

We can't tolerate this anymore. These tragedies must end, and to end them, we must change.

And then the President asked:

Are we really prepared to say that we are powerless in the face of such carnage that the politics are too hard? Are we really prepared to say that such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of freedom?

Mr. Speaker, is this not the most relevant question we should all be asking in the midst of this genocidal murder of thousands of unborn children in America every day? The President has said:

Our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm. That is our generation's task, to make these words, these rights, these values of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American.

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Barack Obama as those I have just quoted. Yet this President in the most merciless distortion of logic, reason, and humanity itself refuses to apply these majestic words to helpless, unborn babies. Oh, how I wish that somehow Mr. Obama would open his heart and his ears to his own words and ask himself in the core of his soul why his words that should apply to all children cannot include the most helpless and vulnerable of all children.

When Barack Obama took his oath of office no more than 200 yards from this well, he put his hand down on the same Bible that Abraham Lincoln placed his hand upon when he was sworn in to take his Presidential oath. Mr. Speaker, we should remember that we honor Abraham Lincoln most because he found the courage as President of the United States—in the days of slavery, he found the humanity within himself to recognize the image of God stamped on the soul of slaves that the Supreme Court said were not human and that the tide of public opinion didn't recognize as protectable under the law.

Could it be—could it be, Mr. Speaker, that President Barack Obama might consider that perspective as well as his own legacy, and even eternity itself, Mr. Speaker, and recognize that these little, unborn children look so desperately to him now for help? Could it be that the President might finally remember that on the pages of the Bible on which he laid his hand were written the words in red:

Inasmuch as you have done it unto the least of these My brethren, you have done it unto Me.

Whether he does or does not, it is time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really here. Thomas Jefferson said:

The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.

Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker. Thomas Jefferson said:

The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.

The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says:

No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here. The bedrock foundation of this Republic is that clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights: the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Every conflict, every battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world, Mr. Speaker. It is who we are.

Yet, today, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American little babies who died today without the protection that we should have given them.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude this sunset memorial in the hopes that perhaps someone new who heard it tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies, that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express or understand or even fathom, and that it is time we stood up together again and looked up to the Declaration of Independence and that we remember that we are the same America that rejected human slavery and we marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust and we are still the courageous and compassionate Nation that can find a better way for mothers and their unborn children than abortion on demand.

It is still not too late for us to make a better world and for America to be the one that leads the rest of the planet, just as we did in the days of slavery from this tragic genocide of murdering nearly 4,000 of our own children every day.

So, now, Mr. Speaker, as we consider the plight of the unborn after 41 years under *ROE v. WADE*, maybe we can each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are all numbered, and that all too soon each of us will also walk from these Chambers for the very last time. And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day, may that be the day—may that be the day—when we will finally hear the cries of these innocent, unborn babies. Maybe that will be the day we can find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, the sun is now setting. It is now 41 years, almost to the day,

since *ROE v. WADE* first stained the foundations of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

CONFLICT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. GOHMERT. This is an important day in the history of at one time the greatest nation in the world, Egypt. It has come a long way since those days thousands of years ago. But there is a lot of misunderstanding about what has been going on in Egypt, including by people in this administration, which also means, of course, The New York Times, The Washington Post, the mainstream media and other liberal bastions.

In fact, The New York Times had an editorial dated December 4, 2013, that talks about the election that is happening today, yesterday, today, in Egypt, 14th and 15th Egyptian time.

This editorial from The New York Times editorial board talks about the Egyptians squandering another chance to build a broadly inclusive democratic system with the latest constitutional revisions.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, what these intellectual giants at The New York Times don't understand is, when you're in the Middle East and you decide to try to build a democracy, a democratic republic as we have here, and you decide to be inclusive of people who believe in utilizing terrorism—there are religious fanatics who believe if they kill innocent children, women, men, then they may have just earned a place in paradise. That is so foreign to American way of thinking, to Western way of thinking, to Israeli way of thinking, to European way of thinking—historically, that is.

As radical Islam, not to be confused with the moderate Muslims, such as those who are trying to establish democracy in Egypt, radical Islam, if included, will use terrorism, will use violence, will use anything they can to take over, and there will be no democratic republic. There will be no democracy of any kind. It will be top-to-bottom totalitarian, a religious extremist country.

I know the editorial board has people that are extremely intelligent, but it is amazing to read these kinds of things broadly inclusive. So they are wanting the people of Egypt to do things like release a man who is acting outside the constitution. He is charged with ordering the murder of so many who just wanted to have liberty in Egypt. Morsi was playing the new version of Chavez in Venezuela; get elected and then pull all power to you.

I asked General el-Sisi if it was true what a former American intelligence

agent had told me that Morsi, President Morsi, was trying to hire—take out a contract, basically—to have General el-Sisi killed. He beat around the bush, but eventually he said in the presence of other U.S. representatives that, yes, they had evidence that Morsi was trying to have General el-Sisi killed.

It may be a shock to some, say, at *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and others, but when you have a religious fanatic as the leader of a country, even though he may have been—and this is arguable as well, but he may have been elected. When he starts acting outside the bounds of the constitution, then the people have to act. And the constitution that the Muslim Brotherhood shoved through in Egypt after the so-called Arab Spring was one that did not even provide a provision of impeachment.

That seemed strange to most Americans. I am sure it doesn't to *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. But to most Americans, not having a way to remove someone who is the highest official in the land, who is acting outside the bounds of their authority, it is a problem.

How do you remove the highest leader in a country if your constitution, if you have one, does not provide for civil impeachment and removal of the leader? And Egypt's constitution that the Muslim Brotherhood shoved through did not, because the Muslim Brotherhood, once they seized power, there was going to be no need for impeachment, because radical Islam would be in charge. It is reported by credible people, there are videos of the supreme religious leader dictating terms that President Morsi would have to follow.

The Arab Spring under President Morsi did not yield the kind of republic, democracy that had been hoped for, but this *New York Times* editorial says:

The new charter defies the revolutionary promise of the Arab Spring by reinforcing the power of institutions that have long held Egypt in an iron grip.

Apparently, not realizing that the Muslim Brotherhood had seized Egypt in its iron grip, and the only way around it, since there was no impeachment provision in the Egyptian constitution, was exactly what happened. It was not a military coup. A military coup is when the military rises up and takes over. What happened in Egypt was one of the most beautiful acts of true democratic efforts, and some have reported that this was the largest gathering, largest rebellion in the world's history, reports of 20 million people gathering in demonstration by Egyptians, a country with 90 or so million people.

Another report of another effort, 30 million; 33 million, one report said. Morsi only claimed to have gotten around 13 million votes when he seized power. He said the opponent—the Muslim Brotherhood made clear if the opponent tried to contest and say there

was any fraud, they would burn Egypt down. So they got control. They had a constitution that wouldn't allow them to remove Morsi, not to impeach him.

This was a real revolution. Barely peaceful as revolutions go, until the Muslim Brotherhood began to carry out what they had promised previously, that if people who wanted true democracy in Egypt tried to contest Morsi being the supreme leader there, then they would burn the country down. Well, they began burning down churches.

Now, some people when they hear the word “church” think in terms, well, maybe it was like a rural southern church. Maybe they had a trailer or something. This is in an area where there have been Christian churches for nearly 2,000 years. These are incredibly historic places, some of them, and the Muslim Brotherhood could have cared less.

Now, we have plenty of Muslim brothers here in the United States, and so far they say we have been—in essence, their position is we have not really needed violence in the United States because we are getting so much control without violence. But certainly violence is an appropriate tool in places like Egypt where they got ousted so they couldn't follow through with pursuing a new Ottoman Empire, a new world caliphate as the Twelfth, the Twelvers, the Twelfth Imam believers wanted to take over and begin right there where the Ottoman Empire used to exist as it began its way around the Mediterranean.

But for those who believe the Twelfth Imam is going to emerge out of chaos, even if it is self-inflicted nuclear chaos, those who believe he will emerge and begin ruling and take over a world caliphate, they know they can't afford to lose Egypt as an important linchpin. You have 90 million people there in Egypt. That is critical if they are going to take over and have a world caliphate. You have got to have Egypt.

So last July, I took to this floor and this podium and talked about the incredible uprising, how deeply touching it was to hear personal accounts, to see the photographs, to hear and see the videos of what was going on when moderate Muslims, Christians, Jews, seculars were coming together figuratively and literally, hand in hand, to protest against radical Islam being in control of Egypt.

As some have indicated, if the Egyptian people had waited another year to try to oust Morsi, he would have gathered so much power, they would probably not have been successful. It was critical that the people of Egypt rise up, as they did. And we owe them a debt of gratitude for rising up and saying, We are not going to have radical Islam in charge. Moderate Muslims did not want radical Islamists in charge. That is true throughout the Middle East. It is true in Afghanistan, where our allies who fought and defeated the Taliban, by 2002 with less than 500

Americans in country embedded, weapons we provided, aerial support we provided, under the lead of General Dostum who summoned this administration, now called a war criminal, they defeated the Taliban. These are moderate Muslim friends, allies, because their enemy is our enemy, the Taliban, and they do not want radical Islam taking back over Afghanistan.

What does this administration do? It empowers the group that will end up allowing the Taliban to take right back over, when we ought to be empowering our friends in Afghanistan, not with 100,000 precious American men and women's lives, but empower the enemy of our enemy and let them protect their own country. They can do it, but not when you call the enemy of our enemy war criminals and do everything you can to marginalize them.

The *New York Times* editorial says:

The constitution, approved by a 50-member citizen committee on Sunday, replaces one imposed last year by the government of President Mohamed Morsi, who was deposed in July, and his Muslim Brotherhood allies. It is expected to be ratified by a popular vote in a referendum within the next 30 days.

This was written December 4, published December 4.

The editorial goes on toward the end to say:

This new constitution is equally flawed because it was drafted with minimal input from Islamists and could further crush the Brotherhood by banning political parties based on religion.

All one needs to do is just a little bit of investigation, open-minded investigation. If you are taking your lead from Al Jazeera, from the Muslim Brotherhood, from Imam Magid, who is the head of the Islamic Society of North America—the Federal courts have said it is just a Muslim Brotherhood front organization—or from leaders of CAIR, which Federal courts in this country have called a Muslim Brotherhood front organization to which is given great honor and credibility by this administration, but if you are listening to them, then, oh, yeah, this is a terrible constitution, because they are not going to allow a radical Islamist political party to take back over.

Now, again, if you do a little bit of research, you find out this is something that Ataturk fought against and was able to overcome in Turkey so many decades ago. And because he was able to overcome and overwhelm radical Islam in Turkey, Turkey has surged to the forefront over the past decades in all kinds of areas.

Now, we see the scary creeping of radical Islam back into control in Turkey. But the way they advanced as rapidly as they did in Turkey after this great leader Ataturk forced out radical Islamist leaders was they prevented those types of people from taking over, and it is the same thing. These are smart people, Emir Musa, the chairman of this constitutional committee, convention, whatever you want to call

it, of 50 very diverse people. But no, it did not include the Muslim Brotherhood. They don't want a radical Islamist group taking over Egypt.

□ 1915

I know it is hard for some in this country to believe who read too much of their own press, but banning a political party based on religion in the Constitution and recognizing other religions in their Constitution and recognizing the absolute right of belief religiously in this new Constitution should be hailed as a good thing.

I was shocked—I believe it is article 235, perhaps, in the new Constitution, these moderate Muslims and secularists are so bent, so dedicated to try to have a democracy that they can build on and grow and advance. They even put this article in there that says, in essence: the country is going to rebuild the churches that the Muslim Brotherhood destroyed during their radical violent temper tantrum after a president acting outside the bounds of the Constitution and charged with ordering the death of so many civilians there, after he went so far astray. They don't want that kind of people back in charge.

Now, something that The New York Times says at the end:

In the final analysis, the real test of any constitution is how it is carried out in practice.

That is true. That is so true.

I once heard Justice Scalia telling a group, one of which had asked: Is the reason we are the greatest country with more freedoms than any country in history because we have the best Bill of Rights ever in history? Justice Scalia can be so blunt and so brilliant. He indicated: Oh, gosh, no. The Soviet Union had a better Bill of Rights than we do.

That is why that last statement in The New York Times editorial is so true. It is more how the constitution is carried out. I am glad they recognized that by the end of the editorial.

One thing is clear: if a constitution is pushed through by the Muslim Brotherhood, it is going to be radically religiously based on radical Islam, and the first elected leader could very well end up being the last until he is gone. Of course, in Iran, where we have radical Islam in charge, you have a supreme leader and then you have the token president that is elected that serves as long as the supreme leader is okay with it.

The Washington Post, in an editorial published January 13, on down in it says a criticism of the current Egyptian government. They have a judge who is the interim President. Talking with him, meeting with him a couple of times, I think he is really trying to do right by the people in Egypt, but The Washington Post says:

Opposition media have been shut down, and three Cairo-based journalists from Al Jazeera have been imprisoned without charge.

One of the things that is so hard for some pseudo-intellectuals here in the U.S. to realize is something that Franklin Roosevelt grasped, even with his unconstitutional actions of interring American citizens, something that he appropriately understood is, if you have media that is helping the cause of anarchy or the overthrow of a constitutional democracy, Democratic Republic as we have here, then they are enemies of the state and they are guilty of treason and they can be stopped.

Some in this country think freedom of speech means—whether it is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed down in Guantanamo or some other religious fanatic that wants to destroy our freedom here—they think: oh, well, you have to give them freedom of speech. Whereas, for most of this country's history, people understood if you are advocating for the overthrow of the constitutional government we have, it is treasonous. If you are advocating by peaceful means using the government, as some are trying to do: Let's move toward progressivism, let's move to what is really socialism, where the government gets to dictate everything, they know everything you are doing.

As I said earlier today to a group, it appears that the main thing George Orwell missed was the date. He said 1984 when it turns out it was closer to 2014 where you have the government spying on their people, taking whatever actions they want, saying if Congress doesn't do it, we will just do it without Congress, which is a violation of the Constitution in most cases.

This editorial from The Washington Post comments that the "military's repressive methods cannot stabilize Egypt, much less address its severe economic and social problems." That is true. That is a wise comment because Egypt is suffering severe economic and social problems.

We need to be concerned, because what Egypt had become is a social welfare state; what we are trying to become here in America, a social welfare state where most of the country is dependent upon the government for at least part of its means of living, that cannot long endure. It is always doomed to fail.

The only reason socialized medicine doesn't completely fail is because socialized medicine ultimately ends up putting people on lists to get the treatment they need, they die while they are waiting on the list, and enough people die so it doesn't go broke.

A country that is under a socialistic authority, as the Soviet Union was, it eventually will fail because the model can never work in this world.

Egypt tried to do that. You had a tyrannical leader, as charged by many different leaders, but in order to buy loyalty, more and more welfare was provided, and they have severe economic and social problems.

It is my hope and prayer, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Egypt will con-

tinue to show the courage they did when they rose up last summer and said: We are not going to allow radical Islam to rule this country, we want religions to live in peace, and they will not live in peace when radical Islam is in charge.

That is why you don't find a synagogue in Afghanistan. For heavens sake, all the blood and treasure of Americans that has been lost and spent in Afghanistan for freedom's sake, and because we were okay with them having a constitution under sharia law with supreme power basically in a very tight federal government, then it becomes corrupt, it becomes easy to take over, as the Taliban will if this administration doesn't change its policies.

Christians are persecuted in Afghanistan. For heavens sake, there ought to be religious freedom anywhere America sacrifices that much of American lives and treasure. Iraq, where Christians are persecuted, and we provided so much American blood and treasure there.

The Washington Post says:

If President Obama believes the United States should sanction a new autocracy in Egypt, he should make the case for doing so. Otherwise his administration should side with those Egyptians who continue to fight for a genuine democracy—starting with those who have been imprisoned.

They have imprisoned radical Islamists who have killed Christians and burned churches, and here we have a newspaper advocating: let those people go that terrorize Christians and Jews and people who are secularists that don't want to follow any religion, let them out, let them back in charge of the country.

The people of Egypt have spoken in greater numbers than percentage-wise we have had in this country in so many years when they went to the streets: we are not having radical Islam in Egypt. They are to be congratulated for that.

They are a long way from being out of the woods. People here need to understand that this is a big deal.

I got a letter today from the PLO, the Palestinian Liberation Organization, delegation that is here in Washington. They expressed concern with my comments on the House floor January 10. They claim that "U.S. academic sphere demanding an end to decades of discrimination against Palestinians are based on the principle of equality, not hatred of Jews."

Unfortunately, they are either lying or they haven't reviewed the material that children are being taught in Israel in the Palestinian schools. They are teaching hatred with money we are providing. They are naming holidays, they are naming buildings and areas after terrorists who have killed innocent women and children.

I have got a tremendous amount of material that I could use, but time does not permit here today. But I am going to take some time to talk about the hatred that is being taught among the Palestinians.

Here is a Palestinian summer camp named after Wafa Idris, the first woman suicide bomber who murdered one and injured 150 in Jerusalem January 27, 2002. It is a girl's camp naming it after a woman who went out and killed an innocent person and injured 150 innocent people.

A Palestinian soccer tournament is named after a suicide bomber. This is a camp for 14-year-old Palestinian boys and it is named: "The Tul Karem Shahids Memorial Soccer Championship Tournament." He was a suicide terrorist who killed 31 on Passover, and the children are participating in this tournament named for this horrendous human being who thought it so grand to kill 31 innocent people on a religious holiday of Passover.

People from the PLO want to try to tell me that they are not using hatred.

For heaven's sake, start spending some of that money to teach love and affection, and we will have peace in the Middle East. As Netanyahu said right here at this podium: If the Palestinians lay down their arms, there will be peace in Israel and among the Palestinians, and if the Israelis lay down their weapons, there will not be an Israel in which there are Jews.

Now, I get it. The PLO and others say: Oh, yeah, we recognize Israel's right to exist. The Prime Minister of the Palestinians told me that years ago: Oh, yeah, we recognize their right to exist.

As a Jewish state, that is why they were created after the Holocaust killed 6 million Jews in Europe. That hatred of Jews is arising again in Europe among academics in the United States. Shame on you. You are allowing that

hatred to grow, and it is fermenting more hatred. It has to be stopped—talking about a boycott of anything Israel. So you want the Jews out there without a country so they can be killed in another Holocaust, or you want Iran to have a nuclear weapon so they can with one weapon have another Holocaust? This is where it is going.

If people's voices are not heard as the Iranian gas chambers are being constructed now despite this ridiculous deal that is allowing them to keep the centrifuges going and developing, then the blood will be on our hands, and Mr. Speaker, we should not—cannot—allow that.

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

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in Book II.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 13 through 16 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1434. An act to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill and Joint Resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3527. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 16, 2014, 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:

4487. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Service Contracts Reporting Requirements [FAC 2005-72; FAR Case 2010-010; Item I; Docket 2010-0010, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM06) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4488. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-72; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2013-0076, Sequence No. 8] received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4489. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans [Docket No.: CFPB-2013-0020] (RIN: 3170-AA11) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4490. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Removal of Certain References to Credit Ratings Under the Investment Company Act [Release Nos.: 33-9506; IC-30847; File No. S7-7-11] (RIN: 3235-AL02) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4491. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Army (Civil Works), Department of Defense, transmitting the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basin Study (GLMRIS), November 2013; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4492. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area — Weymouth Fore River, Fore River Bridge Construction, Wey-

mouth and Quincy, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0876] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4493. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Clearwater Super Boat National Championship Race, Gulf of Mexico; Clearwater, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0101] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4494. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area, Gulf of Mexico: Mississippi Canyon Block 20, South of New Orleans, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0064] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4495. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Diego Shark Fest Swim; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0786] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4496. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chelsea River, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-1069] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4497. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Inner Harbor Navigational Canal, New Orleans, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0562] received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.