

Now, think how difficult it is to do business with somebody that won't talk to you. And I know they had a meeting today, Mr. Speaker. And the report that came out of that was they sat down, they talked, but they didn't negotiate. That's kind of what I expected, to tell you the truth, Mr. Speaker.

So we have a dysfunction. We have a lot of demagoguery. We have a lot of hypocrisy. And I'm hearing it on the other side, and I heard a lot of it here tonight as they rolled out some of their practice buzz phrases.

They said a series of ransom notes, Mr. Speaker. Ransom notes?

Pull your Constitutions out and read it, guys. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. That's my advice to them, should they be listening, that they should pull their Constitution out and read it. And they should understand that it's not a ransom note when you're working within your constitutional authority, in fact, constitutional directive.

When you stepped down on the floor of this Congress at the beginning of the 113th Congress and you took an oath to uphold this Constitution, it wasn't to vacate your constitutional responsibilities or hand over your vote card to somebody else, or accept some kind of an idea that, because you disagree with the President, you should capitulate to his demands.

How do you capitulate to a man's demands who won't talk to you?

He talks to you through the press and sends out a message that says I'm not going to negotiate with Republicans. I'm not going to negotiate with people in Congress. I refuse to negotiate, and I'm not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling either.

Well, we have this bill called ObamaCare, and ObamaCare is a piece of legislation that was pushed through here by hook, crook and legislative shenanigan. And there are those who say it's the law of the land; you must accept it, and you're obligated to fund it.

Show me where in this Constitution you're obligated to fund something because a previous Congress, on a very partisan, narrow margin, passed the largest piece of socialized legislation in the history of the United States, a Federal takeover of our skin and everything inside it, the government and Federal takeover of our ability to make our decisions, as American people, on our future, on our health decisions, to dictate insurance policies, to dictate that people shall buy a product that the Federal Government either approves or produces. Never before in history has that happened.

It was a manufacture of new taxes that President Obama said were not taxes. And John Roberts and the Supreme Court said, well, you know, they weren't taxes for the purposes of hearing this case, but they are taxes for the purposes of deciding the case.

Then people will say, it's been found constitutional by the Supreme Court. Now you're obligated to fund it.

And I say, no previous Congress can obligate a subsequent Congress. And this Congress cannot obligate the 114th Congress. We're in the 113th, Mr. Speaker. This Congress cannot obligate the 114th Congress or any subsequent Congress.

All we can do is put statutory language in place that is our best judgment at the time, that likely will influence the people that come behind us and cause them to stop and think it over. But it doesn't mean they can't come in and repeal anything that's been passed in the past. And it certainly doesn't mean we're obligated to fund it.

And the House is here with a majority that was elected to repeal ObamaCare and a majority that was elected, I believe, to defund ObamaCare.

I brought the amendment to defund ObamaCare for the first time on February 15 of 2011. My amendment passed. It was detached in the Senate. I'd like to have had it be part of the bill as it came through. I didn't get that done in the Rules Committee this time.

But it happened here over the last week or two, the same thing I asked for then was approved by Rules this time and stuck with the bill when it went over to the Senate.

And so now where we sit is this: the House has said we don't want a government shutdown. We don't want a government slowdown. What we want is a government that's funded in every aspect legitimately, with the exception of the funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare.

That's our stand. If the American people reject that position, let them come to the polls and say so.

So where we sit today, Mr. Speaker, is we have Members of Congress and their staff that are receiving phone calls that are ginned up by the other side, by the stacked language that we're seeing come here. And people are calling in and they're saying, you can't shut something down as big as the government. It would be a disaster.

Well, it's HARRY REID and the President that have brought about this partial shutdown, a certain slowdown. It's HARRY REID and the President.

But it doesn't look to me like it's a disaster. If it was a disaster, they wouldn't have to manufacture a crisis and borrow money from the Chinese to rent barricades to haul them down with a forklift and bring people back who have been furloughed already because of this government partial shutdown and ask them to take the barricades and build barricades around our memorials to our veterans, in particular, the World War II Memorial.

They are borrowing money from China to rent barricades and bringing people off of furlough to put barricades up. And now, today, they're reinforcing barricades around the World War II Memorial and others, not just with yellow tape, caution tape and rented barricades, but now wiring them together,

and they're bringing sandbags in and stacking sandbags up around the bases to better stabilize this, and bringing in welded wire mesh, wire that is another barrier for people.

Why?

These memorials have never been blockaded before. They're open 24/7, year-round. They're designed for people to come in, and they're designed for people to be able to go to the memorial at any time. They don't require guards. They don't require staffing. There's no money required to keep the memorials open.

Most of them were built with private money from donations from the American people who want to honor our veterans, especially the World War II Memorial.

To see those buses from Mississippi roll up, see those red-shirted veterans, between the age of 84 and 99, arrive and be able to look at that memorial from a distance but not be able to go into their memorial—

A manufactured crisis. It would save money if the President does nothing but, instead, what we have is a President who has decided to commit, I believe, the most spiteful act in the history of the Commander in Chief in the United States of America.

□ 2100

To manufacture something in order to try to extract the maximum amount of pain by borrowing money to rent barricades to put up barriers, to put more people on to guard—especially our World War II Memorial—and to deny access to the memorial that's built to honor the World War II veterans, many of whom who have never been to Washington, D.C., before and have not seen their memorial before, and to say to them this one chance in your lifetime, your 90-plus years into this lifetime and your chance to come back again is pretty slim, to say you're never going to get to go in and experience this memorial because I want to send a message that I disagree with the decisions of the United States Congress, that is a huge political tantrum and a spiteful act, Mr. Speaker.

I think the right thing is this: honor our veterans—those who fought in all wars, those who put uniforms on at all times. We must be there to open the gates for them every time that a bus pulls up.

I thank and congratulate my colleagues who have stepped up to do so, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

TIMES THAT TRY MEN'S SOULS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these can be the times that try men's souls.

I heard my colleagues across the aisle talking earlier this hour about a

GOP tantrum over the Affordable Care Act. I'm not aware of the GOP throwing a tantrum over the so-called Affordable Care Act.

We've had word from many, many of our constituents that it is anything but affordable, that it is a disaster. We heard our colleagues across the aisle talk about ObamaCare being the law of the land. Yet these same people can't wait to come running in here and say, You've got to raise the debt ceiling. If you ask them why we have to raise the debt ceiling, they say, Because we've got to. We're spending too much money, and we've got to raise the debt ceiling.

I guess now we know the proper answer to our friends and to the President when they come running in, desperate to have the credit card limit continuously raised and raised and raised yet again, and that is that actually it's the law of the land. The debt ceiling is the law of the land. You just need to get over it because it's the law of the land.

And I recall hearing our President say in the past few days, talking about the law, saying that both Houses of Congress passed it, I signed it, it bears my name. It's the law. It's been upheld. Therefore, they just need to live by it. It can't be changed. It's got to stay the way it is.

So that sounds to me like if the President feels that strongly about it once a law is passed, then we need to force him to live within the debt ceiling without moving it one penny.

The Constitution, I think, is a great document to live under, but some find it much too taxing—those who do not want oversight and just want an unlimited budget and want to spend whatever they care to spend and on cronies and tax those they don't care for, refuse to allow those they don't care for to not have the same tax advantages or tax status so that they can engage in nonprofit activities like the Democratic groups. They find that rather enjoyable. But if we're going to live within the Constitution, it's important that people understand laws can be changed. The Affordable Care Act is the law right now. But it was passed against the will of the majority of the American people.

We've heard from Democrats at both the other end of the Hall, this end of the Hall, and down Pennsylvania Avenue, that there was an election in 2012 and everybody needs to understand that and that the elections have consequences.

And so I'm hoping that as the President, as the leader in the Senate, HARRY REID, continue to say those things, that hopefully they will hear themselves say those things, and they will realize that there was an election in 2012 that resulted in the most important part of Congress, the House of Representatives, when it comes to issues of raising revenue and setting budgets and appropriating money, and people need to understand setting

budgets and appropriating money are two separate things. You can create a budget, pass it in the House and Senate; but it doesn't appropriate a single dime.

The Senate had gone years without ever passing a budget. And now, all of a sudden, the Senate finds its voice about budgets, saying, Hey, the House didn't send conferees to work out a budget. And actually we find that those who have glassy-eyed looks and don't really understand the Constitution or how things work here with the law, they accept what is said. Gee, there's the problem.

Well, that's not the problem. We're way past the issue of budget. That should have been done many months ago. We're grateful that the President now, in the fall, recognizes the importance of doing a budget on time. But the President actually waited so long beyond his deadline, not caring about the deadline, just completely being oblivious to it, that it was beyond the time when the House was doing its own budget. So the President did his in such a way that it was so incredibly late, it was of no consequence, no help.

So it's kind of tough to hear lectures about the budget from anyone who completely failed and refused to participate properly in the lawful activity of preparing a budget. Then, to come forward this fall, months later, after the massive abuses with regard to the budget, and start lecturing about the budget, again, hoping that the American people would not understand that the budget does not appropriate a dime.

When you come to September 30 at midnight, when you come to October 1, it doesn't matter whether you had a budget at that point or not because the budget was going to lead to appropriations. The House did appropriations. The Senate did none. We had four important appropriations bills that are still sitting down at the Senate without any activity whatsoever.

So once we got to August, it was too late. Even July is too late for a budget. It's now time we've got to appropriate money. We're coming up against the hard end of the fiscal year, September 30, and we've got to get appropriations done.

They can talk about budget conferees, but what the House here did, for those who are confused and don't understand the process we use here, we passed a resolution appointing conferees. That's appointing negotiators. The House passed a resolution appointing negotiators. I felt like we should have had a counterproposal of some kind that showed some adult was acting at the other end of the Hall by producing something that indicated that people in the Senate majority understood that there were massive amounts of waste, fraud, and abuse in our Federal money appropriations; that we've seen the abuses—the Solyndras, the massive amounts of money just thrown here, there, and yon.

And so I would have hoped that someone in the majority in the Senate would have noted, you know what, there's no such thing as a clean CR—a clean continuing resolution—because there are projects that have ended and finished being paid in the last fiscal year. Those certainly don't need the same funding anymore. So why should we continue with the same amount that we spent last year when we don't know what other projects there may be?

Well, the answer is they don't want a magnifying glass looking at the waste, fraud, and abuse. Down on Pennsylvania Avenue, they just want these massive sacks, metaphorically speaking. For those in the liberal media who do not understand metaphors, then go back to English school. But they just want the sacks of cash.

Just give us the money. Forget the Constitution. Forget the requirement that you actually appropriate the money and tell us what it shall be spent on. Just send us the cash. We've got a lot more Solyndras to waste it on.

That's not how it's supposed to work. We're supposed to actually go through and deal with the problems, cut out as much as we can in the way of waste, fraud, and abuse so that we don't have to keep borrowing over forty cents of every dollar. We can live within our means.

So I hope people in the future will understand a clean CR should provoke in your mind the most filthy, nasty, larded-up appropriations that someone can create. Because we are not going to look at the waste, fraud, and abuse that's contained therein.

There are a lot of looks that should be taken at where all our money goes, how it's being spent. Because if we really bear down and look at that, you would begin to wonder about a department that is shut down, we're told, yet finds money to go rent barricades to take out to a farm, though it is called a Federal property. It's the Claude Moore Colonial Farm. The story was reported by PJ Media.

This story says today:

It's a perfect fall day, and yet we can't do anything, Managing Director Anna Eberly told me in a phone interview. Eberly has managed the Claude Moore Colonial Farm for 32 years. Before managing the farm, she worked for the National Park Service. Visitors unaware of how the farm is run are apt to conclude that the government shutdown, now 2 days old, is directly responsible for the farm's closing. But Eberly sent a note Wednesday morning to the park's email list. In the email, Eberly says, For the first time in 40 years, the National Park Service has finally succeeded in closing the farm down to the public. In previous budget dramas, the farm has always been exempted, since the NPS—the National Park Service—provides no staff or resources to operate the farm.

□ 2115

Eberly says:

The Claude Moore Colonial Farm has thrived even as the Federal Government has treated it with "benign neglect" for decades.

That “benign neglect” would serve it better than the barricades now surrounding it.

Eberly writes that the National Park Service has already gone out of its way to disrupt an event at the farm.

The first casualty of this arbitrary action was the McLean Chamber of Commerce, who were having a large annual event at the Pavilion on Tuesday evening. The National Park Service sent the Park Police—

Why couldn't they have been furloughed? Oh, here came the Park Police.

over to remove the Pavilion staff and chamber volunteers from the property while they were trying to set up for the event.

Fortunately, the chamber has friends, and they were able to move to another location and salvage what was left of their party. You do have to wonder about the wisdom of an organization that would use staff they don't have the money to pay to evict visitors from a park site that operates without costing them any money.

It should be noted that the farm has not used Federal funds since 1980, yet they found money to print a sign that said: “Because of the Federal Government shutdown, this National Park Service facility is closed.” It's as if somebody is sitting around saying, regardless of whether it cost any Federal money or not, let's find things that will hurt people and upset people, stick a sign on it, and blame the shutdown so that we can get all of the money with the waste, fraud, and abuse we want to keep spending.

One other note: our former Speaker, Newt Gingrich, sent out a photograph of barricades that have been put out by Mount Vernon. Now, most people hopefully know Mount Vernon is not run by Federal money, so what difference does it make if the Federal Government would put barricades up somewhere around Mount Vernon? Well, there is a little part of the road where buses can turn around to make it convenient as they drop people off out at Mount Vernon. By closing that, even though it doesn't need to be patrolled—it's just a turnaround area for big vehicles and buses—they can make as much chaos as possible for those coming out to Mount Vernon, to this historical site of our Founding Father, George Washington, and create some chaos. So they spent money, took time to go create as much trouble for American tourists as they possibly could.

You want to talk about fairness? There isn't any in what this administration and the Democrats at the other end of the hall are doing to the American people and blaming the so-called shutdown.

I see my friend Mr. LAMALFA here, and I would yield to him.

Mr. LAMALFA I appreciate my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and your heartfelt opinions and ideas you're holding up here tonight. And hearing you speak of what's going on, just this microcosm of the Park Service here and what's happened the last couple of days, it seems that as the ne-

gotiations—if there is any that have actually broken down—the Federal Government, this administration has been poised to exact the kind of pain that we're seeing just in this area of our national parks.

You mentioned Mount Vernon, arbitrarily closed down. Mount Vernon is a private enterprise, done with their own funds, done with support of private people, the public. So they find a toe-hold to use the parking lot as a way to exact a little meanness on the tourists there at a time where this place can't come to an agreement on some basic issues with a continuing resolution, as well as the very outrageous act with our open air monuments we have right here in town.

The Lincoln Memorial, of course what we're seeing with the Honor Flights that have been coming in the last couple of days and will continue to come in for a while, World War II vets, Korean vets, Mr. GOHMERT and I both had the opportunity and the pleasure and the honor of being able to join with some of those vets today as Members of Congress and others pulled back the gate and allowed them to enjoy their memorial, the country's memorial. These are areas that are not normally even staffed, at least to this extent. They had to bring in more staff than what is normally on hand.

These are 24-hour memorials and exhibits, open-air, you can see any time of the day or night, sometimes without staff at all. Yet they did have to go to the trouble, as was mentioned, to rent barriers, bring them in, put them up, and, boom, they were up there first thing in the morning on Monday morning. They were poised and ready to go, taking political advantage of the difficulties we're having here.

It reminds me a lot of the grievances that were brought originally with the Declaration of Independence. The people and Colonies, having had enough of the King's edicts and unfairness, listed a whole bunch of grievances that they thought were outrageous and caused them to actually break away from that long-held bond they had with England. Let me just recount a little bit of that from the Declaration:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed.

Do you think what we see going on here is the consent of the governed? Leading into what a lot of this battle is about here, the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, as it's called, that's been a line in the sand for Republicans I think for good reason. If you recount the history of how it was passed, it was done during a window of time when the majority party was the Democrats in the House and the Senate, as well as holding the White House, during the period of late 2009

and early 2010. A little window of time when, after all these years when they were looking for socialized health care, they had that window. They also had, I guess, the daring to do so.

You might recall HillaryCare back in the early nineties, when it was called that. There wasn't the political will—certainly ever by the Republicans, but the Democrats at the time. We saw then that elections have consequences. The consequence of HillaryCare back then was a big portion of what scared, I think, the country into putting a revolutionary Republican majority into the House in that '94 election.

We keep hearing from the other side of the aisle, 2012 had consequences in the Presidential. Well, let's just go back one election, 2010, following on the heels of what is called ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. That sent a giant red flag amongst a lot of freedom-loving Americans to look at how this takeover of their health care system by a government that can't even run the Veterans Administration and getting the claims processed for veterans who languish for years just trying to get simple claims done, we want to take that blueprint of the government running things and expand that to everyone? It shouldn't be that way for the people that are subject to the VA, and we want to make this an example for the entire country. I shutter to think what that would be like. So many people feel like they're being herded into this program without any choice. That's really the case.

So let's talk about liberties for a minute here. Let's talk about those founding principles outlined in the Declaration and then later carried out in our Constitution that we all come here and are sworn to uphold. Let me list just one of the grievances you find in the Declaration talking about the King of England:

He has erected a multitude of new Offices, and sent hither Swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their Substance.

This doesn't just apply to the Affordable Care Act. You can name this with a lot of government agencies that are coming out there—swarms—to harass people and eat out their substance. Whether they are a small business or farming or timber or any one of many different endeavors in this country, the harassment people are feeling by a runaway government is huge and it's not right.

So why do Republicans dig in? Because we feel like this is a critical moment in time for our liberties, but for a program that is doomed to fail and become so entrenched that we never have the opportunity to come back from it because it becomes an entitlement or, as a lot of people are saying around here now, a right.

To me, the rights as laid down by the Founders are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, just as outlined in the Declaration. Anything beyond that probably came from the force of legislation—which is enforced by a badge, a

court, or a gun; not one of the basic inalienable rights sent down by God, natural law.

So we have a lot to do around here. Republicans dig in for a reason because this is a solid belief system. It's not even politics. Yeah, not politics. This is an important cornerstone principle we're fighting for here—the basic liberties, the freedom of choice. And these are not being laid down 230-something years ago either by the King or by this mandate now.

My friend, I appreciate the time that you are giving me here tonight. We have a lot more to do on this effort, and we are going to continue to fight the battle because it's for the right thing on the founding principles of this Nation.

Thank you, Mr. GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, one of the things that I greatly appreciate is the in-depth analysis, the careful cogitation and contemplation about the role we are supposed to play. I have greatly appreciated that.

Another new Member of Congress is here with us. We have about 4 minutes, and I would yield to my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Thank you for your leadership here in the House of Representatives, and also thank you to my friend from California.

I would just like to maybe have a brief dialogue with the gentleman from Texas if that's okay.

It wasn't too long ago we passed a bill to fund the entire government. That was something that was hard for a lot of us to swallow because there's a whole lot of things in a continuing resolution that we're not, frankly, interested in funding, but we swallowed that pill because it defunded ObamaCare. We sent it to the Senate. HARRY REID stripped out the defunding, and he sent it right back to the House of Representatives.

So we said, Okay, let's just take 1 year. The President has already delayed major provisions of ObamaCare. He saw the jobs report. People were shifting from full-time work to part-time work. Some people were losing their jobs. People were losing their health insurance. Health insurance premiums were spiking. Companies were trying to get down below 49 employees. So we said, Okay, the President wants to delay major provisions of ObamaCare, let's give him a year. We'll delay it for a year and fund the entire government. Again, I voted for that.

I would just like to ask the gentleman from Texas, I'm new here. I've been here for 9 months now. We passed that at about 1 o'clock in the morning on a Saturday night—I guess it was a Sunday morning—and the next day the Democrats didn't show up. The next day after that, they didn't even come in until 2 in the afternoon.

I would just, with your vast wisdom and experience, sir, maybe you could clarify for the American people what

was going on. I mean, we're on the brink of a government shutdown and they just didn't show up. Was it maybe that they were looking for a shutdown?

Mr. GOHMERT. There doesn't seem to be much question at all. Having tried many cases as a lawyer, judge, and chief justice, the evidence is clear. We sent four things, the last of which was saying, Okay, we're appointing negotiators. You don't agree with any of the compromises we've sent, all you have to do now is appoint negotiators, conferees, and we'll work it out this evening and it will all be done. They refused to even appoint people to negotiate and get it worked out during the night. That tells you pretty clearly they wanted a shutdown for 3 years now, since the Republicans won the House back in November of 2010.

□ 2130

We have heard them talking about, gee, if there is a shutdown they always blame the Republicans and we can get the majority back.

But I would ask the gentleman the question that was asked to the Senate Democratic leader today, when a CNN reporter, Dana Bash, said: "But if you can help one child who has cancer, why wouldn't you do it?" And Mr. REID said: "Why would we want to do that? I have 1,100 people at Nellis Air Force Base that are sitting home. They have a few problems of their own. This is—to have someone of your intelligence to suggest such a thing maybe means you're irresponsible and reckless." She said: "I'm just asking a question."

Just asking the original question: "You all talked about children with cancer unable to go to clinical trials. The House is presumably going to pass a bill that funds at least the NIH. Given what you've said, will you at least pass that? And if not, aren't you playing the same political games that Republicans are?"

He talked around it and wouldn't answer it. But the ultimate answer is: Why would we want to do that if we could save even one child?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. When you think about what we did last night, we talk about common ground a lot in the House of Representatives. It is a couple of words I hear all the time: common ground, common ground, common ground.

Here we had an opportunity last night in the midst of a government shutdown knowing that we have warriors coming back from the battlefield—I am one of them myself; I flew combat in Iraq and Afghanistan—and we wanted to pass a bill where there is strong common ground, we want to fund the Veterans Administration, we want to make sure that our veterans get the care they need.

Yesterday, on the floor of the House, the Democrats in this body killed that. Maybe you could shed some light on why they would want to do that?

Mr. GOHMERT. It sounds like the gentleman is basically asking a ques-

tion like Dana Bash. Well, that would have helped veterans who are sick and need help and are seeking medical care and need their checks to finish getting the medication and things that they need.

The question that Senator REID asked keeps resonating back as the Democratic answer: Why would we want to do that?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. The only thing—and I have thought about this a lot—the only thing I can possibly think of why they would not want to fund the veterans is that they want to hold the veterans hostage for something else, namely ObamaCare. That is the only thing I can think of.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, Dr. LAMALFA, and my friend the combat veteran, Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

Mr. Speaker, we are still wondering why they would not want to help these people?

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 3, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3184. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-125, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3185. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-121, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3186. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-122, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3187. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-089, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3188. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-079, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3189. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No.