

leaks—he had ever seen. Turns out all of the leaks that allow him to go after a conservative group or to intimidate a group like the AP, to them they're egregious. When we find out, Mr. Speaker, he could have just looked at the records of a handful of people in the administration—he chose not to do that, it might have embarrassed the administration—he abuses the freedom of the press.

It's time that people who are responsible are made accountable.

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

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives to raise the issues of our time and have this opportunity for this dialogue that I know that you turn a focused ear to, as well as do the other Members, their staff, and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor here, one thing is to support the statement made by the gentleman from Texas across the spectrum of the topics that he addressed. He does see the world through a clear set of eyes and isn't afraid to say so, and we need more Members like Congressman GOHMERT, who is fearless and courageous and a constitutionalist and a rule of law Member, and he understands the Constitution and the law, being an attorney and a judge and a member in good standing of the Judiciary Committee for a number of years now, where one can learn a few things about those topics, as well as bring their own expertise in.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's the committee, the Judiciary Committee, where the immigration issue is likely to process through—or up to and, perhaps, not through.

□ 1410

There is a tremendous amount of, I will say, a hurry up, urgency momentum that has been created on the immigration issue over in the United States Senate. We can count it in hours the time that it has been since the Senate passed, I call it, an amnesty bill, a comprehensive immigration reform bill, which is the more modern vernacular for "amnesty." That's phraseology that was manufactured by people who couldn't quite bring themselves to say the truth on this, and that was the case back in 2006 and 2007 when it was George W. Bush and his people who were pushing this comprehensive immigration reform-amnesty.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, was that we had an election last November, on November 6 to be precise, a Tuesday

we would all know. There was a great expectation that Republicans would win the majority in the United States Senate and a great expectation that our Republican nominee, Mitt Romney, would be elected as President because, after all, who could imagine a second term for a man who refused to carry out his oath of office in his first term.

So the voters went to the polls, and there was a bit of a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the people on my side of the aisle, and a good number of them stayed home, a number that is calculated to be about 8 million voters; and about a million voters who normally would have voted for Barack Obama stayed home, but that's more than the difference between the election in the popular vote, and it may well have translated into a difference in the election in the electoral vote.

However, we know what happened in the election. The President was re-elected. There were some seats that were lost by Republicans, a net seat lost by Republicans in the Senate. Republicans lost some seats here in the House, but maintained still a strong majority in the House and would expect to do so at least into the foreseeable future.

But the results of that election were overreacted to by many people on my side of the aisle. They looked around and asked, How did we lose? Of course, the people who were the architects of these kinds of campaigns wouldn't want to take on the blame themselves, so they looked around to see where they could cast the blame elsewhere. They settled upon this theory in the middle of the night, so I would say it was in the morning, which started at 12:01 a.m. on the morning of November 7, 2012.

That theory that they settled on was that Mitt Romney would be President-elect that morning and President today if he just had not been so strident on immigration, if he just had not said those two words: self-deport. Their theory was that that was the reason that Mitt Romney is not the President today.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I think that's a manufactured theory, that it's a flawed theory, that it's not based on fact, in polling, in logic. If it's likely true that the Hispanic votes were the decision-maker on this election and then if the Hispanic vote went 71 percent for Barack Obama, I would ask those folks who think that you'd turn that vote around the other way by passing amnesty. Can you tell us how it is that Republicans can capture a majority of the African American vote when typically African Americans in this country will vote 92 percent for the Democrat or 95 or 96 percent for the Democrat if it's Barack Obama on the ballot?

So, if they can't tell me how one should reach out to the African American vote when we are the party of the abolition of slavery—and I can stand here and tell you my great grandfather

five times great—and for the record, because people get things intentionally confused, that's great, great, great, great, great grandfather—was killed in the Civil War. He was killed in the Civil War, fighting to put an end to slavery. They were an abolitionist family, and 600,000 Americans gave their lives in that struggle to put an end to slavery, roughly half on each side, roughly 300,000 on each side—more on the Union side than actually on the Confederate side by the data that I'm looking at.

Mr. Speaker, the emancipation of the slaves and an end to slavery and the blood that was spilled by the sword that was to be compensated for the blood that was spilled by the lash seems to be forgotten in the political parties of today. When you look to see what it took to pass the Civil Rights Act in the sixties, it took Republicans in greater numbers in the House and Senate to pass the Civil Rights Act than it did Democrats. There were a lot of Southern Democrats who were segregationist Democrats, I would remind people.

Nonetheless, the promise of what's coming out of the U.S. Treasury—and some of it's borrowed money from the Chinese and the Saudis and others—seems to have eroded the support for Republican fiscal conservatives among the certain minority groups in this country and others who are struggling to make a go of it. It's hard for them to see down the line a little ways as to how much more opportunity there is in America if we recreate the opportunity society that is being replaced by the cradle-to-grave welfare state that we have in America today. Not only is it a cradle-to-grave welfare state, but it is a cradle-to-grave welfare state that promises a middle class standard of living.

I look at some of the numbers that have been rolled out by, for example, Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, who is the most accomplished, senior, respected, and definitive researcher on these topics that I know, and I deal with many, many of them. I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the executive summary of about a 102-page report that was issued by Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation. It's a special report dated May 6, 2013, and the title of it is "The Fiscal Cost of Unlawful Immigrants and Amnesty to the U.S. Taxpayer." The data that's in here should cause anyone in this Congress to pause before they would begin to look in any positive way on the Senate bill that is their 844-page comprehensive amnesty bill. Some of this data that's in here, Mr. Speaker, is shocking to people who haven't at least been numbed by the reality of it for some time.

The average illegal household in the interim phase of this bill would be a net cost to the taxpayer. They'd pay taxes and draw down welfare. Some will say that folks who are in this country illegally don't qualify for welfare. No, the truth of that is there are

at least 80 different means-tested welfare programs, and those who are in this country illegally just qualify for some of those 80, not for all of those 80. That is the truth, and it has been often distorted. So the net cost to the taxpayer per household in the interim phase for people who are unlawfully here now and who would be granted the amnesty status by the Senate version of the bill would be \$11,455. That's borrowed against our children's labor, I might add, Mr. Speaker.

After that interim, when they qualify for a larger number of those 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs—"post-interim" is how it's defined by the researcher Robert Rector—then the net cost per household is \$28,000. The taxpayers will be subsidizing these households in the interim for \$11,455, and when they qualify then for more of the welfare benefits, that net cost goes to \$28,000. The average retirement, because they are going to retire just like anyone else, is going to be a net cost to the taxpayers per household of \$22,700.

Robert Rector in his report—and I'm going to quote from it because I think the language is very powerful—says:

Regrettably, many policymakers also believe that because unlawful immigrants are comparatively young they will help relieve the fiscal strains on an aging society.

Regrettably, this is not true. Now here is where I focused on this, Mr. Speaker:

At every stage of the life cycle, unlawful immigrants on average generate fiscal deficits, and that's benefits exceeding taxes. Unlawful immigrants, on average, are always tax consumers. They never once generate a fiscal surplus that can be used to pay for government benefits elsewhere in society. This situation obviously will get much worse after amnesty.

That is an irrefutable fact. There are others who will argue that there is a dynamic economy, and you can calculate this growth and dynamic economy. Well, they're not calculating the cost to society. They accept that we are a cradle-to-grave welfare state.

I've had this debate with Art Laffer, who I have great respect for. He is the author of Ronald Reagan's, I'll call it, "Laffer curve." I agree with that theory to cut taxes and stimulate the economy. That worked when Ronald Reagan came in in the early part of the eighties and was sworn in January of 1981. Art Laffer was there, and I'm glad he was. The economy grew and we recovered, and the Reagan years are looked back on as the transformative years when America was pulled from the abyss of the malaise.

□ 1420

So I give him great credit. Not only that, he's intelligent and he has a fantastic sense of humor. But here's where I disagree with Art Laffer and why I disagree with some people in Cato and why I disagree with the purist of Libertarians is this:

Many of them believe that labor should flow back and forth across the

border as if it were any other commodity like corn, beans, gold, or oil, and that the marketplace will determine where labor will go just like it will determine where you send these other commodities that I've listed.

The flaw in that rationale, Mr. Speaker, was spoken to by Milton Friedman, whom I'm confident Art Laffer knew well and probably had this debate with him. But Milton Friedman, the University of Chicago economist, famed internationally, said a welfare state and open borders cannot coexist. You might actually turn that around the other way, but the principle is the same. Yet we have a cradle-to-grave welfare state that guarantees a middle class income. If you don't work at all, you can draw down enough benefits to live as if you were working at a modest wage.

Milton Friedman understood that, that the welfare magnet will draw people in and they won't have the necessity to work in order to maintain that standard of living because it's being bought down, bid against by the welfare system.

And my debate with Art Laffer came out to be essentially this:

When I make that point to him that open borders and a welfare state cannot coexist, his answer is, Then end the welfare state.

Well, that would be nice if we could do that, Mr. Speaker. If we could at least ratchet it down and take that hammock that used to be a safety net—it was as safety net to keep people from falling through. That was the original welfare system that we had. Now we have people in this Congress that continually ratchet in another program here, another program there, manufacture this one here and that one there. There was only one welfare program out of an entire 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs that required work.

Some of us will remember the intense welfare reform debates in the nineties when this Congress so aggressively and eagerly required the Welfare-to-Work program. Most of us in America have forgotten that the Welfare-to-Work program really was only one program, the TANF program, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. All the rest of them, none of them require that there be work, only TANF. And the President of the United States, even though the law is specific and he doesn't have the constitutional authority to do so, the President of the United States simply waived the work requirements in TANF. So this country now has no requirement of Welfare-to-Work, not even in one of the 80 different means-tested programs that we have.

We're seeing wealth transfer in this country. We're seeing class leveling in this country. We're seeing work and production and wealth punished and extracted from the sweat of someone's brow to pass it into the bank account, or, should I say, the EBT card, of some-

one else. When that happens—John Smith saw that that didn't work. He said, No work, no eat. Jesus said essentially the same thing, that you've got to work and earn your way. It's in numerous places in the Bible. It's in numerous places in our history.

Think about it in your family. If you have one family member that won't do anything, they want to sit on the couch and they want somebody to bring them food and bring them entertainment and they don't want to go out and mow the lawn or carry out the garbage or scrub the floors or do the things that you do around the home, let alone go punch a time clock and earn a living, how long does it take before that family says, I'm tired of that? I'm going to send you out into the world to earn your own way because you're digressing here; you're not developing your skills.

That is the way of the family. It's the way of the tribe. It should be the way of the Nation. Gently and compassionately take care of the people that can't take care of themselves, and nurture those that have an ability to contribute to our GDP out to go contribute to the GDP.

But we've lost that because there's a class-envy wedge that's being driven from the White House on down. It existed before Barack Obama became President. It was driven hard in here when we had the previous Speaker of the House, these class-envy wedges driven in and the effort, because somebody has something more than you have, to take from them and give it to somebody that has less.

Perhaps I can find this while I talk, Mr. Speaker, but that was well-articulated by Adrian Rogers, who has since passed away. But the principle of why people work and why they won't is an important principle to make, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Adrian Rogers was talking about wealth and work and stated:

You cannot legislate the poor into freedom by legislating the wealthy out of freedom. What one person receives without working for, another person must work for without receiving. The government cannot give to anybody anything that the government does not first take from somebody else. When half of the people get the idea that they do not have to work because the other half is going to take care of them, and when the other half gets the idea that it does no good to work because somebody else is going to get what they work for, that, my dear friend, is about the end of any nation. You cannot multiply wealth by dividing it.

That was the late Adrian Rogers, from 1931 to 2005. I never met him, but with clarity, he spoke to this issue, and more articulately than I am able to, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate his contribution to the discussion in our society, but there are people here that see this; they see that there is a political gain to be made by expanding the dependency class in America. So they decide that they're going to punish the rich, tax the rich.

Remember, the tax rates had to go up on the upper-income bracket. That was

a demand of the President of the United States. He could have gotten just as much revenue by cleaning up the loopholes and it would have given a more balanced tax plan than we have, but he had to raise the taxes on the highest bracket because that was a notch in his belt, a feather in his cap to punish the rich.

There's been a political gain to do that. That's been the motive because it gathers votes and it expands the dependency class. When you do that, that keeps people dependent upon one party with one-party rule. And this country and this society has one place where we block bad ideas. That's here in the House of Representatives where there is a Republican majority, where there's still a majority of us, I believe, that support and will defend free enterprise capitalism.

Anybody that's going to take the naturalization test to become a citizen of the United States can go look at the flashcards that CIS—Citizen Immigration Services—hand out. They're a glossy flashcard like that on a red backing, and you can pick them up. On one side it will say, Who's the father of our country? Flip it over, George Washington. Who emancipated the slaves? Abraham Lincoln. What's the economic system of the United States of America? Flip that over, and it says, Free enterprise capitalism.

Newly arriving immigrants, to-be-naturalized citizens study that and know that, but I suspect there are a whole lot of people over on this side of the aisle that, if they know that, they don't believe it. They don't understand how supply and demand is answered by the marketplace, how people need to be rewarded for the work that they do.

I take you back, Mr. Speaker, to 1976 when Jimmy Carter, one of the least successful Presidents in our history, said something that I'm happy to quote. He said this in Iowa, as he traveled all over Iowa and made the first-in-the-Nation caucus an effective venue for Presidential candidates. He said:

I believe the people that work should live better than those that don't.

That's probably going to be labeled "offensive" in today's Congress. But it was Jimmy Carter's statement back then in 1976, and I believe it.

And we have people in this party, my party, that looked at that theory that popped up in the early morning hours of November 7 and concluded, We're never going to win another Presidential election, another national election if we don't first pass comprehensive immigration reform. That's based on Barack Obama getting 71 percent of the Hispanic vote because that number has—it's gone up and down, but it's crept up for Democrats over time.

What they have forgotten is that tens of millions of dollars and very much organizational effort has been put into it by the Democrats to call Republicans racists; and my colleagues on my side of the aisle, they seem to disregard all

of that money spent, all of those dishonesties perpetrated. They think that if it exists at all, it didn't have any effect. It all was just those two words that Mitt Romney said, "self-deport."

□ 1430

We need to look at the actual facts. The actual facts are Bob Dole had the lowest percentage of Hispanic vote when he ran for President in '96. It was 21 percent. It is also true that Ronald Reagan, who signed an amnesty act in 1986, didn't get George H.W. Bush, Bush 41, a higher percentage of the Hispanic vote. It got him a lower percentage of the Hispanic vote.

If they're going to correlate this thing, I tell you, here's how you correlate it, Mr. Speaker, and it's this:

There were about 800,000 people that originally were to qualify for the amnesty in 1986 that Ronald Reagan signed. That number crept up to about a million. That's kind of the settled historical number. There were about a million that were here that fit the qualifications to receive amnesty from the '86 act that Reagan was honest enough to call the Amnesty Act.

And then once he signed that bill, then there was document fraud and people who came across the border. The magnet of amnesty drew more people in, and that number now, the lowest number that I see of those who received amnesty in 1986, or from the 1986 Amnesty Act, is about 2.7 million people. A lot of times you see 3 million as the quote. It'll go up to 3.5. Well, let's just settle on 3 million people.

If 3 million people received amnesty under Ronald Reagan's 1986 Amnesty Act, and then on average each of them—and this is data that can be chased down, and bigger numbers than I'm about to quote are available out there in certain studies, but on average a low number for family members brought in because of those that received amnesty is about a factor of five, or a little bit more. So let's just hold it down on the low end.

Three million received amnesty. They averaged bringing in five people by the family reunification plans that are there. Now, that's 15 million people. Some of them have died, and some perhaps have gone back to their home country, but there are a large block of voters there that have shifted over to vote for whom, Mr. Speaker? Barack Obama. Barack Obama.

I will make this statement. If the theory of those who believe that they can reverse the trend of Hispanic vote, if their theory is correct, then I would suggest to them, if they can provide amnesty and somebody is going to benefit from that, if their theory is correct, they have to admit that Ronald Reagan's signature on the 1986 Amnesty Act brought about Barack Obama's election. If you take those numbers of people out of the polls and you calculate that percentage of 71 percent—so let's just say we take 15 mil-

lion people out of the rolls and say they wouldn't have been here without the 1986 Amnesty Act, or at least they wouldn't be voting, and if 71 percent of them voted for Barack Obama, then it's clear to anybody that can do any kind of statistical analysis that Barack Obama wouldn't be President of the United States without Ronald Reagan's 1986 Amnesty Act.

And if that's the case, then how do the people on my side of the aisle think they're going to fix that problem? If it was created by amnesty, you create a bigger problem by amnesty by a factor of, let's say, four. And I'm just rounding 3 million times up to about 12 million, or 2.7 times 4 gets you in that 11.5 million range.

That's the facts of what we're dealing with here, Mr. Speaker. They've suspended their logic. They've suspended their reason. They've suspended their ability to look at data, surveys, polls. They've suspended their respect for the intelligence of the American people who honestly want to see the rule of law.

And all of us have compassion for all humanity, and I believe in the dignity of every human person. It's commanded by my faith. But also, when those who use religion to advocate for amnesty say, "For I was a stranger, and you let me in," Matthew 25:35, when you look at the interpretation, you have to go back to the Greek. "Stranger" in English, in Greek is "xenos." Xenos in Greek means invited friend, invited guest. It doesn't mean intruder. There's no religious commandment that says when someone comes into your house that you have to welcome them in. You're not commanded by God to do so. That's why we have a man's home is his castle. That's why we have nation-states with borders.

In fact, it says in Act 17:

And God created all nations on Earth, and he decided when and where each nation would be.

That's his commandment. And I'd suggest to those people that say to us, "For I was a stranger, and you let me in," they should understand also what Jesus said when they tried to trick him on that question about whether to pay taxes or not. And they showed him the coin and he said:

Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and render unto God the things that are God's.

Civil mercy is not something that can be delivered by religion, and mercy is not something to be delivered by government. We have civil law. Civil laws are set up by the judgment of the people. That's why we have penalties that are written into these laws, and that needs to be applied evenly. And, yes, people can have their dignity and still respect our laws; but somehow, some of the religious movement in the country believes that mercy should be delivered by civil law, that we can grant amnesty in the name of mercy to give a legal status to people here that

are unlawfully here in the United States.

And so I'd ask them to go back and peruse through their Bible, Old and New Testament, and show me where the word "mercy" is used. And wherever mercy is advocated in the Bible, next to it you will see the word "repentance." Mercy is never delivered biblically without repentance as a prerequisite, a requirement.

I don't see repentance out here in the people advocating for U.S. citizenship and the reward for that, but I can tell you, they and their descendants will remember who offered it, as they did in 1986.

And when the President of the United States came to the Republican Conference and he said to us, You must pass comprehensive immigration reform as Republicans or you will never win another national election; I'm trying to help you—that's the President of the United States. He's not trying to help Republicans.

We have some people who will take the bait on that, and the hook has already been set and they're trying to reel that amnesty bill over from the Senate and line it up here in the House of Representatives. It will split this party in half. It will pit Republicans against Republicans. The Democrats know that. That is a clear tactic in politics to divide the other party down an issue if you can. Republicans are falling for that. We should not take up anything until the President keeps his oath of office and enforces the laws that we have.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), I am pleased to re-appoint of The Honorable Betty McCollum of Minnesota to the National Council on the Arts.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today until 11:15 a.m. on account of a family obligation.

Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of traveling to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, to serve as the senior guest speaker for the 82nd Airborne's All-American Week Division Review.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 24, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1596. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Horse Protection Act; Requiring Horse Industry Organizations to Assess and Enforce Minimum Penalties for Violations; Correction [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0030] (RIN: 0579-AD43) received May 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1597. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: System for Award Management Name Changes, Phase 1 Implementation (DFARS Case 2012-D035) (RIN: 0750-AH87) received May 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1598. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Government Support Contractor Access to Technical Data (DFARS 2009-D031) (RIN: 0750-AG38) received May 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1599. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Clarification of "F" Orders in the Procurement Instrument Identification Number Structure (DFARS Case 2012-D040) (RIN: 0750-AH80) received May 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1600. A letter from the Director, Office of Public and Congressional Affairs, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting NCUA 2012 Financial Statement Audits for Temporary Corporate Credit Union Stabilization Fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1601. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems Centers Collaborative Research Project [CFDA Numbers: 84.133A-7.] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1602. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Immi-

grants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended (RIN: 1400-AC86) received May 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1603. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1604. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for *Eriogonum codium* (Umtanum Desert Buckwheat) and *Physaria douglasii* subsp. *tuplashensis* (White Bluffs Bladderpod) [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2012-0017] (RIN: 1018-AX72) received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1605. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Eriogonum codium* (Umtanum Desert Buckwheat) and *Physaria douglasii* subsp. *tuplashensis* (White Bluffs Bladderpod) [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2013-0012] (RIN: 1018-AZ54) received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1606. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2013 and 2014 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications [Docket No.: 130104009-3416-02] (RIN: 0648-XC432) received May 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1607. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 50 [Docket No.: 130219149-3397-02] (RIN: 0648-BC97) received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1608. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Three Synthetic Cannabinoids Into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-373] received May 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1609. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tentative Eligibility Determinations; Presumptive Eligibility for Psychosis and Other Mental Illness (RIN: 2900-AN87) received May 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1610. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Proportional method for OID on pools of credit card receivables (Revenue Procedure 2013-26) received May 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1611. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule