

they've worked very hard not to have one. Their businesses aren't subjected ever to a sales tax audit if they don't have to collect a sales tax. So I think he's too modest in not reminding us that he's coming from the State of Montana that has no sales tax.

This Marketplace Fairness Act could be called the "Offshore Online Retailers Act," because, while as Congressmen and Senators we can force the States to collect these taxes, we can't go into other countries and force them to collect taxes. So what will happen is a lot of our online retailers will move across the border where they enjoy the advantage of collecting those sales taxes, and there's no way to reach them and impose that tax upon them.

Now, some say this is not a new tax, don't call it a new tax, while others say that it's not a tax increase, don't call this a tax increase. Well, I say if it quacks like a duck and it walks like a duck, it's a duck. I'm new to Congress, but if at the end of a transaction, I have less money in my wallet and the government has the money in their coffers, I call it a tax.

Now, some will say, look, consumers already owe this tax. At the end of the year on April 15, they are supposed to pay the sales tax that wasn't collected in other States. But do you know what? That's just not true. They don't owe a sales tax because States long ago conceded that they don't have any authority to tax an event which occurs outside of their physical borders. They just can't do it without a physical presence. But States resented that they couldn't tax in other States, so they created something called a use tax. I say the use tax is actually a contrived tax. They know they can't tax an event outside of their borders, so they try to tax an event inside of their borders, which is the use of a product. But it's contrived in the sense that it's only owed if you didn't pay a tax on it somewhere else already.

So what kind of a tax is that? I'll tell you what it is: it's an uncollectible tax. And the States haven't exerted much effort in collecting that tax. We are not here to become tax collectors for the States. I just want to remind the States that.

Also, I want to talk a little bit more about my district. A large portion of my district is rural. We don't have stores to buy everything that we would like to be able to purchase. A lot of folks go online. A lot of folks are disabled and can't get to the store to go online. This is a regressive tax. This will punish those individuals who have the least mobility because they're online shopping. It also diminishes opportunities for businesses in rural areas by taxing those businesses that weren't taxed before that don't have a ready marketplace immediately in their vicinity.

Look, we've heard from Big Business, we've heard from lobbyists, and we've heard from State governments. But there's somebody absent from this de-

bate so far, and it's our constituents. I think we need to hear from them. And with that, and to address that issue, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and I would just add to your comments. You started by talking about federalism, the ability to kind of choose different tax laws, whatever laws, and this would actually facilitate higher taxes. It's a thumb on the scale in favor of higher taxes because it gives States the wherewithal to tax beyond their borders. So we should at least be trying to go in the other direction. I want Florida to be more like Montana, not more like some of the other high-tax States. And so that bears repeating.

Here are some of the folks who have written in via Twitter with their thoughts. Chris writes in:

Please tell the House that #InternetTax translates into higher costs for families and consumers. A weak economy cannot afford this.

Andrew writes in:

This will just be the 21st-century version of Smoot-Hawley. Will the lunacy from D.C. never cease?

Jay writes in and says:

The Internet tax is an inappropriate extension of the State's powers. It does not make commerce more fair.

Another fellow writes in and says:

It's a revenue grab, plain and simple. No taxation without representation. Is that vague?

Tiffany Lyle says:

If you tax the Internet, it's like taxing air. We work hard enough to earn what little we have.

And then Glenn writes in:

Remind them of how the Stamp Act went.

I have some more, but I will yield back to the gentleman from Kentucky because I know you probably have some more comments, as well.

Mr. MASSIE. Well, those comments bring up a very good point, and so do your comments. If this is a finger on the scale for higher taxes, States get to arbitrate and decide what gets taxed in their State. So right now we have exemptions for farm products and whatnot, but some States tax professional services in the transaction. And, of course, this bill opens up financial service transactions in one State to consumers in another State. But where does this end?

Senator BAUCUS stated in the other Chamber that not just the financial world would be open to taxes on their services, but also possibly attorneys, architects, engineers and accountants. One can only imagine, by not asking the States to do anything to simplify their system in return for the benefit of having out-of-state businesses collect taxes for them, we're giving carte blanche to the States to impose even more taxes on business.

Again, I think I'd like to hear a few more comments from our constituents.

Mr. DESANTIS. We do have some more.

Cory writes in:

I feel it may hinder an online business I've just started. It's already making business pay.

Mark says:

#InternetTax won't help local stores, but will protect online incumbents from new competition.

Taylor Neuhaus writes in and says:

I like the #InternetTax about as much as I like getting teeth pulled.

We have another fellow writes in and says:

It hurts small businesses, and it's basically Walmart vs. Amazon with consumers in the middle.

Finally, I think this is a great comment from Ian Stumpf:

An Internet tax will hurt one of the few remaining healthy sectors of the economy #disastrous.

□ 1940

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for sharing that with us. I think all too often we don't listen as much to our constituents as we should; and on this issue, it's very important because those are in fact the people who are going to bear the burden of this new tax. And I will call it a new tax. It's unprecedented in our Constitution and in the history of this country.

I want to end this discussion tonight the way it began and the way I said it would end. No single individual who's a proponent of this tax has told me that it's going to help the economy. In fact, when I point out that it will increase taxes on consumers, when it will increase the burden on small businesses, and when it will apply pressure to offshore or online retailers, they all ultimately concede those points. This is not good for our country.

The resistance to this bill comes from our constituents, and it's also bipartisan as well. So hopefully by bringing light to this today, we will begin the conversation, begin the debate that all too often doesn't happen out in the open and shed some light on this issue.

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

## THE IRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, do we live in a banana republic? Are we living under a tin horn dictatorship? I mean, just this evening the IRS Acting Chief Steve Miller resigned. I suppose that's damage control, that's how we're going to fix this—you know, heads are going to roll.

Just recently, Mr. MILLER wrote to Members of Congress at least twice to explain the process of reviewing applications for tax exempt status without disclosing that Tea Party groups had been targeted. So it's nothing new. As a matter of fact, in July of last year he

testified before the House Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee and didn't mention it, he didn't mention the additional scrutiny. I'm sure it must have slipped his mind. Oh, that's right, it couldn't have slipped his mind because he was asked about it specifically.

Now we're supposed to trust these answers that are forthcoming at this time and are continuing to be revised. But initially—and falsely—they claimed that the practice of flagging conservative groups for additional scrutiny was contained to low-level staffers at a Cincinnati office. First we heard it was a couple hundred, or 75, and then 200, and now it's like 500. I mean, how much do we trust someone that continues to change their story? And if it was low-level folks at the agency, how come the guy at the top just resigned? I mean, I understand that the buck stops there, but does the buck stop there—or should it stop there?

According to the report by the Inspector General, they knew about the problem by June 2011. I mean, they knew about it. They're testifying in front of Members of Congress and misleading Members of Congress. Forget Members of Congress, what about the American people? What about the people in these organizations, God-fearing, tax-paying Americans that were targeted, what about them?

According to the IG report, the IRS was not only targeting Tea Party organizations; it was going after groups focused on government spending, government debt, taxes, and education on ways to make America a better place to live. Really? I mean, maybe I'm being targeted because I'm looking through that list and I think those are things I stand for. I think those are things that most of my constituents stand for.

It also started targeting groups criticizing the government or educating Americans about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Since when is it a problem to criticize your government? I mean, isn't that one of the fundamental things that this Nation was founded on? And now we're going to have the IRS come after us. And is it bad that we educate Americans about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights? Is that a bad thing? Apparently—according to the IRS—it is.

The use of the IRS to target political opponents of an administration is one of the greatest dangers of the tremendous power of this Federal agency. I mean, I asked, are we living in a banana republic? Is this a tin horn dictatorship, because certainly this can't happen in America. These are things that happen in these other small rogue nations where there are political dissidents that come to America to escape persecution.

So what's next for us in America? If it starts here, does it end with then us going to jail as political dissenters against some ideals that the administration currently in power has?

I'm going to read an excerpt of the Federal law, 26 U.S. Code 7217. It prohibits any employee of the Executive Office of the President and Vice President, as well as Cabinet Secretaries, from requesting, directly or indirectly, that the IRS investigate any particular taxpayer with respect to the tax liability of such taxpayer.

It is important for the rule of law and the interest of justice that the Congress aggressively pursue its oversight function to get to the bottom of the scandal. We don't want to just get to the bottom of the scandal so we can make sure it never happens again. I mean, that's what we so often hear. We need to find out who instigated it and who authorized it, because it is very hard for us to believe that these were just some low-level employees that, you know, took it upon themselves.

And I must ask everybody, what is their impetus? What is their motivation to do that? What low-level employee would take it upon him or herself to say, well, we're going to start investigating Tea Party groups and groups with the name "patriot" in their organization. What's in it for them? And I suspect you're having a hard time coming up with the answer, just as I am.

How long has this been going on? Well, apparently it started in February of 2010, and it lasted for about 27 months. The last appeal that was approved was in Champaign, Illinois, in February of 2010. So if you think back to February, what was happening in February of 2010? Well, first of all, if you own an iPad right now, you couldn't get one in February of 2010 because there were none available; it wasn't on the market. If you remember back then, there was a volcano over Iceland that was stopping air travel to Europe. There was the Freshwater Horizon that blew up in the gulf, killing many workers and destroying the environment or contaminating the environment in the gulf. That's how long ago this has happened. That's how long this has been going on. And that's how long people in this administration knew about it and said nothing.

You know, I don't know what this means for Tea Party organizations and patriot groups and the like. I mean, if I quote Julian Bond, the former head of the NAACP, he calls the Tea Party the Taliban of American politics. I would suggest to you that they're exactly opposite that, and the actions of the administration are more keeping with Taliban-like tactics. I mean, these folks are continually ridiculed for being, oh, opposed to government intrusion in their lives, and worrying about conspiracies, and what kind of personal things about them the government is looking into and what they're doing with it. And it's all very conspiratorial, and they're seen as kind of kookie whack jobs. Apparently they're right. Who knew?

During this same period of time, interestingly, a director in the IRS fast-

tracked an application for the President's half-brother. That took 1 month. It took 1 month. Meanwhile, 27 months went by where organizations with the name "Tea Party" or "patriot" couldn't receive the same consideration.

Did front-line employees do this? Again, I've got to question that. It just doesn't add up. Again, day by day we hear more and more. I mean, the first thing that came out recently was that rogue employees did this—and at one point only one employee. Really? One employee out of 106,000 that work at the IRS, that's what we're supposed to believe?

Are we supposed to change our trust level and our belief level every day as new reports come out with new information that countervails the information of the day before? I mean, we've got to ask—the government asks its citizens all kinds of information, whether you're a farmer and the Agriculture Department forces you to do a survey, complete a survey under penalty of law.

And folks call up their Congressman. They call me up in the district office and they say: Why must I fill this out? Why do they need all this information? What is this relevant information? That's the Ag Department census. And maybe it's fair; maybe it's not. I take issue with it. But in this case, I really take issue with it because in this application and in their findings, the IRS findings, they looked at what books Members were reading. Are we going to have a book burning next?

□ 1950

They looked at Facebook posts, resumes of officers, minutes of meetings since the organizations' inception. And I ask you, what does any of that have to do with your tax status? Or does it have to do with something else? Does it have to do with your political status and who you may disagree with?

Thirty-one organizations' information was released to organizations like ProPublica—31 organizations. Maybe that's the beginning of that, and maybe we don't know the extent of how many other organizations were leaked this information. What did they do with it? Did they maybe use it to target candidates in political elections to make sure that they lost because they disagreed with their ideology?

We understand that we oftentimes disagree on ideology on policy, but we expect a fair and level playing field, and we certainly expect the government to provide that. That's the government's role. That's one of the government's core missions. In this case, obviously, the government was working for one team and decidedly against the other team. What does that mean to all Americans?

Some applications were under review at the IRS for 3 years, yet you could sue the IRS after 270 days for inaction. For 3 years these things went dormant. So who's responsible?

We have had a host of scandals in this town from time immemorial. This administration is really at some point no different than the next, but on one point I think it has been so far: nobody is ever responsible. People take responsibility, but there's no accountability, and no heads really roll. Nothing happens to anyone.

Finally, there is a firing here and we're not sure this guy had anything to do with it. But I would ask you this:

The President says that he finds out this information that you find out in the public on the same day you find it out. Mr. Speaker, that seems odd to me. He's the President. He's the leader of the country. We know that he can't know every little thing in every agency. He can't know that, and we don't expect him to know that. That is why he hires top people, smart people to run those organizations for him. But he is the leader of the country, and when this is going on for a couple of years and they know about it, shouldn't we be concerned that he doesn't know anything about it? I mean, is that a failure of leadership? I think that's a great question. And I think that it is bad that our President says that he doesn't know, and that he truly doesn't know. I don't see that as a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, the American public increasingly has a trust issue with this administration, which is now in damage control, and we understand that they have to be. But, Mr. Speaker, while they are in damage control, is the people's business, the legitimate people's business being conducted right now? Where is their focus? Where was their focus on these issues when they could have been stopped or averted, and where is it now and what is the cost of that?

And I would also say to you this: as a person who has lead organizations myself, at the top is where the culture starts. The person at the top, he or she determines the culture of that whole organization. The people within that organization survive or do not survive by going along and learning to fit in with that culture. If everything below that starts eroding, you can only, at some point, look towards the top.

I would submit to you under the current scenario of the last week's events that we might really be seeing the advent of the evidence of a culture of corruption that has been going on for more than just a few days. Let's just go through a couple of them. I know you know it is coming.

It started with Fast and Furious, and I can tell you that I don't feel like I've gotten the answers. I don't think the American people have gotten the answers that they have been looking for. I certainly don't think that justice has been served for those folks and, in particular, the one agent on the border who lost his life over that.

And, of course, there's Benghazi, which information continues to come out even as we speak, including emails today that show that the State Depart-

ment and the White House changed the intelligence talking points. Changed them why? Why change them? Why not tell the American people what happened, especially when apparently you know what happened? Is it because it shouldn't have happened and it didn't have to happen, but there was inaction when something could have changed? We heard that, well, we couldn't get folks there in time. We can do a lot of things in this town, but one thing I haven't seen anybody be able to do is to predict the future.

I don't know who in the White House or who in the Department of State predicted that the attack would only last so long. Years ago, when I was a little kid, I watched hostages in Iran being taken, and that lasted for well over a year, 470-some days or something like that.

How did we know, how did the Department of State, how did the White House know that this wasn't going to be the same scenario and these folks weren't going to be held captive for years and years and the United States held hostage? They just assumed whatever they assumed, I guess.

It is just interesting. We don't know the President's whereabouts during that period of time. I don't know if we will ever know. But it is interesting that there is no culpability, there is no accountability. Folks at the State Department, we were told, well, there were some low-level folks that were responsible for the security misfortune and missteps at the consulate and they have been reassigned. Four people are dead. Families don't know why their children died—their brothers, their sisters, their husbands, their fathers—they don't know to what end, and they still don't know. If we left it up to this administration, who keeps on stonewalling and just metering out the information only as fast as we can pull it out of them, they may never know.

Is it embarrassing? Americans are forgiving. If a mistake was made in good faith, a mistake was made. We are all human. But was a mistake made in good faith or was a mistake made—scratch that. Was it a precalculated decision for political purposes? And, if it was, that is, indeed, reprehensible. I'm sure that is, indeed, embarrassing and there will be a cost to that. So maybe that is the motivation we don't know.

And then there is the Justice Department wiretaps at the AP. The Attorney General recused himself. He recused himself. He recused himself of what? I'm not sure the timeline there. Does that mean he knew that the Justice Department was going to tap the AP, one of the largest wire services in the world? Did he know and say, well, there is an investigation going on so I'm going to stay out of it and he left it to his deputy?

We don't know what to trust, but I can tell you this. According to the Department of Justice, their media subpoena requirement is:

The approval of the Attorney General is required before a government attorney can

issue a subpoena to a member of the news media.

That is not my words. That comes right from 28 CFR 50.10.

Fifty-two major media organizations have spoken out against this. This is not a liberal/conservative thing. This is a freedom of the press. This is an issue that crosses all lines.

The press Shield Act has been introduced in the Senate. It was introduced a couple of years ago when Democrats held the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. Now it is being reintroduced and retouted. Oh, really? If it was so important—if it is so important now, why didn't you pass it then? Why did you wait until now to reintroduce it and make a big deal of it?

I would suggest to you that that is more damage control. It is more political gamesmanship and trying to just smooth over a bad situation.

The Justice Department wiretaps at the AP led right to this House gallery. And I wonder about jurisdictional issues. Doesn't the Executive Office have a separation of powers duty? Can the Executive Office wiretap the House of Representatives?

And what about the Senate? Isn't it curious that the House of Representatives is controlled by the majority party, which is Republicans, so the wiretaps come here, but they don't go to the Senate, where arguably most of the reporters hang out because that is where things are really happening most of the day, but no wiretaps there? I guess it is just a coincidence, Mr. Speaker.

Let's move on. Health and Human Services Secretary Sebelius out soliciting funds to pay for ObamaCare. Is that appropriate or is that not a little scandalous? Is she shaking them down? Are we just now waiting for the next shoe to drop on that and to get some information about that?

There's another one waiting in the wings as we speak, the EPA. Fees for FOIA requests. Freedom of Information Act requests are normally waived for philanthropic and public policy-oriented organizations. And, of course, they were waived for 92 percent of green groups friendly with the EPA. Interestingly, during the same period of time, the fees were universally applied to conservative groups.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, we have a trust issue. We've had a trust issue in the House of Representatives with the administration for some time, and the American people are starting to realize that they, too, have a trust issue. It is unfortunate. It is unfortunate because, at a time when Congress is, generally speaking, still pretty close to an all-time low in approval rating, what we need is uplifting things from the most transparent organization in history to make sure that the American people know that they can trust their government even though they don't always agree. Sometimes they disagree with

policy, but if it's out front—if you give somebody your rationale, if you tell him this is why I think we should do what we should do—a citizen says, I don't agree, but you're our leader, so go ahead.

We don't lie to the American people. We don't hide things from the American people. We don't watch Americans die and do nothing about it and then lie about it after the fact. We don't mislead Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it's the most critical time during these times for the administration to fully come clean on everything. Be up front on everything. Don't parse the information, because all that will serve to do is to erode the trust of the American people further day by day, not only in the administration, but in the halls of all of government institutions from the top to the bottom.

We as Americans are right to be cynical of our government. We are right to, and we have a right to be cynical. It's not a bad thing. We have the right to question, and we should question—that's how answers come—but we shouldn't have to question the trust. Questioning motives, questioning policies, those are apt things, but not wondering why the government is collecting information to give to the IRS.

Why would you give it to the IRS? Why did the IRS need that information? Was it to get more taxes? Why do they need to know what books you're reading? The IRS can put people in jail, folks. Are we looking towards a time when we put people in jail for reading the wrong books? for thinking the wrong things? for opposing the ruling powers? That is something for another world. That is something from another world, another country.

This is America. These things do not happen here. These things should not happen here. Yet these things, apparently and sadly, have happened here.

It is time for the administration to lay everything on the table so that we know where we stand, so that we can get past this and get back to the business of governance. We have slow economic growth. People are struggling. People have lost their jobs. People will continue to lose their jobs. Bills are going up, and paychecks are going down. That's what we need to be focusing on.

We are held hostage by foreign governments who own our debt. We are held hostage by foreign governments who hold energy supplies while we're standing right on top of them in America. Those are the policies we need to be discussing, not whether our government misled us about Benghazi; whether they misled us about wiretaps; whether they misled us about Fast and Furious; whether they misled us about Health and Human Services and what they're doing with shaking down companies for money for ObamaCare; whether they're going to mislead us about the EPA and fees charged to certain organizations only; and certainly, the IRS' targeting of certain individ-

uals for what they think and what they say.

There is no place for that in America. We need to get back to the people's business, and we need to do it right fast.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

#### 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. 360. An act to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where there 4 little Black girls' ultimate sacrifice served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 15, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 360. To award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where these 4 little Black girls' ultimate sacrifice served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### 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 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

MARK SANFORD, First District of South Carolina.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1487. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on National Guard Counterdrug Schools Activities, pursuant to Public Law 109-469, section 901(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1488. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Program Integrity Issues [Docket ID: ED-2010-OPE-0004] (RIN: 1840-AD02) received April 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1489. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Higher Education Programs, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities; Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) College Savings Account Research Demonstration Project [CFDA Number: 84.334D.] received April 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1490. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablock Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1491. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 113—25); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1492. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 113—26); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1493. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 113—27); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1494. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendment to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28