at the end of the generation to take the earnings of that generation and spread it out amongst the other people instead of allowing it to go to the next generation.

And I think about my ancestors that came across the prairie in a covered wagon. I think about my great-grandfather who arrived here from Germany on March 26, 1894, and he had four or five of his children with him, and the balance of his nine children were born here in the United States, the ones that survived. And his dream was to be able to homestead, buy and build a farm for each of those children, nine children that reached maturity. And he bought nine quarter sections of land, 160 acres each, and that's what it took to support a family. You need to raise, oh, six, seven, eight, nine or ten kids on 160 acres.

And he had a diversified farming operation that had a few milk cows, some sows. He raised some corn and later on some soybeans and some oats and some hay ground, and everybody went to work and they built their future and their destiny on that land. And the dream was: Can we hand that land over to the next generation? Can we take this unit and deliver it to the next generation? And his dream, with nine children, buying those nine quarter sections of land was, if he could set each of them up on 160 acres of land that they would inherit from him, that if they took care of the land, they took care of the livestock, it would all take care of them, and they could raise their children, and the next generation could go build upon the equity that was earned in his generation.

Mr. AKIN. You know, I can't help but get excited about what you're saying. You're talking about the American Dream before there was all this tampering government. And the thing that I find just absolutely amazing—let's compare your grandfather to somebody else. And I don't know who it was, but somebody else who, instead of making those sacrifices and doing the hard work, went out and drank and gambled everything away so he died penniless. Now, the system of tax that is being proposed by the Democrats is going to reward that guy because he won't pay any death taxes at all. And yet your granddad, who made all kinds of personal sacrifices and hard work to set up his children and grandchildren, he's going to get his hide taxed off of him. What kind of tax policy is that? A tax policy should encourage the American Dream, not destroy it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And if I would say that if he was sitting in Germany in 1893 planning his trip here in 1894, thinking he was faced with tax policy that would confiscate his life's earnings and pass it back to the government and distribute it to the people that were not engaged in the free enterprise—

Mr. AKIN. Fifty percent of his earnings

Mr. KING of Iowa. Or 55 percent. Even if the ball drops at Times Square and we don't get this thing resolved, taking away half of what he'd earned in his lifetime, he would have not had that dream. He's unlikely to have even come to the United States. But he's really unlikely to have bought those nine quarter sections of land, because he would know that before he could hand it off to the next generation, the tax man would come in and swallow up half of it.

And so here's the scenario. I mean, unfortunately for my great-grandfather, he lost all of that land when the stock market crashed in 1929. He didn't lament that. He'd engaged in free enterprise, capitalism, and commerce, and it didn't work out for him. The timing was wrong, and he lived the rest of his life in Pierson, Iowa, a lonely man in a tiny little house. But he had the dream. He had the chance to access the dream. And it didn't work out for him, but his children received the vision of his dream and they went to work and they built, and they raised their children with the same dream that brought him here to the United States.

And so I think today, even though it hasn't worked out for my family in the way that it was envisioned, and there isn't wealth on either side of my family that counts as taxable in the estate tax configuration, no matter what it is, it inspired them nonetheless. They worked nonetheless. They invested capital anyway, and they went to work. And so—

Mr. AKIN. You know, just stopping your story for a minute there, it strikes me that the policies that killed your grandfather's dream in the Great Depression were the same policies that we've been following for the last 2 or 3 years. There's nothing new about it. It was excessive Federal spending, excessive Federal taxation all packaged up as Keynesian economics. And Henry Morgenthau, after he killed that dream, came to this Congress and said, Guys, it didn't work.

And we're not listening to it, and here we go again doing the same thing. I just feel like we have got to learn something from history. And your grandfather is such an inspiration. And certainly what he passed on was the vision of the fact you can make it in this country. You can go from being poor to being well-to-do if you work hard and you try hard and you live that dream that's in your heart. That's what America's supposed to be about.

I yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, in the succeeding generations, the dream was passed on even though the equity was not, because they didn't build the equity but the dream was there. The obligation and the duty and the appreciation for America embracing my ancestors coming here was passed on to me, and it said stand up for this United States of America, this free enterprise dream. And today, the families that it's worked out for, those who have made that investment, that hung on to that land, that spent two or three generations or more building a family farm—and let's say now, today, it's not 160 acres that it takes to sustain a family but 1,000 or 1,500 acres that it takes to sustain a family. And that's more accurate.

□ 2340

Let's just say that that unit that was put together, two sections of land now, 640 acres a section, 1,280 acres altogether.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for joining us in the discussion here about really the future of America.

KILLING THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the gentleman from Missouri if he would mind sticking around here for a seamless transition into this dialogue. And I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. It is always my privilege.

And I would pick this narrative up where it was left off in the transition component of it, and where I was, with 1,288 acres now required to sustain a unit of operation, that would be these acres, and a home place that was built with grain storage and transfer equipment and livestock facilities and those things that make it a system and a unit. Maybe some rented land out there, some rented pasture, some hay ground, some rented crop ground that keeps this system that is a viable and effective unit. And now, let's imagine that.

Mr. AKIN. A couple tractors, combine, some equipment worth a lot of money.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And let's say five kids. That is a good number. Five kids, and they are raised on this farm.

Now, two sections of land, paid for, and the 90-year-old patriarch of this family has reached the end of his life and he is watching how his life's work that is the legacy of his predecessors, the life's work of almost a century of his memory adding all up to this point where, if he passes away in the first minute of next year, the taxman hovers over the death bed and reaches in and pulls out, aside from the $1 million exemption, 55 percent of the asset value.

That means that half of the land that has been accumulated goes to pay the taxman. The other half of that land, the five children that would inherit the balance of what is left, would have a 20 percent equity share in the land that is left, 20 percent equity share in 45 percent, roughly, of what was left. None of those children then, on that basis, have enough equity to hold that system, that unit, in place.

And so they look at this and they would think, do I want to be in debt the rest of my life trying to retire this debt, trying to borrow the money to buy the section of land that it takes to pay the taxman and buy the 80 percent that is left that they don't have equity in, that goes to their siblings, and to be able to turn the cash flow to retire it to serve the interest and principal on those two sections of land? And the answer that they will come away with, and a rational banker will tell them: You can't hold this land. I am sorry, but you have got to put it before the auction, sell this land off, pay the taxman, and then distribute the rest of the proceeds amongst your siblings and you get your 20 percent that is left over after taxes.

That means that a century of work, three generations or more that have compiled these assets, is gone, taken away, because of the class envy that comes from the leftists in this Congress and the people that think that the American dream isn't about building equity, and that you shouldn't be able to transfer wealth from generation to generation, and that somehow, because someone else worked and created the capital that this Nation thrives on, you should be punished in the transfer of that wealth into the next generation. The gentleman from Missouri knows this. I know this in the Midwest. They should know this all across America.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate your yielding for a moment, because what you are talking about, I guess economists would say, there is sort of an economic lot size. If you have a farm worth 2,000 acres, that may be viable; but if you have to sell off 55 percent of your land, 55 percent of your tractors or your combines or your equipment, and then you divide it across several siblings, it won't work anymore.

So what you have done is not only have you taken away something that was part of the dream that somebody saved all their life to pass on to their kids; we are saying we are going to punish people who want to pass things on to their kids. That is not the American dream. That is killing the American dream.

Now, you raised another thing, and I would like to talk about this. I have heard people, talk show hosts and others, talking about this, and I feel like they are not approaching it from the right way. You are talking about class envy, and it is always the upper class and the middle class and the lower class, and, ''I am for the middle class.'' And it is all this class, class, class stuff. And I feel like saying: Stop. Wait just a minute. I thought America was a classless society. I thought America was a place where you could come here dirt poor, end up as a millionaire, and nobody really made a whole bunch of stuff about that. They didn't tag you with, you can't go to dinner at somebody's house because you are not the right class. That is the way it is in Europe, but that is not the way it is in America. The America I know is classless. And I don't look down my nose at somebody doing a hard job, because the guy working hard is probably going to be the guy who is going to be the millionaire, he is probably going to be hiring my kid to mow his yard for him.

So why do we talk about classes? Why don't we talk about jobs and the American dream? That is what I don't understand.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentleman is completely correct on this. I would add to this point. Let's just say that a entrepreneur has a bright idea, and let's say 10 kids. That is a good start on a family, I tell them. And this bright idea from the entrepreneur starts a business, and they build their equity base because of the creativity and the energy and the conviction and the productivity and the competition that they put into the marketplace. This individual reaches that age of 45 or 50, and they can look ahead and say: I can check out of this. I can sell out my business and I can make the rest of this on really solid, stable investments, and I don't have to worry about the rest of my life. And, furthermore, if I continue to work, continue to take risk, continue to produce and expand the capital base of America, everything that I work for, for the rest of my life, is going to go off to the taxman to be redistributed among people across America, and I can't even give it to my children.

What does a rational person do in a case like that? And I will submit to the gentleman from Missouri and the Speaker that a rational person would come to the conclusion that it didn't pay to continue to produce once you reach the level that you could take care of yourself for the rest of your life, because you couldn't pass it along to the next generation. That destroys the American dream, and it blows the entire thing up.

I see my friend, the Judge and the gentleman from Texas, who concluded that legislating from the bench was the wrong thing, and coming to Congress to legislate from here is the right thing. And I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Iowa yielding. In fact, exactly what you are talking about was a real-life case in my extended family. There was a great aunt, predeceased by her husband. They had 2,500 acres in south Texas. It had been built up over a number of generations, over 100 years. They have done exactly what you are talking about. They worked. And, by the sweat of their brow and all the sweat equity, scraping together money, they kept accumulating land and would pass that on.

Well, along comes a greedy Congress that decides: When you are dead, we are going to do as our friend TED POE has talked about happened in a case tried in his court where a guy died in an accident, and a thief came in and stole his wallet out of his pocket while he was dead. Well, that guy went to prison for a long time because he was caught. Well, the government is doing that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And a place in eternity.

Mr. GOHMERT. Exactly. Anyway, my great aunt's husband predeceased her. When she died, she had left a will that set aside one section of land to be sold to pay off the estate tax. Unfortunately, this was 1986, and that also happened to be a time when FDIC and the SLIC, later the RTC, they started accumulating and they started dumping land around that area.

Land had been valued around $2,000 at the time of her death in 1986, but within a year or so when the estate was being settled, because of the land being dumped in the area, it fell to $600, $700 an acre. The IRS took every acre of the estate, because at the time the land fell to $600 or $700. The IRS did allow a year or two extension hoping the land value would come back so they would get to save an acre or two. But out of 2,500 acres, it was around a $5 million estate at 2,000 acres, and there were some comparables around that when she died to show it was that value. But when it fell to $600, $700, the IRS said, ''It is all ours, because it will take every acre of land to pay your 55 percent estate tax even after the exemption.''

They forced the sale of every acre of land, and her home, where she had designated specific bequests: I want you to have my china; I want you to have my crystal; I want you to have these beautiful pieces of furniture, you to have the table.

Well, we got a cry from her immediate family, ''Please come, because the public is coming to this auction. The IRS is auctioning every single item from her home.''

I was one of a number of family members, and we had an agreement between ourselves: If the individuals that she had specifically bequested things to were able to bid, we let them bid on those things and stayed back.

□ 2350

But it was heartbreaking to see item that Aunt Lilly loved after item she loved being bought by the general public who had come with lots of money to take aunt Lilly's things, all because a greedy Congress couldn't care less that they took every acre, they took her homeplace, and her heir that was willed the home had to buy her home. That is the IRS, and, of course, the IRS is nothing more than the designee of this Congress to go steal things from people, and we make it all legal by what we pass here.

Morally, it is not right what we do in taking people's property, in prying their wallet from the dead carcass of someone because we can, because we have that power. It is not right.

I can tell you, in my immediate family I will never be affected by the estate tax. Not in my immediate family

I won't be. But I know as a moral factor, it is wrong. It is just wrong. It is incentive killing.

And speaking of Congress and the things we do, you know, we may be voting as early as tomorrow on this so-called tax extender bill. Leave it to this Congress to figure out a way, when people across America have said, hey, people across America didn't get a pay raise. Social Security, they didn't get a pay raise. They got no COLA. You guys don't get any COLA, you don't get a pay raise. And this Congress, the Democratic majority said, you are right, we are not going to get a pay raise. We hear you. We are not going to get a pay raise.

But, you know what? In this tax extender bill we are going to cut 2 percent off the Social Security tax. In other words, we are going to give ourselves well over a $2,000 raise next year if this thing passes. I mean, how ingenious was it for this Congress to come up with a way to get a pay raise, when we promised people we weren't going to do that this year?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Reclaiming my time, I look at the configuration of this proposal that is coming to the floor tomorrow and I am troubled by it. There are some good things in it.

To ensure that the current tax brackets can run for 2 years, that is a good thing. It is not as good as it needs to be. It mitigates the damage of the increase that is impending in the death tax, but it doesn't address and fix the problem. It just makes it less egregious. So those are the good things about it.

I am one who supports the credits for ethanol and biodiesel. I could make that argument, and it is not a bumper sticker argument. But the Federal Government has said we want you to invest your private sector capital in producing renewable fuels, and if you will do that, we will make sure there is enough there to get you started.

Well, they invested, at least in my district, 3 years in a row over $1 billion in renewable energy, and now we are looking at that rug being jerked out from underneath the people that trusted the Federal Government. We may or may not agree on that policy here, but I think the government needs to be consistent.

But in any case, here is what we are really looking at: We need to make the current tax structures permanent. We need to eliminate and abolish the death tax, because it is an immoral tax.

And into this bargain, what do we get? We get an increase in the death tax that goes from zero on up to a $1 million exemption with a 35 percent tax, and that ax that is hanging over the head instead is a $1 million exemption and 55 percent.

The current tax is zero. George Steinbrenner's heirs paid zero in death tax, and those who pass away in this year pay zero, no matter what the amount of their equity. Actually, these are the goods things about this proposal.

But the bad things are this: That the unemployment extensions that are there take it out to 99 weeks. We have gotten along for about three generations with 26 weeks of unemployment. We know that that bridges people over a seasonal job, it gives them half a year to find a job. And when you look at the time that people that are on unemployment spend to search for a job, it is about 20 minutes a day in the first weeks of their unemployment, and as that unemployment winds down into the 26th week, it is about 70 minutes a day that they spend looking for a job. They are far more likely to find a job the first week after their unemployment runs out than they are to find a job in the first week that their unemployment starts.

So there is a huge transfer of wealth that takes place there, paid for out of borrowed money that comes from the Chinese, the interest and principal that is dumped on our children, and that is about $56.5 billion that accumulated there.

Then we have about $40 billion with the transfer payments. These transfer payments come in the form of refundable tax credits. Refundable tax credits is money that goes off budget, 100 percent of it is borrowed, and a lot of it from the Chinese, that pays people that are do not have a tax liability for the child care tax credit that is there and about two other credits that transfer wealth.

You add this up, that is about $40 billion in that category, and $56.5 billion in the other category. So we are in the area of $101 billion or $102 billion in transfer of wealth, before you get to the pay control component this, which troubles me.

They lower the payroll tax by 2 percent on the employee side, but not on the employer side, which distorts the equation of a dollar out of the employee, a dollar out of the employer. And most of us see this as that is all money that is earned by the employee. As an employer, I will make that case. But when you distort the equation, then you are presuming that the employer is making money and the employee is not, and the favor goes to the employee side of this. It will take awhile for economics to balance that one out.

But in the end, we have a 2-year extension of current tax structure for personal income tax, which if you think about it from a business perspective, if you have a business plan and a business model and you are going to invest capital in order to try to get a return on that capital, which means make some money, and in the process of doing that you create jobs, if you have a business model that has a 2-year ROI, return on investment, if you have got that kind of a business model, you have already invested that as fast as you could come up with the idea and come up with the capital to invest it. But most of this on the other side, most capital investments are 10 or 15-year returns on investment.

So if you have got a 2-year extension and a tax increase on the other side of that, it doesn't release the capital in such a way that it is going to create the jobs. So we don't get anywhere near the kick out of this for our economy that some of the economists say that we do. And the day will come at the end of these 2 years, we are in the middle then of a presidential race, congressional races, House and the Senate, and the debate then engages again, do we do President Obama's Keynesian economics on steroids, do we continue and add to the $3 trillion in wasteful spending that has come from that? And they are going to say, well, we gave you your tax model for 2 years and it didn't work. Therefore, we need to go back to spending money like Morgenthau admitted was wrong.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri. I see we have 3 minutes left.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate your yielding. Certainly I think the point that you have said eloquently I tried to make earlier tonight, and that is what you are looking at here is not the Republican solution. It is not a good economic solution. It is not a good moral solution. It is something that is a Christmas-New Year's solution on something that people have seen for 3 or 4 years coming along, plenty of time, if we really wanted to deal with it.

The other thing is that all of the discussion that I hear is so amazingly oblique to what we should be thinking. It is all about, well, does the middle-class guy get more? Does the rich guy get more? Does the poor guy get more? It is not about that. It is about America. It is about the fact that we have got an economic recession going. It is about the fact that we want the American dream to have some fresh life breathed into it and economic policies that don't rip people off. It is about the fact that socialism is theft. It is not a legitimate function under the Constitution or the government. It is about the fact that we want the government to be the servant and not the master.

It is the time now for us to blow the whistle and say, enough already. It is time to get back to the system that was designed by our forefathers, and not this endless class warfare gibberish which misses the fact that we are USA Americans.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, we have the 87 freshmen Republicans and however many Democrats are coming here who are the cavalry coming over the hill, and we ask them to bring the freshness of their convictions here and weigh in. I believe they need an opportunity to weigh in on this tax policy.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. One of the things about this 13 months of unemployment insurance is that if people haven't found a job already, rather than pay them not to work for over a year, train them to do a different job where there are jobs. That is the more caring thing to do.

And one more comment about the tax policy that took all of my great aunt's land. I bought at the auction her music box that was a church that played Amazing Grace. At the end of the auction, most everybody had left, and the observation I had is there was nothing amazing or graceful about that policy.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas and the Speaker for his indulgence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. WOOLSEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

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. FRANK of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YARMUTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4005. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent the proceeds or instrumentalities of foreign crime located in the United States from being shielded from foreign forfeiture proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1061. An act to transfer certain land to the United States to be held in trust for the Hoh Indian Tribe, to place land into trust for the Hoh Indian Tribe, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6278. An act to amend the National Children's Island Act of 1995 to expand allowable uses for Kingman and Heritage Islands by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1275. An act to establish a National Foundation on Physical Fitness and Sports to carry out activities to support and supplement the mission of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports.

S. 1448. An act to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, to authorize the Coquille Indian Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw, the Klamath Tribes, and the Burns Paiute Tribe to obtain 99-year lease authority for trust land.

S. 1609. An act to authorize a single fisheries cooperative for the Bering Sea Aleutian Islands longline catcher processor subsector, and for other purposes.

S. 2906. An act to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, to modify a provision relating to leases involving certain Indian tribes.

S. 3794. An act to amend chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, to include organizations whose membership comprises substantially veterans as recipient organizations for the donation of Federal surplus personal property through State Agencies.

S. 3984. An act to amend and extend the Museum and Library Services Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, December 16, 2010, at 10 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111–139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 6517, the Omnibus Trade Act of 2010, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 6517, THE OMNIBUS TRADE ACT OF 2010, AS TRANSMITTED TO CBO ON DECEMBER 15, 2010

	Millions of dollars, by fiscal year—											
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2011–2015	2011–2020
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (−) IN THE DEFICIT												
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	813	1,104	347	112	−2,449	2,482	0	0	0	−2,433	−73	−24

Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.
Source: Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

10896. A letter from the Director — National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Competitive and Noncompetitive Nonformula Federal Assistance Programs — Administrative Provisions for the Sun Grant Program (0524-AA64) received November 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10897. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spiroxamine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0136; FRL-8850-9] received November 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10898. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter of notification that the Department of the Navy intends to expend funds to design the OHIO Replacement SSBN with the flexibility to accommodate female crew; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10899. A letter from the Legal Information Assistant, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket ID: OTS-2010-0023] (RIN: 1550-AC35) received November 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

10900. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Indonesia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

10901. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting first quarterly report on Progress Toward Promulgating Final Regulations for the Menu and Vending Machine Labeling Provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, pursuant to Public Law 111-148, section 4205; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10902. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia: Stage II Vapor Recovery [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0113-201016(a); FRL-9234-4] received November 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10903. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Extension of Attainment Date for the Atlanta, Georgia 1997 8-Hour Ozone Moderate Nonattainment Area[EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0614-201055; FRL-9234-2] received November 30, 2010, pursuant