REPEAL OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOWDY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. And I want to say that I appreciate the presentation that came from just some of the great team of doctors that we have here, especially on the Republican side of the United States Congress. I occasionally sit with these learned individuals, and I am grateful. I'm grateful that the American people have been able to review their presentation here tonight, looking at the numbers and the dollars that have come out of the health care because of this great burden of ObamaCare.

You know, I was thinking of the necessity for us to continue to remind Americans, ObamaCare is right now the law of the land. It is the law of the land. And until such time as this Congress repeals it or the Supreme Court should find it to be completely unconstitutional, it will remain the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to be reminded that even though it's creating fear, more people are realizing what ObamaCare is doing, a few people at a time, it is an insidious creeping of a malignant tumor that is metastasizing and consuming American liberty, and it has to go.

If we look back at the special elections in Ohio 2 or 3 weeks ago, on it were several ballot initiatives. The second ballot initiative was one that rejected the collective bargaining initiative that had been initiated by Governor Kasich. It was a tough loss for Governor Kasich. I think he was right, but he lost in the ballot place because there was a liberal-heavy, union-heavy turnout in the State of Ohio for that special election night 2 or 3 weeks ago. And by 61 percent, the Kasich-initiated ballot initiative that limited collective bargaining was shot down by a union-heavy, liberal-heavy turnout. And they spent a lot of money in Ohio to turn out that type of a base.

But in the same ballot, the next item down, ballot initiative No. 2 was collective bargaining. No. 3 was a constitutional amendment to amend the Constitution of the State of Ohio to protect Ohioans from ObamaCare, to be able to reject the individual mandate and a whole series, about three different points there, to amend the constitution to protect Ohioans from the ObamaCare mandate.

And, with a union-heavy, liberal-heavy turnout in Ohio in which 61 percent said “no” to Governor Kasich on collective bargaining, sixty-six percent of that voting universe voted to protect Ohioans from ObamaCare and to reject ObamaCare. That's a serious step, to step forward and amend the State constitution. But they did so in an effort to reject ObamaCare in the State of Ohio.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a resounding rejection, that two out of every three people that went to the polls rejected ObamaCare. I will tell you that when American people said so if they're reminded that it exists out there. And there are two things that protect the American people, two stops along the way that can keep ObamaCare from becoming the perpetually institutionalized permanent law of the land, and that would be when the Supreme Court hears the case and yields a decision. I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no severability clause in all 2,600 pages of ObamaCare. No severability clause.

What that means to the lay person is this: If a component of ObamaCare is found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, then all of ObamaCare is thrown out by the Supreme Court. There's no provision that stipulates that if a component of ObamaCare is unconstitutional, the other components will stand on their own.

That is not just an ignorant omission on the part of the people that drafted and promoted ObamaCare. ObamaCare. They knew it didn't have a severability clause in it. I knew it didn't have a severability clause in it. That means every Member of Congress had the opportunity to know that it didn't have a severability clause. So Congress, wisely and intentionally passed an ObamaCare piece of legislation that didn't provide that if a part of it is found to be unconstitutional, the balance of it would be found to be constitutional. And the important component of that then, Mr. Speaker is this. If a part is found unconstitutional, it's all unconstitutional, and all 2,600 pages of ObamaCare then, by a Supreme Court decision, will be rendered null and void.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are exceptions to those types of decisions by the Supreme Court. But generally speaking, the court honors and respects a willful decision of the legislative branch. If that willful decision is that there be no severability clause, the Supreme Court should understand that that wasn't an accident. It was an unintentional omission. It was a willful omission because the drafters and the proponents of ObamaCare, of which I am not one, understood that if a part of it is found to be unconstitutional, the rest of it collapses anyway of its own weight.

The components of this that prop up ObamaCare are cutting that $575 billion out of Medicare to fund other parts of ObamaCare and then ending Medicare Advantage. The individual mandate that's in there, all of this is delicately drafted to try to find a way to argue that it could be paid for. And our colleagues on the other side discovered that the CLASS Act in ObamaCare can't sustain itself. The numbers that they had advanced to try to pass it aren't sustainable. And so the administration
self for the incumbent President that
wouldn't know I'm right and accept
that.

The job of this Congress, the job of
the American people, is this: To
maintain people here in the House of
Representatives who are pledged to,
committed to, and will pass a repeal of
ObamaCare. It is also the decision of
the United States Senate, where I'm
asking, Mr. Speaker, for the American
people to put Senators over there that
will also vote to repeal ObamaCare,
pledge to do so, and pledge to drive it
and push it and use every fiber of their
being to rip that malignant tumor,
ObamaCare, out of the Federal
Register, out of the code, and give people
back their American liberty. It's not
enough to trust the Supreme Court to
make a constitutional decision and sit
back on our hands and think that
somehow the court is going to save us.
I remember what happened when
McCain-Feingold passed and then went
to the President's desk. That was
President Bush. And the word that
came back—and this is rumor and con-
tecture, Mr. Speaker—was that the
President had decided that he would
sign the bill because it had such mo-
mentum when it got there and political
support when it got there because he
expected the Supreme Court would find
McCain-Feingold to be unconstitu-
tional.

Well, over time, and thanks to Cit-
izens United and their lawsuits, parts
were found to be constitutional—not
all of it—and the limits that were put
on free speech within that were liti-
gated by Citizens United. I congratu-
late the people that had the vision to
take it to the Supreme Court and win
the case there. But no executive officer
and no Member of this legislature, the
House or the Senate—and, Mr. Speak-
er, I would send a message also to all
legislators in the land, everyone in the
statehouse in all 50 States, be you in
the State house or the State senate, or
in Nebraska in the unicameral, never
vote for a bill because you believe that
the court will be unconstitutional and
protect the citizens from a bad policy or
an unconstitutional policy.

Mr. Speaker, we take an oath to up-
hold the Constitution of the United
States. That oath is not to take is to
preserve, protect, and defend the Con-
stitution of the United States to the
words and the language that are in the
Constitution, not as it would be rein-
terpreted by someone else—a court-to-
be, and then hand that property over to
an other private interest to be developed
privately through eminent domain and
then hand that property over to an-
other private interest to be developed
for a shopping mall or a strip mall be-
cause they believed that they would
get a better tax base and get a better
return than they were from the indi-
vidual that owned the land.

Now, it directly and clearly violated,
in my opinion—and I'll put my opinion
up against any Supreme Court Justice
in the United States Supreme Court in
particular—the clear language in the
Fifth Amendment of the Constitution
that protects our property rights and is
an essential pillar of American
exceptionalism, the right to property:
"Nor shall private property be taken for
public use without just compensation."
"Nor shall private property be taken for
public use without just compensation."
And the effect of the Kelo decision by the
Supreme Court, which I believe was unjustly
found, is to strike three words out of
the Fifth Amendment in the Constitu-
tion of the United States, the words:
"for public use." So, now the effect,
after this wrongly held Kelo decision,
is for the Fifth Amendment to read:
"Nor shall private property be taken without just compensation."
The "for public use" taken out of the
Fifth Amendment.

This Constitution has to mean what
it was understood to mean at the time
of ratification. It has to mean what the
clear words mean in this Constitution.
It can't be anything else. We can't take
an oath to anything else, and we can't
be bound by a later interpretation to
the Constitution that someone else
makes unless there is a clarity that's
added to the understanding of the plain
meaning and the plain words and the
original text of the Constitution and
the amendments as they were ratified.

What did they mean when they were
ratified? Mr. Speaker, we had a su-
preme court in the State of Iowa that
concluded that they could find rights
in the State constitution that were "up
to this point unimagined." Seriously,
judges wrapped in black robes—no
longer any wigs—sitting there saying
the rights and the words and the rights
in the constitution that were up to this point
unimagined, and that somehow this
contractual guarantee that gets passed
down through the generations and the ages, this contract with American citizenship—with lowan citizenship in that case—can be breached because they have found rights that were up to this point unimaginable? Hereafter unimaginable?

What kind of guarantee can there be, a court that can discover new rights out of their imagination and declare that no one else had the imagination to discover those rights, but they had the imagination to discover new rights that were in this Constitution but not discovered before? That says there's no guarantee whatsoever. That says this Constitution becomes just only one of two things: it becomes an artifact of history with no meaning whatsoever, or it's a shield that the justices can use to protect themselves from the criticism of the unwashed masses, those laypersons that think that they can't read this clear language and understand it. Mr. Speaker, I'll say the people I represent can read the Constitution. They do understand it. They understand what it means. And they can make the argument with the Supreme Court justices if they were not intimidated. If they read the language up to the Fifth Amendment, read the language, "Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

What does "for public use" mean if a local government can confiscate private property and hand it over to another private entity for the purposes of private use? That means they have violated the Constitution. And the bill before the Judiciary Committee today, thanks to Chairman SMITH and former Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER, fixes that to some degree; but it doesn't repair this Constitution that is so sacred to all of us that we take an oath to it. And so I'll continue my oath and pledge, if you'll allow me to do so, Mr. Speaker, and continue to make this point that we have to have constitutional legislation come before this Congress; that when someone brings a bill called ObamaCare to this floor—2,600 pages—that violates so many of the components of the constitutional guarantee, let alone sapping the vitality from this very vigorous American culture that we are, the American people rise up. They rose up in tens of thousands. Came to the country and surged the place, jammed the place so heavily that people had trouble getting in and getting out. It was a glorious thing to see, Mr. Speaker, that the American people love their liberty enough that they would come from all 50 States to jam this Capitol to say to us, do not do this. Do not commit this affront to the Constitution. Do not usurp American liberty. These are God-given rights. And who takes them away? This Congress, that is led by then-Speaker PELOSI and HARRY REID in the Senate and Barack Obama. The ruling troika imposed ObamaCare on us, and the American people have rejected it soundingly by sending now 89 freshman Republicans to the House of Representatives. And every one of them pledged to repeal ObamaCare. And all but two of them—because they haven't had a chance to do so yet, they're the special election mandate. Republicans in the House and every single Republican in the Senate voted to repeal ObamaCare. And it was bipartisan. Some of the Democrats in the House voted to repeal ObamaCare.

The Constitution states that it's been sent in the State of Ohio; it's been sent by the polling. It goes on and on and on: repeal ObamaCare. Now, every Presidential candidate on the Republican side is running on repealing ObamaCare. Every one of them will sign the repeal if they're elected President and sworn into office.

Now, I'd like to see us put the repeal of ObamaCare, if we can't get it passed before he or she shuffles the hand of ObamaCare, if we can't get it passed before he or she shakes the hand of ObamaCare, if we can't get it passed before he or she signs the President of the United States, from the Office of the Chief of the Navy Chaplains, dated 13 April 2011, that says, don't be biased by sexual orientation when you're conducting weddings. Go ahead and marry same-sex couples on these military bases anywhere where it doesn't otherwise violate a law.

That tells me that that goes worldwide, bases everywhere. I suppose it's probably not happening in a base in Kuwait. They might frown on such a thing, but I don't know, and it's hard to get the facts on this. It's hard for me also to imagine a Marine—a Navy chaplain marrying a couple of marines, let's say a same sex couple of marines, whichever sex it might be. And this is going on in the United States of America and on bases around the country, and it needs to come to an immediate halt.

This Congress has acted on this. This House has sent the message, and of course you have the Senate on the other side, run by HARRY REID, one-third of the former ruling troika that now becomes a shield for the President of the United States and the person who carries the water for the President, protects him when he doesn't want to have the confrontation himself. They've gone the other way. Now these things stricken out of the code. If the Senate language passes the House, they've stricken the language that prohibits bestiality in the local policies. And the Region Legal Service Office, the RLSo, should be consulted to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations, absent some existing statute, however. This is a change to previous training that stated same-sex marriages are not authorized on Federal property. This memo says they are now authorized on Federal property in direct contradiction with the Defense of Marriage Act, DOMA, that was passed by this Congress, signed into law, clearly is the law of the land.

I mean, we have, apparently, a directive from the Commander in Chief of the United States military, Barack Obama. He surely has to be the one that has ordered the Navy, you shall send out a memo here to direct the chaplains to conduct same-sex marriages on the bases unless there is some other law that gets in the way. I think that this kind of activity is an affront to the legislative power that exists by the Constitution within the legislature. This is not an executive decision. This is a decision of the legislature.

We passed the Defense of Marriage Act. I testified to defend the Defense of Marriage Act over in the United States Senate a month or so ago. And if the Senate were able to pass a repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act, it still has to come to the House, where I'm confident it would not pass. And I don't think it'll pass the Senate either.

But in any case, we have a defiance of Federal policy set by the Congress, signed by the President of the United States, from the Office of the Chief of the Navy Chaplains, dated 13 April 2011, that says, don't be biased by sexual orientation when you're conducting weddings. Go ahead and marry same-sex couples on these military bases anywhere where it doesn't otherwise violate a law.

That tells me that that goes worldwide, bases everywhere. I suppose it's probably not happening in a base in Kuwait. They might frown on such a thing, but I don't know, and it's hard to get the facts on this. It's hard for me also to imagine a Marine—a Navy chaplain marrying a couple of marines, let's say a same sex couple of marines, whichever sex it might be. And this is going on in the United States of America and on bases around the country, and it needs to come to an immediate halt.

This Congress has acted on this. This House has sent the message, and of course you have the Senate on the other side, run by HARRY REID, one-third of the former ruling troika that now becomes a shield for the President of the United States and the person who carries the water for the President, protects him when he doesn't want to have the confrontation himself. They've gone the other way. Now these things stricken out of the code. If the Senate language passes the House, they've stricken the language that prohibits bestiality in the
military in their overwhelming effort to try to advance same-sex marriage among our military and use it as a social experiment.

The military’s job is to protect our freedom and our liberty. They take an oath to the Constitution. They put their lives on the line, and we give them something that defies the Federal law, the Defense of Marriage Act.

Now, this is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, and I’m going to ask to introduce this into the RECORD. I know that I have the, I guess I’ll say the privilege to do that. I will go on to another subject matter here that’s—I don’t know if it’s more egregious, but it’s plenty bad.

This is a memo dated September 14, 2011, Department of the Navy, Walter Reed National Military Medical Center up on Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland. I visited up there and visited wounded a number of times. And this memo is from the Commander of Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Baltimore, Maryland. I visited up there and visited wounded a number of times and injured partners visits, how they should be conducted, etc.

And policy, according to Patient and Family Centered Care, Mr. Speaker, children in good health under the age of 18 must be accompanied by an adult. Okay. Fine. I’m good enough with that. Can’t take pictures unless the patient agrees. Fine with that.

Due to dietary restrictions and infectious disease protocols, the distribution of home-produced baked goods to the patients, family members is prohibited. You can’t bring cookies to the patient. Ooh, that’s tough.

But I wouldn’t be standing here if that was the worst thing, Mr. Speaker. That’s Item E.

Here’s Item F, and I’ll read it into the RECORD. “No religious items, (i.e., Bibles, reading material and/ or artifacts) are allowed to be given away or used during a visit.”

Mr. Speaker, these military men and women who are recovering at Walter Reed and Bethesda have given their all for America. They’ve given their all for America, and they’ve defended and taken an oath to the Constitution, and here they are. The people that come to visit them can’t bring a religious artifact? They can’t bring a Bible? They can’t use them in the services? A priest can’t walk in with the Eucharist and offer communion to a patient who might be on their deathbed because it’s prohibited. In this memo from the Department of the Navy, the Commander of Walter Reed and signed, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, by C.W. Callahan, Chief of Staff. I would also like to introduce this document into the RECORD.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
NAVY CHAPLAINS,
Washington, DC,
From: Chief of Chaplains (OPNAV N987)
To: Chaplains and Religious Program Specialists
Subj: Revision of Chaplain Corps Tier 1 Training

1. Chaplain Corps Tier 1 DADT repeal training has been revised. The current version, dated 11 April 2011, has been posted on the Navy and Marine Corps DADT website. This revised version supersedes all previous versions and should be reviewed in its entirety.

2. During the initial stages of curriculum development, several policy questions were raised related to same-sex marriages. Those questions were forwarded for legal counsel and approval was secured to commence Tier 1 training while awaiting further guidance. Additional legal review concluded that the curriculum did require modification of content related to same-sex marriage issues as found in Version 1.

a. Regarding the use of base facilities for same-sex marriages, legal counsel has concluded that generally speaking, base facility use is sexual orientation neutral. If the base is located in a state where same-sex marriage is legal, then base facilities may normally be used to celebrate the marriage. This is true for purely religious services (e.g., a chaplain blessing a union) or a traditional wedding (e.g., a chaplain both blessing and conducting the ceremony). Facility use is sexual orientation neutral and the Region Legal Service Office (RLSO) should be consulted to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations. This is a change from previous versions where same-sex marriages are not authorized on federal property.

b. Regarding chaplain participation, consistent with the tenets of his or her religious organization, a chaplain may officiate at a same-sex, civil marriage: if it is conducted in accordance with the laws of a state which permits same-sex marriages or union; and if the chaplain is, according to applicable state and federal laws, authorized to officiate at that state’s marriage. While this is not a change, it is a clearer, more concise and up to date articulation. Again, consult training (Religious Legal Services Office (RLSO)) to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations.

c. Intensive Care Units. Primary next of kin (PNOK) may visit at any time. Other
partners in care may visit if accompanied by the PNOK.

d. Exceptions. Visits before or after the established hours of 1000–1500 and during impa
tient quiet hours of 1300–1400 for other partners in care will be reviewed on a case by
case basis through the WFCC, attending physi
cian, and charge nurse.

e. SI Patients. During patient visits for the SI and VSI patients who are not WII will be
managed at the discretion of the attending physician and respective charge nurse in
consultation with the patient. Visitors should be limited to the immediate family or
other individuals identified by the patient and/or immediate family. These visits will be
coordinated through the appropriate charge nurse prior to being directed to the patient's
room.

f. WII Patients. Those visiting the WII in an official capacity will make their request
utilizing the WFCC “Gold Line” at (855) 875-GOLD (4653) and will be limited to the
hours of 1000–1500 Monday through Friday. To en
courage patient and family rest, foster a re
habilitative environment, and accommodate clients' needs, it is requested that visitors refrain from scheduling visits during impa
tient quiet hours of 1300–1400 daily. In gen
eral, officials visiting the WII population outside the established visiting hours will need prior approval from the WFCC. To en
sure an optimal experience, these visits will be scheduled five (5) days prior to the
planned date; impromptu or last minute vis
ts to WII will not be entertained. WII vis
its include the following partners in care: a. Family

b. Leadership of Title 36 Congressionally
Chartered Organizations

c. Members of the:
   (1) Executive
   (2) Legislative—to include Professional
   Staff Members (PSM)

J. Judiciary

k. Active duty General, Flag, and Senior
   Executive Service (SES)

l. Celebrities and sports personnel vetted
   through the Staff Judge Advocate (SJA).
m. Members of the press vetted through the
   Public Affairs Office (PAO).

g. Other partners in care who represent committees who wish to visit the WII from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion,
   Veterans of the Merchant Marine, VFW Post 189, Marine Corps League, Army League, and other similar organizations shall be referred to the
   WFCC for WII visits.

h. Leadership of the Military Coalition and National Military Veterans Alliance.

i. Out of town visitors or visitors who cannot
come during normal visiting hours shall be
referred to the WFCC for patient visits.

c. Partners in care representing verifiable 501(c)(3) benevolent organizations wishing to interact with the WII and or provide goods or services will be directed to the WFCC. These organizations will not be allowed unattended access to the inpatient environment for the purposes of information gathering, solicita
tion, or delivery.

(1) All donations of goods or services to the WII will be coordinated through the WFCC utilizing approved processes and setting
   procedures, and/or delivery.

7. Exceptions. SI, VSI, and WII patients may refuse visits at any time.

8. Partners in Care Guidelines

a. All non-family visits must be scheduled five (5) days in advance.

b. Group size will not exceed five (5).

c. All partners in care, under the age of 18, must be accompanied by an adult.

d. Photographs may not be taken before,
during, or after the visit without express permission of the attending health
Order and/or the PNOK if the patient is in
capacitated. At no time will personal identi
fiable information (PII) or protected health
information (PHI) be recorded, retrans
mitted, and/or utilized in any manner without
the express written consent of the pa
tient or their PNOK if incapacitated.

e. Due to dietary restrictions and infec
tious disease protocols, the distribution of
home produced baked goods to the patients,
families, or staff members is prohibited.

f. No religious items (i.e. Bibles, reading
material, and/or artifacts) are allowed to be
given away or used during a visit.

9. Release of Patient Information. All pa
tient information will be released in accord
ance with reference (a).

C.W. CALLAHAN, 
Chief of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of ab
sence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for after 4:30 p.m. today on ac
count of medical reasons.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill
of the House of the following title, which was therupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 394. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accord
ingly, the House adjourned until tomor
row, Friday, December 2, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the
Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4067. A letter from the Congressional Re
view Coordinator, Department of Agri
culture, transmitting the Department's final
rule — Importation of French Beans and
Runner Beans From the Republic of Kenya
Into the United States (Docket No.: APHIS
-2010-0011) (RIN: 0575-AH39) received Novem
ber 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

4068. A letter from the Chief, Planning and
Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of
Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final
rule — Applying for Free and Reduced
Schools Programs and School Breakfast Program and
Schools [CFDA Number: 84.282M] (RIN: 198

4069. A letter from the Assistant General
Counsel for Regulatory Services, Depart
ment of Agriculture, transmitting the Depart
ment's final rule — Final Priorities, Re
quirements, and Selection Criteria; Charter
Schools Program (CSP) Grants for Replica
tion and Expansion of High-Quality Charter
Schools [CFDA Number: 84.282M] (RIN: 198

4070. A letter from the Program Manager, Depart
ment of Health and Human Services, transmi
ting the Department's final rule — Head Start Program (RIN: 0970-AC14) re
ceived November 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.
S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Educa
tion and the Workforce.

4071. A letter from the Director, Regula
tions Policy and Management Staff, Depart
ment of Health and Human Services, transmi
ting the Department's final rule — Bever
ages: Bottled Water Quality Standard; Es	ablishing an Allowable Level for di(2-
ethylhexyl)phthalate [Docket No.: FDA 1993-
N-0259 (Formerly Docket No.: 1993N-0088)] re
ceived November 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.
S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Educa
tion and the Workforce.

4072. A letter from the Chief, Policy and
Rules Division, Federal Communications Commis
sion, transmitting the Commission's final
rule — Amendment of Part 15 regarding new requirements and measurement guide
lines for Access Broadband over Power Line Systems; and Establishing Broadband over Power Line Systems [ET Doc
ket No.: 04-47] [ET Docket No.: 03-104] re
ceived November 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.
C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4073. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commiss
ion, transmitting the Commission's final
rule — Standardized and Enhanced Disclo
sure Requirements for Television Broadcast Licensee Public Interest Obligations; Exten
sions Policy and Management Staff, Depart
ment of Health and Human Services, transmi
ting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post
Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Tele
vision Programming Accessibility; Exten
sions Policy and Management Staff, Depart
ment of Health and Human Services, transmi
ting the Department's final rule — Tele
vision Programming Accessibility; [CGB-CC-0005] [CGB-CC-0007] [CGB-CC-0006] [CG Docket No.: 96-181] [CG Doc
ket No.: 11-175] received November 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Com
mittee on Energy and Commerce.

4074. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Programming Accessibility; Exten
sions Policy and Management Staff, Depart
ment of Health and Human Services, transmi
ting the Commission's final rule — Ang
gers for Christ Ministries, Inc.; New Begin
ning Ministries; Petitioners Identified in Ap
pendix A: Interpretation of Economically Burdensome Standard; Amendment of Sec
tion 79.1(f) of the Commission's Rules; Video Programming Accessibility; [CGB-CC-0005] [CGB-CC-0007] [CGB-CC-0006] [CG Docket No.: 96-181] [CG Docket No.: 11-175] received November 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Com
mittee on Energy and Commerce.

4075. A letter from the Chief, CGB, Promoting Youth Access to Educational 
Communities, Wireless Telecommunications Bu
reau, Federal Communications Commission, transmi
ting the Commission's final rule — Establishing an Allowable Level for di(2-
ethylhexyl)phthalate [Docket No.: FDA 1993-
N-0259 (Formerly Docket No.: 1993N-0088)] re
ceived November 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.
S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.