

And I think being a mom is worth the tradeoff of slowing down my career because I think it's great being a mom.

And that's the love that flows. That lady is not a fetal container. She's a mother, a mother that's brought love to each of the children that God's gifted this family with, just like the millions and millions of mothers across the planet who have done so, done so out of love, out of faith, out of conviction.

And I can't understand the people that would cheer and celebrate the tax dollars of American people going to any place that provides abortion services and counseling.

That is what happens, Mr. Speaker. And I know the gentleman from New Jersey has a few more words.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Just a couple of final comments. And I again thank my friend and colleague for his leadership on this fundamental human rights issue of protecting the unborn child.

You know, the most persecuted minority in the world today are unborn children. The acceptable bias today is abortion. To be prejudiced against unborn children is somehow acceptable. It's certainly legal in this country. And that is a very significant tragedy for our society.

It is time we called it for what it is. It is child abuse, abortion. It is violence against children. It is prejudice. And I would hope that Members—you know, I've heard some of our finest leaders in the pro-life movement say over the years that Americans won't stop abortion until they see it. We have to push away the euphemisms that have cloaked this for the last three decades and figure it out, not figure it out, just simply spend some time focusing on what it is that the abortionist does. It is violence against children. It actually engenders pain for the unborn child.

My friend and colleague will know that 3 years ago, 4 years ago I offered legislation on this floor called the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act. We got 250 votes, bipartisan votes for at least advising a woman that, from at least the 20th week on, her child might feel significant pain. The evidence clearly suggests that a child who is killed by dismemberment or some other hideous method of abortion, feels pain that is up to four times more excruciating than a newborn or an older child because the nerve endings are so close to the skin, and the ability of the body to dampen pain has not matured sufficiently.

There's a method of abortion known as the D&E. The method literally involves hacking off the arms and the legs of an unborn child, decapitation, takes upwards of 30 minutes for that method to effectuate its kill. And at least in the beginning moments of that abortion, the child feels excruciating pain.

Today, because of the great work of people like Dr. Anand and others, when

prenatal surgeries are performed and the child needs to be surgically opened up to do some procedure that is benign and life-affirming, he or she gets anesthesia. An unborn child gets no such consideration. We treat animals with more benevolence and in a more caring way in terms of pain mitigation than we do unborn children.

That legislation should be on this floor. A child should not only not suffer the cruelty of being killed, but also the pain that goes along with it. Most Americans are woefully unaware. Some of my colleagues, our colleagues are probably woefully unaware as well that pain is real for these children as they die a death due to abortion.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I very much thank the gentleman from New Jersey. And it brings to mind an image that many of us have seen of an in-utero surgery where that—not only does that little unborn child feel the pain, but that little child reached up out of the incision and grasped the finger of the surgeon. I'll never forget that image. And it was something that floated around the Internet for a long time, and I think it would be worth bringing to this floor. Very, very human.

And as I listened to Mr. SMITH, the gentleman from New Jersey, I have to reflect back on our dear departed friend and colleague, Henry Hyde, who was a stalwart on the life issue. And I wrote this down from the back of the program at his funeral in Chicago that day. His last day on this Earth was November 29, 2007. And I think it's a good place, Mr. Speaker, to close this special order with a quote from Henry Hyde. And he said this:

"When the time comes, as it surely will, when we face that awesome moment, the final judgment, I've often thought, as Fulton Sheen wrote, that it's a terrible moment of loneliness. You have no advocates. You are there alone, standing before God. And a terror will rip through your soul like nothing you can imagine. But I really think that those in the pro-life movement will not be alone. I think there will be a chorus of voices that are not heard in this world that will be heard in the next, beautifully and clearly. And they will plead for everyone who has been in this movement, they will say to God, spare him because he loved us, and God will look at you and say not did you succeed, but did you try."

Mr. Speaker, I will yield back.

□ 2145

THE CONCERN OF AMERICA'S FUTURE DIRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. I appreciate the impassioned gentlemen and their commitment to a pro-life agenda. I truly do.

I stand tonight and rise because of my concern about the direction of this country. I was elected here as a freshman. I did not create this problem in Washington, D.C., but I am here to help clean it up. We have the greatest opportunities ahead of us. The United States of America is the single greatest country on the face of the planet, and every time we are faced with a challenge, we overcome the obstacles that are thrown ahead of us. I would like to see our government get out of the way and stop being an impediment. I want to make sure that it is the American entrepreneur who is emboldened. It has always been the American entrepreneur who has driven this country forward.

As I rise today, my concern is that often what we hear and see in Washington, D.C., is not a reflection of the reality. The rhetoric has been very strong, but with all due respect to our President, of whom I have the greatest admiration—he is a great success story—what I hear and what I see tend to be two different things. There has been some good work done by Phil Kerpen of the Americans for Prosperity. I appreciate the work that he has done. I want to touch on a few points that I have great concern about.

We were promised by this administration and by the Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker, that we would have this sunlight before signing things. In this body right here, the House Republicans and Democrats unanimously passed a resolution that said we would have 48 hours to review a bill before we would sign it. Yet, shortly thereafter, the single largest spending bill in the history of the United States passed out of the Rules Committee. It was just around midnight when we got the final copy of the bill, the so-called "stimulus bill." Just over 13 hours later, we had to vote on it. That is absolutely the wrong direction.

Then candidate Barack Obama said, "Too often, bills are rushed through Congress and to the President before the public has the opportunity to review them. As President, Obama will not sign any nonemergency bill without giving the American public an opportunity to review and comment on the White House Web site for 5 days." That does not happen on a regular basis, and it is wrong. It needs to change. We need to live up to those campaign commitments. They are not happening now.

The American people were promised that lobbyists would not be participants in this administration. On the Barack Obama Web site, it says, "No political appointees in an Obama-Biden administration will be permitted to work on regulations or contracts directly and substantially related to their prior employer for 2 years, and no political appointee will be able to lobby the executive branch after leaving government service during the remainder of the administration." That

is not happening. That is not happening.

During the campaign, we talked about there being no tax hikes on the poor. On September 12, 2008, in Dover, New Hampshire, the President said, "I can make a firm pledge. Under my plan, no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase—not your income tax, not your payroll tax, not your capital gains tax, not any of your taxes." What was one of the first bills that the President signed? A tax increase. It was the SCHIP bill. It was under the disguise that we were going to help children with their health care insurance. He raised the taxes on cigarettes. That affects a host of Americans. Now, I don't smoke; I don't advocate smoking, but the reality is there are a whole lot of smokers who make less than \$250,000 a year. That was a tax increase. That was in opposition to what the President said he would do. There are other examples.

We were encouraged by the President to pass in this body legislation free of earmarks. We were promised earmark reform. The statement on earmarks that came out on March 10: "The system is broken. We can no longer accept a process that doles out earmarks based on a Member of Congress' seniority rather than the merit of the project. We can no longer accept an earmarks process that has become so complicated to navigate that a municipality or nonprofit group has to hire high-priced D.C. lobbyists to do it, and we can no longer accept an earmarks process in which many of the projects being funded fail to address the real needs of our country."

When the President addressed the joint session of Congress, I was sitting right there in the seventh row. The President said he wanted no earmarks. The very next day, the United States Congress, despite a lot of us who voted "no" against it, passed a \$410 billion appropriation with no less than 8,500 earmarks. The President signed it.

Big government: In the joint address to Congress, the President said, "Not because I believe in bigger government—I don't." Now, I want to believe the President when he says he doesn't believe in big government, but we have the single largest expansion of government in the history of the United States happening, one of the largest tax increases in the history of the United States of America.

So, when I look at the President's budget, when I look at what NANCY PELOSI is proposing as the Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker, I have serious questions and reservations because I believe that this budget that I am looking at and that we are going to be asked to vote on very soon spends far too much money; it taxes us on too much money, and it borrows too much money. We are fundamentally compromising our future.

You know, I have worked for big companies. I have worked for small

companies. I have owned my own company. I have spent 16-plus years in the local business community. I have hired people in the past, and there is a fundamental thing that I look for. I just want to hire people who will do what they say they are going to do. I think the American people should demand that with regard to what is happening in Washington, D.C. I think we should demand that at every level of government.

Earlier today, we saw the next nominee for the Secretary of Health and Human Services admitting that she had failed to pay taxes. Shouldn't there be a standard, a level, that says, "You know what? If you can't figure out how to pay your taxes accurately or if you can't hire the right person to get your taxes done properly, then you're probably disqualified for being a secretary-level person in this United States Government"? It is so disappointing. It is so disappointing.

We have great hurdles, great opportunities ahead of us. There is probably nothing stronger in this country and more fundamental to what we should be doing in this government than our national security. I am joined today by somebody who is passionate about national defense, about the great work that men and women are doing all across the world to help us, to protect us.

During my campaign, I had an opportunity to meet a number of soldiers who did not come home to this same kind of welcoming that they thought they would. They were injured. They came back to families who were so concerned because the breadwinners in their families could no longer win the bread. These were brave men and women, soldiers, who fought and sacrificed for our country. I fundamentally do not believe we are taking as good of care of them as we should be. These are people who are giving so much. It is not welfare. It is not a handout for us to take care of the men and women who are taking care of us.

So, as I look at all of these broken promises, at all of these things that we are supposed to be doing—basic, fundamental things within our government—I find that one of the true, proper roles of government and that one of the things we really should be doing is making sure we are taking care of our military.

So I would like to take a moment, if I could, and yield for a time to my friend, the gentleman from California, Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from Utah. Thank you for your leadership and for your courage in telling the American people and in telling the Members of Congress what is really going on and what the money is being spent on that the President is asking for and that the Democrats are asking for. Thank you for your kind words as well.

I have been to Iraq twice as a United States marine, and I have been to Af-

ghanistan once. We are probably at the biggest tipping point that we have ever seen since World War II when it comes to national defense and to national security. We have more violence along our border region than we have ever had in this country. Right now, with those two, large, pressing issues, we are spending a pittance on those two issues—the national security issues that involve the border and that involve Iraq and Afghanistan and China and North Korea and Russia—compared to what we are spending in giving money to the failed companies run into the ground by their executives who have been ruled by greed. I would like to go over some of those shortfalls in the President's defense budget coming up.

First off, in fiscal year 2010, the President's budget is \$30 billion less than what the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are the ones who are the experts on the military and on what the American military needs to sustain itself and to fight future threats and future enemies. We are \$30 billion short. They asked for \$584 billion for fiscal year 2010. The President is only going to give them \$533 billion. This is a 10 percent decrease over what the joint chiefs asked for over 10 years. That is a \$1.3 trillion deficit for the U.S. military at a time when we are fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan and when we are prosecuting terrorists around the world for our security here at home.

We have veterans returning home, and we have people coming home who have given that ultimate sacrifice, those who have paid that ultimate price, who have given that final measure of devotion. We are going to cut spending for them. We are going to cut their benefits here at home. We are going to cut the money that goes towards their armor and their bullets and their food and their medicine. We are going to cut that right now. In this time of gluttonous spending, we are going to choose to cut spending for our U.S. military.

Our Navy fleet has declined from 568 ships in the late 1980s to 276 ships now. We need over 300. The average age of the airplanes in the Air Force has risen from 9 years in 1973 to 24 years old. I mean the average age of each of the Air Force's airplanes is over 27 years old. They used to have 37 fighter wing equivalents in the '80s. Now they have only 20. This past year alone, ship maintenance funding is \$417 million short. That is not what I would call putting America's security first. That is putting America's security last.

When I hear the President talking about national security or when I hear the Democrats giving a moment of silence in this room for our military, it seems insincere to me that they would do that on one hand and tell the American people that they are helping out and that they are doing everything that they can do for national security's sake while, at the same time, they are

going to cut defense spending. JFK spent more on defense than we are spending now. Ronald Reagan spent more on defense than we are spending now. While in the middle of two wars, we need to increase, if anything, defense spending and keep it at 4 percent of our GDP to keep America safe. We have more threats now than we have ever had.

I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Well, thank you, and thank you for your personal service to this country. I know that you have served and have served with honor, and I know that your father has served in this body. He was a great inspiration to me and to a lot of Americans, and I appreciate your commitment to making sure that our United States military is taken care of.

You know, when we passed the stimulus bill, I did not vote for it. In fact, 100 percent of the Republicans did not vote for it. It took \$1 trillion and sprinkled it over 106 Federal programs and grew government. The loser in this budget, in addition to the American people with the debt that they are saddled with and the overspending that is there and the borrowing that has to happen, is the military. We are in the middle of armed conflicts, and the United States of America can never, ever be second. It can never, ever be close to somebody else.

We have to have the very best intelligence. We have to have the very best equipment. We have the best men and women, but we are not taking care of those men and women. I wish this budget that we are looking at would take care of those men and women and would take care of the weapons systems and things that we need to do to keep this country safe and to keep the world safe. The sacrifice that those men and women give and that the families give is just unparalleled. It is absolutely amazing.

I want to tell a quick story here—a little perspective if I could—of a man who served in Vietnam. He happens to be my brother Alex's father-in-law. His father-in-law is named Bob Johnson. You know, when I think about this budget and about what is happening, I think about Bob. I think: What about Bob? You know, what about Bob? Because Bob is just a great American. He is working hard. He is doing exactly what we want him to do. Yet this budget and this administration seem to want to punish success and reward failure.

□ 2200

It is exactly the opposite of what I think we ought to be doing.

And on March 16 of 2009, the President said—I want to read a quote from an address he gave related to small business, and I am extracting one paragraph, but I would encourage everybody to go back and read it for themselves.

In one paragraph, he said, “Small businesses are the heart of the Amer-

ican economy. They are responsible for half of all private sector jobs—and they create roughly 70 percent of all new jobs in the past decade. So small businesses are not only job generators, they are also the heart of the American dream. After all, these are businesses born in family meetings around kitchen tables. They're born when a worker takes a chance on her desire to be her own boss. They are born when a part-time inventor becomes a full-time entrepreneur, or when somebody sees a product that could be better or a service that could be smarter, and they think, ‘Well, why not me? Let me try it. Let me take a shot.’”

The President delivers it a little bit better than I do. I understand that. He's the President of the United States.

I agree with everything that he said in that paragraph. But as I look at this budget, it fundamentally does not help the small businessman. Because it extends spending, it increases taxes, and puts borrowing at record levels. Literally double.

Let me tell a really quick brief story here about Bob Johnson, what about Bob, in Topeka, Kansas.

Bob has lived his whole life in Kansas. He was raised on a farm with six brothers and sisters. After high school, Bob joined the Marines. He wanted a better life for himself. He served in Vietnam and was honorably discharged.

He went back home to Kansas, married his high school sweetheart, Janet. Together they raised a daughter, Christy. Bob spent his days and nights learning a trade, and when he mastered that trade, he opened up his own transmission shop in Topeka, Kansas. And for the past 30 years, Bob Johnson has worked his tail off to make sure that the Topeka Transmission Service is the most successful, most disciplined, cleanest-run shop in town. People who know Bob know they are going to get good service, and a lot of people in town know Bob. He's using the skills he learned as a farmer and a marine to teach his employees that character, skill, and hard work are the formula for success. And Bob has undoubtedly been successful.

His daughter was the first in their family to graduate from college, the University of Kansas, the Jayhawks. His business has been successful. His employees have earned their paychecks. Bob cares about their success and his customers being happy. And Bob's business pays their taxes so this Congress has resources to spend.

So I ask what have we done to support Bob lately? Bob is the heart and engine of the United States. He's the heart and soul of the dream. It's what drives this country forward.

Well, lately he's probably seen his savings get obliterated like the rest of the hardworking Americans. As a small business owner, he appears to be the target for a tax increase. That's Bob's reward. Work hard for 30 years, do ev-

everything right, and now suddenly we're going to tax him more, we're going to spend more and we're going to leave his family and his grandkids, Jake and Taylor, a legacy of debt.

So what do you think Bob's choices will be? Do you think he will be in a position to give his employees a raise? Do you think he will be in a position to hire more people? Or do you think Bob Johnson will get more protective of what he has and worry more about how he's going to meet his payroll and how he's going to keep the employees he has and the savings he's worked so hard for over the last 30 years?

I don't think we're doing him any favors with this budget. There is nothing in the stimulus, there is nothing in the bailouts, there is nothing in our tax policy that rewards Bob Johnson. And yet Bob Johnson—I agree with the President—he's the heart and soul of what is going to drive this country forward representing 70 percent of the new jobs.

The Obama budget spends at record levels, it taxes at record levels and doubles our national debt by spending, taxing and borrowing too much. That's what we're doing to destroy the American dream.

I have another colleague here who is also a freshman. He didn't create any challenges, but like me, he's here to help clean it up.

I would like to yield some time to my friend from Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA.

Mr. AUSTRIA. I thank the gentleman from Utah. I thank you for the great work you are doing for the State of Utah and our country as a freshman. Thank you for putting this on today.

I want to thank my other colleague from California. Thank you for your service to our country. Thank you for putting things in perspective for our military.

And I want to add one thing. We had an opportunity to change some of this budget, and another freshman—it seems like the freshmen now are taking the lead role on some of this stuff, which is good—Congressman HARPER from Mississippi and myself cosponsored an amendment in the budget that would put the troops' increase, their pay increase where it should be at 3.4 percent where it has been lowered and marked down in this budget to 2.9, which is the minimal amount required by statute.

When we have troops that are now fighting in two wars, we're increasing the number of troops in Afghanistan—I have had an opportunity, I represent the largest single site employer in the State of Ohio Wright Patterson Air Force Base. I have four military facilities in my district. I have had an opportunity to attend a number of deployments for men and women in the military. And I have to say, they are the greatest people I have had an opportunity to meet, and I would go so far as to say it's the next greatest generation that's serving our country today.

And when these—we're asking these men and women to serve and the deployments are lengthier than what was expected, more often than what was expected. There are tremendous sacrifices that are being made by their families, by our troops. I think that the least we can do in this budget is not cut what was expected as far as their pay but give them the increase that they deserve, and in my opinion earned. They are doing a spectacular job in protecting us, and we thank them for their sacrifices to protect our freedom.

But unfortunately, that amendment was shot down and was voted down in Budget by the other side of the aisle. And so we had an opportunity to try to fix some of that, and we didn't do that in the Budget Committee, and I hope that we can get our priorities straight on that.

Let me build off of my colleague from Utah. Let me talk about Ohio because you two are out west and some of the things that you talked about—the difficult times that small businesses are going through, families are going through out west—we are experiencing these things in the midwest.

I represent the State of Ohio, the heart of the midwest. And I can tell you we have over 900,000 small businesses in the State of Ohio. And within the last few weeks, in particular, our phones in the district offices have been ringing. Business have been calling us, families have been calling us. They are going through very difficult times right now. They are making sacrifices for our country. Small businesses are calling us, and they are having difficulty getting the financing, the credit that they need to be able to meet their payroll, to be able to save the jobs that are out there, much less create new jobs and sustain those jobs in the long term.

The Bob Johnsons that you just talked about. We have a lot of Bob Johnsons, those types of businesses in Ohio, and they are the economic engine of our State and this country. As you mentioned, they create 60 to 80 percent of the jobs across this country. And I think here in Congress we can do better.

As freshmen, we've been in Congress now for less than 100 days, and we have been faced with a \$700 billion TARP financial market bailout that has not worked, in my opinion. It has been a disaster because there's been no—there hasn't been the accountability needed, there hasn't been the transparency as to how that money has been in place. There is no plan in place.

The Treasury Department did not have a plan in place. We had Secretary Geithner come into the Budget Committee, and we asked him about the financial bailout, the market bailout. And he could not give us specific answers as to how the money that has been spent has been spent and how their plans on the future dollars on how they were going to be spent.

And then we had the stimulus package, \$791 billion spending package, I call it, \$1.1 trillion over the next 10 years of taxpayers' dollars. In that stimulus package was a paragraph in there on a bill that not one Member of Congress had an opportunity to read completely before we voted on that, said, You know what? We can now take your tax dollars, we can use it as a bailout, give it to a company like AIG, and they can pay out \$165 million in bonuses, 73 of those being over \$1-million bonuses. One lucky guy got a \$1.64 million bonus, and twelve of them don't even work for the company.

These are hardworking American taxpayers' dollars that are paying out these bonuses. As the public begins to understand what is happening here in D.C., they are outraged. They are outraged by this stuff, and it shouldn't be happening. We can do better than that.

Now we have a \$3.9 trillion budget before us. And guess what is in this budget? We're now going to tell you how we're going to pay for the historical amount of debt that we just built up. We're going to start taxing the American people.

In this bill, there is nearly a \$2 trillion tax hike over the next decade: \$2 trillion of taxes. That's going to further weaken America's prospects with sustained economic growth and job creation well into the future. And let me tell you who's going to be paying for this. It is going to be many of our small business owners that are struggling to make paycheck to paycheck, that are struggling to not just save jobs but create jobs and be able to sustain those jobs. Now they know they have a tax increase coming at them. I mean, is that how we're going to expand and create new jobs?

American families, 95 to 100 percent of the American families across this country, we're now going to hit you with higher costs on energy, taxes. This little thing that's stuck in the budget—and I appreciate your chart up there because I think it helps put things in perspective as to how we're paying for this debt. We're going to stick this proposal in there that's cap-and-trade. It sounds harmless. It is not harmless. We're talking about \$629 billion of tax increases on families, families that are making sacrifices right now that are struggling to make it paycheck to paycheck.

Anyone who uses natural gas, who turns on your light switch, who uses electricity, heats their home, fills up their gasoline tank, you know what we're going to do now in this budget we're going to raise the cost of energy on you for the average American family of about \$1,600 per household.

So everybody's electricity rates—anybody that uses any type of CO₂ or carbon, your energy costs are now going up.

And then this tax is also—this is what worries me in Ohio because we have a lot of manufacturing in Ohio. It's the number one industry with agri-

culture. It's going to further erode the job growth in the U.S. manufacturing sector. It's going to put American companies at an even greater competitive disadvantage with China and other companies—or other countries. I apologize. It's late tonight.

And this is what is supposed to be turning our economy around creating jobs, this cap-and-trade proposal, which should be called a cap-and-tax proposal. We can do better. We should be doing better. And let me tell you, the reality is that all of this infusion of spending in government and expanding government, the reality is we are serving our constituents in our district, and we have constituents that are out there that are asking for our help right now. They don't know where to go. This is not good for them. They can't get the financing, they can't get the credit to help save and create new jobs. And we can do better. We should be targeted on our small businesses, on those families that are struggling.

And I know both in your States, Utah and California, and across this country, they are going through the same thing.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will yield back. I know you've been wanting to jump in on this.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. The people in Ohio, so much like what is happening in California and which is what is happening in Utah.

I look at the State budget in the State of Utah for the entire State. Everything they need to do is roughly \$11 billion. And here this Federal budget is going to be nearly \$4 trillion. It's a number so big we can't even fathom how big it is.

I heard this great stat that is just mind boggling. It says if you spend \$1 million a day every day, it would take you nearly 3,000 years to get to \$1 trillion. And we're going to spend 4? The numbers are so astronomical.

I really believe the heart and soul of what we've got to do is get back to the proper role of government. The former Secretary of Agriculture wrote a great talk that's turned into this pamphlet. It talks about the proper role of government. And the essence of it is we can't be all things to all people. The government is there to provide some very basic needs and services to protect the community.

But it is not there to be all things to all people. We vote on a regular basis in the United States Congress for things we, as a Federal Government, have no business doing. And when we have men and women, businesses that are struggling, how can we look at a budget and look at this chart here, where based on the President's own numbers, his scenario, that we will double the debt? How can you look at—look. We cannot run this government on a credit card. We've been doing it. Too many people in the United States have been doing it. But it just gets you further and further into trouble.

I feel a duty and obligation to leave this country better than how we found

it. When you have a budget that spends this much and taxes to the degree it does and it borrows at these record levels, I just don't think that we can sustain that. And certainly for my kids it is not going to leave the world a better place.

Nearly 30 cents in this budget, nearly 30 cents of every dollar. Think about that. Nearly 30 percent, 30 cents of every dollar will be spent by the Federal Government.

What about Bob? Who do you think is better to run Bob's transmission shop? Bob or Washington, D.C.? The Federal Government? It's Bob. And that's fundamentally what I have challenges with.

I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER.

□ 2215

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

You know, as freshmen, we can honestly say that we're not responsible for what's going on right now, but we are trying to fix it.

We came into this Congress in January with President Obama; and, frankly, I believe what he said when he was campaigning. When he talked about making tough choices, when he talked about not spending so much, when he talked about tax cuts for the middle class, when he talked about our foreign debt and the money that we owe China and money that we owe the rest of the world, I believed him, along with majority of the American people.

But it turns out that those tax cuts and that spending reduction and that reduction in debt and that reduction in borrowing were simply campaign talking points because they don't exist in the administration's budget as it exists now.

I would like to know where those tough choices are. Where are those cuts? Where is Bob's tax cut? First, how are we going to pay for all of this spending? For that chart that shows that debt, how are we going to pay for it?

As my colleague from Ohio mentioned, we're going to raise taxes on people who use electricity. I have news for the administration; this is everybody. Everybody uses electricity. We're going to put a \$640 billion tax on Americans who use electricity. For every small business that uses electricity, that has carbon emissions, this cap-and-trade tax is going to kill American business. We're going to raise taxes on small businesses. We're going to raise taxes on the middle class. Bob's tax cut isn't there.

You know, we talk about energy right now. I would encourage my colleagues to be extremely skeptical over any talking points that talk about energy in this country and becoming self-sufficient on energy when it doesn't mention nuclear. If you don't mention nuclear, then it is not a real alternative to using oil that we get from foreign countries, especially when we

are going to tax the American people for using electricity.

It's hard to trust the administration when they talk about fixing the economy, but they want to tax small businesses and the middle class, and we maintain record trade deficits with countries around the world.

We're not talking about trade right now. No one is talking about fixing our trade relations with China so that American companies and American manufacturing firms are punished right now for making American goods and trying to ship them overseas. They're being punished, but we're not talking about helping them out. We're going to tax them more.

When we talk about national security, the administration wants us to think that they're going to be good on national security while at the same time cutting defense. Where are these hard choices?

Right now, every man, woman, and child in this country owes \$35,000 in debt that you show on that chart. With the President's plan, that's going to increase to \$70,000 in 8 years. Every man, woman, and child is going to owe \$70,000. I have three children, too. Each one of them is going to owe \$70,000 in 8 years if the administration budget goes through.

I would like to say to my colleagues and to the President; we don't need anymore stimulus. We don't need any more TARP, no energy tax, no small business tax raise, no tax raise on the middle class. The President is spending, taxing, and borrowing into oblivion. It is time that he put the checkbook down.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman from California. You're exactly right. I mean, just look at this chart. You look at the spending, and yet, didn't we all hear in the campaign from the President that we were going to rein in spending? How many times did we hear during the campaign, "a debt we inherited"?

Well, I ran against it. I ran against the Republicans. I'm a Republican and I ran against it. I said, look, they had the House and Senate and the Presidency and they blew it, they overspent, but somehow we were going to change. That change under this budget represents a doubling of the debt and all-time record-high expenditures.

No matter which financial statistic you want to do, this is the biggest, especially if you look at it as a percentage of the gross domestic product, nearly 30 cents of every dollar.

Mr. AUSTRIA. If the gentleman would yield for just a moment, because I think what these tax hikes are doing, they're giving the illusion that they're not really increasing the deficit or the debt as much as they really are. And the fact is, without any spending restraints—and you have got your chart up there—that this illusion is only going to last so long, because even with all these tax increases, the budget's spending growth is so explosive that it

outpaces the revenue for the entire budget. I mean, the entire budget period, you know, the spending outpaces the revenue that even these huge tax hikes can bring in.

And I think it's a feel-good thing. I think it's one of those where the Federal Government right now thinks that they can just spend all they want for as long as they want, just continue to borrow, and now they're going to start taxing families and all so that they can keep this feel-good spending going on. And I think the Americans, as they begin to realize what's going on here in D.C., are becoming more and more outraged, and businesses are already very concerned on how they're going to be able to continue to survive.

I thank you for yielding.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Again, September 12, 2008, in Dover, New Hampshire, Barack Obama said, "I can make a firm pledge. Under my plan, no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase. Not your income tax, not your payroll tax, not your capital gains tax, not any of your taxes."

One of the very first bills he signed, tax increase on cigarettes. That affects Americans across the board. This energy tax, the so-called cap-and-trade, will affect 100 percent of Americans. Every single American's going to have to pay this tax because those energy needs affect every single industry, every single product, and every single household.

This is not the time to be raising taxes, and I think there's something to be said about self-restraint, self-responsibility, personal responsibility.

You know, you look at Wall Street and you look at some of these big fat cats, and you see this greed and it makes you mad. It makes you mad, especially when you know that the government went into everybody's pockets—I mean, this is what I try to tell my staff, my kids, myself. When we have an expenditure before the United States Congress, what you really need to ask yourself is, is it right for the government to reach into the people's pockets, everybody's pockets, and pull out money and give it to somebody else over here? Is that right? I mean, that's the prism by which I think we should be asking are these expenditures proper, are they right, and is this what we should be doing.

And yet, as I look at that, I just think, my goodness, we cannot keep pulling money out of people's pockets. We just can't keep doing that. There's no way for the American entrepreneur to thrive if you continue to do that. What about the Bobs of the world? How are they going to grow their business?

So I look at that, and I get so infuriated because we have such great opportunities. We're the greatest country on the face of the planet, but as I look at this idea of personal responsibility, you know, cable television in this country is not a right. It's not a right. You have to get out there and earn it.

You've got to go take care of it, take care of yourself, take care of your family. We're turning into this nanny State.

People get all uppity when I say we're turning into this socialist Nation. How can you look at the definition of that and say, no, that we're going in the opposite—we're just not going in the right direction. We seem to have this socialist mentality that we've got to take care of everyone and everything, and yet this country was founded on the idea of the right to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness.

Remember when President Kennedy said those famous words, probably some of the most famous words ever uttered by a President of the United States: Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country? And yet look at where we are today. Everybody's got their hand out, and it just feels so wrong and so wrong that our government just wants to pull more out. They want to spend more, and if they don't have the revenue, well, they just keep borrowing more.

So we have to have I think a gut-check and a realization in this country that we can't be all things to all people. We're going to have to make some hard decisions. The President campaigned on that. I campaigned on it. I think you gentlemen campaigned on that. We've got to make some hard decisions around here. We can't be all things to all people.

With that, I'd like to yield a moment to my friend, DUNCAN HUNTER from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding, and you're absolutely right.

Whoever thinks that we can spur this economy back into action by taking money out of the American people's pockets is delusional. Whoever thinks that we can bring this economy, the greatest economy in the world still, put it back on its feet by taxing people for using electricity is delusional. Whoever thinks that by increasing the per capita debt for each man, woman, and child in this country from \$35,000 to \$70,000 in 8 years, that that's going to help the country out, they're delusional.

I'd like to read a letter here from a small business owner in my district in eastern San Diego: "President Obama has unleashed his massive grassroots army in an attempt to sway Members of Congress to support his bloated \$3.55 trillion budget." I think it's actually higher now. It was 3.55 when this letter was written.

"I urge you to resist such attempts, and oppose his irresponsible budget plan that would usher in massive tax hikes, including the imposition of a global warming carbon tax, a doubling of the publicly held national debt, and a permanent expansion of the Federal Government.

"There is no measure of fiscal responsibility and accountability with

this budget. Instead we are merely breaking the backs of hardworking taxpayers and passing the buck on to our children.

"Any budget that doesn't have the best interests of the American people at heart must be opposed."

And that's the key to this budget. It does not have the best interests of the American people at heart. What it has at heart is the biggest government Federal grab of power that this country has ever seen. From our founding—the gentleman from Utah is absolutely right—it's been about rugged individualism and individual responsibility, people taking responsibility for their actions.

Right now, we're punishing those people that take responsibility for their actions, punishing those people that pay their mortgages, punishing those people that actually can get out there and start businesses and hire people. And we're doing it so we can help out those who maybe don't want to help themselves, who look to us here in this Congress as their savior.

When this stimulus bill was passed, one of our Democrat colleagues from Florida actually said that this stimulus bill will heal the sick, feed the hungry, and house the homeless. The stimulus bill was not the Messiah. I have news for him: it was not the Messiah. It will not do any of those things.

What it will make happen is make the American people more dependent on a failing Federal bureaucracy that's growing at an unprecedented rate.

I thank the gentleman from Utah and the gentleman from Ohio for their leadership in this and for pointing out to our colleagues in Congress and to the American people the evils that are about to befall us in this country if we have unrestrained spending, unrestrained taxing, and unrestrained borrowing, which is exactly what the President's budget gives us.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. I think you're exactly right. Somebody has to pay the bill. You know, you can't just take and take and take and not actually produce things.

I worry that this country has this mentality that manufacturing's bad. Manufacturing's good. We have to remember in this country, we succeeded when we created things, and that manufacturing is so critical and important to our future. We actually have to create and invent and get up out of our seats. When the going gets tough, we ought to get going.

And I would expect that people take on their own personal responsibility, that they set greed aside, that they remember the words of John F. Kennedy: Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country? Great words. The reason we learned them in school is because they're so profound and they withstand the test of time.

And so I still have the greatest optimism about the United States of America. The reason we spend time away, all

of us, from our families night after night to serve in the United States Congress—it's a great honor, it's a great privilege—but the reason I think we fight and have that passion and we're fired up about the United States of America is we want it to go the right direction.

□ 2230

I, too, was elected. I think if we can get back to those core principles of fiscal discipline, limited government, and a strong national defense, that will empower the Bob Johnsons of the world to be that entrepreneur, be the best they can be, provide for their family, get up off their tush and actually get out there and make things happen.

I know that the gentleman from Ohio shares those same values. I want to yield my time.

Mr. AUSTRIA. Let me tell you, it has been an honor tonight to stand up here with my colleagues, all of us being new Members here. Congressman CHAFFETZ from Utah, you are doing an outstanding job in representing your great State; to have a Member who's served in our military, and we thank you for your service, Congressman DUNCAN from California; two of my outstanding colleagues that I have had the honor to come in with in this class. There's 22, I think, Republicans, and 34 Democrats, if I'm not mistaken. Just outstanding talent. And to join the two of you.

I also have a family at home. I have three sons. When I came to Congress, I came to Congress because I thought I could make a positive change. I thought we had opportunities to change the direction this country was going and to really move in the right direction to help our small businesses, to help strengthen our economy, to help those families that were out there that are suffering right now going through difficult times.

Let me tell you, I did not come up here to run up the deficit, to create historic amounts of debt for my three sons at home, for our children and our grandchildren that will have to pay for this in years to come.

We have a budget that we will be debating this week and voting on this week that's now going to, all of a sudden, start taxing. This is how we are going to all of a sudden start paying down some of this debt and start taxes American families, as we have talked about tonight, by hitting them at home where it hurts most, we know, with heating their homes, filling their cars with gasoline, and electricity, as we mentioned multiple times.

It's not the way to go. I think we can do better. I think the American people expected better last November. They expected us to work in a bipartisan manner to move good public policy forward. Quite frankly, I haven't seen that in my first 100 days. What I've seen is business as usual here in Washington, D.C. It's been partisan politics, it has been legislation decided by a small group on one side of the aisle

only that has been pushing this stuff through.

I think the American people know, as they are beginning to realize what is going on—and many of them have gotten their quarterly statements. Their retirement accounts are down significantly. Their children's education funds are down significantly. Their savings accounts are down significantly.

It's starting to sink in what is really happening here. The concern is tremendous. We have a responsibility to be accountable for those hardworking Americans tax dollars. That's our responsibility in Congress, is to ensure that there's accountability, there's transparency, and that we do have a plan to turn this country around.

So, again, I thank my two colleagues for allowing me to join them tonight. Every day I walk into my office, I take off my coat, roll up my sleeves. I've got a wonderful intern by the name of Louis who comes in and says, Congressman, what fight do we have today?

I can tell you, we're not going to give up that fight. We're going to keep fighting and fighting for the hardworking Americans out there and hardworking taxpayers out there and being accountable for their tax dollars. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. It really is about personal accountability, about getting up, whatever your situation in life is and, believe me, people are hurting. We know that. The question is how do we best move forward. There's some that would argue that only government, only government, can solve these problems. I don't think so. I beg to differ.

I think it's the American entrepreneur, it's the American families, it's the strength of the individuals collectively within this country that, given the right set of freedoms, the right set of liberties, that can pursue their own happiness. That's what makes this country great. That's what makes this country so strong.

It's also the right and the opportunity to vote and participate. I've got concerns about another big initiative that's being slammed down the Americans' throats, and that is card check. I recognize the right of people if they want to gather together and join a union. But how we do that—if we don't get the process right, we can't ever get good results.

I look at the way we look at things in the United States Congress. When the single-largest single spending bill in the history of the United States came before this body and we just over 13 hours to review it, there was not one Member of the United States Congress able to read it. It's physically impossible to go through the 1,400 pages of a \$1 trillion bill, the single largest bill in the history of the United States, and actually try to consume that.

So if you don't get the process right, it's really hard to get a good result.

Mr. GOHMERT's here with us from Texas. I'd appreciate it if he would join

us. I'd like to yield to him because I'm really concerned about this card check and what it's going to do to the American way of life.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend for yielding. He knows about scoring points—going back to school—but this is outrageous.

Here, the economy is hurting. And, as my friend so eloquently put it, the government doesn't do things better than business. Business always does a better job than government. Yet, here we are. We are piling on.

I don't know if most people are aware, but virtually every week we are putting more of our energy resources off limits. So we are going to run up the price of energy as we approach the summer—and the prices are already going up on their own. And then you have got this ridiculous spending that's going crazy. Begging the Chinese to keep loaning us money. We're going to print money. Inflation is going to hit it.

On top of that, we're going to really hammer free enterprise by saying, in effect—you guys wouldn't know this, but my elementary school teachers, who I think were all Democrats, were liars. Because they told me growing up in school that you cannot have a free society, a Democratic country, if you don't have a secret ballot. That's what they told me. And I believed them. I still believe them.

Yet, here is this bill, they call it card check, but it's the anti-secret ballot initiative by the Democratic leaders. Obviously, it's being pushed by the people they owe a great deal to.

But Fox News had a story on about the Dana Corporation Auto Parts in Albion, Indiana, and they said that the card check process has nearly torn the 50-person plant apart after harassment and intimidation from the United Auto Workers Union forced them to a secret ballot vote.

The union organizer, they said, came to the plant 2 years ago, asking employees to join the UAW because the company had signed a neutrality agreement with the union. The meeting didn't go well.

One of the people interviewed, Larry Guest, said, "He was using real rough language—cursing. It didn't go over well with the women at all. There were a couple that just got up and left."

So employees said the union representatives approached them in the break room, at the plant doors, and even followed them to their cars and just harassed them and even followed them home—and the employees verified this—and they said, "We're in a little town. We're in a plant of 50 some people. The last thing you need is to have a union come to your door saying: I want your name."

But that's all it took under the card check process. They didn't get a secret ballot. All they needed was their name. So if it meant following them home, following them to their car, going to their kids' baseball games, whatever it

took until they finally got them to sign just to get them off their backs.

As one employee said, Jamie Oliver, "When they approach you every day, every day, every day, after a while it's like 'Okay. Fine. I'll sign the card.'"

The UAW collected the necessary signatures but plant employees appealed to the NLRB—the employees appealed. Then they finally got it overturned. The card check didn't make their life better, it made it more miserable. So here you have got companies struggling to stay afloat.

Now I have had private businesses in my district say: I'm barely staying afloat. If this card check bill passes, I'm going to have to let everybody go. I'm too old to keep putting up with it. I've heard this from a number of people. We're going to let them go. And the card check will put a bunch more people out of business.

Here, at a time when the economy is already struggling, and I think my friend is so right—my friend from Utah nailed it—the American people are what makes this country great.

I was visiting with some students here from the Big Twelve. We have A&M, Baylor. They're still here, but the House rules say you can't acknowledge people in the gallery, so I won't. But we have some from Missouri, from Texas Tech. From around the Big Twelve. They get it. They know that the American people are the real strength of this country. And for the government to try to cram this stuff down on them and say, We do it better, is really outrageous.

So I appreciate all of my friends here today making that point to the American people.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. Thank you for your service. It's an honor to serve with you. We're on a committee together.

I want to talk about another bill that recently passed the United States Congress—something that I voted against. It's the so-called GIVE Act. Now think about this. Again, I think the way we ought to be looking at whether we ought to be spending money is to say: Is it right, is it proper to put the government's hand in everybody's pockets and pull money out and give it to somebody else. If the answer is yes, so be it.

National defense? Absolutely. It's in the Constitution, it's in all of our best interests. We have to have it in order to survive. Yet, that is the place that the President is trying to cut the budget. That's a proper role of government.

The so-called GIVE Act was going to be a program for paid volunteers. Now, to me, that is an oxymoron. It doesn't seem right. We are going to pay and compensate volunteers. It's just amazing to me.

PETE ROSKAM pulled out these quotes—a colleague of ours here in the House—the President said, "The question we ask today is not whether our government is too big or too small, but whether it works." Moments later, he

said, "Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, the programs will end."

I also remember the President said "we go line-by-line through the budget." Line-by-line. Have you heard anything that we're going to cut, other than national defense, one of the key cornerstones of things that has to happen in this country? I haven't heard that.

Where is that middle-class tax cut. I haven't seen it. To think you're going to get an extra \$10. You can barely get through Quiznos to do that.

Yet, they pass this GIVE Act—over \$5 billion in new money. There's a great Web site out there called ExpectMore.gov. It's put out by the Office of Management and Budget. There are over 1,100 Federal programs. Go to that Web site—ExpectMore.gov. You can look it up for yourself.

One of the things that was funded in the GIVE Act was Learn and Serve. According to the Office of Management and Budget, it is described as, "not performing; results not demonstrated."

It also funds AmeriCorps, the National Civilian Community Corps, which the OMB described as, "not performing. Ineffective." Yet, they just got a huge funding increase. And the President promised us, "Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, the programs will end."

I hope partly what I can do, Mr. Speaker, in my career, leaving at whatever point I do, that I can leave some mark at some point to say that we shrunk the size and scope of government, because we can no longer be all things to all people. We cannot take 30 cents of every dollar in this economy and spend it through the Federal Government. That is not the way to prosperity, that is not the way to pursue life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It's the American entrepreneur, it's the American family, it's the American businesswoman, it's my 16-year-old son who's getting ready to go in the world. And look at the debt. Governments going to do everything. No, it's not. And until the American people get fed up, they stand up, they call their representatives. There are a good number of people here on both sides of the aisle.

But we cannot be all things to all people. We have to say "no." You do it in your life, business does it every day. And this government and this President fails to do it every day.

Get fired up. Get all a hold of your representatives. We cannot have a budget that spends this much, that taxes this much, and that borrows this much. You're going to double your debt. Would you let that happen in your family? No. Would you let that happen to your business? No. Your government's doing it right now.

Please, stand up and get involved. Mr. AUSTRIA from Ohio, Mr. HUNTER from California, a host of other people,

they are passionate about this. We can't do it ourselves.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTHRIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today and April 1.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 681. An act to provide for special rules relating to assistance concerning the Greensburg, Kansas tornado, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 1, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1099. A letter from the Undersecretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the demonstration project notices, amendments, and changes requested by the Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories during calendar year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 110-181, section 1107(d); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1100. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 2 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1101. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Office of Justice Programs' Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Annual Report for 2008, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617, section 207; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1102. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Immunology and Microbiology Devices; Classification of Enterovirus Nucleic Acid Assay [Docket No. FDA-2008-N-0517] received January 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1103. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's 88th Annual Report covering the fiscal year from October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1104. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's fifteenth report, pursuant to Public Law 110-252, section 9204; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1105. A letter from the Secretary General, Inter-Parliamentary Union, transmitting notification that the Parliamentary Conference on the Global Economic Crisis will take place in Geneva at the United Nations European Headquarters — the Palais des Nations — on May 7 and 8, 2009; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1106. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 18-37, "Records Access Temporary Amendment Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1107. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 18-36, "SOME, Inc. Tax Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1108. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 18-35, "Randall School Development Project Tax Exemption Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1109. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's Notification and Federal Employees Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 Annual Report for fiscal year 2008; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1110. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1111. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's fourth Annual No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1112. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2008 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1113. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting draft legislation to reauthorize the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board for a period of five years; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1114. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-