

where people don't have insurance; they have to make tough choices.

There is nothing tough—people have said, Oh, this is a tough choice that people have made. They have gone forward and taken a situation that they think is not affordable and they are going to make a tough choice and remove it. There is nothing tough about asking the weak or the poor to pay more so that oil as an industry can get more benefits and millionaires and billionaires can draw down a larger tax cut. There is nothing tough about that.

What it is is insensitive. It is un-American. It is immoral to have such an outcome after so much success with a program that has proven itself time and time again to be a great friend to the senior community.

There are those who have spent countless hours and effort to put together a plan that would respond to this Nation's seniors with respect and dignity. And we can simply not afford to walk away from this concept in the very calloused manner that we are asked to. I was proud when I saw so many people stand up and say "no" to this vote. Unfortunately, it passed in this House. If this budget had its way to the finish line, it would end Medicare at the expense of so many of our Nation's seniors.

They have enjoyed this benefit. They have prospered from this benefit. They have realized a great sense of dignity with this effort, and we must maintain it. We must continue the fight to preserve a program that has served this Nation very well.

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

#### THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me and presiding over these affairs tonight.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana yielding his time as he prepares his remarks, which I look forward to hearing.

Earlier this afternoon and into the evening, this House considered an appropriations bill related to Veterans Affairs and Military Construction. At that point I asked my colleagues to support an amendment that I offered for the FY 2012 Military Construction-Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, and that amendment I am thankful to say was accepted. It was bipartisan acceptance. Both the majority and minority agreed it should be added to the bill, and I just wanted to tell the gentleman and my colleagues that amendment is very straightforward. It moves \$22 million from the VA general administration to solve a dramatic cut in medical and prosthetic research.

This bill that we are talking about, the VA-Military Construction account, as it was written, funds medical and prosthetic research at \$509 million in FY 2012, but that is a \$72 million cut over last year. But the amendment that I offered restores funding to an account that directly impacts treatment of amputees and other wounded veterans.

Like all of my colleagues, I want to do everything I possibly can to support our veterans and to promote these programs. And like many of us, I have visited the facilities for amputees at Walter Reed Army Medical Center right here in Washington, DC, and I have spoken with those disabled wounded warriors who have lost limbs in the line of duty.

Through technological and medical improvements at that facility, the DOD has demonstrated its ability to improve world-class health care to amputees and other wounded servicemembers. The VA must have the funding necessary to carry on that mission after veterans leave the service.

Just last week, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs held a hearing entitled: "Seamless Transition—Meeting the Needs of Servicemembers and Veterans." During the hearing, multiple wounded warriors testified about the difficulty of transferring between DOD and VA care.

In particular, one witness, Lance Corporal Tim Horton from Oklahoma, highlighted the disparity between health care he received as he sought out prosthetics that help him go about his everyday life.

Lance Corporal Horton said: "I know other veterans who live in close proximity to Walter Reed who are able to walk in and out with the services and equipment they need within the same day, all without ever needing to go through their local VA. While waiting weeks for an appointment might seem like a minor inconvenience, for a warrior like myself, spending weeks without necessary prosthetics equipment, or sometimes even worse, equipment that causes extreme discomfort and other medical issues, can be wholly disruptive to our daily lives. The timeliness and consistency of care should not be a function of where warriors happen to live."

I have spoken with amputees with similar stories from my district in western Pennsylvania who have expressed their dissatisfaction with the medical care they receive after retiring from the military. I am sure all of my colleagues would agree, we can never repay America's veterans for the sacrifice that they have made for our country. What amount of money could replace an arm or a leg lost in the line of duty?

I firmly believe, as I am sure we all believe, that we need to get our fiscal house in order, but in this extreme time of fiscal restraint and prioritization of appropriations, I believe that no one should stand ahead of

our Nation's veterans when making these difficult funding decisions. I believe that medical and prosthetic research is a higher priority than bureaucratic administration.

CBO has scored my amendment as having no impact on budget authority, and it would actually reduce FY 2012 outlays by \$5 million.

This amendment helps direct the priorities of the VA towards the veterans that deserve its funding and support, and I want to thank the American Legion for its support in helping craft this amendment because it is good for veterans, and I am so happy that my colleagues have agreed to accept this amendment as part of the bill. Hopefully, it will survive in the Senate and become law.

I greatly appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana yielding me some time to allow me to discuss this.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much.

Several weeks ago I had the opportunity to come down to the floor of the House and start something that I think is very significant. Mr. Speaker, I can't directly can't talk to the American people. I have to address you. But if I could talk to the American people, I would remind them that a couple of weeks ago, when I came down here, I was inviting them to participate in what I am now calling "The People's House" so that ordinary people can have a say in what we do and make sure that their opinions are heard. So again, I would invite anyone and everyone to join me in this conversation to make sure that everyday people have a voice and have a way to contact me. So, again, you can reach me at [myidea@mail.house.gov](mailto:myidea@mail.house.gov) or you can find me on Facebook or you can find me on Twitter.

What I want to remind everyone of is the fact that it is very clear that many of us know a lot of things, but the most important thing we need to know is that we don't know it all. That is why I am soliciting, Mr. Speaker, the help of the American people, so they can give us their ideas.

When I started this the last time, I was asking them to send me their ideas on ways to cut spending and ways to save money. I also was asking for ideas on how to raise some revenue, how to make this country the great country that it used to be.

Well, the good thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we had people who took me up on this idea and to say that they thought that this was a good idea and they wanted to participate. They wanted to make sure that people heard their voice. They sent me a number of ideas, and we are going to talk about some of those ideas and those comments today.

So my goal here is to again have and initiate a conversation with the American people, because this is truly "The People's House." The United States House of Representatives, you cannot be appointed to it. You have to be

elected. And the history behind it is because we are the closest to the American people. So now, in this day of new technology and all of the outlets and social media that we have in order to strike up conversations in different ways, we should do that. This is not the day when the only thing we have is the United States Postal Service or slower means of communication.

□ 2040

Today, we can communicate in seconds if not nanoseconds. So I want to make sure that we use all of this new medium in order to expand this conversation to everyone who is concerned. These are some of the people who responded last week and some of the people whose ideas we will talk about. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to get such a large response, and these are some of the people I wanted to point out.

We had Sheila Baker who responded; Robert Becker from New Orleans, who also responded; Mary Anne Lawrence Cazaubon responded several times through several different media outlets, and had some very interesting things to say, as well as Micah Hill, Barbara Olinger from Folsom, and Freddy Vazquez, Jr. Then, through Facebook, we had Adam Haney, Anthony Sadler from Tennessee, Phil Schlittler, and Deloris Wilson, all of whom participated and gave me some of their thoughts about what they thought should be going on.

I want to make sure that at least the people back in the Second Congressional District of Louisiana understand that they are more than welcome to participate in this conversation but that this conversation is open to the American people. There is no monopoly on good ideas. Although I respect and value the opinions of the people from Louisiana in the Second Congressional District, we want to hear from everybody. So let's just start talking about some of the ideas. I will tell you before I start that I may or may not agree with all of the ideas, and some of my colleagues from the Republican side or the Democratic side may or may not agree.

The one thing I think both sides will agree on is that this is America and that this is what makes America the great place that it is. This is the place where we can provide kids with a free quality public education, which will prepare them for the future. This is the place where we strive to get the sick the health care that they need even if they can't afford it. This is the great country where we take care of our seniors and our disabled with Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. This is the country where we care for our fellow man and strive to feed the hungry, clothe the naked and shelter the homeless. Tonight, I am sharing recommendations on how we as Americans get back to that great place of humanity, of sacrifice and of prosperity.

Now, Micah Hill's comments were very, very interesting. Micah's frustra-

tion was the fact that Congress should address underachievement in our grade schools. He wanted us to address that underachievement by holding parents accountable for their children's performance. I'll give you an excerpt from his letter.

Micah's response was: Children who are not doing well in their studies are children who are constantly in trouble. Their parents should be investigated. The students' homes should be investigated to see if the parents are abusing substances or anything else. If young students, like those in grade school and freshmen in high school, are having problems, then the parents should be investigated. That will help educate our children who are not getting their educational needs met because of their home fronts. Find out the child's educational strengths, and find out what is lacking in the home.

Now, Micah, that is a very creative idea, and I think that that conversation has started numerous times back in my State legislature. It is a conversation that we should be having at the Federal level because, when we talk about our children's success, when we talk about their education, the one thing that everyone agrees on is the fact that parental responsibility and parental involvement is the single biggest indicator of that child's success. So, as government, if we can help to do anything to make sure that that home life is safe and secure and that that child can succeed, then we absolutely should do it, and I look forward to continuing that conversation with you.

I will now touch for a second on Mary Anne Lawrence Cazaubon, who, by the way, is 72, and is a retired teacher. Before her teaching career, she worked more than the required quarters in order to draw Social Security. Between the two lives that she lived and the two jobs that she worked, she now lives on less than \$1,150 per month. If there were a flat tax of only 10 percent, it would cost her, roughly, \$115 per month. She says, even though she would have to spend every dime of her check every month, she would just have to do that. She also mentions, some months, she has to go without food, but she always makes sure that she gets her medicine for her heart and her osteoporosis.

That's the type of sacrifice, that's the type of predicament a lot of our families are in.

Ms. Mary Anne went further as she talked about tax and fiscal issues, and she was very clear to write this, a statement that I absolutely agree with: Congressman, I hope you appreciate the fact that many of your constituents do support limited government and fiscal sanity. Our country is in real danger of economic collapse. Please don't just toe the party line and reject solutions to this crucial issue. Our Nation's fate depends on it.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think Ms. Mary Anne is absolutely right. I think that everyone in the

country is calling for limited government and fiscal sanity. Also, I think that we have to recognize at the same time that as we cut and make very prudent decisions to restore our fiscal sanity that we have to invest in this next generation, that we have to invest in the future, that we have to invest in those things that spur our entrepreneurial spirit and our innovation, and in those things that are going to continue to make sure that we are the leader in every industry and in every category that we used to be the leader in.

After Ms. Mary Anne talked about the limited government and fiscal sanity, she also volunteered that she would like to see an indexed income tax without any exceptions for individuals or families and no incentives or exemptions to any industry or company, large or small. Here is the recommendation that Ms. Mary Anne came up with:

She would recommend a 0 percent tax for anyone with an income of less than \$20,000, 5 percent for anyone with income from \$20,000 to \$40,000, 10 percent for any of those from \$40,000 to \$60,000, 15 percent for those from \$60,000 to \$80,000, 20 percent for those from \$80,000 to \$100,000, 25 percent for those from \$100,000 to \$150,000, 30 percent for those from \$150,000 to \$200,000, and 35 percent for all incomes over \$200,000.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is very interesting because we're talking about a 72-year-old lady who survives on \$1,150 per month, and she has taken the time not only to watch C-SPAN but to join in the conversation with me and the people's House to say that she understands that people who make more should pay a little bit more.

On that note, I'll go to Sheila Baker, whose quote, I think, is directly applicable to what Ms. Mary Anne was saying. Ms. Baker says: I pay my taxes responsibly with the understanding that I must pay more than those who earn an income less than mine.

Ms. Baker is clearly saying that she makes a little bit, and she understands that she pays more than the person who does not make what she makes and who is not as fortunate as she is; but her next sentence is the most important one. She says she also expects and demands that those who earn more than she should do the same and that those who make more than Ms. Baker should also pay their fair share, hence the concept of a fair shared burden of taxes.

So I want to thank Ms. Baker, one, for acknowledging that she is doing better than other people and that she has to pay a little bit more, and I want to thank her for participating in the people's House and in expressing her concerns and her opinions about where she thinks we should be as a country.

□ 2050

The next person I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is Freddy Vazquez, Jr. He has concerns about our spending; he

has concerns about foreign aid; and he has concerns about the war that we are fighting. And he writes, "We spend billions on helping others, and that's fine when we have the means. Libya, Pakistan, Iraq and Afghanistan, they take our money, then they stab us in the back. America can and will go bankrupt. Our government is acting like a teenager who just received a credit card." He then goes on to quote 2pac, where 2pac said, "They got the money for war, but they can't feed the poor." And he closes with, "That's not right—that's not America."

And I would just say that the frustration that Mr. Vazquez is expressing here is a frustration that we're hearing all across the country, the fact that we're fighting so many wars on foreign soil, the fact that our humanity goes far out immediately. People are wondering, does humanity start at home? Do we have obligations to take care of on the home front before we go across the globe doing the same? Mr. Speaker, I would just chime in here and add my personal opinion that we're America, we can do both; we can provide here at home, and we can continue to be the world leader, spreading democracy around this world to make sure that the world is just as great as the free country that we live in.

Now, what is it going to take to do that? It's going to take a shared sacrifice. In the last People's House we talked about, American people, give what you can give—if you're a high school student, mentor an elementary kid; if you're a college student, help out at a senior citizens home; if you're a millionaire, then contribute to a charity. What makes America great is the fact that we are willing to give what we have to give. So I would just implore everyone, Mr. Speaker, to give what it is you have the ability to give because that's what made this country what it is today and allowed us to achieve what we were able to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I would also add that Anthony Sadler wrote in to say that he believes we should buy more products from local businesses, especially minority businesses. Anthony, I just want you to know that down here today I don't have our minority whip, Mr. STENY HOYER, but I will tell you that you and STENY HOYER are a match made in heaven. STENY and our Democratic Caucus are pushing what we call "Make It in America." And if STENY was down here today, he would go on and on and really get excited about the fact that we will make it in America. That's what we do—we make it in everything we do.

Another part of that Make It in America, we need to make more products in America. That's what we do—we manufacture things, we build things, we have the best innovation, but we need to make sure that we have a focus, a commitment, and an investment in the American people so that they can make it here in America. So that goes right with what you're say-

ing, Mr. Sadler. Because as Steny will push that we make it in America, you're pushing that we buy American products, and those two things go hand in hand. So Mr. Sadler, I just want to thank you for chiming in. And I'm sure that my minority whip, STENY HOYER, is somewhere right now very appreciative of the fact that you also recognize the importance of making it in America.

Now we have Ms. Deloris Wilson and Phil Schlittler, who posted on my Facebook. And both of them didn't post very long messages, they both posted the same thing at different times, and they simply said that they agree with the President's rationale not to release the pictures of Osama bin Laden's body. And I just want to say to Ms. Wilson and to Phil that I agree with both of you. I think the President made the right decision. But it's very comforting to know that we have citizens like you all that are at home, paying attention, and simply are not voicing an opinion to get attention, but simply a heartfelt belief. And it just so happens that I agree with your opinion. But even when we don't agree, I want to hear from you. I want to make sure that we keep this conversation going.

Now, the next person is Adam Haney, who I did not know before the first time I did the People's House, but he was watching and this is what he wrote, "Saw you on C-SPAN, good job. Those maniacal Republicans want to kill my hopes for class mobility. Save the safety nets Republicans used to get into Congress for those of us who want to benefit from those same programs that they did." And I would just add, Adam, that there are a bunch of programs out there, and those programs are what make this country great. And I don't have to talk about the obvious—Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare—we can talk about Head Start, that gives our toddlers the ability to start school and give them a head start on their future.

As a country, we invest in things. We should look at what return do we get on our dollar. When we invest in early childhood education, we get a 9-1 return. For every dollar that we invest in that child, we get \$9 back. Those are the types of programs that Adam is referring to when he said that the majority would prefer to cut all of those programs now that they have received it and they've been the beneficiary of it.

Also, we can go back to free and reduced lunch in our public schools. We can talk about public school education, period, the fact that many of us that are lucky enough and honored enough to be Members of the United States Congress in this 112th Congress came from public schools with public school teachers funded by the American people. We should hold that very high, the privilege that we were able to do that, but at the same time we should recognize that that was a sacrifice by generations before us to make sure that it

was fully funded. We had the quality teachers that we needed so that we could be prepared, so that we could prosper and that we could be successful. It would be a sin and shameful for us not to invest that same energy, same money, same commitment into our next generation, and I'm afraid that that's the route that we're taking. So Adam, I just want to say I agree with you wholeheartedly.

The second to last one is Robert Becker from New Orleans who wrote me with an idea about Social Security and retirement security. He said, "We should increase the amount that is deducted from paychecks to pay into the trust fund and increase the amount employers contribute to the fund. It is in America's best interest not to have a great portion of elderly Americans living on the edge of poverty." Not only is it in America's interest, Robert, I will tell you it's the right thing to do. And at some point we have to remember that while we're here on Earth, it's for a purpose, and that's to make the world a better place. And what you're advocating for absolutely is the right thing to do. It makes this country the special country that it is.

And our last person is Barbara Olinger from Folsom. She is from Louisiana, not in my district, but she wrote, urging Congress to act on Social Security and related issues. Specifically, she was requesting that we as Congress reconsider the Social Security Fairness Act of 2009, which would repeal rules related to the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision. She says this reduces her income during tough times. She wrote, "Saddest of all is I am a retired social studies teacher, American history, civics. I am so distraught. We only ask for what is right and just. If I had not ever paid a dime, I would not be asking for a dime." Well, Ms. Barbara, you're absolutely right; you paid into it, you should get it, you shouldn't be penalized. I'm not too big, too arrogant to say sometimes government gets it wrong, and government has it dead wrong on this issue, and it's something that we should address. So I want to thank those people for writing in.

And now I just want to turn for a second to something that is absolutely the climax of foolishness. See, I have a shipyard in my district called Avondale Shipyard. It used to be Northrop Grumman, then Northrop Grumman spun it off, got a \$1.5 billion credit for the asset, and they spun it off to a new company that they made, Huntington Ingalls Shipyard. Well, Huntington Ingalls, in just the first quarter this year, made \$45 million, but they decided that they're going to close that shipyard in my district. Now that's almost 5,000 direct workers that work for Huntington Ingalls, 6,000 indirect jobs. Well, it's every American company's right to decide when they want to close a business. They can decide it's just not profitable. They can decide that the heat in Louisiana and the humidity

and the mosquitos are too much for them, that they can quit, that they're going to shut their plant down. That is their right and that's what we fight for in this country, to give people the right to do what they want to do. It doesn't mean I have to like it. But government should not be a coconspirator in that company's quitting on the American people.

So what I have here today, I have all of these petitions—and they're not signed by the workers. It would have been far too easy to come in here with a big box of 5,000 signatures from people who depend on Huntington Ingalls for a paycheck. This is from businesses in the community that are saying that it's just not right for Huntington Ingalls to just abandon the community.

Here's the part that rises to the level of the climax of foolishness. Now that Huntington Ingalls has decided to close, they have applied for the Federal Government to reimburse them the cost of closing. So the Federal Government is contemplating giving Huntington Ingalls \$310 million to pay for their cost of ramping down and laying off almost 5,000 people. To me, that just doesn't make good sense. We can take that \$310 million, we can put it in an economic development fund for any other business that wants to come along and create thousands of jobs. We can put it in education for those 5,000 employees so that they can be competitive in another occupation. We can take that \$310 million and pay down the debt. We can take that \$310 million and do a number of things, but I would submit to you that we don't take that \$310 million and reward a company for closing.

I offered that amendment on a bill just a few days ago, and some of my Republican colleagues supported the idea that we should not reward a company for quitting on 5,000 employees, and my Democratic colleagues overwhelmingly supported the same amendment. I would just tell you that in these tough economic times it is unconscionable to reward a company for quitting.

For those people who voted against that amendment, I would hate to have to go back to Montana, Minnesota—somewhere—and say not only did I have an opportunity to take \$310 million and give it to paying down the debt or doing something productive with it, or even doing something in my district, I decided to give \$310 million to a company that is going to make \$180 million this year. And why are we giving them \$310 million? Because they're closing. They're still going to own the property; they're still going to have the asset; they won't have the employees.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just wanted to quickly touch on one thing, and that is, on the last district workweek, I had the opportunity to go to the Second Harvest Food Bank of Greater New Orleans. They are leading the fight in

eradicating hunger. Last year, they served 262,800 people, including 82,000 children and 40,000 seniors. I just want everyone to know that the problem of hunger, homelessness, and all of those things in our community is real. So as we cut, we need to remember to invest.

Again, I look forward to continuing this conversation on the next People's House. And you can email us at myidea@mail.house.gov.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after noon and tomorrow on account of a family funeral.

Mr. CICILLINE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 3 p.m. on account of attending a funeral in district.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 3, 2011, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1773. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report entitled, "Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Cooperation Account", for the period ending March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1774. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8177] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1775. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to United Arab Emirates pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1776. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1777. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016] (RIN: 1904-AB99) received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1778. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Rate Increase Disclosure and Review (RIN: 0938-AQ68) received May 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1779. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Animal Drugs, Feeds, and Related Products; Withdrawal of Approval of New Animal Drug Applications; Aklomide; Levamisole Hydrochloride; Nitromide and Sulfantran; Roxarsone; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0002] received May 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Revised Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Lowell [EPA-R01-OAR-2010-0445; A-1-FRL-9305-1] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1781. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0999; FRL-9304-8] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1782. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Permitting Authority and Tailoring Rule Revision [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-1028; FRL-9305-2] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1783. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Kahuku and Kualapuu, Hawaii) [MB Docket No.: 09-189] received May 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1784. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Electric Reliability Organization Interpretations of Interconnection Reliability Operations and Coordination and Transmission Operations Reliability Standards [Docket No.: RM10-8-000] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1785. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Version One Regional Reliability Standards for Facilities Design, Connections, and Maintenance; Protection and Control; and Voltage and Reactive [Docket No.: RM09-9-000] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1786. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Version One Regional Reliability Standard for Transmission Operations [Docket No.: RM09-14-000] received May 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared