

donor civilization on the planet. Every country that contributed immigrants to the United States has sent us their dreamers, their doers, their workers—those people who wanted to access the American liberty and develop out the American Dream.

So, when you think about America as being an appendage of England or Scotland or Ireland or Italy or Ethiopia or Colombia or any other nation on the planet, we're not an appendage of that. We're the country that set up the filter, that screened out those also-rans—those people who had only a mediocre dream—and let through that filter people who had the exceptional dream, the dream that gave them an exceptional energy, an exceptional vision, an exceptional desire to come here and add to American exceptionalism.

American exceptionalism is built upon those liberties, those rights—the freedom of speech, religion, the press, to keep and bear arms, the protection from double jeopardy, property rights, States' rights, to be tried by a jury of your peers. The list goes on. It's all of those things, and free enterprise capitalism is an essential component.

If you want to be naturalized into the United States and if you want to study for the naturalization test, then you can use the flashcards—the glossy flashcards put out by CIS, Citizen Immigration Services—to study in order to become a naturalized American citizen. They have these little flashcards. You look at them, and on one side, it will say a question such as: Who is the Father of our country? Snap it over and it says—we all know the answer, Mr. Speaker—George Washington. Then you pick up the next card, and it might say: Who emancipated the slaves? Snap it over: Abraham Lincoln. The next card: What is the economic system of the United States of America? The President might flunk this, but the answer is—snap it over—free enterprise capitalism.

Those are principles that give us American vigor. When you look at the American vigor and the component of that and at the American vigor that comes from a filter, the filter of the difficulty of legally coming into the United States that skimmed the also-rans out and skimmed the global vigor in and redirected them into the United States, we have this saying: The dreamers came to America. The doers came to America. We are an American vigorous civilization and society of people who came here because they wanted more opportunity than they had in the country that they left. There was only one place they could go that had the opportunity that matches that, and it was the United States of America. They came here to do, and they did. They came for religious freedom. They came to raise their families. They came to leave this country a better place than it was, and they succeeded in all of that.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is the unchallenged greatest

Nation in the world because of the fundamental principles, the fundamental rights, the fundamental American liberty—that exercise by dreamers and doers who stood on principle, who came here for religious freedom, for economic freedom, for property rights, for all of the things that are listed and laid out in the Bill of Rights. They were not just a mediocre cross section of the global population. They were the dreamers, the doers. The vigor of the planet came to the United States of America, and this vigorous American character, culture, and personality is unsuitable for the nanny state. It's unsuitable for the nanny state. The nanny state cannot be used and should not be used to oppress a free people—a people of vigor, a people of personality, a people of can-do spirit.

Yet here we are with what happened in the last Congress. The ruling troika imposed upon us Dodd-Frank, ObamaCare, and they tried to impose upon us cap-and-tax. All of them should be rejected by a vigorous American people who will regulate themselves, who will moderate and control themselves, who will set their own moral standards, and who need to have those standards implemented and enforced at the closest level to the people as possible. That's the cities, the counties, and the States, not the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker.

So I think it's important for us to realize and recognize that the American people are a unique race of people, that we are not like anyone else on the planet. We may not look like anyone else, but underneath whatever those looks might be of your idea of what a cross section of Americans are is an American vigor, an American personality, an American culture, a common sense of history, a can-do spirit, people who are members of the society and the culture and the civilization of the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world. We derive our strength from free enterprise capitalism, Judeo-Christianity, Western civilization. That's the core of America, the vigor of America, and that's what we must continue to protect, regrow, and refurbish.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the clock is winding down, and whether there is another speaker who is about to arrive, I have more in me, but I would pause for a moment to receive my instruction from the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In which case, Mr. Speaker, I would recap this with my gratitude to the American people: We are here. We are putting a mark in place for posterity, and posterity watches us today. They're inspired, and they're informed by the actions of this Congress and by the actions of the President.

As I watch what unfolds here in the continuing growth and dependency and in the growth of the regulatory class in society and as I think about the growth of the nanny state—the nanny state

that seems to think that it can be the protectorate for all of us and that somehow we can't make decisions for ourselves and for our well-being—Mr. Speaker, yes, we can, to quote the President, but not in any foreign language like “*si se puede*.”

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your attention and the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE WORLD ACCORDING TO OIL

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oil is about \$100 a barrel. We're in a recession. The United States, just a couple of years ago, used 22 million barrels of oil a day. Now we're using less than 19 million barrels of oil a day, and still oil is \$100 a barrel in the middle of a recession. We are also producing more oil in our country than we did last year for the first time since 1970. The production of oil has increased this last year. Every year before that, the production of oil was lower than it was the preceding year. Now, with Bakken oil, we're producing a bit more than we did last year.

So why, with increased oil production and decreased oil use in the middle of a recession, should oil still be \$100 a barrel?

This is really hurting our economy. It increases the cost of just about everything we use because, if you've got it, a truck probably brought it, and the increased fuel cost increases the cost of just about everything, therefore, that we have.

□ 1920

I believe the most important speech given in the last century was given in 1956 on the 8th day of March in San Antonio, Texas, by an oil geologist known as M. King Hubbard. We need to put his speech in context. At that time, the United States was king of oil. We produced more oil. We used more oil. We exported more oil than any other country in the world.

On this 8th day of March in 1956, M. King Hubbard made an astounding prediction. He said that in just 14 years, the United States would reach its maximum oil production. He wasn't sure what that number would be. But he made the prediction that we would reach our maximum production in 1970, just 14 years later, and no matter what we did, it would continue to go down after that. And from 1970 until about a year or so ago, that was true.

Here I have a chart that shows what has happened to oil production in our country. A whole lot of it comes from Texas, as you can see from the lower dark blue below, and the rest of the United States is the lighter blue above.

The kind of orange here is natural gas liquids. That's not in your gas tanks. That's propane and butane and chemicals like that.

M. King Hubbard made his predictions using only the contiguous 48. He didn't include Alaska, and he didn't include the Gulf of Mexico in his predictions. He made that prediction in 1956, about here. In 1970, as you can see here, we reached our maximum production in the lower 48, and it went down pretty consistently after that. Then we found oil in Alaska, a lot of it. And there was a little blip on the way down when you add that to the oil to the rest of the United States and Texas. And then a little later were the fabled discoveries of oil in the Gulf of Mexico. And you can see what that did—you can hardly see the blip there. A lot of oil, but we use a lot of oil.

The world uses 1 billion barrels of oil every 12 days. It's pretty simple arithmetic: 84 million barrels a day by about 12; that's 1,000 million, which is 1 billion barrels of oil every 12 days.

Oh, by the way, the M. King Hubbard that predicted that the United States was going to peak in 1970—of course he became a legend in his own time because he lived well beyond that, and he was exactly right. Relegated to the lunatic fringe for maybe 15 years or so, he became a celebrity after his predictions came true.

And he predicted that what happened to the United States had to happen to the world. Oil is finite. One day, it will run out. One day, we will reach our maximum production, after which it will tail off in the world, just as it did in the United States.

Now if you think that, collectively, the world is brighter and cleverer, and so forth, than the United States, then you might think that that won't happen. I think that we are the most creative, innovative society in the world. And if we couldn't turn it around, I think it's unlikely the world is going to turn it around.

Well, here is a chart from just a few years ago: Peak oil, this is a plateau. The maximum production is called peak oil. And the question was asked, Are we there yet? Because you see, these curves have flattened out. These are from the two entities that do the best job of cataloging the production and use of oil, the EIA and the IEA. It's the same three letters of the alphabet turned a bit. One is a creature of the OECD, and the other is a part of our Department of Energy.

They both, as you see, had a plateau here. And look what happened to the price of oil. Now this was a little bit before it peaked at \$147 a barrel and the economy collapsed, along with the housing market. That was kind of a double whammy, with both the housing market and the price of oil at \$147 a barrel. When the economy came tumbling down, oil dropped to something under \$40 a barrel, and it has steadily climbed since then up to now around \$100 a barrel, where it has been for several months now.

Are we there yet? Well, just recently we've had two charts produced by one of those entities, the IEA, the International Energy Agency. This is called the World Energy Outlook. The chart on top here is from 2008, and the one on the bottom is from 2010. Now if you look at their Web site, you're going to have trouble finding the chart from 2008. They have purged their Web site of that chart. And in a few moments, you will understand why they purged it.

Let's look at that chart. This dark blue is conventional oil. That's what we looked at before in the production of the United States. And it's been going up now for a very long time. If you started back here 150 years ago at zero, and then we pumped more and more and more. And now the total liquids—not all of it oil; some of it is natural gas liquids—are up to about 84 million barrels of oil a day.

Now they are predicting just exactly what M. King Hubbard predicted, and that is that there would be a peak, and after that peak, it would fall off. And you see, they are predicting a fairly dramatic falloff in the production of oil from the fields that we are now exploiting.

But predicting out to 2030, they believe that by then, we will have a total liquid fuels production of about 106 million barrels of oil a day that will be made up of increasing amounts of natural gas liquids. And that will happen. We have found a lot of natural gas, so those will increase.

The green here is nonconventional oil. That's going to also increase. That's oil like the tar sands of Alberta, Canada, that won't flow. You have to lift it with a 100-ton shovel and put it in a truck that hauls 400 tons. And then you cook it into what we call stranded natural gas. That is natural gas where there aren't very many people to use it. So it's kind of stranded, so its price is less. So you can afford to cook this oil with it. And that's going to grow too some.

And then they make two predictions here. That this light blue is production from fields that we've found but are too difficult to develop, like a field found in the Gulf of Mexico under 7,000 feet of water and 30,000 feet of rock. I heard a number. I have no idea how you get this precise. But it was said that when oil was \$111 a barrel, they could afford to develop this field. So this is projected production from fields that we have found but are, with the current price of oil, too difficult to develop, uneconomically feasible to develop.

And then the bright red here are fields yet to be discovered. The dark red here really belongs as a part of the oil down here. It's a little bit of additional conventional oil we've gotten by what we have called enhanced oil recovery. That's pumping some live steam down there or pumping some CO₂ down there or, in Saudi Arabia, pushing some seawater down there. And

some of their wells now are producing seven times as much seawater as oil, but it's okay because they can separate the seawater from the oil.

Okay, two things about this chart: Note the falloff in production from conventional fields, and note that by 2030, 106 million barrels of oil a day projected—that's what the world is going to be producing. Just 2 years later, in 2010, reality is setting in—that's the lower chart down here—reality is setting in. Now they are up by 35, 5 years later, now they're up to only 96 million barrels of oil a day, not 106 million barrels of oil a day. This is 5 years later, when it really should have been higher.

□ 1930

These top two curves here have been reversed and the colors different, but they are exactly the same thing. This is unconventional oil and this is natural gas liquids. Notice the precipitous decline in production from our current fields. And this includes, by the way, the enhanced oil recovery. You see it is in this chart, but it doesn't exist in this one because they have now incorporated and included where it belongs, and it is part of the conventional fields where we are now pumping from.

Here they show two huge wedges. To keep this production going up slightly, they show two huge wedges here. Notice how considerably bigger they are than the ones they projected just 2 years earlier.

I don't think that these two wedges are going to occur. They did not occur in the United States. Now today we have technologies that we didn't have there, like horizontal drilling and fracking. So we can get more out of a field than we could then, and we are going to go down and get some more oil out of fields that we thought were exhausted with this new technology.

When you find a field that produces 10 billion barrels of oil, that is a big field. We have not found very many fields that produce 10 billion barrels of oil. That will last the world 120 days. Every 12 days, we use a billion barrels of oil.

Now, I think you can see why you can no longer find this projection they made in 2008 in their Web site, because it is just not consistent with the reality that they are forced to use in projecting here just last year, in 2010.

I will be enormously surprised if these two wedges occur. There is little evidence that they should occur. They did not occur in our country. Unless you think the world is incredibly more capable than the United States, then you will have some doubts whether those two wedges will occur or not.

If they don't, this top curve is going to tip over for the world just exactly the way it did for the United States. We're not running out of oil. Many people who are disparaging, people who talk about peak oil will say that the peak oil people say we're running out of oil. We're not running out of oil.

There is a lot of oil out there. There is more oil out there to be pumped than all of the oil that we have pumped in the last 150 years. What we're running out of is our ability to pump that oil as fast as we would like to use it.

This next chart is an interesting one. It kind of puts what we're talking about in perspective—the world according to oil. This is what the world would look like if the size of the country was relative to how much oil reserves it had.

You see here that Saudi Arabia kind of dominates the planet. They do for oil reserves. They have, we believe, maybe about 22 percent of all the reserves in all the world. Now, we aren't quite sure of that because a Wikipedia leak a few months ago indicated that they may have 40 percent less oil than they've said.

Let me explain what happened back when OPEC could produce more oil than the world needed and increased production would drive down prices. And so they had an agreement in the OPEC nations that you could pump a certain percentage of your reserves. So if you were a country that needed some more revenue, you simply had more reserves. And without finding any new oil, you can look back through history and see that some of them magically had maybe twice the reserves that they had. They didn't find any new fields; they just said they had twice the reserves in the fields they already had. Then you see, they could pump more oil. None of these OPEC nations will let our technical people in to look at their records so we really don't know how much oil they have, but we believe that it is relatively like this.

You see little Kuwait looms huge on the world scene in terms of how much oil they have. Iraq, Iran, huge amounts of oil. Venezuela really dominates our hemisphere, doesn't it. It's bigger than all of the rest of the countries put together in terms of oil reserves.

And here we are, the United States. We have 2 percent of the reserves of oil in the world, and we use 25 percent of the world's oil, a little less now because our cars get a little better mileage and our economy is down a little so we're using a little less, but roughly 25 percent of the world's oil.

Our number one importer is Canada. They have less oil than we, but they don't have very many people up there to use it, so they can export it to us.

Until a couple of years ago, our number two importer of oil was Mexico. They also have less than us. Now, they have a lot of people, but their people are too poor to use the oil so they can export it. Just a few years ago, the second largest oil field in the world, the Cantarell oil field in Mexico, started in rapid decline, declining as much as 20 percent a year in production. So now Mexico is our number three importer and Saudi Arabia is now our number two. Mexico has been displaced by Saudi Arabia.

Look at China and India over there. Tiny. China with a 1.3 billion people, India with well over a billion people,

with an economy in China that's growing—well, in a recession; they've slumped. They were 16 percent growth, and now I think they are something like 8 percent growth, and India is not far behind them. With a static oil production of 84 million barrels a day, and China last year used 6 percent more oil than they did the year before, where is it coming from? We used less. We used to be 22 million barrels a day; now we're less than 19 million barrels a day. And some of the poorer countries of the world just can't afford the oil so they are doing without.

This disparity between the people who are using the oil and the people who have the oil is going to set up some huge geopolitical tensions in the world. China last year sold more cars than we sold, and that curve is accelerating. China is now the number one polluter in the world. They just passed us. China is buying up oil all over the world. I wonder why.

We have only 2 percent of the oil in the world, and we use 25 percent of the oil in the world, and we're not buying oil anywhere. We don't need to because all you need to do is go to the global oil auction and have enough money and be the high bidder or participate at the bid price, and you get all the oil that you need if there's enough to meet everybody's needs. So why is China buying oil? They aren't just buying oil; they're buying goodwill: you need a hospital, soccer field, roads.

Simultaneous with buying oil reserves all over the world, China is also aggressively building a blue-water navy. They soon will have more ships than we. They aren't our ships yet by a long shot, but this year they will graduate seven times as many engineers as we graduate, and about half of our engineering students are Chinese mostly and some India students.

We can't for long have that disparity between the graduates of engineers and our two countries and we continue to be the world's premier economic and military power. We have got to do something to capture the imagination of our people and encourage our young people to go into careers of science, math, and engineering.

Let me tell you what I think may happen; I hope it doesn't. Why would China buy oil while they're simultaneously very aggressively building a blue-water navy and building capabilities for denial. There is now—look it up—a Chinese anti-ship missile that we essentially have no defense against. It travels 1,200 miles. There's no reason they can't put it on a ship, which means you couldn't get within 1,200 miles of a Chinese ship that had this missile on it unless we developed some defense against that missile.

□ 1940

Let's hope the time does not come when China says, hey, guys, I'm sorry, but we have 1.3 billion people. We have 900 million people in rural areas that, through the miracle of communications, know the benefits of an industrialized society, and they're saying, hey,

guys, what about us? And our empire may unravel if we don't meet the needs of those people, so we can't share our oil. It's ours, we bought it, we can't share it, and we've got to have it. That would plunge the rest of the world into a recession, and China then would have to look to their population as consumers for the goods that they produce. And 1.3 billion people could be a pretty big consuming population.

The tragedy is that your government has paid for four different studies, two of them issuing in '05 and two of them in '07, that said the same thing, the peaking of oil is either present or imminent with potentially devastating consequences. Your government chose to ignore those four studies because it was not politically expedient to admit that we had a problem of those proportions.

Now, we should have known that those predictions were coming because a very wise man in what, I think, was the most insightful speech of the last century, M. King Hubbert, gave the most important speech. I think that Hyman Rickover, the father of our nuclear submarine, gave the most insightful speech just about a year later. I don't know if these two men knew each other, but on the 15th day of May in 1957 to a group of physicians in St. Paul, Minnesota, Hyman Rickover gave a speech that was lost until a few years ago, and now you can find it on the Internet. Just Google for "Rickover" and "energy speech" and it will come up.

He said some things there that should have been self-evident, and everyone should have been saying it; but it took Hyman Rickover to say the obvious. There is nothing man can do to rebuild exhausted fuel reserves. They are finite. The Moon is not made out of green cheese; the Earth is not made out of oil. One day, it will be gone. They were created by solar energy 500 million years ago and took eons to grow to their present volume.

In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuel reserves are finite, the exact length of time these reserves will last is important in only one respect: the longer they last, the more time do we have to invent ways to live off renewable energy—you've heard of renewable energy—or substitute energy sources and to adjust our economy to the vast changes that we can expect from such a shift.

Have you noticed we've been doing that? I haven't. I love this last quote here because I think it pretty well describes where we are and what we're doing.

Fossil fuels resemble capital in the bank. A prudent and responsible parent will use his capital sparingly in order to pass on to his children as much as possible of his inheritance. A selfish and irresponsible parent will squander it in riotous living and care not one whit how his offspring will fare.

Drill, baby, drill. And the unspoken part of that mantra is the hell with our

kids and our grandkids, let them shift for themselves.

I remember when the Vice President came and asked me if I would vote to drill in ANWR, and I said I would be happy to do that when you commit—this was Dick Cheney—that you're going to use all the revenues you get from ANWR to invest in alternatives, because we're way late in doing what Hyman Rickover said we needed to do in 1957.

I noted that we were going to leave our kids a huge debt. It's bigger now than I thought it would be then. I said, wouldn't it be nice to leave them a little oil?

Here is a quote from one of those studies. This was the first and the biggest of those studies, the so-called Hirsch, SAIC, big study: world oil peaking is going to happen, world production of conventional oil will reach a maximum and decline thereafter. That maximum was called the peak. A number of competent forecasters project peaking within a decade. It has happened. Others contend it will occur later. Prediction of the peaking is extremely difficult. He says that oil peaking presents a unique challenge. The world has never faced a problem like this. It is an unprecedented problem that the world faces.

I have a last chart here that I think kind of helps us to put this in perspective. And this shows the production of oil, and this chart is a few years old. We need to have it updated. But this is when oil was discovered, way back in the 40s, the 50s, the 60s, the 70s. This is the use of oil.

By the way, tonight when you do your prayers, thank the Islamic world for the oil price spike hikes in the 70s. Look what it did. It woke us up. If they hadn't awakened us and this curve continued, we would be through the top of the chart by now. Up until the Carter years, it was a stunning statistic. Every 10 years we used as much oil as had been used in all of previous history. Now look at the slope of that curve. It is much lower than that.

Our time is running out, and I must yield back; but I will come to the floor again soon, and we'll spend quite some time looking at this chart. Because if you had only one chart to look at where you were going to predict what you thought might happen in the future, I think this would be the chart, because you look back through history and see what has happened, and then you'll make a judgment. Wow, are we going to find that much more oil in the future that we found back here even with our increased capability to find oil? Yeah, we're going to find more, and we're going to pump more, but I think there is little or no chance that we'll be able to produce that oil fast enough to meet the growing demands of the world.

I love challenges. This is a huge challenge. And I think that facing this challenge we can produce more jobs; we can be an exporter of the technologies

for green energy. I just feel challenged by this, Mr. Speaker, and I hope Americans feel the same way.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 658. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 8, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 7, 2012.

To: Trudi Terry, Chief Clerk, Office of Official Reporters

From: Karen L. Haas, Clerk

Subject: Oath of Office

In compliance with the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25, please have printed in the appropriate place of the House section of the Congressional Record of Tuesday, February 7, 2012, the following entry related to those Members who have executed the Oath of Office:

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 112th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

SUZANNE BONAMICI, Oregon First.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4876. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Real-Time Public Reporting of Swap Transaction Data (RIN: 3038-AD08) received February 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4877. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* strain D747; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0944; FRL-9334-3] received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4878. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1235] received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4879. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Net Worth Standard for Accredited Investors [Release Nos.: 33-9287; IA-3341; IC-29891; File No.: S7-04-11] (RIN: 3235-AK90) received January 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4880. 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; Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; Determinations of Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Standard for the Philadelphia-Wilmington Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0714; FRL-9620-3] received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4881. 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; Missouri; Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2011-0859; FRL-9621-1] received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4882. 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; Pennsylvania; Clean Vehicles Program [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0605; FRL-9620-2] received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4883. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Great Lakes Steamship Repower Incentive Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0928; FRL-9618-9] (RIN: 2060-XXXX) received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4884. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Guidance for Fuel Cycle Facility