

have a plan that, number one, gives the individual control over their health insurance so that you can pick a health insurance policy that you like even if the employee next to you chooses a different policy. Why should it have to be the same? Why should you have to carry insurance for acupuncture if you never use acupuncture? Some States actually mandate the coverage of acupuncture. This is why insurance costs so much.

Your car insurance does not pay for an oil change. It does not pay for new tires. It does not pay for routine, small expenses that you can expect because that's not what insurance is for. Insurance is for a catastrophic event. If you want your car insurance to pay for oil changes and new tires, it's going to cost a lot of money because that's not the purpose of insurance. The purpose of insurance is to protect you from a catastrophic event.

That's why the Health Savings Account is an important component of free market health care reform because then you have—for example, say you're working for somebody; instead of paying your health insurance, your employer pays into a Health Savings Account, which is then your money to use for health care. And it comes to you tax free, so you're not paying any taxes on it. It would be the same as if your employer was paying for a health insurance policy for you.

So with that money, then, you could be paying for your routine health care out of that. Now, this is money in your account now, so you may want to choose how you spend that a little carefully because that money is in your Health Savings Account, that's money that belongs to you now, and you can use that any way you want for your health care. Or maybe if you don't even use it all, that would be there for you in your estate once you die for your children. So you want to be careful with that.

So when you're going to go get an MRI for your shoulder, you may not just go to the place that your doctor may recommend, you may shop around for an MRI. Because I know, for example, that at some places you can get an MRI for \$2,500, at another place you can get an MRI for \$600, the same MRI. Unless you actually kind of look around for it, you're not going to be able to find that deal. You're not going to even know about it because right now you don't even care about it perhaps because your insurance pays it and you have a copay that doesn't affect you. But if you're taking this money out of a Health Savings Account, you're going to be shopping more. That's the power of transparency in cost.

So, looking around to see where you can save money to keep money in your Health Savings Account, and then shopping for insurance that suits your needs, not the needs of the person next to you, but suits your needs so that you may choose an insurance company,

like for your car insurance, that differs from our neighbor's but suits you just fine. You may have Chevrolet insurance or you may have Cadillac insurance, but it's your choice. Those are just two things that I think would really diminish the cost of medicine and not involve taking over everything by the government and actually decrease costs.

The other thing that nobody really talks about much in the cost of medicine is the cost of malpractice. Malpractice is something that doctors can be very uncomfortable with, but sometimes injuries do occur. Is it a good result for a patient who's been injured to have to go to court for 5 or 6 years and then have to pay fees for attorneys of 50 to 60 percent of the judgment after 5 or 6 years in court? Is that justice for an injured patient? Frankly, it's not something that doctors want to see.

Doctors want to see, if there is actually an injury, let's have it dealt with in a reasonable fashion. Let's have it adjudicated in an administrative law situation when there has been an injury. A panel of people can decide, yes, there has been actual injury, let's make a judgment, and let's give that patient a judgment, and let's get it done with within several months. That would be better. It would eliminate the entire cost of a trial, the attorney fees and all that, and physicians would like it. Patients would like it, I think, because it would give them speedier access to justice. I think that by doing that we would eliminate a lot of the extra costs that come into medicine.

Right now, if you come into the emergency room for something, a pain in your belly, you're going to get a CAT scan pretty much automatically because the doctor is afraid of being sued. And it doesn't cost him anything, it doesn't cost the patient anything, he's going to order a CAT scan, he's going to order the x-ray, he's going to order a lot of tests just to protect himself. These are some of the hidden costs of malpractice that people don't really think about. They just think about the cost of malpractice as simply the cost of the doctor's insurance, which can be expensive.

Right now, different States will have different abilities to attract physicians because they have different means of dealing with malpractice. But I think that for the patient, really, we need to have a better system where they get compensated faster and with less aggravation than the system we have now.

So, I think the main thing that we're talking about on this side, we talk about health care reform, is to talk about having a conversation with the American people. Maybe you don't agree with some of these ideas on how to make our health care system better and more efficient. Well, I can understand that. Let's have a conversation. Let's decide how we can do it better.

Let's try a pilot program in one State. Let's allow States to experiment

in how to do things. Let's not write a bill of 2,700 pages in the middle of the night that nobody read and then put it on the American people and say it's going to be great, but we don't know what's in it because we haven't read it, and then go through the next 2½ years realizing that it's a mistake. I mean, there definitely needs to be room for improvement in our system, but can't we have this conversation in an open fashion? I think a lot of people even on the other side would realize that, hey, we made a mistake, but isn't it more important to admit that we made a mistake and try to move forward in a fashion that actually cuts cost? We see it's not cutting costs. It's been devastating to the American economy.

I've talked to small business owners across my district over the past 2 years and they say the same things again and again: There's regulations cost us money and our health care cost us money; it's going to make us not be able to hire more people.

So I think we've made some real mistakes here in the past, but now is the time to address them and move forward and try to make some commonsense decisions. Frankly, I'm happy to hear from people with ideas. I hear ideas from people all the time in the district that really make some sense and are certainly worth trying out.

So with that, I want to thank the members of the Physicians Caucus that were here this evening for our evening hour, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PROTECT AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to yield to my doctor friend from Texas, a former student of Texas A&M University, as myself, a guy who, as a junior in college when I was a senior in college, helped tutor me to make a 98 on the final exam of our accounting course. I yield such time as he may consume to my friend from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN HERO BRIAN BACHMANN AND ALL FIRST RESPONDERS ACROSS AMERICA

Mr. FLORES. I would like to thank my friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for allowing me a few minutes of his time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an American hero, Brian Bachmann, who served as Precinct 1 Constable of Brazos County, Texas, who was killed in the line of duty on August 13, 2012. Also, with yesterday being the 11th anniversary of 9/11, I also want to recognize first responders all across our country.

As I began to write my reflections for this conversation, which I originally delivered on August 18, the words that kept coming to mind to talk about were the words "home" and "celebration."

Before proceeding, I want to remind us of the heroes of Texas District 17. Since I was sworn into office on January 5, 2011, the 17th Congressional District of Texas has lost seven military personnel: Sergeant Scott Burgess; Staff Sergeant Bryan Burgess; Sergeant Edward F. Dixon, III; PFC Jesse Dietrich; Lieutenant Colonel David Cabrera; Captain Nathan Anderson; and Lieutenant Colonel Roy Tisdale.

□ 1900

In addition, we have lost two law enforcement personnel during that time, Deputy Sheriff Taylor from Johnson County; and on August 13, we lost Constable Brian Bachmann. In each case, God called home one of his children and heaven has been celebrating since each of those arrivals.

Brian and I met in early 2010 when we were both running for our respective offices. Neither of us had ever run for public office before; and even though we came from different backgrounds, we formed a great friendship that endured the rigors of tough political campaigns.

Following our victories, we remained great friends. Each time we were together at various events, we always picked up our conversations where we had left off at the prior events. Most of the time we teased each other in these conversations.

The last time I talked to Brian was the Thursday before he was called home by God. We were both volunteers at the Brazos Valley Food Bank's Feast of Caring. We started out by teasing each other again. He began saying that I must not be a very good politician because I was already having to run again for office, to which I replied, Oh really, Bachmann? From what I've seen, you're the reason we need term limits.

Following that conversation and fellowship, we went back to cleaning tables and serving food. I never appreciated the fact that I wouldn't see him on this Earth again.

This is the Brian Bachmann that I knew, the friendly and always smiling guy who could care less about anyone's title. He was the person that loved our community and would do anything for it. He was the model public servant. However, and more importantly, he was a servant leader who ultimately modeled the words of Jesus in John 15:13 which state: "Greater love hath no man than this that he lay down his life for his friends."

I started this conversation by talking about home and celebration. At the end of each week, I jump on a plane and head home from Washington to Texas. That is where I'm happiest. That's where my wife, Gina is. It is close to our sons, our daughter-in-law and our granddaughter. In short, it is the community that I love. I always celebrate those homecomings, and my sense of excitement always builds as the airliner approaches Bryan/College Station.

The same thing happened on the afternoon of August 13. As Brian's situation changed here on Earth, others were preparing his new home. Brian knew this day would come. However, like the rest of us, he didn't know when, where, or how. But because of his relationship with Christ, he knew that he would someday be able to look forward to going to his next home for eternity. God knew all the details about Brian's homecoming, and the celebration started immediately on the afternoon when he left us.

The Apostle Paul reinforces this in 2 Corinthians 5:8, where he says: "We are confident, I say, and would prefer to be away from the body and at home with the Lord." This is the same knowledge that all Christians have. We know that when our human life ends, we will move to our eternal home with God.

At that moment, on August 13, Brian instantly heard the voices of those who had gone before him welcoming him home but, more importantly, the One who loved Brian enough to die for him held out his nail-pierced hands, embraced him and said, "Howdy, Brian. Welcome to your new home." Those same hands and arms embrace and comfort Brian's family and all of us here now.

About 20 years ago, Max Lucado wrote a book titled "The Applause of Heaven." I'm going to paraphrase the last few paragraphs of that book, as follows:

You'll be home soon. You may not have noticed it, but you're closer to home than ever before. Each moment is a step taken. Each breath is a page turned. Each day is a mile marker passed, a mountain climbed. You're closer to home than you've ever been.

Just as when my airline flight approaches Bryan/College Station each week, before you know it, your appointed arrival time will come. You'll descend the ramp and enter the city. You'll see the faces that are waiting for you. You'll hear your name spoken by those who love you. And in the back, behind the anxious crowd, the One who would rather die than live without you will remove His pierced hands from His heavenly robe and applaud your arrival.

We should be celebrating Brian's heavenly homecoming here on Earth as well. He is another soldier that fought the good fight and gone home where God has told him, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Brian's parents, Brad and Carmen, his wife, Donna, and his children, Sam, Amanda, Colby and Caitlyn, can all take comfort in Brian's homecoming because we know that the cross of Jesus has won again.

Brian's sacrifice should remind us that we're all here to serve. It is my prayer that Brian's homecoming reminds us of all our human frailties and the shortness of our time here on this Earth. I'm hopeful that all of us will have the type of relationship with Christ that Brian did, so we will have

similar homecomings with Him in heaven.

Let me close by asking everyone here to pray for and support the Bachmann family. Please pray for our country during these troubled times. Please pray for our military men and women who sacrifice to protect us abroad, and please pray for our first responders like Brian Bachmann who protect us here at home.

Brian, we celebrate your homecoming.

I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan). The gentleman from Texas will be recognized.

Mr. GOHMERT. How much time is remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's a difficult day, difficult week in the world. And I appreciate the tribute of my friend, BILL FLORES, for a great American hero.

I also want to pay tribute today to our U.S. Ambassador, Chris Stevens, and the three others who were killed in Libya in the service of their country. We grieve for their families. We grieve for their friends and all who may have come to harm and will come to harm; hopefully, no more, but our thoughts and prayers are with them.

It is important, during times when Americans are attacked on American soil, American buildings are attacked, which is what an American Embassy is, that the world understand that there will be consequences.

For those who sometimes want to ask, well, aren't you a Christian, don't you believe in turning the other cheek? The answer is, yes, individually. But there is a different charge for the government. There is a different charge for the people who have the responsibility of government and protecting the people and their rights.

The United States Government has the obligation to protect our citizens, to protect those who are serving this country, and as far as our military, to give them everything they need to win, whatever it takes, give them rules of engagement to allow them to win, whatever it takes, and then come home.

So it grieves me much, also, to see a time when people are dying, not for a wishy-washy government in Washington, D.C. that can't decide what its priorities are, but for the ideal for which America stands and for what it represents, for what it represents to people who yearn for freedom around the world.

And it does not help when an administration, in response to American attacks on American soil and American individuals, the administration ends up asking Americans to give up their First Amendment rights for which our servicemembers are fighting.

□ 1910

It doesn't help when a general calls an American and asks an American to

give up your First Amendment rights rather than proclaiming to the world, We're the United States military. You've attacked our country. You've attacked our brothers and sisters, and you will pay for that.

When we took an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, it means that when enemies who are foreign enemies attack on American soil—attack Americans because they're Americans—we have an obligation if they were not protected and they got hurt or killed. We have an obligation to those who would serve behind them—to those who are in this country—to protect them for the future.

That doesn't come when an administration or even a general turns around and says, Hey, I know I took an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, but we think, by your utilizing your First Amendment rights, it may be offending people around the world, so why don't you just subject your First Amendment rights to shari'a law. So it's okay to burn a Bible. That's okay. It's okay to burn a flag. Okay. That's all right. But just, for heaven's sake, don't say anything that might offend someone of the Islamic religion.

I, personally, don't think anybody should do that, but I certainly do think we should defend ourselves against radical Islamists who want to annihilate this country and destroy our way of life. We have an obligation. We took an oath to do that, not an oath to say: Let's give up the Constitution. I took an oath to defend and subject it to shari'a. No, no, no. Let's give that up so that maybe the people who are killing Americans and the people who are attacking our Embassies won't feel so offended, and maybe they won't kill people.

That is not the role of a general. It's not the role of a general to tell former military members that they should never speak out against a Commander in Chief when, as former members of the military, they're in a good place to be able to judge what's going on. It is and it should be a crime within the military to create problems for good order and discipline by publicly demeaning or condemning anyone in your chain of command. In my 4 years at Fort Benning, we knew that. President Carter drove me crazy with his ineptitude, with his inability to make decisions, to make the tough calls, and in his pathetic handling of the attack on our American Embassy in Tehran for which America still pays in the pathetic way it was handled.

For those of us who have been in the military, there is an obligation when you see the same mistakes being repeated. Since you know that those in uniform cannot step up and criticize the chain of command, we have an obligation to do that, and it is not helpful for anyone with stars on his shoulders to tell former military members, Oh, this is not appropriate for you to criti-

cize my boss. How about the person with stars on his shoulders stepping up and doing the criticizing privately on behalf of the soldiers he is supposed to be commanding and protecting?

There are stories that are coming out. Time will tell. This one is from Fox News today. It's entitled "U.S. Officials Suspect Strike on Benghazi Post 'Coordinated,' Timed for 9/11 Anniversary."

U.S. officials are increasingly suspicious that the murder Tuesday of the U.S. Ambassador to Libya, Christopher Stevens, and three other American officials was not the result of a protest against an anti-Islam film, but instead was a coordinated terror strike timed for the 11th anniversary of the September 11 attacks.

A senior administration official told Fox News they are exhaustively investigating every angle of the attack in Benghazi, and an earlier assault on the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt, and there are early signs the Benghazi assault may have been planned. The official cautioned, though, that the administration has not jumped to any conclusions about what happened, saying it would be "premature" to do so.

The article goes on down, and it quotes different people. One is Pete Hoekstra, the former chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, who told Fox News that the attack appeared to have the markings of an al Qaeda or an al Qaeda-affiliated strike.

It quotes him as saying:

"We've been talking for years about the desire of Al Qaeda, radical jihadists to celebrate the anniversary of 9/11. All my background, all of the conversations that I've had over the last 18 hours lead many people to believe that this was just more than a mere coincidence."

Hoekstra noted that the supposed protesters—purportedly angry over a film that ridiculed Islam's Prophet Muhammad—didn't attack in Tripoli. They attacked in Benghazi, "where it so happens our Ambassador is." And they happened to be "fully armed and fully equipped," he said.

Hoekstra noted that al Qaeda chief Ayman al-Zawahiri had recently released a video calling on militants to attack Americans in revenge for the killing of an operative in Pakistan. The message said his "blood is calling on you, inciting you to fight and kill the crusaders."

Hoekstra said the film may have been just a cover to carry out such an attack.

Two intelligence officials also said the attack looked "coordinated."

London-based think tank Quilliam reached the same conclusion, saying the Benghazi strike appeared to be a "well-planned terrorist attack that would have occurred regardless of the demonstration (over the film)."

Also, the brother of Zawahiri was nearby during the separate protest at the American Embassy in Cairo on Tuesday.

There is so much going on, but one of the last things that people ought to do is say it's time to give up First Amendment rights. One of the goals that we know of for the Muslim Brotherhood in the United States within 10 years—it was one of their 10-year goals—is to subjugate the U.S. Constitution to shari'a law. There are great patriots who have called upon Americans to, perhaps, make it illegal to speak out and offend or to do anything that

might offend worshipers of Islam without saying the same thing about any other religion whether it's Buddhist, Christian, whatever.

If they have their way and if we make the mistake of curtailing our constitutional rights to avoid offending people who want to annihilate us anyway and who want to have an international caliphate where they rule over us anyway—those they don't destroy—we make a major error. There are those who say there should be no criticism among Members of Congress and people in the government as to the handling by the Commander in Chief, but since we know people in uniform cannot speak out when they see mistakes by their commanders, we have an obligation to them to speak out.

But I do make this pledge to my friends across the aisle that, in any criticism, I will endeavor to ensure that I, personally, do not ever make the kind of wild-eyed allegations against this President that were leveled at President Bush by them.

□ 1920

How quickly some people forget.

Also, I understand this is a political season, it is a time when people are running for election and reelection. We all know that. But we have a friend. We have a prime minister of a friendly nation who has been mistreated by this administration, who deserves better treatment by this administration, who deserves to have this administration and this President keep their words that have been given to our friends in Israel, and it wouldn't hurt to meet with such a leader.

We know that in July that there were people who came to the White House for meetings in the White House, one of whom was a member of a known terrorist organization. That terrorist was allowed into the White House. Obviously, from the hearing we had with the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, from a response she gave to me, she was ignorant of fact that we had a terrorist going into the White House for meetings. But by the next day when she testified, I believe, across in the Senate, she had become aware that we had a member of a terrorist organization meeting in the White House, and apparently this administration intends to continue meeting with members of known terrorist organizations, from what was said back in July.

And yet, the President—though he had time for meetings with known terrorists—will not carve out a little time to meet with the prime minister of our dear friend Israel at a time when Israel and many in the United States suspect that Iran may be 2 months away from having the nukes to carry out another Holocaust. We don't know the specific days there may be, but it would seem that you wouldn't necessarily need a rocket to have pinpoint accuracy if it's carrying a nuclear weapon. And now that we've seen trouble on the borders

of Israel, all around Israel almost, it doesn't seem it would be impossible to get one smuggled in. Rockets have been smuggled in by the hundreds that are routinely fired into Israel from the Gaza Strip. That's why there was a legitimate legal blockade to try to prevent those types of things from coming into the Gaza Strip, but they came in anyway, and they continue to come in.

We owe our friend, our ally, who this President has pressured, has cajoled, has ridiculed, has snubbed, and taunted by just saying, Trust us, we'll take care of Iran, don't worry about your national security, trust us. No nation should be told that they cannot invoke self-defense when their nation is at risk of being annihilated.

I remember learning in college that President Eisenhower had ordered that people from towns surrounding areas of these concentration camps where, when totaled together, was 6 million Jews that were killed, murdered, tortured, maimed, and he ordered that the people from the towns be required to come help clean up. The reasoning was so that no one could ever say the Holocaust never happened, because they cleaned up the atrocity. I remember thinking that was a little overboard for General Eisenhower. Really, you had to rub those peoples' noses in such horrible affliction? It hasn't been that long ago that I had these thoughts, and now we have people, like leaders of countries like Iran, that is about to have nuclear weapons if we don't intercede, who have said just that the Holocaust never happened, it was a hoax. Unbelievable.

It is unbelievable to me that in a matter of decades since World War II, since that horrible Holocaust, such an indictment against the human race, that people could do that to one race. It's just almost unfathomable that even in Europe, where those atrocities were committed and genocide was attempted, that we would see this growing anti-Semitism raising its ugly head again. And at the same time anti-Semitism is growing even in Europe, a civilized area, an educated area, it grows around the world, as we see people in the Middle East begin to have dreams of a new Ottoman Empire where every religion will be subjected to some of what we've seen happen in those countries where we helped bring about an Arab spring that's turned into a winter nightmare.

This is not a time to play petty personal games, to snub leaders of friends, of allies, even when you disagree with them, for heaven's sake. Take a little time from a fundraiser, take a little time that you don't go to the golf course, and meet with the leader of a country that sees hatred for its people, anti-Semitism, the racism, the bigotry growing around the world, that is scared for its own existence, that can't be sure we're going to be there with them because of the actions of this administration. Take a little time to meet with them. It is an inconvenient

thing to have to be President when you are really best at running for office, but take some time and be President and meet with our friends.

The messages that are going out to those whom we seek to make allies for the future is not a good message. The people that have laid down their lives for the American ideal deserve the best we can give them. So on this day when we grieve and our flags are at half mast for the atrocity committed against our ambassador and others, our thoughts and prayers are with the families, and our thoughts and prayers are that our leadership will become what it should be to protect America.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today until 3:30 p.m. on account of a family obligation.

Mr. CICILLINE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for September 10 and 11 on account of district work.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 13, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7583. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Reporting of Government — Furnished Property (DFARS Case 2012-D001) (RIN: 0750-AG83) received August 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7584. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Wireless Communications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter: Amendment of Part 101 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate the Use of Microwave for Wireless Backhaul and Other Uses and to Provide Additional Flexibility to Broadcast Auxiliary Service and Operational Fixed Microwave Licensees; Petition for Rulemaking filed by Fixed Wireless Communications Coalition to Amend Part 101 of the Commission's Rules to Authorize 60 and 80 MHz Channels in Certain Bands for Broadband Communications [WT Docket No.: 10-153] [RM-11602] received August 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7585. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Endorsement of Nuclear Energy Institute Guidance for Developing Seismic

Hazard Information Requested in the 50.54(F) Letter Dated March 12, 2012 received August 20, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7586. A letter from the Acting Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 3-12 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7587. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-068, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7588. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-081, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7589. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-085, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7590. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-073, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7591. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-099, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7592. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-084, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7593. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-038, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7594. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-049, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7595. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-088, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7596. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-065, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7597. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-074, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7598. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12-097, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.