seen since the drawdown in the aftermath of World War II. So we hear a lot about fiscal irresponsibility directed at the White House, notwithstanding the fact that this White House has presided over a near historic level of deficit reduction.

Invest in the economy.

The second thing that is important is that we should get rid of some wasteful corporate loopholes that have outlived their usefulness. We can just close or change or modify some of the benefits that oil and gas companies have received. They are making record profits. There is no reason for the loopholes and the benefits and the subsidies that exist right now. If we just were to address them, we could save the American people $25 billion over the next 10 years. If we were to change some of the loopholes that actually incentivize companies to move jobs overseas, we could save the American people $168 billion over the next 10 years.

If there is such a moral imperative not to saddle our children with the debt burden that we have in America, if that is such a moral imperative, can't we not agree upon a single loophole that can be closed in the name of the children and the grandchildren of America? Not one?

That is what we believe is the right thing to do here in the CBC.

□ 2115

The third thing that, I think, is part of a balanced approach to dealing with the budget and a reduction in the deficit has to do with making some spending cuts where appropriate, but we have got to do it in a manner that is sensitive to the fragile nature of the economy. I think all of us on this side of the aisle are willing to concede that there are probably some areas in which efficiencies can be found in the name of fiscal responsibility for the American people. Spending reduction sensitive to the fragile nature of our recovery should be part of any balanced approach in dealing with the problems that we face in America.

Lastly, we in the CBC certainly believe that any budget agreement has to stand up for important social safety net programs in America, like Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid—programs that have been phenomenally successful, particularly in reducing poverty amongst older Americans. It is unfortunate because there are times when these programs—Social Security and Medicare—are unfairly demonized and are made part of deficit reduction talks even if the facts suggest they don't necessarily have a place in that regard. Social Security, for instance, remains a solvent program at this moment and into the foreseeable future. Social Security has nothing to do with the deficit. That, in fact, was a statement that Ronald Reagan made in 1984 in a debate with Walter Mondale. It was true then, and it is true almost 30 years later.

Now, when you think about the attack on our social safety net programs and on the obsessive desire to change—decimate—so-called entitlement programs, often this discussion is raised in the context of the enormous debt problem that we have in America—$16.7 trillion. Certainly it is a problem that we have got to confront in this country, but what also is often not clear is the fact that spending on so-called entitlement programs really does not account for the debt problem that we confront in America. This is what this poster board and the chart so clearly illustrate.

In fact, much of the debt that we currently confront in this America can be tied directly to policies emanating from the 8 years that George W. Bush was at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. More than half of our debt can be traced to the failed war in Iraq—totally unjustified in search of weapons of mass destruction that still haven't been found and never will be found. The debt can be tied to the war in Afghanistan and to the fact that it was mis-prosecuted as a result of being distracted by the joyride that took place in Iraq, costing lives and American treasure. The debt problem can be traced to the Bush tax cuts passed in this Congress in 2001 and 2003 without being paid for.

Then, of course, was the laissez-faire attitude toward Wall Street, resulting in reckless behavior by some that collapsed the economy, robbed millions and millions of Americans of the little wealth that they had tied into homeownership, and the resulting bailout that took place and the need for an economic stimulus package through the Recovery Act. All of that accounts for a significant amount of the debt that we now confront.

So when both sides sit down at the negotiating table in the context of the Budget Committee, we should do so with the facts objectively established as opposed to putting a bull's-eye on the back of important social safety net programs like Social Security and Medicare just because some folks in this Capitol don't like those programs from their very inceptions.

The last observation that I will make is that the budget that has been set forth by the CBC and by Democrats in the House and the Senate, as compared to the budget that has been put forth by the House GOP, is very different in the context of how we review and evaluate tax fairness in America.

I think some would be surprised to know that, in the House GOP budget, it cuts taxes by lowering the top tax rate for high-income Americans from 39.6 percent to 25 percent. This is not the Reagan budget, supply-side economics. This is not George Herbert Walker Bush or George W. Bush in 2001 and 2003. This is the current budget on which we are going to have to negotiate and find common ground. It cuts the tax rate from 39.6 percent to 25 percent in order to slash all of the social safety net programs that we reviewed earlier.

Why is that a wrong-headed policy?

As I close, and as this chart illustrates, the top tax rate was at 39.6 percent notwithstanding the fact that so many people on the other side of the aisle, in good faith, constantly say, that type of tax rate is the type of rate that hurts the economy. Under the 8 years of the Clinton administration, with a 39.6 percent top tax rate, 20-plus million jobs were created; 8 years later, when the top tax rate was cut by this Congress from 39.6 percent to 35 percent, we lost 580,000 jobs. That is an apples-to-apples comparison that discredits the notion that lowering the tax rate somehow stimulates growth in the economy when the 8 years of the Clinton administration as compared to the 8 years of the Bush administration clearly discredit that theory in the manner that a former President referred to as voodoo economics.

So I am just hopeful that, as we move forward with this conference committee—we have got big differences—we can sit down and endeavor to find common ground and do the business of the American people: keep government open, invest in our economy, protect our social safety net programs, and help create prosperity for the greatest number of Americans possible.

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

THE SECRET OF AMERICA'S SUCCESS—TECHNOLOGY AND FREEDOM

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, in the words of my former boss, President Reagan, Well, here we go again.

Over the last 25 years, I and a small band of ''just refuse to go along and get along'' types here in Congress have engaged in a constant fight to maintain the intellectual property of American inventors.

The intellectual property rights of our inventors is something that has been a great treasure to our country. Our Founding Fathers felt so strongly about technology and freedom—and, yes, with the profit motive—that that was the formula that would uplift human kind, and they believed in it so much that they wrote that into our Constitution.

Article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution:

> The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

I might add that this is the only place in the body of the Constitution in which the word ''right'' is used.

The Bill of Rights comes in during the amendment process of the Constitution, but our Founding Fathers thought so highly of technology and technology advancement that the right

of inventors was included in the body of the Constitution.

This provision has served America well. It has led to general prosperity that we would not have had otherwise. It has led to national security where we have faced foes that have outnumbered us so heavily, but what were heavily relied upon were the technologies that were developed to help our Armed Forces defend themselves and, thus, defend the country. Of course, this has served us well because the technology and the freedom we have has created a society in which ordinary people—decent people—can live very fruitful lives and can enjoy the fruits of their labor.

Americans work hard, but this wasn't just created by hard work. That is the important thing to remember. Without hardworking Americans, it wouldn't have worked; but it was the technology that they used that made the difference. People work hard all over the world. They work long hours, and they live in poverty and deprivation, but we coupled the hard work of our people with technology; and, thus, what we have had is a success that has uplifted the common man and has served as a light of hope for all human beings in that we can produce the wealth needed for regular people to lead decent lives. So that is the secret of America's success—technology and freedom—and, yes, perhaps we could include the right values.

It was our strong patent system and a respect for law that made the difference in that technology and freedom. Yet, today, multinational corporations run by Americans want to diminish patent protection in the United States. We have had the strongest patent protection of any country in the world; yet we have had for these last 25 years major, major efforts to diminish the patent protection that we have and to harmonize it with the rest of the world. It just happens that the European and Japanese patent systems are much weaker and offer less protection for the inventors. Over the years, we have had to fight back and have had to turn back efforts to weaken the patent system a number of times, and I have been part of that effort and part of that struggle.

I remember when, for example, they had a bill—it was so blatant that we defeated it—called the Patent Publication Act. They said, after 18 months, if someone hasn't filed for a patent, even if he were not going to get his patent, they were going to publish his patent application, meaning all the secrets would be out in the world. They tried to push that over on us. We just barely defeated that, but we defeated it in a bipartisan effort that was led by MARCY KAPTUR and me, Chris Cox, Tom Campbell, and others at that time.

Then there was the effort, of course, to say that, as soon as one files for a patent application, after 20 months, the ticking of the clock starts, and you could end up then with maybe 5 years of patent protection by the time it was issued.

□ 2130

Here we had always said 17 years after you are given the patent you then lose control, but you have 17 years where you own your patent. They tried to change that and could have changed it in a way that somebody, if it took the Patent Office 15 years or 10 years to develop a concept of a new idea and to figure out how to patent it, well, then that person would only have 2 years left.

These were the ways that they were trying to destroy the patent rights that our people have enjoyed. Sometimes we turned those efforts back, other times we had to compromise, and other times, like last time around, we lost. For example, over our objection this body changed the fundamental principle that patents were to be given to the first to invent. If someone has invented it, they should be given the patent. That has been the fundamental guiding post ever since our country was founded. We changed that last year. We changed that to say, not first to invent, but the first person who files for the patent.

Of course, at an age when you have people who are able to sneak in on your computers and there are hackers around, that could turn out to be a catastrophe. Already we could hear rumblings of that from China where patents are being churned out and patent applications are being put in. And, yes, if they can prove they were the first one, and even if they found out about it some other way and can't explain it, no, they get the patent over the people who have done the work.

Well, once again I find myself fighting for the small inventors and struggling to defend the patent rights of these people to own and control their own invention. What we have got now is a bill that has been introduced and that is just making its way. There will be a hearing on it tomorrow in the Judiciary Committee.

There has always been an excuse to change the fundamentals of the way our system works, because we have had the strongest patent system in the world and they have always tried to find some excuse of changing it and there is some sinister force at play that demands that we change the fundamentals of our patent system. Well, we have heard it before.

For example, they claimed there were ''submarine patents.'' That is a derogatory term. A submarine patent, that must be undercover or something suspicious about that. They used that as an excuse to try to limit the time people owned their patent. They used that as an excuse to publish everybody's patent application even before it was issued.

This time, the new word, the new bugaboo that they are talking about and the scary word for the day is ''patent troll.'' ''Patent troll'' is being used as a word—and they probably hired a very sophisticated public relations company to come up with that ''patent troll'' term—they have been used to fundamentally change our patent system, again, in order to diminish and damage the rights of small inventors. They can't say that that is their purpose, so they have to come up with a scary word like ''patent troll.''

These so-called patent trolls are patent holders or they are companies which represent patent holders, meaning people who own patents. They are engaged in defending the rights of those patents that they own. They purchased these patents or their companies purchased these patents basically from small inventors who didn't have the resources to defend and to enforce their own patent rights. These small inventors are now the partners of some of these companies or some of these individual investors. But it comes down to this: the inventor or the investor owns those patents. If you buy a piece of land or a patent from someone, you have that right. These patents that they own are just like any other patent granted by the Patent Office.

But huge corporate infringers would have us believe that these patents are in some way unfair or evil. So what makes these patents different than the good patents that these very same corporations own? There are no differences. They are the same patents, the same kind of patents. Some of these multinational corporations have bought patents from small inventors. They own that and they enforce them through a type of legal action when they are infringed upon. The multinational corporations have coined the scare terms ''patent assertion entity,'' or PAE; they have coined ''nonpracticing entity,'' NPE; and, of course, all of that means ''patent troll.''

The PR blitz, as I say, which was obviously created by a public relations company who made a lot of money coming up with that boogeyman, is used to change the basic legal protection of American inventors and, yes, change the legal protection of people who have bought the legal rights and own the intellectual property rights that they bought from the inventor.

I suppose Halloween is the proper time to talk about scary trolls. How frightening. The so-called patent troll has been identified as being out for a profit from technology that he did not invent. My, my, someone who is trying to receive a profit by making an investment into something that they didn't build themselves. Huh? Doesn't that describe banks and insurance companies and everybody else who puts investments down and hopes that they are going to have a return from those investments? But they, themselves, aren't making anything. They are using money and paper and contracts and helping people who need help.

I have consulted with a number of outside individual inventors and groups, and they have reaffirmed that

the legislation being proposed by the Judiciary Committee further disadvantages the little guy against the deep-pocketed, multinational corporations. This is achieved in the guise of targeting the so-called patent trolls. Pay attention to the patent trolls, but don't pay attention to how this weakens the small inventor.

This means that persons or companies who have contracted with inventors who really need the help to see that his or her patent rights are respected are going to be undercut. How horrible it is of making business out of helping small inventors see to it that their patent rights are enforced.

Proponents of this legislation are covering up the fact that they have stolen someone else's patent rights and now want to change the system so they can get away with it so that someone whose patent rights they don't own, that they have blatantly just arrogantly grabbed and put into their own technology projects, that they don't have to pay for it. When they are challenged in court, they complain, Oh, this is a patent troll. No. What we have here is large companies who are willing to take from the little guy which will in the end, yes, maybe be of short-term help to those companies, but it will undermine the progress of the United States of America, undermine our ability to create a wealth in our society that will make sure that our people can out-compete foreigners. Most of the corporations who are complaining about this are multinational corporations run, of course, by Americans, sometimes not.

Often the only way that a small business inventor can enforce his patent rights is by hiring a patent assertion entity as an advocate, meaning a patent troll. Sometimes the big guys want to simply steal the idea and say, sue me, because these little guys, these small inventors, the mainspring of so many ideas, they don't have the money to fight the big corporations. Now the big corporations want to make it impossible for them by changing the very law that protects them and protects what they have created in their invention.

One of the biggest alleged crimes of these nonpracticing entities is that they don't actually make anything, but just shift money around. Like I say, how horrible that is that some people make money in our society although you can't really see what they actually make with their hands. Banks, lawyers, investment companies, insurance companies, well, they make money, but they don't necessarily make things, but they are important to our economy. Even more important to our economy are those inventors. If we change the rules so that big companies can steal from them, those inventors will not be there in the next generation to come with the creations that uplift our people and defend our country and permit us to have security and prosperity.

We are told that trolls are different. Well, let's put it this way: the trolls are different. They are trying to make money off something they didn't actually make themselves. They aren't trying, as our multinational corporations are trying to do, to infringe on other people's property rights. Look who is pointing the fingers. The arrogance of these megacompanies warning us against small investors having the help of some investor is nauseating.

These attacks on the rights of patent holders are seen as valid and virtuous, but if they happened against any other rights, they would be identified as the problem they are.

Remember the big groups that are angry because they used patented technology without paying the owners, justifying it on the idea of the lack of the owner's enforcement. These companies say, Well, the patent wasn't being enforced, so we can use it. Now they are really upset when someone wants to enforce that patent. Now the rights for the patent are being enforced by someone who paid the inventor to sell him that property right.

A landowner who chooses not to develop a farm or land could be described as a nonpracticing entity. Should we make it simpler and easier for others to take or steal the land because that owner isn't using it? Should we make it harder for him to continue to own his land simply because he doesn't use it or isn't using it like others would want him to? How about a music lover who purchases the rights to a song or an entire catalog of an artist's songs, should we make it hard for him to defend his ownership rights because he wasn't the musician, he didn't make the music himself?

This campaign by multinational corporations and some of the world's richest men is an attack on the little guy's right to sell his intellectual property or to partner with someone else who can help him defend what is rightfully his.

While I don't have time to go through all of the problems of this legislation point by point, I will refer to several problems brought up in this bill.

The claim that this legislation is designed to go after patent trolls, to make these patent trolls more accountable, that is what they claim, but how are they doing it? They are doing it by making it harder for every patent holder to defend his patent rights, every ordinary American. They claim they are making it easier and less costly to defend baseless claims of patent infringement. Well, they claim these are bad patents that should never have been issued. They claim many things.

Section 3 of this bill, for example, makes it easier to defend against false charges of patent infringement, but it also adds significant new burdens onto a patent holder who seeks to defend, rightfully seeks to defend, his patent rights. In addition, this section increases the potential downside risk of suing to defend one's own patent rights.

We should be doing everything we can to make the system quick, cheap, and simple to defend, both to defend patent rights and to defend against baseless charges of infringement. But this legislation is primarily geared toward making it harder, more costly, and more time intensive to file claims of infringement. That is exactly the wrong direction to take.

The added pleading requirements will also require a very thorough and expensive prefiling discovery processes, again, discouraging underfunded patent holders from defending their patents. While there are limitations on a fishing trip type of discovery that may hold costs down and also protect patent holders from discovery IP, those protections don't overcome the provisions which make it more difficult to defend perfectly respectable patents.

In addition, by moving to what is essentially a ''loser pays'' system, which is what this legislation is attempting, the little guy is once again put at great risk when suing a big corporation for infringement. So now the inventor who is being victimized may have to risk everything that he owns to pay the legal fees of his much better financed corporate infringers.

This concept of fee shifting is alien to this country's history but very common in Europe. It has been demonstrated to have a chilling effect on litigation at the expense of the rights of those who can't afford to sue because they can't afford to lose.

The corporations, they can afford to lose. They are not personally having to pay anything; but the small inventor, he will lose everything in his life if he loses. He will owe them that much money. The big corporations, of course, are very capable of handling their own legal fees.

□ 2145

Section 4 requires a patent holder who believes they are being infringed upon to disclose all of his partners, assignees, and other information to court and to the Patent Office as well, and to the accused infringers. Well, what we have then, if you sue somebody because they are stealing your intellectual property, you have to give up all of your privacy rights and from that point on, you are an open book to anyone who is your competition, anyone who is your adversary, and they will probably, as we see happen with large corporations, you now are wide open to victimization by the corporates.

Section 5 seems to repeal a current provision that guarantees a patent holder's right to sue a State, for example. If a State or the government infringes on your patent, there seems to be a provision in the bill that could say that you can't sue to get paid for what the government has stolen from you. That, of course, has to be looked at, and looked at by the court.

Section 9 claims to make technical corrections to the bill, but they make

sweeping, wholesale changes to the way patent applicants and patent holders are allowed to pursue their rights. One of these so-called minor corrections entirely removes section 145 from the law, which allows patent applicants to bring suit in civil court if they are not getting due consideration at the Patent Office. In other words, if the government employees at the Patent Office are blatantly not doing their job for some reason, whether it is corruption or incompetency, the patent applicant now by this rule, by this bill, will not be able to seek justice in the court system. This is totally inconsistent with what our national tradition is all about.

Removing section 145 concentrates all decisional power within the Patent Office, with the exception of an appeal to the circuit, which is required to give deference to the Patent Office through that process. That is exactly the opposite of what we want to do. We want to make sure that people have a legal right, if our government is off base, to appeal it to another branch of government. That's why we have the judicial and the legislative and the executive branches of government. Here again, part of the bill is going in exactly the wrong direction.

A review of this legislation titled ''A Small Business and Startup Perspective on the Goodlatte Patent Bill,'' this is an analysis of the patent bill that we are talking about:

> would gratuitously repeal 35 U.S.C. section 145, which has long protected patent applicants' fundamental right of de novo judicial review of adverse patentability determinations by the Patent Office.

They note here that since 1836, anybody could repeal a decision within the Patent Office, but now they want to take that away, diminish the rights of our inventors, which will mean that we will not have the same type of innovation and creativity that we have enjoyed in this country.

All of this is being done on the notion that these evil trolls are driving up the number of patent litigations. An independent report from the World Intellectual Property Organization, as well as a study from the U.S. Government Accountability Office, says that is not true. So-called trolls may be backing up the little guys, but that is not a major cause of litigation.

So we have the experts telling us that their excuse is wrong, and the GAO suggests that there are many things we can do, but what is being suggested in this bill and others is going exactly the wrong way.

The bottom line is these provisions make it more difficult for the patent holder to defend his rights and raises the stakes so that the downside of pursuing an infringement in cases becomes more costly. We are hurting the little guy. We are making it difficult for the mainspring of human progress. The ideas, the creativity of our country and our countrymen can be brought to play to uplift the lives of our people, to create more energy, to create higher quality goods, to make sure that we compete with the hordes of people in Africa and China and India.

Instead, if we are going to do that, we have to have the best technology, and we are taking our great national asset of a Patent Office that has helped our country over the years, has helped us keep our country safe by producing the best defense technology, to keep ourselves competitive so that the average American can outproduce their counterparts overseas—we are now going to take what has given us that ability, which is the genius of our inventors, and we are going to squash it by giving in to corporate interests of multinational corporations that are not owing their allegiance to us, but instead owe their allegiance to their company, which they see now as an international company, not even an American company.

I ask my colleagues to pay close attention to this legislation and to join me in rejecting this attempt to diminish the fundamental property rights, intellectual property rights of the American people in the name of some troll or some scary title that would get us away from the basic fundamentals of what is being proposed. I would ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. COOPER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 29 and 30 on account of the death of a family member.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 29, 2013, 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:

3399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methyl Parathion; Removal of Expired Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0332; FRL-9401-3] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3400. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Connecticut: Ansonia, City of, New Haven County; [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8301] received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3401. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Extension of Temporary Registration of Municipal Advisors [Release No.: 34-70468; File No. S7-19-10] (RIN: 3235-AK69) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality: Revision to Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds — Exclusion of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0605; FRL-9900-53-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR70) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule for the Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Lancaster 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0058; FRL-9901-21-Region 3] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3404. 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; West Virginia; West Virginia's Redesignation Request for the Wheeling, WV-OH 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0368; FRL-9901-41-Region 3] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3405. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Thurston County Second 10-Year PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0088; FRL-9901-34-Region 10] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3406. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — FD&C Blue No. 1; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0568; FRL-9396-1] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3407. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — FD&C Yellow No. 5; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0945; FRL-9400-6] received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3408. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Vented Lead-Acid Storage Batteries for Nuclear Power Plants Regulatory Guide 1.129 Revision received September 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3409. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f)