected to do this. If the gentleman wants to schedule a bill that we are discussing on substantive grounds, that's what we're about. Bring these bills to the floor for open and fair debate.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, he mentions the disappointment that he has over some on our side of the aisle and the other side of this building in not supporting the President's commission addressing the fiscal outlook for this country. The gentleman knows well the reason many Members on our side of the aisle refused to participate in that vote was because, in fact, the focus was not going to be on that commission cutting spending.

We think that Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem here. So why couldn't we just set aside the need for additional revenues, put that off the table, and focus on spending?

Again, that's what the YouCut program is about. That's why we're bringing these things to the floor, and I would hope that the gentleman could join us in demonstrating that we're listening to the people and actually moving towards a sense of fiscal discipline here in Washington.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I ask the gentleman, there is a Member on your side of the aisle who has, in my opinion, a very thoughtful, courageous, and substantive proposal. I happen not to agree with it, but I think it is a courageous, intellectually honest proposal. And that is Mr. RYAN, who's the ranking member of the Budget Committee. If the gentleman would like us to put that budget on the floor—which is from his chair when he was in the majority of the Budget Committee—that is a really substantive proposal. Again, I don't agree with it, but I think it intellectually is an honest, effective proposal to deal with a very serious problem, not a little problem, but a trillion-dollar problem; not a little problem that sounds good in sound bites but is not going to get us to where we need to be.

I think Mr. RYAN has such a proposal, and I certainly would urge the chairman of the Budget Committee to agree to make sure that's on the floor because I believe that is a substantive proposal. The gentleman says we don't put his substantive proposals on the

floor. That's made by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, one of the leaders of his party, representing your party on the Budget Committee. And I would be glad to make arrangements to have that proposal on the floor.

Would the gentleman want me to do that?

Mr. CANTOR. I say to the Speaker, the gentleman suggests that our ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN's roadmap proposal, is the budget. That is not the budget. That's a 75-year document. The gentleman, I think, knows, if he's looked at that, it is a plan to try and address the very real fiscal challenges that this country faces.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with that.

Mr. CANTOR. And our job here in this Congress is to go about trying to address the problems through the processes that his party has put in place.

Right now, priority one should be a budget. Okay. So if the gentleman is suggesting that perhaps we bring Mr. RYAN's roadmap bill to the floor, a 75-year document, how is that even something that we could expect is a serious gesture to do something about the fiscal needs this country has when his party can't even produce a budget for this fiscal year?

So again I say, Mr. Speaker, let's get serious now. There are a lot of things we can agree on. The budget cut that we brought to the floor today is something that I believe, up-or-down, if his Members were given the opportunity to vote on again and think about without being tainted by some accusation that it may not be for real, these are cuts that are serious. We've got to start somewhere, and the American people have said start here.

So this is what we're about, Mr. Speaker, and I'd ask the gentleman to work with us and bring these types of cuts to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. If the gentleman is really saying that \$2.5 billion is not something that we could start with—as if that's no money. I know he doesn't mean that. And only in Washington somehow has that become a sense that \$2.5 billion is not real money. Of course it is.

But we've got to find ways to work together. And if the gentleman says he'll bring up this bill but he can't support it, then the purpose is not for us to work together. We've got to work together to find a way to solve these problems.

And I'll yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I take that as a "no," that you're not interested in having that bill brought up.

But \$2.5 billion is a lot of money, and to the extent we cut \$2.5 billion or \$2.5 million, we ought to do it. You are going to have an opportunity to vote on that \$2.4 billion, 185,000 job-creation

bill probably next week. We're going to have it on the floor. So you'll have a chance to vote on that, I tell my friend.

We do want to work together. And the reason I keep bringing up is not to blame—I said this a couple of weeks ago—not to blame, but to point out the failure of the premise under which you have operated to do what you said it was going to do: create jobs, lower the deficit. In fact, it did the opposite. We followed that economic policy for 6 years. The American public said, We don't like this. And we couldn't change it because President Bush didn't want to change it.

In 2008, they said, We want new leadership. Unfortunately, the legacy we were left was the deepest economic recession as a result of those policies that this country has seen in 75 years. We're trying to dig out. It's difficult to dig out. We have a responsibility, however, to make the tough decisions to dig out.

You and I made a tough decision at President Bush's request in September. In February, we had to make another tough decision. You and I disagreed on that, and that was trying to put money into the economy, trying to stabilize it and bring jobs back. I suggest to the gentleman that that is working. It's not working as well as we would have liked, but we've had 4 months of job growth. Those 4 months, if they're replicated over the next two-thirds of the year, would create more jobs than were created in the 96 months of the Bush administration—1.7 million jobs. One million were created during the entire 8 years of the Bush administration, net.

We have a hole. We need to dig out. The gentleman is absolutely correct: to the extent that we dig together, America will be better. We want to do that.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Again, I would respond by saying it is just not all that black and white, and he knows it. There is no way that the blame for what happened can go singly to one party, one administration, or what have you. We all have to come here with the best of intentions to work together and to point to the good in this country and what made us who we are, and that is the freedom and the economic freedom afforded by our system.

Those are the principles by which we come to this building, Mr. Speaker. And some of us have a strong objection to the increasing sense that somehow we've got all of the answers here in Washington, that we don't have to listen to the people.

I'm glad to hear that the gentleman is going to bring some YouCut proposals to the floor. That's a great start. We need to keep listening to the people, doing what it is they expect, which is to get the Federal spending under control.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I look forward to working with Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. What I said was we'll bring the proposal to create those jobs to the floor—not to cut it, but to spend it because we believe that that will create 185,000 jobs. So I just didn't want to be misconstrued in what I said.

The gentleman will have an opportunity to vote against that, of course.

Mr. CANTOR. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for misunderstanding the gentleman.

I would respond to that statement then by saying the American people have told us to stop spending, to stop spending money we don't have. And that's the purpose for our sponsoring this provision today, the purpose for our launching YouCut, and we will expect to continue to have the votes on listening to the American people to begin to cut the Federal deficit.

But, again, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I look forward to working with the gentleman from Maryland in a fiscally responsible manner which, again, we would hope starts with passing a budget blueprint this year, making some of the tough decisions to cut spending just like the American families and small business people are doing as we speak.

And with that, I thank the gentleman for his time, and I yield back.

---

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,  
MAY 21, 2010, TO MONDAY, MAY  
24, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate; and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 25, 2010, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

---

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MARK E. SOUDER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable MARK E. SOUDER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 18, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This letter is to inform you that I have sent the enclosed letter to Governor Mitch Daniels of Indiana resigning my office as the United States Representative for the Third District of Indiana, effective Friday, May 21, 2010.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve the people of Indiana.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER,  
Member of Congress.