

wide range of Americans that are already out there.

It will be interesting, in my judgment, to see if Congress is able to exercise the courage, the vision, and the leadership to catch up with our constituents.

Mr. TONKO. Let me tell you, part of my congressional district includes Schenectady, New York, dubbed "the city that lights and hauls the world." They did locomotive manufacturing. We are a center of innovation, with names like Edison and Steinmetz.

So that Greatest Generation was involved in the manufacturing end of that thought process, that seed that was planted, that invention that was sparked in Schenectady, and they were there manufacturing so that they could light and haul the world.

So along that path of my district where the Erie Canal gave birth to an industrial revolution, where we inspired the westward movement, where this necklace of communities called mill towns emerged because of all of the centers of invention and products that were manufactured, this great generation knows what happens when you are at the front of the line where you are the leader in the world. And this is our chance to assume the leadership mantle of a new century of thinking. Just as we did over a century ago to create some of these ways to address energy needs, we are now at a new juncture that can, again, produce that passage that allows us to impact the entire world with the developments that we can inspire simply by committing resources, whoever it is as a nation, whatever nation assumes that leadership status—and someone will—they're going to control, I think, that global setting. And it should be the U.S.

We as a country not only have the challenges placed before us in terms of a tough economy that now we are working to bring back, a tough job inherited by this President, but he is doing a very thoughtful, remarkable job with keen focus, and includes energy transformation as part of that comeback.

□ 2115

Not only are we challenged, but we have that capacity, the intellectual capacity and the history of having been pioneers, people who have taken that leap of faith and who have seen science and all sorts of experimental procedures as a good thing.

This administration, this House's leadership through Speaker PELOSI and the many chairs understand that we have that capacity, and they are leading us in the right direction. I am convinced.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Congressman TONKO, well said. I deeply appreciate you joining me this evening.

We are going to have an opportunity to deal with these issues tomorrow with the budget markup and this next week. And as we have committees mov-

ing forward, as you say, moving in these various directions, I look forward to working with you and deeply appreciate your reasoned voice and your experience. It is going to make our legislation better.

Mr. TONKO. Well, I know you stand for progressive policies in Oregon, and you personify that very well. So it is a pleasure to work with you in this House, and we are going to go forward and have a very innovative budget.

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

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET SPENDS TOO MUCH, IT TAXES TOO MUCH, AND BORROWS TOO MUCH; AND, THE GIFT OF LIFE

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of being recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, this Nation's great deliberative body that we are.

I listened with interest to the gentlemen who have made their presentation in the previous hour, and I think back as we start this discussion, this 60-minute Special Order about what has taken place in the country. And many of us watched the President do his press conference. I wouldn't be very surprised if President Obama has at this point reached the threshold for press conferences in his career that would match that of Ronald Reagan's. Ronald Reagan didn't believe in coming before the American people a lot of times in a row. That is clearly not the case with President Obama, Madam Speaker.

We are here dealing with a full-court press across this Nation that seeks to, as the President seeks to, sell his budget to the American people. We have watched the Congressional Budget Office come out with their estimates on what this budget is going to cost. I have watched the target move. I have watched the irresponsibility of the spending grow. And if you add up the cumulative total of the money that has been spent, taxpayers' money borrowed and spent, I don't really know anybody that has that full total. We need to put it down here on the floor and ring it up every day, just like you put the little thermometer up when you have got a fund-raising drive for a new library. The only thing will be that there won't be any new libraries for our children and grandchildren if we continue on this path.

I recall, Madam Speaker, the President making a statement that, in order to repair this economy, we need to construct this multi-legged stool, and the stimulus plan is only one leg of a multi-legged stool. That is by his words.

So I made the remark then that one leg of a multi-legged stool that wasn't

a milking stool, that would be one leg. It wasn't a two-legged stool, I have never seen one of those. There would be no practical reason to have a two-legged stool, it would fall over. And so a three-legged stool, he would have said so. But we know it is multi-legged. So that is at least four, maybe more, with the legs of this stool that he would like to construct to solved our economic crisis at a price tag per leg of \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion each. And when I said that a month or so ago, there was a significant amount of criticism, that I was exaggerating the President's budget.

Madam Speaker, I submit that, no, now the Congressional Budget Office has exceeded my exaggerated estimate in their objective conservative estimate of what this budget is going to cost this country in debt, and cost the American people.

As I listened to the press conference today, I have been familiar with the term that was trotted at nearly every press conference, of which there have been many, and there are two things we can't get a total on: How much money is being spent, and how many press conferences we have had that set policy for this economy. But I have gotten used to the term that the President had inherited a \$1 trillion debt from his predecessor.

Madam Speaker, I point out that no President inherits a debt from his predecessor President. A President can't spend any money. A President can't initiate any spending. In fact, a Senator can't initiate spending. It has got to be initiated, by Constitution, right here in the United States House of Representatives.

That budget, that spending, that deficit for the 110th Congress and the deficit coming into the 111th Congress, that is the Pelosi debt, the Pelosi deficit. That is the money that was appropriated by this Congress that established much of the debt that was inherited by the 111th Congress that would be administered by the Executive Branch, which would be the President of the United States. His job is to carry out the policies we set and take care to enforce the laws with due diligence. But his statement has been he inherited a \$1 trillion debt. Today we have another milestone I hadn't heard before, Madam Speaker; and that is, now he has inherited a \$1.3 trillion debt.

So the inheritance is growing for the President, but it is shrinking for our grandchildren, unless we consider that they are inheriting debt, as well, and the burden of supporting this government and taking it out of duly-earned profits in future, future years, without a prospect of being able to pay for this, without a plan to come out of it.

And the argument that if we just do something to establish socialized medicine, that will solve our economic problems? I cannot connect the dots on that kind of a statement, Madam Speaker, and it concerns me a great deal.

So the inherited debt, which is not inherited from his predecessor the President, President Bush, but it is debt that is inherited from the 110th Congress and previous Congresses, has grown to \$1.3 trillion. But the debt the American people inherit out of this is over \$8 trillion, perhaps over \$10 trillion. And we are still configuring and constructing more legs of this multi-legged stool that is supposed to bring us out of this economic crisis.

I listened as that language unfolded, and you have to listen very carefully to understand the meaning of the President's words. It is usually an artful job of crafting this ambiguity of language, this ambiguity of language that allows me to pull out of it the meaning that I want to know and hear, and allows someone, my ideological opposite, to draw an opposite meaning from the same words and the same phrase. There are a lot of different ways to describe it. I am going to be generous and call it a classical ambiguity style. And I find myself sometimes turning down the volume and waiting for the newspaper the next day, because you really have to parse all this language and analyze it, and it is hard for me to find time for that. But some of this language is more clear than others.

I intend to take up the issue in a moment of the President's appointment to the Office of Legal Counsel, but prior to doing so I think it would be appropriate to transition into the economic circumstances, and recognize the gentlelady from Minnesota for so much time as she may consume to talk about whatever it be on her mind.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, also known as the Stunning STEVE KING of Iowa, as stated by national political commentators, who certainly know what they are talking about. STEVE KING is one of our stalwart patriots who is here on the floor fighting on behalf of the American people.

And while we are here tonight to talk about several subjects, we can't avoid the first subject that is on the table. It is the fact that under President Obama's budget that he has put forward, President Obama's budget simply spends too much, it taxes too much, and it certainly borrows too much.

We are very concerned about the excessive spending that is contained in this bill. It is \$3.9 trillion. That is almost \$4 trillion in spending under this budget deficit. This is an historical Presidency, historical for the amount of spending that is occurring under this President, \$3.9 trillion.

Not only is that a huge amount of money just for spending and just for taxing; we know that just the energy tax alone that the President is putting in his budget is \$2 trillion in spending. The President's aides just came out within this last week and said that it is not \$646 billion, as we thought, it is nearly \$2 trillion. That means for people in Minnesota, for people that are watching this evening, Madam Speak-

er, we are looking at perhaps an additional \$4,000 per year out of the gate that every American household will see in increased taxes for energy. \$4,000 a year in increased taxes. Who can afford that right now, when 401(k)s are down, when the value of houses are down, when jobs are on the line? We can't afford that, Madam Speaker. The President surely must know that.

But, borrowing too much. Representative STEVE KING talked about the massive borrowing that is coming from under our President's budget. This is what is remarkable. President Obama is borrowing so much of your tax money, Madam Speaker, of the American people's money, that literally President Obama's debt will be more than all previous Presidents combined.

Madam Speaker, you heard me correctly. From George Washington through George W. Bush, the 43rd President, you can add up the debt level of every one of those Presidents. And day after day after day we hear President Obama blaming the previous administration for the current situation he is in; but President Obama will lay so much debt on the backs of the American people that it will trump all 43 Presidents combined. That is historic.

Take a look. These are the figures that are put out, this is the Office of Management and Budget, and these are the figures that the President himself points to. The figures here on the left are the figures for debt prior to President Obama coming into office. These figures on the right are the debt amount that President Obama by his own figures say will be accumulated, \$20 trillion in debt by President Obama's own figures.

As a matter of fact, the Congressional Budget Office came out and said so rosy were the President's figures that he undercounted his debt by \$2.3 trillion. He has rosy estimates of how great the economy is going to grow, and he has very conservative estimates on how high his debt will grow. We are concerned, we are very concerned about what the future debt load will be on the American people.

I am often reminded of the Founders; and Representative STEVE KING and I stand here tonight in this chamber, Madam Speaker. Together with yourself, we are literally standing on the shoulders of the Founders of this great country are. And it was the Founders of our country, as we look through the rearview mirror of history, who very clearly made it known that our government was to be a Constitutional government formed on limited government principles. And the day that the Founders signed the Constitution, they also signed the first ten amendments to that Constitution; and those ten amendments were given as a gift, a protection to the individual American. Why? Because our Founders were so concerned about the abuse of taxing authority of their mother country, Great Britain. They were so concerned

about that abuse of a taxing authority that they said to the American people in the first ten amendments: We want you to know that your Federal Government will be limited in its power. And in the tenth amendment, they specifically said: These limited powers that we are giving to the Federal Government are all the Federal Government will have. Every other power that there is will be given back to the States. We, the Federal Government, won't hold that power. We give it back to the States.

This is very important to realize, because our President doesn't seem to see it that way, Madam Speaker. Our President seems to think that the time and energy and productive years belongs to Uncle Sam and not to the individual. That is a completely different way of looking at the world than what our Founders viewed.

This evening, Madam Speaker, Representative KING wants to turn the subject now to talking about the gift of life, the gift of human life; the issue that our framers talked about in the Declaration of Independence when they called out for inalienable rights and said that we, Americans, were created by a God; that our creator God created us. He gave us inalienable rights, rights that only God can give, rights that no government confer nor can any government take away. That, among those rights are life, liberty, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness.

Tonight, I know that is what Representative STEVE KING wants to speak about, Madam Speaker. He wants to speak about that cherished gift enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, and why we are so genuinely concerned about the nomination to the Office of Legal Counsel that President Obama is making and the individual that Representative KING will be speaking of.

□ 2130

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for the eloquent presentation on the economic side of this thing and the very smooth transition into the life side. And this is an important issue that sits before this Congress.

Before I go to that issue, I would comment that in looking at the chart of the debt and the cumulative effect of the debt of President Obama's debt compared to the sum total of all the previous administrations, Congress has started, the President signed the appropriations bills, there is another statistic that I saw that was a calculation from the Congressional Budget Office that took this debt in the budget that has been proposed by President Obama and lays it out into the future. The greatest share of our gross domestic product that we have had as debt in a budget was 1945, right at the end of World War II. And this Obama budget projects to be not 100 percent of gross domestic product, but twice as high, 200 percent of gross domestic product is

the calculation that comes from numbers produced by the Congressional Budget Office.

Madam Speaker, I point out another component of this, that yesterday there was a plan that was rolled out that was played off of former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson, who argued that he should have \$700 billion to pick up toxic assets from the lending institutions, and that proposal was rolled out yesterday. And here is how this calculates, and that is that the Federal Government—and I want to make this point, Madam Speaker, before we move on, because I think it is so essentially important that we all understand what is taking place in this country with the nationalization of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, reaching into the auto makers with the partial nationalization that is going on there, the nationalization of AIG. The taxpayers own 80 percent of the shares of AIG. They are not worth a lot, but taxpayers own 80 percent of them. We have a big investment in Citigroup. And as the Federal Government swallows up financial institution after financial institution, now this administration reaches in to the mortgages themselves, into institutional investors and individual investors, perhaps, to deal with these toxic mortgages.

Now I have argued, and Congresswoman MICHELE BACHMANN and I have signed on to a piece of legislation last fall and argued that we should use private capital to solve this problem with the toxic debt that exists, the toxic mortgages that are out there, those mortgages that aren't performing and that are going in the tank. It is always preferable in a free-enterprise kind of an economy to have private-sector capital come in and rescue.

The rescue fund, the rescue act was a piece of legislation that I introduced that we are original cosponsors of, and one of the things that it does to put private capital into this very thing, these kind of mortgages. It would suspend capital gains taxes on rescue capital that would come in to pick up the toxic debt. Each time that we have pushed out into the middle of the table the argument that we should be either suspending or eliminating capital gains taxes so that investors could come in and pick up these toxic mortgages, and then if they yield a profit, let them keep the profit tax-free, they will reinvest those dollars and pay taxes on their capital at a later date, Madam Speaker, but we can't get that simple idea of suspending taxes on capital gains to stay on the negotiating table any longer than it takes Chairman FRANK's back of the hand to sweep it off.

Why? Why would the most logical proposal that can be devised, and the simplest one at that, that brings free-market solutions and private-sector investor capital that is looking for a place to go, why would it not be part of the plan to resolve this economic downward spiral that we are in? I will

submit it is because the people that are in charge of devising the plan don't really believe in the free markets. If they did, they would want investors to come in.

So the White House has proposed a plan that would partner up the Federal Government, the White House and the taxpayers with private sector investment. Now I'm saying that we could get trillions of dollars of private investment to come in and pick up this toxic debt. You don't want to buy it at any more than the market price is. There is no reason to overpay for it. But you want to take it off the books of the banks and the lenders and let them move on and heal up. So here is the proposal, and it works out to be like this. If an investor wants to put \$1 down on the table to invest in these toxic debts that we are not supposed to call "toxic" anymore, these mortgage-backed securities, that investor can lay \$1 down, and the Federal Government will lay \$1 down, and then the Federal Government will guarantee another \$12 worth of debt. So, if I'm an individual investor, and I can come up with \$1, that means the Federal Government puts another \$1 in cash up to match it, and then they guarantee the loan on the balance of that, another \$12, so we have got a \$14 investment here. Thirteen of the \$14 are guaranteed by the Federal Government. The risk for the investor is \$1 out of \$14, 7 percent of the whole. The Federal Government's risk is 93 percent of the whole, and if this thing goes down, if it washes out, we are, as taxpayers, holding the bag for 93 percent of the loss. And the result—oh, wait a minute. What happens to the profit, Madam Speaker? Well, the profits are shared 50/50 between the Federal Government, the taxpayers and the investor.

So if I can come out and put \$1 down and somebody else will guarantee or put down \$13, and out of that whole \$14 worth of investment I'm going to get half of the return off of my 7 percent investment, and the Federal Government gets half of the return off of their 93 percent of their investment, I think you know what has happened here. They have rejected the idea that we should just not tax the profits, and instead, in the lust for sharing in the profits themselves and expanding the role of the Federal Government, they have rejected a free-market solution and come up with a Big Government solution that buys the Federal Government in in a big way with no way back out again and not even a respectable platitude that would give us a way to define it out of the ambiguity of the language that that is what is going to happen.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, what we have seen transpire is nothing short of historic. We have seen, since last year, the Federal Government become the bank of first resort and the bank of last resort. We have seen the Federal Government nationalize banks. We have seen the Fed-

eral Government step into insurance agencies, become the insurer of first resort and become the insurer of last resort and nationalize the largest insurance company in the United States, AIG.

And now what are we seeing in the Treasury Secretary's proposal that was just given out yesterday, or maybe it was the evening before that, is this: Now the Federal Government will become a hedge fund. That is essentially what we are looking at. The Federal Government will become a hedge fund. The only thing is that we will have toxic assets in the hedge fund.

How does this work? Again, the taxpayer, John Taxpayer becomes the chump that is holding the bag in all of this. Again, it is the taxpayer that is the forgotten man. Because once again, the Federal Government thinks that the taxpayer is good enough to have to pony up the money for all of these ideas that seem to come out that have a lot more to do with centralized government planning and very little to do resembling free-market capitalism.

We are lurching. We are lurching, Madam Speaker, away from free-market capitalism when you come to the point where the Federal Government now decides to throw the dice and become a hedge fund and the taxpayer is the one who is there for all of the loss but not for the gain. I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentle lady will yield for a question.

It just occurs to me as you speak of this, let's presume that you had \$1 million to invest. And you had been looking at a bundle of these mortgage-backed securities with the idea that you could go in and buy up this bundle with \$1 million in investment and then manage them in such a way that you could get your money back out and make a profit. It would be a good thing for our economy. It would be a good thing for the investment in that capital.

Now, if you're ready to invest that \$1 million in buying up a bundle of mortgage-backed securities, how would you be able to compete with someone who also had \$1 million and who had \$12 million from the Federal Government, between them then \$13 million, to match up against your \$1 million? What happens to the free market in this? And how does someone who doesn't want to participate and make an investment like that in direct competition with the Federal Government, how do they possibly find a profit? How can they compete?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Exactly. And we haven't got the question answered yet. It appears that only large institutional investors, a Goldman Sachs or someone like that, will be able to get in on these sweetheart deals. I don't know too many Joe Averages that will be able to buy into this great deal.

So think of it this way in your example: You have \$1 million worth of mortgage-backed securities. How much skin in the game would this private investor

have? Again, public-private? Public is \$950,000 worth of Federal tax money to \$50,000 worth of investment from the private person. But yet what if the yield is positive? For a \$50,000 investment, you could have a \$500,000 gain. That is pretty amazing. Whereas the Federal Government would be losing 95 percent, and there is nothing to lose when it comes to the private investor.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And reclaiming my time, the gentlelady mentions the institutional investors. And we have also watched the institutions on Wall Street such as Goldman Sachs, AIG, Citigroup and let me see, Lehman Brothers, and Merrill Lynch. The list goes on and on. It occurs to me that some of the same names and faces are inside the room when these decisions are made over and over again.

I think back to AIG, and the situation that flowed across this floor that would go back and back tax those retention bonuses that were paid to the executives. Who makes that decision? Who had the opportunity to say "no"? Some of the same people that are configuring this program now. It looks like it is designed for the institutional investors.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And if the gentleman would yield on AIG, let's not forget what AIG was. Once the American Government came in and federalized AIG, AIG was essentially a pass-through entity, meaning Federal tax dollars passed through AIG, went directly to Europe and made whole foreign investors. So this is what the taxpayer was paying for. The taxpayer gave money to bail out foreign investors.

My question is, foreign investors were made whole 100 percent across the board. Goldman Sachs—and I'm not trying to pick on them—but they were made whole \$13 billion, 100 percent. My question, Madam Speaker, is will the American taxpayer be made whole 100 percent? And when will they be made whole, if ever?

Mr. KING of Iowa. We know that there won't be any opportunity for the American taxpayers to be made whole.

And I'm asking for the taxpayers to wake up. Take on this personal responsibility. Get out the tea bags. The American people can come together and say, enough is more than enough. This is too much. And it is time to put the brakes on this.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If there is one final thing I can add to the gentleman's remarks. It was amazing this afternoon. President Obama had made a statement when he was with the prime minister of Australia. And he was asking Congress to give more power to the Treasury Secretary. As if they don't have enough already, he wants more power to the Treasury Secretary, which means more power for himself, because the Treasury Secretary represents the President.

He wants more power for what? So that if a private corporation becomes in trouble—we are not talking about a

bank now. We are talking about a private corporation that becomes in trouble, he wants the Treasury Secretary to have unilateral authority, on his own decision, to walk into a private business and essentially nationalize it, take it over and reorganize.

I'll tell you what. If investors are worried now about the Federal Government coming in, opening up private compensation contracts and deciding to lower the amount of the wage value, you ain't seen nothing yet. Because the Federal Government is going to come in with its Marxist view of economics and make a decision about who is allowed to make what wage based upon what government thinks. This is one of the scariest ideas to come down the pike.

Mr. KING of Iowa. As I reflect on your discussion about this attitude about the Federal Government deciding what executives should be paid, what businesses are viable and which ones should be nationalized, I recall there is a fine and stellar company that is domiciled in Minnesota that had one of their pieces of their investment that was nationalized. It was a rice processing plant in Venezuela. A Hugo Chavez move, that took over a rice plant in Cargill in Venezuela. And this is a pattern. I think if you would read the story about that and then bring it back and just change the names, the places and the dates, put some American companies in there, I don't think you could discern the difference between the specter of what is hanging out for the American businesses that is coming out of the White House and what has actually happened to Cargill in Venezuela.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And we also have a great institution in Minnesota, a great bank, Twin City Federal. Twin City Federal took some of the TARP money, some of the Federal bailout money. They did so because they felt if they didn't they would appear weak because the money was supposed to be only given to strong banks. Twin City Federal made the remarkable move about 1 month ago to return the TARP money. And people didn't know if a bank even had that ability to return the money. But they said they wanted to. They wanted nothing to do with TARP.

I think now they are very happy that they got out of that program now that they see the Federal Government has no hesitation to step into a company and now go in and renegotiate the wage contracts between upper management and high-end employees.

□ 2145

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady. And it occurs to me that at some point, that the NBA, the professional baseball leagues, the NFL, hockey players all are going to eventually come under this scrutiny, and maybe even the Hollywood actors and actresses. If there is something that you can dictate what it is, the wages and

benefits of executives in private business, then there is no line by which you wouldn't cross to tell anybody in America what they could or couldn't make.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And it makes me wonder if we will have politically correct wage decisions that will be made. For instance, if you are an executive at a wind-powered plant, is it okay for you to make \$800,000 a year; but if you are the president of an oil company, we don't like you so you are only going to make \$60,000 a year. You wonder what kind of decisions are coming down the road.

And again, this has nothing to do with free market capitalism or getting our country back in order. This has everything to do with the banana republic and bringing our country's finances down the road to bankruptcy.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And the point that is being made, the undercurrent of this point that is being made is what the gentlelady from Minnesota made at the beginning of this hour, and that is, getting to the foundational principles of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, these rights that come from God that are clearly articulated in the Declaration of Independence and flow through the Constitution that are part and parcel of our law and our culture and rooted in biblical values. These are the things that have made this a great Nation, along with property rights and free market capitalism, the rule of law, which is God's law transferred into this country. And so today it brings us to this point, this point of the subject of the law itself and how it is interpreted, how the Constitution is interpreted, the profound constitutional questions and how the laws that are written within the parameters of the Constitution are interpreted, and how the President himself is advised by the Office of Legal Counsel. And I will submit that the President's appointment to the Office of Legal Counsel is one of the most important appointments that is ever made. And it is an appointment that, according to the Newsweek magazine, the Office of Legal Counsel is the most important government office you have never heard of. This is the job that advises the President and other branches of government on all constitutional questions, evaluates executive orders as to their constitutionality and anything that might come before the President for a signature, a piece of legislation that would come out of here, for example, Madam Speaker, that is also something that would come under the purview of the Office of Legal Counsel.

The President issued, he rescinded the Mexico City Policy on January 23rd of this year, and that Mexico City Policy is a policy that prohibited Federal dollars, our tax dollars, yours and mine and everybody across this country, from being used to fund abortions overseas. That is the Mexico City Policy. I think the President wanted to issue his

Executive order on January 22, the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, but out of respect for the hundreds of thousands of Americans that poured into this city to make their case about the protection of innocent unborn human life, I think out of the fear of backlash, plus he was a little busy signing his Executive order that closes Gitmo a year to the day, it will be on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* on 2010. But on January 23, the next day, he issued the Executive order that rescinded the Mexico City Policy, opened up the door to compel American taxpayers to fund abortions in foreign countries, under the guise of what shall we call it, population control, reproductive rights.

And then, on top of that, we have the appointment of Dawn Johnson to the Office of Legal Counsel to advise the President on executive orders, constitutional questions, and someone who comes to this job with a real track record, a track record of a built-in bias as an assistant to the Office of Legal Counsel, under President Clinton, and someone who has made a whole series of outrageous statements, mostly that have come in conjunction with her doing her job as a legal counsel herself. So these are not, this is not talk that is coming along in the coffee shop. This is language that flows out of legal briefs that she has written.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And if we could just speak a little bit more about the importance of this office, the Office of Legal Counsel. The gentleman had quoted from *Newsweek* magazine. *Newsweek* went on to say that this role as Office of Legal Counsel acts as a kind of mini Supreme Court. This office is the President's legal counsel, for all practical purposes. They issue opinions, much like judicial opinions, kind of a mini Supreme Court. *Newsweek* went on to say its carefully worded opinions are regarded as binding precedent, as final say on what the President and all his agencies can and cannot legally do. I can't think of a more important office to whisper into the President's ear about where the President will come down and stand on issues.

The other thing to recognize, the Office of Legal Counsel is a training ground, so to speak, for future Supreme Court justices. This individual that the President has nominated for this position, previous occupants were Antonin Scalia, William Rehnquist. This is very important that we know who this person is that will be whispering in the President's ear.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time. I thank the gentelady for that further clarification of the Office of Legal Counsel, the most important government office that most have never heard of, Madam Speaker. And so, as we saw this appointment be made, and looked through some of the documentation of Dawn Johnson, we put together a letter to the President. And this letter is dated March 24 of this year. And there are 62 cosigners on

here, both of us, MICHELE BACHMANN and myself included. And it addresses a letter to the President and it says, essentially, Mr. President you stated when you rescinded the Mexico City policy, that no matter what our views, we are united in our determination—and this is a continuing quote—to prevent unintended pregnancies, reduce the need for abortion, and support women and families and the choices they make. I will just close that quote there.

If it is your intent, Mr. President, that we really reach for those kind of goals, and another component of that statement, we must work to find common ground. Close quote.

I hope the President picks up on this. There is no way to find common ground with an individual who holds such utterly biased views. And this is, in my judgment, one of them.

And this is a quote from Dawn Johnson, and the notion of legal restrictions as some kind of a reasonable compromise, perhaps to help make abortions safe, legal and rare, which is a statement that has come out of a many leading Democrats, including Hillary Clinton. This proves to be nonsensical in her view. And I think it is the rare part that she objects so much too. And she goes on to quote in a different location, progressives must not portray all abortions as tragedies. Absent unforeseen technological and medical changes, abortion is unlikely to become truly rare, and certainly not nonexistent.

In other words, this is a rejection of the position, the most, I will say the most friendly position that I get from people that do not support the protection of innocent unborn human life. At least they will concede that there is a moral abhorrence to it, and it should be minimized if they aren't willing to eliminate. And that was something that Hillary Clinton said. But this statement by Dawn Johnson, I think, makes it clear, Madam Speaker, that she says that abortion will never be rare and safe, legal and rare, as a matter of fact. It will not be. And that just opens up the door to further dialog on this particular issue. There are many issues that I would object to. But I focus this on the abortion side.

And another one of these statements that we carry to the President is this: And this, Madam Speaker, is among the most offensive statements that the American people are asked to accept as part and parcel of the package that you get when the President appoints someone to be, to head of the Office of Legal Counsel who carries this kind of a bias against the people who stand up for innocent human life. And this is her statement on abortion regulation. The State has conscripted her body for its own ends because the State has an interest in babies being born. If a State is not interested in that, you will see a civilization ultimately die. So she goes, recognizing a compelling State interest in protecting the fetus would

provide States with an open-ended invitation to force pregnant women to act in whatever ways the State determined were optimal for the fetus, thereby, and I pay attention to this, thereby reducing pregnant women to no more than fetal containers. That is a remark of contempt towards mothers, toward the cherished role that they have in bringing these young children to birth and nurturing them with all the love they possibly can. It is offensive to me to think that someone has called my mother a fetal container.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If I could add to the gentleman's remarks. I think that the other thing that is glaring in this statement by Ms. Johnson is the fact that she said, recognizing a compelling State interest in protecting the fetus. I would just like to remind her that the State is not only interested in protecting the fetus, the State is also interested in protecting the woman. Many States all across the United States of America have laws known as women's right to know because there is an intention that women who are abortion-minded know what the consequence of that decision will mean. Many women become infertile for life. Once they have an abortion they can never bear another child after that. And many women don't know what the consequences of an early abortion will be. That is a violent act. An abortion is a violent act to a woman's body.

Also, women have tremendous emotional pain that they may deal with, not just for an afternoon, or not just for a weekend, they may, for the next 10 years, suffer with depression and all manner of disorders that they may have to deal with emotionally for years and years because they didn't fully comprehend the consequences of their decision.

And while women should never be viewed as fetal containers—I have never heard any more crass language in my life than the imagery that Dawn Johnson brought up—it is also true that babies are more than a product of tissue. Babies are a gift. Just as women are a gift, babies are a gift. Human life is to be cherished, not discarded.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And reclaiming my time from the gentelady from Minnesota who has lived her life in demonstration to that commitment to life, your own children and the numbers of foster children that you have nurtured, you are the woman that lives in Minnesota and had so many children but always knew what to do. And I have not quite figured out how to put that into the proper alliteration, but that is the concept.

Mrs. BACHMANN. We had great kids, Representative KING. That's how we did it, and a great husband.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It definitely helps to have a good husband. I remind my wife of that, and I appreciate that comment.

Going back to this, as you mentioned, it was the Office of Legal Counsel is a perfect position to whisper

things into the ears of the President, to get the President's attention, to be on his agenda, to make legal arguments, to make arguments that are going to help him rationalize and set the policy, a policy like the Mexico City.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And to help him make his statements for him because these are written statements that become binding precedent within the President's office. This is an amazing amount of power.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Written statements with binding precedent, and the ability to write that into statements or whisper into the President's ear fetal containers, Mr. President.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It also binds the administrative agencies. So this has power throughout the entire Presidential administration. Every agency, every department would be bound by these statements.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And it would limit the ability of each of the agencies to react to the very policy that this Congress has established, this Congress might establish. And this kind of pejorative language has no place in law. And it has no place in the dialog of America. It has no place in families and humanity, has no place in nurturing little children, and it has no place in taking care of the mothers, the brothers and the sisters with the idea that a fetal container, that reduces the unborn child, that innocent little baby, to being a term that hardly makes it as a medical term.

These aren't the only comments that have been made by Dawn Johnson. I just picked them up as they come along. There is quite a stack here. And I don't know if I will get through them all, Madam Speaker, but here is one that is also indicative of a similar kind of language in the previous quote where Dawn Johnson, again, the President's appointee to head up the Office of Legal Counsel, the argument says the argument that women who become pregnant have in some sense consented to the pregnancy belies reality. I would like to think that most women who are mothers have consented to the pregnancy. Not all, but most. The large number of women who never receive proper information about contraception and others who are the inevitable losers in the contraception lottery, no more consent to pregnancy than pedestrians consent to being struck by drunk drivers. Pregnant mothers equivalent to being struck by drunk drivers when they become pregnant? That reduces this thing down into an act of almost negligent violence, if not willful violence. I think it is an act of love.

□ 2200

Mrs. BACHMANN. It almost seems contrary to feminism because feminism empowers women and believes that women have the capability to give consent, informed consent. The way that this is written by Dawn Johnson,

it appears that she is saying that women are without capacity to give consent even in an area of becoming pregnant.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, even when they make that decision themselves.

I as a new grandfather myself 3 weeks ago today, I think of those children who are loved and wanted and planned and of those families who are not able to have children and who are lined up to adopt children who might become available. There are many more families in this country who are waiting for a child to come along who they can adopt and nurture into the bosom of their family and raise as one of their own than there are unwanted children in this country.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And if I could just correct the gentleman, my opinion is that every child is a wanted child. That is one of Planned Parenthood's trademarks that, I believe, is one of the biggest myths that has been perpetrated in the last 40 years—every child a wanted child—

Mr. KING of Iowa. By God.

Mrs. BACHMANN. As if there are unwanted children. Every child is a wanted child.

I can attest to the fact that there are open arms for every child who is born. If a child is considered less than perfect, has a physical or a mental disability, there are homes all across the United States that are begging and pleading and waiting for a child. None of us can ever forget the words of Mother Teresa, who said, "If you don't want the children, I want the children. Give them to me. I will take them," this diminutive, little nun from Calcutta who was willing to take any child from across the planet. Here in the United States, we have willing, open hearts that would take every child who is born in this country.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, raising up on the point made by the gentlelady from Minnesota, it is true that every child is both wanted as is wanted, but also, every child is planned and wanted by God. It is his will, and we need to acknowledge that will and nurture and love these children with all of our ability and with all of our will.

It takes me to another quote by Dawn Johnson. This one fits right in with the category. Perhaps it is more egregious. This is the infamous KKK quote where she says, "The terrorists' behavior of petitioners," meaning those people who are praying for life outside the abortion clinic, "is remarkably similar to the conspiracy of violence and intimidation carried out by the Ku Klux Klan against which Congress intended this statute to protect."

Madam Speaker, I am watching my constituents by the hundreds on these 40 days of Lent, praying outside Planned Parenthood in Sioux City, Iowa throughout these 40 days, and they have been labeled now to be similar to the KKK by the prospective head

of the Office of Legal Counsel who would be whispering these terms into the President's ear and writing legal opinions and bringing influence on the enforcement effort of the Federal Government, bringing that up against people who are exercising their first amendment rights of freedom of assembly and religion to protect innocent life.

Mrs. BACHMANN. This is a remarkable statement because it seems to invoke the worst hate speech that you could possibly make. To call out those who are praying on behalf of life and to liken them to terrorists and to call them terrorists, that seems to me invoke a hate speech and also a form of bigotry, religious bigotry of the worst order.

This really calls into question for me the President's judgment in choosing someone like Dawn Johnson, who used this type of language, and putting her in the position of being Office of Legal Counsel. I think it is shocking and a stunning choice, and it really calls into question President Obama's judgment in this selection.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, the gentlelady has articulated this, I think, very well.

We'll add these expressions up together: pregnant mothers are the equivalent of being hit by drunk drivers; that abortion will never be rare; the equivalent of the KKK are people who are demonstrating and protesting that we should protect and support innocent human life.

I'll put another one up here and add another quote to that. This is another quote from Dawn Johnson.

She says, "The experience of an abortion is no longer traumatic. The response of most women to the experience is relief."

I don't have any experience with that, but that is not the message that I get from the people I talk to who come to this city. The strongest leaders in the pro-life movement and always among them will be women who have had abortions and who have suffered the trauma, the psychological trauma of abortion. They don't feel relief. They feel compelled to pray and march and demonstrate until *Roe v. Wade* is overturned, and we can protect innocent life in this country as God intended.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I would add that, with all due respect, this is one of the most ignorant comments that I have ever heard—that the experience is no longer traumatic. Speak to anyone who deals in the aftermath of dealing with women who have had abortions.

My best friend runs a crisis pregnancy center. She has given her life and has poured her life out because she loves women and she loves abortion-minded women. She wants to meet them at the point of their deepest crises. She has told me that, for women who come in who are considering abortion and also for women who have had an abortion and who come to her, it is

completely traumatic. They agonize as they walk into the clinic. They agonize, the women who have had previous abortions, after they have had the abortion. It is traumatic.

There are reams of scientific papers that have been done that speak loudly to the trauma that the woman has experienced, let alone the trauma that the baby has experienced. That baby's life was taken in cold blood. That baby was murdered in cold blood. Not traumatic? It was traumatic for that innocent child, but it was equally as traumatic for the mother. The mother realizes and understands what has occurred. This is traumatic. To make that statement, to me, is heartless at worst and ignorant at best.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, the trauma that has been visited upon many, many thousands of women in this country has brought about the beginnings of an entire organization, of a movement that has significant inertia and membership, and that is called Women Deserve Better. They come to this city continually and make the case that women deserve better. They deserve proper psychological and medical counsel. They deserve to be treated with respect. They deserve to understand what is going on, and they do not deserve to be told that they are going to feel relief or that it used to be but is no longer a traumatic experience.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That is the cruelest thing that could be done to a woman who is in crisis—to tell her that this is an easy quick fix and that you will experience relief. Women are strong, capable, intelligent people. They can handle the truth, and they deserve to be given full scientific evidence of the procedure they are about to undergo if that is the case. We need to respect women, and these statements do not reflect a true respect for women.

Mr. KING of Iowa. But they may reflect the majority of the input that is going into the ears of the President as these decisions are being made, and they would reflect the position of the Office of Legal Counsel if Dawn Johnson is confirmed by the United States Senate.

Now, we can expect that these ideas—this philosophy, this pejorative approach—is not balanced and that they do not bring a sense of legality or legal scholarship or constitutional analysis. They bring a bias into this discussion. These kinds of biased positions would be reflected throughout the President's positions because he is the one who has chosen her. It does reflect his positions to some degree.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I would say that this reflects his position completely because we know, from the President's previous votes when he was a State Senator in Illinois, he was the most pro-abortion State Senator in Illinois. His voting record here in the United States Senate was that of the most pro-abortion United States Senator.

He fully supported partial birth abortion, one of the most gruesome, cruel

procedures of infanticide one could ever imagine. Also, he voted for the Born Alive Act, which meant that he stood on the floor, as a matter of fact, in the Illinois State Senate and argued that children who were born, born alive, did not necessarily have a right to live, that as to those children who were born alive after a "botched" abortion, the doctor would have the right to kill that baby after it was born, and now President Obama voted in favor of that unthinkable gruesome bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And he argued in favor of it.

The foundational principle that he argued for, Madam Speaker, was: A woman who sought to have an abortion had a right to a dead baby even if they botched the abortion and the baby survived.

That is not a moral principle. That is not a legal principle. It is a myopic principle that is pulled up within the political lobbying that comes out of Planned Parenthood. It cannot be based on anything moral; it cannot be based in law. The philosophy of the President was also reflected during the campaign trail when he was speaking as if his daughters got pregnant—out of wedlock, I presume is what he was referring to.

He said, "I don't want my daughters punished with a baby." I listened to that tape tonight to be sure I heard it right. Those are the words of the President of the United States. He actually said, referring to his daughters, "I don't want them punished with a baby."

I don't believe a baby is punishment. I believe a baby is a gift and that the people whom I know who love their children as we do ours and our grandchildren as we do ours see them all as gifts, all as gifts from God.

Mrs. BACHMANN. One of the most gruesome quotes—and I don't know if the gentleman has this one—is when she is referring to her beliefs and to people who are like-minded.

She said, "Progressives," which would be far-left liberals, "must not portray all abortions as tragedies. Absent unforeseen technological and medical changes, abortion is unlikely to become truly rare and certainly not nonexistent."

In this statement, she is lamenting the fact that abortion could become rare. She wants abortion to occur. When do you ever hear anyone say that they don't want abortion to be rare? But that is what Dawn Johnson is saying.

When President Bill Clinton was running for President, he said he wanted abortions safe, legal and rare. Hillary Clinton said the same thing when she was running for President. Barack Obama—I'm not sure what his words were, but those were the words of the people running for President. Dawn Johnson is refuting that. She doesn't want abortion to be rare. She wants to see abortions occur. That is in the realm of the macabre. I am amazed at that statement.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady.

I have one more shocking statement made by Dawn Johnson. Now, remember, this is the person who would be doing the constitutional analysis, making that decision and making the same thing as a legal opinion, a binding legal opinion to the entire executive branch to one degree or another. She would have the ear of the President. I think Dawn Johnson has a major flaw in her jurisprudence even though she is probably very well trained. This is what she says about the difference between the Bush administration and the Clinton administration on balance.

She calls the Bush administration's claims to executive power "extreme, extraordinary, implausible, illegitimate, appalling, and abusive." By comparison, as to the Clinton administration, "I do not have any specific criticisms of the Clinton administration in these regards." Well, I think that tells us about the lack of partisanship that is there.

Let's see. I was looking for a quote. I have it in front of me. I will take it back to the slavery issue where Dawn Johnson said, "Statutes that can curtail a woman's abortion choice are disturbingly suggestive of involuntary servitude, prohibited by the 13th amendment, in that forced pregnancy requires a woman to provide continuous physical service to the fetus in order to further the State's asserted interest."

Slavery? I could read through that Constitution dozens of times over. I could pour through this case law over and over again. I invite the law school creative people. I don't know who would come up with the idea that the opportunity to be a mother was equivalent to slavery.

For a couple of minutes, I will yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. BACHMANN. You know, I would say that this heavy tax burden that the Obama administration is laying upon the American people has more to do with involuntary servitude than the fact of a woman who has the opportunity to carry an unborn child to term and to give life to that baby. Most women consider that a privilege and a blessing, and they pray for that opportunity so that they can have the chance to share in the joy of motherhood together with their husband, to be able to bring life and to cooperate with God and bring life into the world.

Life is a beautiful thing. It is precious. It is something not to be wasted. It certainly cannot be equated with involuntary servitude, which is slavery. Slavery is what we are looking at right now with the debt burden that we are seeing from the Obama administration, where we are looking at having more debt under President Obama than under all previous 43 Presidents combined. That is involuntary servitude when a person has to work three-quarters of the year just to pay their tax bill, and that is what we are looking at

down the road for our kids and grandkids, because this Obama administration is clearly spending too much, taxing too much and borrowing too much.

□ 2215

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady.

And I would just remind the gentlelady, the Speaker, that we have, by letter, called upon the President to withdraw the name of Don Johnson to head up his Office of Legal Council for these reasons that we have argued here tonight, for a multitude of reasons that we didn't get to in the time that we had, for moral reasons, constitutional reasons, statutory reasons, reasons of logic, common sense, and understanding the nature of humanity; for reasons that we want to see this Nation continue to ascend in all of the levels of morality, and economics, and national defense, and culture, and vision so that this country can be moved to the next level of its destiny that's positive, one that we can be proud of, one that will carry us forward and make our children proud, one day that our children can come to the floor of the House of Representatives, somebody's children, the next generation, and say, We stand on the shoulders of our forefathers, our predecessors, the people who stood up for life, the people who stood up for what is right, the people who stood up for the Constitution and the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that are embodied in the Declaration of Independence; and the argument that these rights come from God, and they are not to be torn asunder by someone who is a liberal activist who would lay out this list of offenses against life and family itself, the very core and foundation of American life.

That is what we have going on here. No good can come of it. This is the reminder that we have. This is the letter with 62 signatures that we sent to the President to withdraw the name of Don Johnson, appoint someone with a Constitutional understanding and a commitment to those principles and not an activist. We don't need an activist to head up this Office of Legal Council. We need someone who will understand the Constitution and the law and respect life.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I would thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. on account of official business.

Mr. WESTMORELAND (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABLAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 31.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 31.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today and March 25.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KRATOVIL, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 25, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1025. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2008 Packers and Stockyards Program Annual Report," pursuant to the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1026. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, monoester with 1,2-propanediol, polymer with a-[4-(ethenoxy) butyl]-w-hydroxypoly (oxy-1,2-ethanediyl) and 2,5-furandione; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0620; FRL-8396-9] received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1027. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with a-[4-(ethenoxy) butyl]-w-hydroxypoly (oxy-1,2-ethanediyl) and 1,2-propanediol mono-2-propenoate, potassium sodium salt; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0617 FRL-8397-2] received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1028. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with a-[4-(ethenoxy) butyl]-w-hydroxypoly (oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), sodium salt; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0621; FRL-8397-1] received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1029. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, 2-hydroxyethyl ester, polymer with a-[4-(ethenoxy)butyl]-w-hydroxypoly (oxy-1,2-ethanediyl); Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0618; FRL-8396-7] received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1030. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with a-[4-(ethenoxy) butyl]-w-hydroxypoly (oxy-1,2-ethanediyl) and 2,5-furandione, sodium salt; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0619; FRL-8396-8] received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1031. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus Mycoides Isolate J; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0303; FRL-8400-2] received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1032. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Benfluralin, Carbaryl, Diazinon, Dicrotophos, Fluometruon, Formetanate Hydrochloride, Glyphosate, Metolachlor, Napropamide, Norflurazon, Pyrazon, and Tau-Fluvalinate; Technical Amendment [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-1170; FRL-8402-1] received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1033. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorimuron-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0301; FRL-8402-6] received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1034. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements for the Import of Halon-1301 Aircraft Fire Extinguishing Vessels [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0131; FRL-8779-6] (RIN: 2060-AM46) received March 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1035. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Implementation of a Dose Standard After 10,000 Years [NRC-2005-0011] (RIN: 3150-AH68) received March 19, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1036. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Investment Surveys: BE-11, Annual Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad [Docket No.: 080731960-81629-02] (RIN: 0691-AA66) received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1037. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of