

the local body that governs the District of Columbia. If that is a principle which applies to your district, it must apply to mine. So we greatly resent that we are allowed to govern ourselves except when some Member decides that some matter would be controversial in his district, so, therefore, he wants to deny the District the right to carry out that matter after that matter has become a matter of local law. Every Framer would turn over in his grave to recognize that we could come to the 21st century with such provisions.

Congress took action in the 110th and 111th Congresses to remove prohibitions on the District's use of local funds for medical marijuana, for needle exchange, and for abortions for low-income women.

In the 112th Congress, Republicans re-imposed the ban on the use of local funds for abortion. Who do they think they are? They are accountable to no one in the District of Columbia. They are in straight, sure violation of every principle of the founding document.

I believe that in good faith many Members, especially newer Members, are simply not aware of this history and not aware that it is grounded in the Framers' documents themselves. That's why, instead of assuming that any Member of this body would intentionally deny democracy to any American, I think the way to proceed is for this American, this Member, this representative of the people of the District of Columbia, to come forward on occasion with information and material that I hope Members will take under advisement.

I thank the Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1320

#### THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). 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 is a privilege to be recognized by you and to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

As I listened to the dialogue take place here in the last 30 minutes and the gentledady from the District of Columbia, I'm glad she has a voice here in this Congress. And I do take an oath to uphold the Constitution, as does everyone who serves in this body, as does the President of the United States and many of our executive officers and every military personnel. I believe every State legislator takes an oath, as I did when I was in the State senate in Iowa, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and the State of Iowa.

As that oath takes place, I would just remind you, Mr. Speaker, that we have to have an understanding of the Constitution in order to take an oath to

the Constitution. And when we place our hand on the Bible and raise our right hand and take the oath to the Constitution of the United States, it's not an oath to a constitution as it might be reinterpreted by activist judges at a later date. It's not even an oath to a constitution that has been interpreted by the activist judges that came after the Constitution was ratified.

The oath that I take to uphold this Constitution is the oath to uphold the Constitution as it was written, as the clear text of the Constitution defines, and as the amendments, the clear text of the amendments defined, and as it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification, whether it would be the full body of the Constitution, or later on the Bill of Rights, or whether it would be the subsequent amendments to the Constitution.

No public official, no person who takes an oath to a constitution can be taking an oath to something that is amorphous, something that fluctuates and something that can change. The Constitution has to be fixed in place. Guarantees aren't amorphous, Mr. Speaker. It is no guarantee if it's amorphous. It has to be fixed in place and fixed in time.

I understand that our language changes over time, and I understand that we have people that have looked at this Constitution with disrespect and they would like to disregard the American Constitution.

If we look back through history, we will see that there was an effort that began in the late 19th century, especially when some of the liberal-thinking people emerged here and in the intellectual world. In the United States, many of those people came here from Germany and established themselves. In fact, they established themselves on the west coast. And our friend whom we expressed our deep regrets at the loss of and our deep sympathy to the family of Andrew Breitbart grew up around some of those people that were the foundation of the progressive movement in America.

These are the people that grew from socialism, the ideology of utopianism. Karl Marx put it down, and it grew from there. Lenin advanced it, and Gramsci also advanced it. It has gone on to the day where liberalism got a bad reputation, so they decided to define themselves as "progressives." It's all rooted in a Marxist, socialist, utopian ideology. And that Marxist, socialist, utopian ideology looks at the United States Constitution, the Constitution of the United States of America, with abhorrence. They reject our Constitution. They're just afraid to stand up and say so.

The clear meaning of the Constitution is something that they concluded, back in the late part of the 19th century and coming into the early part of the 20th century, that they would like to abolish. They would like to abolish our Constitution. They would like to

have a new Constitutional Convention or no Constitution and change and shape America at their will. They reject an America with individual rights that come from God. I would like to think the gentledady from the District of Columbia and I would likely agree on that. They want an America that can always be in constant flux and constant change with no locked-down guarantees or values.

In other words, they looked at an effort to undo and repeal America's Constitution. They concluded that they could not do so because the culture of America has so embraced the Constitution of the United States that Americans would rise up in defense of the Constitution. If they tried to assault the Constitution, Americans would rise up and reject anybody that would seek to do that. So they sold us an alternative of trying to repeal and undo the Constitution and amend it out of existence.

There's another alternative, and that alternative is the one that they chose more than 100 years ago. That was the effort to redefine the Constitution, to undermine the meaning of the Constitution and turn it into this—remember the language, Mr. Speaker?—a living, breathing document. A living, breathing document is the language for an amorphous constitution, a constitution with no guarantees, a constitution that only takes reaction to the majority at the time that can be found in the House of Representatives, in the United States Senate, or a majority in the United States Supreme Court or the activist judges that by the hundreds have been appointed since that period of time during the last more than 100 years, and the law schools in America that have been populated by leftists who have been undermining the Constitution even while they teach the Constitution.

That's what we've seen here in America, Mr. Speaker.

And if the solid, conservative American people understood the flow of history and how the Constitution has been willfully undermined by active and by now self-labeled progressives, they would stand up against them everywhere they appear.

Think of a contract. The Constitution is a contract, it is a guarantee, and it is the supreme law of the land. It's defined as the supreme law of the land in the Constitution itself. When you have a supreme law, a law has to be black and white, it has to be clear, and it must be also enforced. It's impossible to take an oath to something that is amorphous, that's living and breathing.

It is now being taught under constitutional law in universities across the land that this Constitution doesn't mean what it says. That's what some of the judges say. That's what some of the law school professors say. In fact, that's what a majority of the law schools in America teach. They don't teach the foundation of American liberty, which is the clear text of this

Constitution, but they teach something that's been redefined by the courts.

And, by the way, we have course after course across the country—and I could go back to my big-ring notebook when we did the research on this—that teaches constitutional law in law school without using the basis of the Constitution. You can take the course on con law and never be required to read the Constitution. And the test questions aren't on the Constitution; they're on what they call "case law." Well, I will sometimes refer to case law. It is usually a slip of the tongue when I do that. Case law is what they say now is the Constitution. I can think of a lawyer who says: I don't have to amend the Constitution. If you give me a favorable judge and a favorable jury, then I will amend the Constitution in the courtroom.

Think of what that means, Mr. Speaker. An attack on the Constitution is taking place by activist lawyer after activist lawyer with favorable judge after favorable judge in front of a favorable jury that a lot of times just doesn't know the movement of the currents in this country and the competition that's going on between two philosophies and ideologies.

One of them mirrors the words of our Founding Fathers, the beliefs and the foundation of our Founding Fathers, that our rights come from God. No place in history have we seen that aside from the New Testament. No government was ever formed on the foundation of religious belief and believing that we have individual human rights, that these rights come from God. We're endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. I don't say "inalienable." That is a typo in the Jefferson Monument down here. It's "unalienable" rights. We're endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We all know those words. They echoed us. They are writ on our hearts as Americans. And we should remember that our Founding Fathers were inspired and, I believe, guided by God to articulate the vision of the unique liberty that's endowed within each of us who is created in His image. They articulated it; they understood it; they made the argument; they laid it out in the Declaration; they fought a war for it; and they enshrined it within the Constitution itself, this rule of law.

□ 1330

How hard was that compared to our charge today, Mr. Speaker? How hard was it in comparison to the Founding Fathers identifying liberty, articulating liberty, using the language and the scholarship that they created to write on our hearts: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

As an aside, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't an accident that they delivered to us three distinct rights, not exclusive to

those three. When they said life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, Thomas Jefferson didn't just pull those things out of a hat and say, Well, let me see. Life came out first and what is the next one? Well, it is like a Chinese fortune cookie. Liberty. And the third one he pulled out is pursuit of happiness. They are carefully placed in the Declaration because they are prioritized rights.

The most important right is life, the next most important right is liberty, and the last of the three is pursuit of happiness.

Let me start with pursuit of happiness. Our Founding Fathers—and especially Thomas Jefferson—studied and understood Greek. They looked back in the history of Greece and they understood this term that I will pronounce "eudamonia." It is a Greek term that really is pursuit of happiness. It is spelled e-u-d-a-m-o-n-i-a. Eudamonia by my pronunciation. What it means is to be intellectually and spiritually whole, to pursue knowledge, to pursue an understanding of this unique being that we are with a soul, with a spirit, with an intellect, and to expand that to the maximum limit that God has given us. That was eudamonia. Pursuit of happiness wasn't a tailgate party at the ball game. Pursuit of happiness was the Greek understanding of happiness, which was developing your whole being to the maximum amount.

Thomas Jefferson placed that pursuit of happiness language in there understanding what it meant in the Greek understanding. He understood what it meant to the Americans at the time. That's been redefined since that time to now people think somehow pursuit of happiness is a tailgate party or going to the ball game or going out on the deck to light the grill or going down to the corner pub and having a drink with the guys, whatever it is that people do. Go fishing, go skiing in the mountains, that is pursuit of happiness? None of that was in the minds of the Founding Fathers. What was in their minds was the ability to have the freedom that God gave us to develop ourselves as human beings spiritually and intellectually. That was eudamonia. That was the pursuit of happiness. It was the third right, Mr. Speaker.

The second one was liberty. We understand, I think, liberty better here in America than in the rest of the world. Liberty is a component of our history and often gets conflated with the term "freedom." Freedom and liberty are two different terms, Mr. Speaker. They have two different meanings even though they are associated with each other.

You might think of freedom—as I look across outside the snowy landscape where I live, sometimes I will see a coyote run across the field and I will think he has freedom. He is out there in the wild; he can run wherever he wants to run; no fence keeps him in; he is free to chase down rabbits and any-

thing else that he wants to go after, and my pheasants I might say. He has freedom. But there is a difference between freedom and liberty. The distinction is this: liberty is freedom bridled by morality, bridled by an understanding that you have a moral obligation, a faithful obligation not to go outside those bounds that have been laid out for us. If that is the case, you have liberty. You have freedom, and the bridle that goes on freedom is the moral underpinnings that we must adhere to as Americans. That's why this Constitution works for us, we know.

So within liberty, are those rights that are defined in the first 10 amendments in the Bill of Rights? The liberty for freedom of speech, for religion, freedom to assembly and peaceably assemble for redress of grievances, the freedom to keep and bear arms, the freedom from double jeopardy, the freedom to keep and own property, the freedom to have a trial by a jury of our peers, the freedom for the powers that are not defined within the Constitution for the Federal Government to devolve down for the States or the people respectively, that is all liberty. Everything I've defined in there is liberty, provided it is within the moral boundaries.

Now I take us up the ladder of the priorities of life, liberty, pursuit of happiness—eudamonia. Pursuit of happiness is subordinated to liberty. You can develop yourself, Mr. Speaker, intellectually and spiritually in the philosophy of our Founding Fathers, provided that you don't trample on someone else's liberty. If I want to develop my knowledge base, my spiritual base, I can exercise my freedom of religion, my freedom of speech, my freedom of assembly in any way that I so choose under the rights that we have that are liberties, provided that I don't trample on the liberty of someone else.

I can't take a position that says you will be censored because I'm going to exercise my freedom of speech or you can't assemble because I don't like what you say, I'm exercising my freedom of assembly, you must not. I can exercise my pursuit of happiness, my development, my own liberties, provided I don't trample someone else's. The Founding Fathers understood that priority. In the exercise of our liberties—freedom of speech, religion, assembly, keep and bear arms, the list that I've given—Mr. Speaker, in no case can we take someone else's life in the expansion of our liberties.

If I say that there's someone that encroaches upon my liberties, therefore I'm going to take their life, I have violated the principles of the Declaration, the principles of this country, let alone the laws of the United States of America. We need to understand that the Founding Fathers laid out prioritized rights in the Declaration: life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. That pursuit of happiness cannot trample on liberty or life, and the exercise of our liberties cannot trample on life.

They understood that and that life is the most sacred. If we understand also

that life begins at the instant of conception and we need to protect that life both in law and in fact and provide for those who cannot scream for their own mercy, cannot speak for themselves, that protection for life, all of that is wrapped up in this Constitution and in the rights that the gentle lady from the District of Columbia referred to.

I go back to law schools in this land teaching Constitution law as if this Constitution is a living, breathing document and some amorphous combination of case law created by activist lawyers, activist judges, and sometimes I will say compliant juries, because they seldom see the big picture of what is going on. They have respect for what is taught in law schools; they have respect for judges sitting behind the bench. I do too.

But I will take the position, Mr. Speaker, that any judge that believes they can amend the Constitution by their policy decision on case law should not be seated on that bench. Anyone who takes an oath to the Constitution and they believe it was whatever it will be defined to mean by somebody that comes along later, they should stop and take stock of what they are about to do. That may be a violation of conscience just not thought through.

We had a major case in Iowa a couple of years ago called *Varnum v. Brien*. Seven State supreme court justices universally declared that they could find rights in the Constitution that were up to this point unimagined. They wrote unanimously that they had discovered unimagined rights in the Constitution itself.

Can you imagine a guarantee with unimagined rights, Mr. Speaker? The Founding Fathers could not have imagined allowing judges to sit on a bench who believe that they could write any decision they chose to write, that they could manufacture unimagined rights in order to get their public policy in place. But that's exactly what happened in Iowa in that case. Three of those judges were up for retention and Iowans voted them off the bench. Now there are three new supreme court justices there, and hopefully there is a reconsideration among the other four.

The unimagined rights that were inserted into the supreme court decision impose same-sex marriage on the State of Iowa. That brought about some people like my good friend Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT, who came there to help with that cause and went on the bus to help with that cause who made the constitutional argument consistently and continually. It is an example, Mr. Speaker. But we have a number of other examples of activist courts, and I'm concerned about what has happened historically.

□ 1340

And I'll make this point: that if I look through the continuum of Supreme Court cases that take us to where we are today, and we have a conscience protection piece of legislation

before this Congress, one of them may have had a vote in the Senate this afternoon, and that would be Senator BLUNT's language, Senator BLUNT from Missouri. In this Congress, it's JEFF FORTENBERRY from Nebraska, who understood conscience protection and introduced the legislation that protects the health care providers and all of us for our religious liberty. And this Congress may get a vote on it, and it may actually have failed in the Senate this afternoon is what I'm advised was about to happen. I haven't confirmed that. And it could actually be happening after I finish speaking, Mr. Speaker.

But what I see happening is that the Constitution protects our religious liberty, our religious rights, and still, this government steps in to usurp them. This executive branch steps in to usurp our religious rights.

To this extent, and I'll take you, Mr. Speaker, through this continuum that is appalling to me, and it would be appalling to the Founding Fathers had they lived through these decisions.

1965, no, excuse me; I'll go back to 1963, Mr. Speaker. There was a case called *Murray v. Curlett*, and I don't know that that is very well universally recognized, but that was the case that took prayer out of the public schools. There was an argument made before the activist court in 1963 that there was a separation of church and state, and that that separation of church and state was firm enough and solid enough that we could not pray in our public schools because that advocated for a religion.

And so I'll read to you the language that surely had to be reviewed by the Supreme Court justices. It says, Congress shall make—this is the First Amendment, Mr. Speaker—Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. And it goes on, of course, freedom of speech, the press, and the right of the people to assemble.

It says Congress shall make no law. There was no law that came from Congress that established a religion. The law that Congress made just didn't exist with religious freedom because Congress understood that the First Amendment means what it says. The textual reading and the original understanding said Congress shall not establish a religion. We're not going to be like Sweden, establishing Lutheranism as a state religion. We're going to have freedom of religion, but it shall not establish a religion. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

But if you believe in judge-made law, the Supreme Court, by that decision in 1963, *Murray v. Curlett*, outlawed prayer in the public schools by a court decision. I think it's in direct violation of the First Amendment of the Constitution. If we're going to respect judge-made law and stop praying in our public schools, that was the beginning of

the judicial activism that's begun to break down this civilization and this culture. I think those decisions needed to be made at the local school level, not at the Supreme Court level.

And I remember sitting, as a freshman in high school, and this news came to me, I was sitting in general science class. And they said now there will be no more prayer in our school. And I remember thinking, what does that actually stop? How will they stop us from praying? If the teachers decide not to, does that mean I can't? Can we not, as students? Can I not pray before a test? I needed help, I will tell you.

A thought process went through my mind. The only way that the Federal Government could prohibit prayer in the public schools would be to clear out the public schools. If we insisted on following through, they'd have to empty the schools. Otherwise, there was going to be prayer in the public schools, as well as our parochial schools. They would have to come in and march us all out of school, chain the doors shut, and post a guard to prevent prayer in the public schools.

So what did we do? We genuflected to the Supreme Court, accepted the *Murray v. Curlett* decision in 1963, stopped activity of public prayer in public schools, and we've had subsequent decisions along the way about whether students could pray, whether athletes could pray, whether coaches could pray with athletes, whether coaches could be there when athletes prayed with themselves, all of these things decided by a Supreme Court that believes in stare decisis, that there was a decision made in 1963, and that they're somehow bound by that decision, rather than looking back at the plain text of this Constitution and concluding that as long as Congress doesn't make a law establishing a state religion, or interfere with the practice of religion, then it isn't the Federal Government's business to be engaged in religious activity that takes place in the public or the private schools. But that's what happened in 1963.

Then, Mr. Speaker, 1965, we went through, at breakneck speed, went through the Constitution over here at the Supreme Court, out those doorways and off that way, breakneck speed. This was *Griswold v. Connecticut*. At that time, Connecticut and Massachusetts and multiple other States had outlawed contraceptives in their States. That meant that you couldn't go in and buy contraceptives at the drug store. The case of *Griswold* was brought against—*Griswold* brought the case against the State of Connecticut and said, your State law that bans contraceptives is unconstitutional. And they went before the Supreme Court and argued.

What are you going to base that on? How does a State not have a power that's not—all non-enumerated powers are reserved for the States or the people, respectively. So the Constitution, I say, defines that the States had that

power. But yet, the Supreme Court, in their imagination in 1965, created this right to privacy, a right to privacy fabricated out of whole cloth, didn't exist in the Constitution, doesn't exist today in the Constitution, but it exists on the lips of every law school professor that's teaching constitutional law, a right to privacy that's been created now by the Supreme Court. They say it was in this Constitution somehow but had never been discovered until the Supreme Court discovered it in *Griswold v. Connecticut*.

So it was against the law in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and multiple other States to even sell contraceptives. So the Supreme Court created a right to privacy and outlawed the ban on contraceptives in Connecticut.

I say if you lived in Connecticut in 1965 and you wanted contraceptives, you could drive across the State line, or you could move to another State. That was the vision of the laboratories of the State experiment of the Founding Fathers. States' rights, Tenth Amendment. They imposed that in 1965.

Oh, by the way, in 1972 there was a case called *Eisenstadt* that said, well—it was just married people in *Griswold* in 1965. *Eisenstadt* came along and said, well, if there's a right to privacy for married people to be able to purchase contraceptives, surely that exists for unmarried people as well. They imposed that, and the Federal Government took another reach, and now we have the foundation for *Roe v. Wade*, which turned into—the right to privacy became the foundational argument for *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, just 8 years after *Griswold*.

And they found, in the emanations and penumbras, a right to abortion. Only the right to abortion of a non-viable fetus, I might add, but the companion case was *Doe v. Bolton*. And in that case it said, But there will be exceptions to the viable fetus if the health of the mother is considered. And health of the mother was defined to be mental, physical, or familial health of the mother. And so it was an open door right to any kind of abortion, this all rooted in judicial activism, I might add.

Today, seeing what has happened in *Griswold*, and then setting aside a State law, now, to the point where the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, stepped before a press conference, a week, 2 weeks ago, on a Friday at noon, and he said, Well, okay, you know I might have gotten in a little hot water about taking away the rights to conscience of the Catholic Church and other religious institutions by telling them, through Kathleen Sebelius, that they shall provide, not just contraceptives any longer—I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't just that. It was contraceptives, sterilizations, and abortifacients, pills that cause abortion, requiring religious organizations, pro-life organizations, especially the Catholic Church, to pro-

vide that if they're going to provide any kind of health care for their employees or their patients, a direct, clear, imposition of a violation of rights to conscience.

And Father Jonathan Morris said, publicly, that you cannot force someone to violate their conscience. You keep your convictions of your conscience, even unto death. I applaud the position that he has taken. I endorse that position that he has taken.

But now, a few days after this announcement came out, and the heat came on the President, his noon press conference on that Friday, he stepped up and, instead of, let's say, legislating within the confines of the Constitution itself, the supreme law of the land, or amending the Constitution if you disagree with what it says, or even legislating from the bench, as *Griswold*, *Eisenstadt*, *Roe* and *Doe*, and many others have done, we have now a President with the highest degree of audacity I have ever seen—and by the way, he uses that term “audacity” pretty often.

□ 1350

He thinks he's legislating by press conference. He said, Well, I'm not going to impose this on you any longer, Catholic Church and others. I'm going to impose it on insurance companies. They shall provide contraceptives, sterilizations, abortifacients, abortion-causing pills, and they shall do it at no charge.

The audacity of the President of the United States to issue such a thing. And we should not comply with such an unconstitutional order from the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of surveying tornado damage in his district.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 5, 2012, at noon 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:

5146. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting

a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5147. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5148. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8213] received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5149. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2010 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5150. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patent Compensation Board Regulations (RIN: 1990-AA33) received February 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5151. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — DOE Patent Licensing Regulations (RIN: 1990-AA41) received February 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5152. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — NRC Procedures for Placement and Monitoring of Work with the U.S. Department of Energy, Management Directive 11.7, DT-12-02 received February 6, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5153. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of proposed lease with the Government of Poland (Transmittal No. 02-12) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5154. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting Periodic Report on the National Emergency Caused by the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for February 26, 2011 — August 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5155. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting report on proposed obligations of funds provided for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5156. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the fourteenth quarterly report on the Afghanistan reconstruction, pursuant to Public Law 110-181, section 1229; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5157. A letter from the Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Sunshine Act Report for 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5158. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report on the detailed boundary of Sturgeon Wild and Scenic River in Michigan, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5159. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change of Addresses for Regional Offices, Addition of One New Address, and Correction of Names of