

to order the University of Mississippi to admit its first ever Black college student. It was a Republican Supreme Court Justice who authored the decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* that recognized racial segregation for what it was: a violation of the United States Constitution.

And when a school district in Arkansas refused to integrate, it was a Republican President, Dwight David Eisenhower, who sent in the 101st Airborne Division to escort the Little Rock Nine to class. However, it was a Democrat Governor in Orval Faubus, you may recall, who had tried to use his National Guardsmen to prevent them from enrolling.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans were unfazed by the many Democrats, including John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, who criticized President Eisenhower's decision. Meanwhile, it was the Democrats in the Senate who filibustered the first civil rights act of the 20th century and the Republicans who managed to pass it nonetheless.

The law established a Civil Rights Division within the Justice Department and authorized the Attorney General to request injunctions against anyone attempting to deny a person's right to vote. It was written at the behest of President Eisenhower after a long drought of civil rights bills under Presidents Franklin Delano Roosevelt and President Harry Truman.

It was a Senate minority leader, Everett Dirksen, a Republican, who helped write the first Civil Rights Act of 1964, widely regarded as the most influential of them all. And in recent years, it's been the Republican Party that has fought to prevent African Americans from being trapped in a permanent underclass through dependence on government handouts.

In the 1990s, it was the Republican-controlled 104th Congress that passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act. Then-Democrat President Bill Clinton signed it only after reluctantly having vetoed it twice.

This reform changed the face of welfare, ensuring that recipients who were able to work would be required to seek employment. No longer would government checks be seen as an entitlement. No longer would States have a financial incentive to add as many names to their welfare rolls as possible. Finally, there was an alternative to the cycle of poverty caused by years of misguided Democrat policy. And it's been Republicans who have continued to fight for the underprivileged communities, even as we're painted as the party of the white upper class.

In 2004, another Republican-controlled Congress under the leadership of Republican President George W. Bush signed an omnibus bill that included a voucher program for school children right here in the District of Columbia. Instead of being shackled to the failed public school system, thousands of students were able to use the

first Federal Government vouchers to escape high-performing private schools.

□ 2020

Mr. Speaker, what Republicans have long understood is that poor communities are best served when they're empowered to care for themselves. The more they come to rely on government checks, the less they learn to rely on their own ability and ingenuity.

Our party firmly believes in the safety net. We reject the idea of the safety net becoming a hammock. For this reason, the Republican value of minimizing government dependence is particularly beneficial to the poorest among us. Conversely, the Democratic appetite for ever-increasing redistributionary handouts is in fact the most insidious form of slavery remaining in the world today and does not promote economic freedom.

Time after time, the GOP has stood strong as leaders on issues of conscience. Even when the positions we've taken have been unpopular, we've held the line and ultimately brought about liberty and justice for all. From eliminating slavery, to securing full citizenship and voting rights for African Americans, to calling for desegregation even in the most hostile bastions of the Deep South, to implementing school choice in poor communities, to helping black families break out of the cycle of welfare dependence, Mr. Speaker, Republicans have been on the front lines of the fight for equal rights and individual manifest destiny since our party's founding under Lincoln.

So, too, has the party led on issues like reducing the size of government, streamlining the Federal bureaucracy, and returning power to the States. These positions didn't always garner the most popular support at the time. It's easier to convince a person that a government should be doing something for them it currently isn't than to convince a person the government shouldn't be doing something for them it currently is.

But real visionary leaders don't retreat from fights. It is said that one evening, as George Washington sat at his table after dinner, the fire behind him flared up, leading him to move his chair away so as not to end up getting burned. When someone called George Washington out, saying a general ought to be able to stand the fire, he responded that no general should ever be taking fire from behind.

That is the essence of integrity and conviction—the willingness to stand for what you believe at all times, alone if need be, without the option of retreat, no matter how tough the slog ahead may be, and to do so with the faith that eventually it is possible to transform a losing fight into a winning one.

For inspiration, we need only to look to the former slave and Republican, Frederick Douglass. Having found his way to freedom through education and

hard work, he could have been forgiven for retiring from the public eye, but he didn't back down from the work still to be done. Instead, he made himself one of the most stalwart champions of not just the antislavery movement, but the women's rights movement as well. He wasn't content to lend his political capital to causes that would benefit him. He knew what we know, that injustice anywhere is an affront to the human spirit.

To free African Americans from the bonds of slavery was only the first step for Frederick Douglass, and he would not be satisfied until he helped liberate women from the bonds of misogyny as well. In those days, Douglass could count on the Republican Party to be his ally in the fight. Today, we remain no less dedicated to the cause of freedom.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, with a core belief in the supremacy and the sovereignty of the individual and the unconditional dignity of every human life, the Republican Party is, always has been, and forever shall be the party of equality of opportunity.

Happy Black History Month.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is such an honor to serve with such an honorable man as Colonel ALLEN WEST. I've known him for a few years, going back to his previous efforts at election to the House of Representatives. I'm just delighted that he is here. I'm delighted to call him a friend. He has been a fantastic addition here to the House of Representatives.

I would like to address something a Democratic colleague had referenced, and that was with regard to Medicare. My friend was taking issue with what my Republican doctors were addressing here on the floor with regard to Medicare. And it was interesting to hear a Democrat say that actually ObamaCare strengthened Medicare. It's interesting. I guess the definition of "is" means something to some folks. In this case, I guess the definition of "strengthen" would have to be what was at issue here.

The Democrats strengthened Medicare, cut \$500 billion—with a B—out of Medicare, and are proud to report to the American people that they strengthened Medicare. Well, in a bill I didn't agree with, the debt ceiling bill, it's cutting hundreds of billions of dollars from our national security, for our national defense. I guess the same reasoning would say we're cutting hundreds of billions of dollars from our national defense. And under the Democratic strategy and definition, I guess, of "strengthen," could say, under that

logic and that thinking, will strengthen our military and our national defense.

I don't happen to agree with that definition. I don't believe that's what it does; \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare that ObamaCare rammed down America's throat, to my way of thinking, does not strengthen Medicare. It guts it.

Now, an explanation has been that the hundreds of billions of dollars that the Democrats in the House and Senate, when they were in the majority, took from Medicare, we're told, well, that wasn't cuts to the American people. That was only cuts to the health care providers. Well, lest I become too sarcastic, let me just say, when you cut the payments by \$500 billion to those who are going to provide seniors with health care, you didn't cut the money going to seniors, you cut it to the people that the seniors need to provide them care.

If people haven't gotten out from around this town and gone out and talked to doctors across the country, including doctors in what some would deem "flyover country," you find out the doctors say, if and when those cuts occur, we cannot stay in business; we'll have to close our doors.

I've had a number of doctors tell me, Once ObamaCare is fully law, I can't live on that. There's so many pieces of equipment that cost so much. There's so much medication that costs more and more. The government would require me to provide services and not reimburse me enough to pay the people I have to hire, to pay for the equipment I have to purchase and lease, and the medications I have to have in our facilities. Can't stay in business. I've had doctors tell me repeatedly, I had hoped to have more in savings before I retired, but I'm just going to have to do with what I've got there because I can't stay in the practice of medicine once those \$500 billion in cuts are made.

□ 2030

So I guess someone can make the argument that the \$500 billion in cuts to health care providers somehow strengthens Medicare for seniors since it only guts the payments to the health care providers, the doctors, the hospitals.

But I don't think it takes a whole lot of reasoning to understand seniors will find themselves in the position that the lady at the White House did during the President's town hall, when she pointed out, My mother was 95. Her personal doctor said she needs a pacemaker. The cardiologist said, she's too old, but he had never met her. Once he met her, he realized this is a woman that's going to live a lot longer. She does need a pacemaker. So he installed it, and 8 to 10 years later she's still going strong.

And the woman's question to the President was, in deciding who gets treatment and who doesn't, who gets

surgery and who doesn't, will the people making the decisions under your bill consider the quality of a person's life in deciding whether they'll get the surgery, whether they'll get the health care they need, whether my mother would get the pacemaker she needed?

The President, after beating around the bush—it can be found online, both the video and transcript—the President ultimately said, you know, we have to come to the conclusion that maybe we're better off telling your mother she should just take a pain pill. In other words, the woman's mother would be dead, but she would have gotten a pain pill under the President's idea of good health care, under his ObamaCare program.

So that's what happens when you cut \$500 billion to Medicare, as the Democrats did, in ObamaCare. And I know my colleague across the aisle pointed out that the AMA, the AHA, and others, I would add, many leaders of the Catholic Church, encouraged the passage of ObamaCare. And now, so many are finding egg on their faces.

Heck, the big pharmaceutical groups, they supported it. Every one of those groups that signed on was bought off. That's just the way it is. They thought that they were signing on to something that would help them out because they were given some little bit that they wanted in the bill.

Some from those groups told me, gee, we wanted to have a seat at the table. I tried to warn them, you don't want a seat at the table when you're on the menu. When they signed on to agree to ObamaCare, they signed their own group's death warrants because \$500 billion in cuts to health care providers, when you don't even eliminate the fraud and waste and abuse, is going to gut the very people financially that are supposed to provide the care.

So who suffers? Well, the doctors, the health care providers, they retire. They go on and do something else. Who suffers? The seniors do. That's what the \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare under ObamaCare do for Americans.

I had a health care bill. In the CBO's effort to help the President get ObamaCare passed, of course they had scored it originally as being over \$1 trillion; but since the President promised it would cost much less than that, there was a meeting with the Director of CBO at the White House. We don't know what was said, but we understood the President was saying before and after the meeting that it had to be scored to where it was under \$1 trillion. And lo and behold, CBO went back and scored it at \$800 billion, approximately.

ObamaCare passes, and then after it becomes law, CBO re-scores. And guess what? It's over \$1 trillion. So we now know that anything we get from CBO in the way of a scoring has to be considered plus or minus 25 percent accurate. I think we ought to change legislation, get rid of CBO, and find entities competitively who are most accurate at scoring bills who can come closer

than a plus or minus 25 percent accuracy.

But my bill would give seniors a choice and say, if you like your Medicare, and especially now, with all the cuts that are coming to health care, if you like it, great, keep it. But if you would like the best health insurance that money can buy, with a high deductible, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, whatever we found to be most accommodating, then we would buy that for the seniors, their choice, Medicare or the best private insurance with a high deductible.

Say, for example, if we made it, in my bill it was 3,500, say, 4,000, 5,000 now. That deductible amount would then be provided to the senior's household in a health savings account that they would control with their own debit card so that, for the first time since Medicare came into existence, seniors would get to control their own health care. They wouldn't have to go begging to an insurance company, because insurance companies, health insurance companies have gotten out of the business of health insurance. They're in health management. I don't want them in health management. I want them in health insurance.

Insurance is when you pay a small premium to insure against an insurable event down the road. You don't know what's coming; but in case there's a catastrophic accident or disease, then you're covered.

In the meantime, each year we'd provide that cash in the health savings account that can only be used for health matters. Now, that would put patients back in control because the most effective government, we have found—and yet we have to keep relearning this lesson—comes not when government is the referee and the coach, and a player. It doesn't work well. We have to keep learning that lesson.

People in this body say, oh, well, it'll work out better if government competes with the private sector. No, it doesn't. It works better if we're a referee.

So whether it's the stock market, there are referees. There are officials that watch out for people like Madoff. Instead of being so engaged in details of day-to-day transactions, they're engaged in health insurance as a referee to make sure people are playing fairly with their consumers, with their patients, so that they're not getting jerked around, so that the government can go after those who are defrauding or being unfair in their treatment. That's the government's role. Be a referee.

But when the government becomes a player and a coach and the referee, then everybody suffers. There is no reason we should have to keep relearning that lesson.

Now, I wouldn't mind so much guest-worker permits. We hear from some of the farmers in California and what-not that, gee, we have to have guest workers come in and harvest our crops. But we shouldn't have to have the rest of

the country pay for their health care because they don't have it.

So we ought to have a new requirement for visas. Yeah, we'll give you a visa to come into the country, but you have to show that you're going to have health insurance the entire time you're here.

You want to bring guest workers in to harvest your crops, well, then provide an umbrella health insurance policy for them so that the rest of America doesn't pay for that farmer's, that rancher's employees' health care.

Those are just little things. But one other thing that we need to do to really get health care on track is get competition back in health care.

□ 2040

When a hospital, when a doctor, when a clinic cannot tell you exactly what the cost is unless they know which insurance company you have or if it's Medicare or if it's Medicaid or what, whether it's cash—because if it's cash, the way the system is now, you're going to pay more than the insurance companies pay—well, that's no way to have a competitive system.

When I grew up in my hometown, Mount Pleasant, Texas, my parents sometimes switched doctors. If one doctor went up, well, we knew there were a number of good doctors in town. We went to one that was cheaper because we knew they were good, too.

We don't do that anymore because nobody knows what things cost. Well, that ought to be posted. You ought to be able to find it, published, post it, so people know this one is cheaper. If you have your own debit card with money in that account or a health savings account, then you would be concerned about that. But the government gets so involved that it becomes the problem.

VISAS

I want to address one other area in which the government ought to be the referee, but it's so busy trying to be the coach and the player that the job is not getting done. That is in the area of visas.

Apparently, we have this EB-5 program that, in essence, says if you're a non-American, but if you want to come into the United States and you have a million dollars and you're willing to invest it in the U.S., hey, we'll give you a visa, one of these EB-5 visas. Then you can come into this country, and you can be a legal resident. So you buy your way in.

Well, everybody acknowledges times are tough. Things have not gotten any better than they were when President Obama took office. We're worse off than we were when he took office, debt through the roof. But I can understand. It makes sense. Let's encourage outside investment in America.

Well, it just so happens that the month of February has been quite revealing in this program in that in my hometown of Tyler, Texas, we had a very weary local law enforcement. I know from my days as a district judge

handling felonies, we have some very capable, competent local law enforcement. We have extremely capable State law enforcement in Texas.

A car was pulled over. It had no front license plates. That's required in Texas. Then the officer found that there were some questionable things going on and asked him for permission to search. Permission was granted. \$67,000 in cash was in the car; children in the car; two individuals in the car with another adult driver; shotgun in the car. Strange situation. When they were taken in for their violations, the name was run, the shotgun was run, lo and behold, they hear from the Federal Government. ICE says, We're in charge. These folks are ours. So they take them from Tyler, Texas, detention to Dallas to the detention there.

We just happen to have the mug shots of these folks. These individuals were Hector Hernandez Javier Villarreal. He's the former secretary executive of Tax Administration Service of Coahuila, Mexico, along with his wife, Marie Teresita Botello. Then they also had a driver with them, Oswaldo Coronado. These were their mug shots.

Well, ICE takes over. They take these folks to detention in Dallas. Homeland Security gets alerted. We don't know whether it was the shotgun being run or the people's names being run, but they get involved reporting to the Smith County Sheriff's Office wanting to interrogate these individuals. They were told, well, you'll have to get in line behind ICE. They've just taken them to Dallas about 100 miles up the interstate.

Well, once they were in Dallas, and there was computer material, different things that were obtained after they were arrested in Tyler, obtained by warrant, and they begin to find out a little bit more about them.

This is in the Tyler Morning Telegraph, my hometown paper. They do a good job of reporting local news. So they report, as did FOX and the San Antonio Express-News:

Villarreal and at least six other men face charges linked to more than \$3 billion in debt racked up by the Coahuila government during the administration by the former governor, Humberto Moreira.

Villarreal is accused of falsifying documents involving \$325 million in bank loans to the state shortly before Moreira resigned to become national president of the opposition Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI.

State police arrested Villarreal and another former Coahuila official October 28 charging them in connection with suspicious loans. Villarreal was released on bail within hours after being detained.

I was told that bond was around \$1 million. The article continues with a quote from our sheriff there, J.B. Smith:

"All we did was make a traffic stop. We did not realize we had stopped a major person of interest for Mexico and the United States."

Villarreal was charged with money laundering and turned over to Immigration and Customs Enforcement. He was released on February 6 on \$20,000 bail, according to jail records. Carl Rusnok, an ICE spokesman in Dallas, would not comment on the situation.

Three days later, Federal investigators in Mexico issued a warrant for Villarreal's arrest. Members of Mexico's ruling National Action Party, or PAN, are asking the same questions: Why was Villarreal able to enter the U.S. and why was he released?

We're giving visas to people because they promised to come in here and invest \$500,000 or \$1 million in the U.S. What, do we need to change the inscription on the Statute of Liberty? Give us your tired, your fugitives, your embezzlers? Give us your criminals longing to stay free?

Some of us have been pretty critical of the Mexican Government not being tougher on corruption. Here we have a case where it appears the Mexican Government is trying to crack down on corruption.

I know from my days as a judge, when somebody is released on bond, they're not allowed to leave the country. Why wouldn't our government—because I was assured today in a hearing of the Immigration Committee by the Customs and Immigration Service Director that, gee, they do a very thorough background study on people before they will give them this EB-5 visa. They're very thorough, I was told. I'm looking forward to the report from the Director that he promised me today in the hearing as to exactly what happened here, why they didn't pick up that these people were being charged in Mexico with embezzlement of hundreds of millions, maybe even billions of dollars.

I mean, is the economy so in need of help that we welcome people charged with criminal activity to come in as long as they'll invest their dirty money in our country? We need to have better standards than that. We need to be the country that was, as it once was, a rule-of-law Nation, where the law mattered.

But once they were in Dallas, the State Department, I was told by the law enforcement officials I'd talked to, they were told—Homeland Security, ICE—you've got to let these folks go. We gave them a valid visa. They told the local officials that, now, we did revoke that visa, but since they came into the U.S. before we revoked the visa, we have to let them stay, so you've got to let them go. They were ordered to let these three individuals go.

□ 2050

Now, I was told that upon pulling these folks out of detention and being told that the State Department had ordered their release and that they were free to go wherever they wanted in the United States that Villarreal's wife said, But you told us we were going to be deported back to Mexico, where the charges were waiting for them.

He said, No, we're told we have to release you here in this country.

When she started to say that didn't make sense, Mr. Villarreal responded very assertively in Spanish, and she didn't say anything after that. It's not hard to figure out what he must have said:

Look, if these people are so stupid they're going to let us go when we're wanted in Mexico, when we're wanted here and they're going to let us go, just shut up, and let these stupid people let us go.

So they were let go.

It was only a day or two later that the State Department said, You know what? These people are wanted fugitives, and we need to hang onto them.

They're gone and they haven't been found, and they told local law enforcement that they had access to private jets so they could come in and out of the United States when they were ready to.

Well, I hope they find them. As a former prosecutor, as a former judge and chief justice, the law needs to be addressed.

In the meantime, here in Congress, we did have a hearing today with immigration officials, including the inspector general of the immigration service, CIS. I was told during the hearing that if the chairman of our immigration committee will request an investigation, the IG will do that investigation, and I'm hopeful that will be forthcoming.

We've got to clean up this administration's mess. It's bad enough the damage that's being done to Medicare and our seniors. It's bad enough that a payroll tax rate of insurance is being reduced so that there is not enough money to pay Social Security from the Social Security tax coming in again this year and that it may go from an approximately 5 percent shortfall last year to a maybe 14 percent or so shortfall this year. It's bad enough we're doing that to the seniors. It's bad enough what ObamaCare will be doing to the seniors in making it difficult for them to find the care they need in the years to come unless we repeal ObamaCare—but now we have to deal with fugitives coming in from Mexico because they were willing to invest money that the Mexican authorities allege was stolen, embezzled money.

At some point, it is time to stop hurting American citizens who have contributed and who have been law-abiding for their lives. It's time the government became a proper referee and quit trying to divide America, quit trying to be the player, the coach and the referee and got back into the business of making sure Americans are treated fairly, that Americans are protected from outside evil forces—those who want to harm us and destroy our way of life. It's time to get the United States Government back into the business of providing for the common defense, of making sure there is a level playing field, of encouraging competition, not rewarding cronies who have some wild-eyed scheme of something that they call "green energy" while the rest of America can't even fill up their gas tanks.

It is time to do the job that is given to Congress, that is given to the President in the Constitution; and once we

get back to that and concentrate on doing that well, America could make another 200 years.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2129

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) at 9 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MOORE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 3 p.m. on account of official business in the district.

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. 1162. An act to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 16, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5004. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trichoderma virens strain G-41; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0053; FRL-9333-5] received January 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5005. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility for Repealing Its Floodplain Management Regulations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0020] received January 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5006. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration,

transmitting the Administration's final rule — New Worth and Equity Ratio (RIN: 3133-AD87) received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5007. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Corporate Credit Unions (RIN: 3313-AD95) received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5008. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Covered Securities of Bats Exchange, Inc. [Release No.: 33-9295; File No.: S7-31-11] (RIN: 3235-AL20) received January 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5009. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Maryland; Determination of Nonattainment and Reclassification of the Baltimore 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0681-201124; FRL-9625-3] received January 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5010. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nonconformance Penalties for On-highway Heavy Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines [AMS-FRL-9623-8] received January 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5011. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval, Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0913; FRL-9625-5] received January 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5012. 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; Virginia; Amendments to Virginia's Regulation Regarding the Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0731; FRL-9625-8] received January 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5013. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; San Joaquin Valley; Attainment Plan for 1997 8-hour Ozone Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0589; FRL-9624-5] received January 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5014. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; South Coast; Attainment Plan for 1997 8-hour Ozone Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0622; FRL-9624-6] received January 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5015. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFIS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Amendments to the Queen Conch and Reef Fish Fishery Management Plans of Puerto