

There are a couple of other mechanics here, but I want to make it perfectly clear for many of us—and hopefully I am speaking for many of my supporters and friends and family and my State—this isn't enough. It may be just the beginning.

I do hope we get the chance to discuss the one issue here that continues to be a bit of friction. The President's deferred action, many of our friends on the left keep trying to tell us that that had nothing to do with what we are seeing at the border, but as we have already just walked through the documents, once the deferred action, referred to as DACA, had gone into effect, they knew the numbers were coming. They were calculating. We now have some charts that much of this crisis was being watched for months. It finally just became overwhelming.

Illegal immigration—and legal immigration—work on incentives and disincentives. We have created incentives. This President has created incentives to break our laws, and until we step up with a number of policies that change those incentives, I believe we are partially chasing our tail here. We will do some good things. We need to step up the quality of our law enforcement and our border enforcement, but we also need an administration that we can trust, an administration that will tell us the truth, and an administration that will actually follow our laws.

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

#### THE CRISIS AT OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

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 of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be recognized to address you here on the United States floor of the House of Representatives in this most deliberative body that we have and are. I appreciate the comments and the position taken by the gentleman from Arizona ahead of me. He is one who has lived along the border for a lifetime. He deals with the issue every day, every week. He is one of the individuals that I look to to inform me, but also I have taken a real interest in it myself.

Even though I am from the heart of the heartland, from Iowa, Mr. Speaker, I have a great appreciation for the Constitution and the rule of law. Because of that, I have watched as the lawlessness has grown along our border.

I will say that certainly in all of the time that I have been in this Congress and in the years building up to it, and less so in the years prior to that, and I take myself back to 1986 when Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act of 1986 due to the counsel that he had around him, I believed at the time that he would veto that bill because of his reverence for the rule of law would over-

come all of the counsel that came from the House and the Senate and the people around him. Well, Reagan relented and signed the bill on the promise that we would legalize roughly a million people in exchange for the enforcement of the law thereafter and that there would never be another amnesty again so long as this country would live.

The 1 million became 3 million, and the amnesties that were added to that in smaller proportions added up to at least 6, perhaps 7, in addition to the 1986 amnesty. And here we are today, having fought off this amnesty these years for more than a decade that I have been directly involved in the immigration policy, and we are on the cusp of it again.

The President of the United States stood up there in front of you where you are, Mr. Speaker, and he gave his State of the Union address here on the floor of the House of Representatives and essentially, and figuratively, he waved his ink pen at us and he said: Congress, you do what I tell you on immigration. I want comprehensive immigration reform. I want you to pass the Senate Gang of Eight amnesty act.

Now I am speaking figuratively, of course, because that is not a direct quote of the President, but it is certainly the message that the President delivered: Do what I tell you to do, or I will use my, in one other setting, his cell phone, or his ink pen, to act in a unilateral—he didn't say it, but he knows it—unconstitutional fashion.

I can think of another night during the State of the Union address when our President came here and he spoke right in front of you, Mr. Speaker, and he pointed down here to the Supreme Court and he lectured the Supreme Court on what they should do, as if somehow he were article III, somehow he was the man who commanded the Supreme Court of the United States. And the camera was looking over at the Justices as the President lectured them on the Constitution and the rule of law as if the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court needed to get a lesson from an adjunct professor of the University of Chicago School of Law who taught Constitution law for 10 years in Chicago. He should go to school with every one of those Justices, Mr. Speaker.

And one of them, the television cameras repeated it over and over again until they read the lips, and they interpreted his lips to say "not true, not true." That seat that that camera was focused on has been empty ever since. It has been empty ever since because that Justice, and I suspect a number of other Justices, decided I am not going to listen to that again. I am not going to listen to a President that is out of bounds, a President who believes somehow he can lecture to the judicial branch of government, that he can lecture to the judicial branch of government, that he can stand here at this rostrum as a guest of the House of Rep-

resentatives and wave his ink pen or finger at us and announce that we shall do in this Congress what he commands or he will do so in a unconstitutional fashion. Essentially, what did the President say? So sue me. The President says: I am going to do what I am going to do. I know it is lawless, it is unconstitutional, so sue me.

So today we passed here on the floor of the House of Representatives a resolution that declares that the House of Representatives has standing to go before the court to command the President to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

We have had multiple hearings before the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives. We have had excellent constitutional scholars come forward. There hasn't been one who can carry water for the President's position and hold his own under the scrutiny of the constitutional lawyers and other scholars that we have on the Judiciary Committee who take them apart one by one, argument by argument, piece by piece. And yet the President of the United States persists in asserting that he can be article I, the legislative branch of government, the United States Congress, and he can be article III, the judicial branch of government, and the sole commander of the executive branch, article II.

He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He leads from behind. He stepped back and followed the French into Libya, and he waited for the British to go before the House of Commons and vote down David Cameron's initiative to go into Syria, and then the President of the United States, following—and leading from behind is the very definition of following—the President of the United States then offers to Congress, through trial balloons through the press, that he would like to have Congress endorse military action in Syria.

Where is our leader? Where is our Commander in Chief? Well, he is off in the never, never land of advancing administrative amnesty, calling together his smartest, leftist lawyers that he can find, Mr. Speaker, and saying to them: Put your think tanks together. You guys go grab the best brains you can find, attached to the leftist brains you are, and see if you can come up with a strategic plan that I can grant some administrative amnesty to the maximum number of people because, Lord knows, there aren't enough undocumented Democrats in America. We need more of them. We need an endless supply and endless stream of them. And where do they come from? Well, they come across our southern border primarily, although they come in other ways.

□ 2130

And Democrats in here, when the President says to Congress: Thou shall pass the bills that I tell you to pass or I am going to use my pen to unconstitutionally—that is in parentheses, Mr.

Speaker—enact executive edicts that will do what I want done, regardless of whether it has the support and the will of the people or not—we are the support and the will of the people—when the President said that he is going to enact those immigration unconstitutional executive edicts, when the President uttered that, I saw a little less than half of this Chamber rise in a spontaneous standing ovation, enthusiasm for the President's statement.

It reminds me of the one Democrat who said: I am marching for abortion rights because my mother didn't have that opportunity. Who would say that? If your mother didn't have the opportunity to have an abortion, but you want to march so that you wish she would have, that means you wish you had never been born. And this Congress with less than half of it, a bunch of Democrats over here, cheered the President when he said: I am going to usurp your article I legislative authority, and I am going to write legislative law with my pen the way I see fit. And they cheered.

These are the same people that stood here on the floor of the House a year ago last January and took an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States so help them God. And they say: Well, we were glad when the President decides he is going to roll over Congress, roll over the House, roll over the Senate, roll over the judicial branch by intimidating them into, some say, a decision on ObamaCare that would not conform with the constitutional directives that they have.

We are in a mess, Mr. Speaker. We are in a mess, and we have the President of the United States poised during August, when this Congress has every year been out of session because our Founding Fathers and our early, early leaders recognized that Washington, D.C., gets to be a hot and humid place in the month of August, and you need a little break to get out of the circle of the Beltway that causes Potomac fever to go back to your districts so you can look real people in the eye and hear from them. That has been the tradition of this country.

Some people complain that Members of Congress actually go home. I would say on the other way around, if we didn't go home we would hear a lot of complaints. It is important that we go back to our districts and go out and hear from the people that we have the honor and privilege to represent, and we will do that, maybe as early as tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

But the President is poised to follow through on his threat to issue the edict, not a lawful act, not a lawful executive order, an edict, that he would give a lawful status to 5 or 6 million illegal aliens, many of them, maybe most of them, probably not all of them, criminal aliens.

He has issued orders to the Department of Justice to examine how they can get an early release for people who

are in our prisons who have been sentenced. That is hundreds of thousands, as many as 400,000 felons that the President would release on the streets of America. He has released criminals to the tune of 36,000-plus out onto the streets. That is in one category. There is another category of tens of thousands more.

And he has opened up our borders by signing the documents and the Morton Memos—not physically signed, he had his subordinates do that—and the Morton Memos say we are not going to enforce a law against people who didn't commit a felony or aren't guilty of these three mysterious misdemeanors. And they said that if you came into the United States illegally, theoretically through no fault of your own, if you did so before your 18th birthday and you did so before December 31 of 2011, then you get to stay for the duration of this permit that he manufactures lawlessly out of thin air.

And then he manufactures a work permit so that these people can compete for jobs against naturalized and natural born American citizens and green card holders, who likely did it the legal way.

Because he gets a political kick out of this, a political bonus out of this, because he is bringing in undocumented Democrats, and they have a plan to document them so they can vote, we have a situation here where the constitutional underpinnings of America are in crisis mode. The employment in America is at great risk and under great threat, and the security of our border is very weak.

I went down, Mr. Speaker, last weekend, down to the southern tip of Texas, down to the mouth of the Rio Grande, planted a flag right there at the southern tip where the waters of the Rio Grande flow out into the sea, and then followed the river to Brownsville and went through the ports of entry at Brownsville, other facilities in Brownsville, on up into McAllen and to the ports of entry there, to the border patrol centers there, to a resettlement center there, and on up all the way to Laredo.

And from what I saw and what I heard, from our Border Patrol, from our Customs and Border Protection, from the Department of Public Safety in Texas, and others, they are good people, a lot of them with uniforms on, that are doing a good job, doing the best they can with what they have to work with.

We have a lawless order from the President, DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, which is more accurately DACA, Deferred Action for Criminal Aliens. DACA has become the magnet that the coyotes have used to advertise throughout the Central American countries, in particular, El Salvador, Honduras, and also Guatemala. People that are already in the United States oftentimes will save up money, maybe borrow money, and send it down to Central America to the tune

of, the lowest number that I pick up is \$4,000 a head, on up to 5, 6, 7, 8, maybe even \$9,000, for the coyotes to transport an illegal alien into the United States.

They are coming into America in the southern tip of Texas and the Rio Grande Valley sector of the border in numbers that work out this way. The unaccompanied alien children, UACs as they are known, and referred to sometimes as “unaccompanied alien juveniles,” number this way: this fiscal year, from October 1 to June 15, 57,000 UACs, unaccompanied alien children—57,000. That number has surely grown to over 60,000, probably over 70,000, predicted to go to 90,000 for this fiscal year.

The peak of this thing seems to have passed behind us. We are either in a temporary lull, or we have seen the peak behind us. But, in any case, when we think of numbers in the area of 60,000 unaccompanied alien children coming into the United States, that is only 20 percent of the overall population coming in. So we are at 300,000 or more. But of those roughly 60,000—the number that we surpassed—here is how they break down: 80 percent male, 20 percent female.

The 80 percent male and the 20 percent female also need to take into account that these are not kids that range from age 1 day to 1 day before their 18th birthday, Mr. Speaker. These are unaccompanied alien children that have a demographic breakdown that works like this: 80 percent male, 83 percent that are either the ages of 15, 16, or 17. Once they are 18, they are no longer qualified as UACs—83 percent.

So I do the simple math, Mr. Speaker, and I say: 0.8, 80 percent, times 0.83, 83 percent, 15, 16, or 17 years old—that means that 66.4 percent of these unaccompanied alien “children” are young men ages 15, 16, and 17 years old. They come from the most violent countries in the world. The six most violent countries in the world are south of Mexico. It is not Mexico, it is south of Mexico, Mr. Speaker. Eight of the 10 most violent countries in the world are also south of Mexico.

It is a fact, according to the United Nation's data, that of the most violent countries in the world, only Honduras is more violent than the city of Detroit. Yet, there are those in this Congress that are convinced, because the Central American countries have a high degree of violence, that the people are leaving those countries because of the violence, and they are scared and they are running off. Well, if that is so, then one would think they would be running out of Detroit at a pace similar to the pace they are running out of Guatemala and El Salvador and other violent countries down there—probably run a little faster out of Honduras than they are out of the other countries, than they are maybe out of Detroit.

But as I said in a Judiciary Committee hearing, in response to the witness' testimony that was there, I said: If we are going to bring these kids to

the United States because they are afraid where they are, we had better not take them to Detroit because they will be in more danger there, unless they came from Honduras. Those are the facts, and those are the data. Yes, they come from violent countries, and they come from countries that are controlled to a high degree by drug cartels.

But here is what is happening. The families that are sending people here usually have one or more members in the United States now. They may have left their kids back in their home country in Honduras. They will send money down there, they might borrow money. Then usually locally they will hire a coyote that is going to smuggle them up into the United States.

Then the family most often, not 100 percent of the time, but most often, whoever is in custody of this young girl that might be 12 or 13 or 14, or on up to 17 or older, they go down to the local pharmacy, where a prescription is not required, and they buy a monthly supply of contraceptives, birth control pills, and they take it back and they start giving those birth control pills to that girl, and then send her across 2,000 to 2,500 miles of dangerous Central America and Mexico to get on the train of death—it is called “The Beast,” and ride that train up as near the Rio Grande as possible. Then that child has to get off of there and make their way to the Rio Grande River, then pay a coyote to get a ride across the river, and then submit themselves to the U.S. authorities.

We went to center after center, we talked to people after people that had been working with these unaccompanied alien children, and we asked them how many of them are sexually assaulted, how many of them are raped? And the answers came back a guess, but a range, a range between 30 percent and 70 percent.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker. Think of having a daughter and living in El Salvador and deciding, I want to send her to her mother in the United States or her aunt in the United States, or being an aunt in El Salvador and you want to send your niece to her mother in the United States. You get a wire that sends you down \$5,000 or \$6,000, and you go out into the neighborhood and you solicit a coyote, and then you say, I want to send this niece or my daughter up to America, but why don't you wait a few days because I have got to go down and buy some birth control pills and make sure she is ready for the trip, because I am pretty confident she is going to be raped along the way.

That is what is going on, Mr. Speaker. It is not going on now and then; it is going on from a third to 70 percent of the time for the girls, and they told us that the numbers of boys were equivalent to the numbers of girls who were sexually assaulted. That was a question that was repeated over and over again.

So this President has done real damage and destruction to the rule of law.

The result of that is America is flooded with illiterate, unskilled people into the job categories where we have the highest available employment, the highest ratios of unemployment. The double-digit unemployment exists in the lowest-skilled jobs. There is no metric out there that suggests that we should be bringing more unskilled people in, more people who are illiterate in their own language into America, thinking somehow that that is work that Americans won't do.

Nuts. There is no work that Americans won't do. There has been no work that I won't do. I have done some of the toughest, nastiest, most difficulty, and some of the dangerous jobs that the country has to offer, and I haven't come close to doing the jobs that the United States Marine Corps does on a regular basis.

What is the most dangerous job that we ask an American to do? How about rooting terrorists out of places like Fallujah? How about taking on radical al Qaeda extremists in places like Afghanistan?

When the Marine Corps goes into Fallujah for the first or second battle, and we have seen what has happened since then, what do they get paid to put their lives on the line? If you figure it at 40 hours a week, something like \$8.49 an hour, Mr. Speaker. That is back then when I calculated it, when we had operations going on then. If you can pay a United States marine \$8.49 an hour to lock and load and go into a place like Fallujah, you can't convince me that there is work that Americans won't do, especially if it pays an appropriate wage and we respect the work that gets done.

So we have a President who has decided he is going to defy the rule of law, and he is going to manufacture law as he goes and create work permits out of thin air.

□ 2145

When we see this calamity of the huge hole in our southern border, primarily at McAllen, Texas, the House of Representatives decides it wants to overreact to the President of the United States, and since they are afraid that they will somehow get the blame if nothing gets done in the month of August, they decided to bring a piece of legislation here to the floor.

This piece of legislation was written by a staff person that was once that of JOHN MCCAIN, and we know what he has brought for immigration policy. It has been very troubling to me to deal with the legislation that he has supported, but I have this in my hand here on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

It doesn't do what it is advertised to do. It doesn't do what needs to be done, but it grants this. If there is an unaccompanied alien child, here are the consequences for failure to appear to a hearing:

Any alien who fails to appear at a proceeding required under this section, shall be ordered removed in absentia if the govern-

ment establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien was at fault for their absence from the proceedings.

No evidence can be admitted into that proceeding after the fact, and it can't be admitted if they don't anticipate that there is not going to be an appearance of the alien, so that means the government has to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it was the alien's fault they didn't show up.

The only way I know that you can do that is if you have a video camera on them, and they are sitting on the couch, Mr. Speaker. This is a wide open hole that grants a pass under that provision. Then it says:

In General—at the conclusion of a proceeding under this section, the immigration judge shall determine whether an unaccompanied alien child is likely to be admissible to the United States.

They get a new hearing under a new section created, which is 235, and if the preponderance of the evidence indicates that they might receive asylum and if they think they are likely to receive asylum in a separate category, then 50 percent plus 1 is preponderance—likely is 50 percent plus 1. Fifty percent of 50 percent is 25 percent, plus one, are the odds that they need to claim in order to receive a hearing for asylum.

So if you have got a one in four shot at it, Mr. Speaker, you are going to get a hearing for asylum. Then you are going to get an asylum hearing, and then if you are turned down at the asylum hearing, you get to go to a removal hearing. That is three bites at the apple. They are all renewable; times two, that is six different bites at the apple.

No such thing exists for Mexican unaccompanied alien children. The determination is made under the Wilberforce law of 2008 by the Border Patrol whether or not they go back to Mexico.

They purport that this bill treats the other than Mexican unaccompanied alien children the same as the existing law treats unaccompanied alien Mexican children. Mr. Speaker, if it does, there is language in here that then diminishes our ability to send the Mexican kids back. That is what we have. We have a bill that has been whipped to be something that it is not.

I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee tonight. There was a long discussion and debate over it, Mr. Speaker, but here is what we have: my amendment said that we have got to fix the 2008 William Wilberforce language.

By the way, no Republican voted for that, not one. It was introduced on December 9, 2008. It was taken up by a unanimous consent request after everybody left town on December 10, 2008. It was passed by voice in the House, sent to the Senate. The Senate caught the lateral and passed it by voice to the President.

We didn't see that bill. It became a component of what they have utilized as an open door; coupling the 2008 bill

with an expansive reading of the asylum language and the President's DACA language is what is bringing these tens of thousands of unaccompanied alien minors here, which are only 20 percent of the overall group that are coming.

There are also family units—usually, mothers with a child or children. There are individual males coming in, in significant numbers. I have said that we have imported at least 40,000 15-year-old, 16-year-old, and 17-year-old boys—prime gang recruitment age—and that doesn't give you the data on those that are 18, 19, 20, 25 to 31; and those are just the ones that are covered under DACA.

I offered an amendment that would have cut off all funding to DACA. It mirrors the Cruz-Blackburn language. It is good language, and it should be part of this bill. It is not, by the information I have, Mr. Speaker.

There is a 2008 fix that I wrote over a month ago that needs to be part of this bill. It is not, by the report I am getting from the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. I don't know that there was even a vote on it up in the Rules Committee.

There is asylum language that has been offered by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, BOB GOODLATTE, that fixes some of the expansive utilization of asylum that is allowing for people to be distributed all over the United States at taxpayers' expense. That is not part of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

We don't have a deliberative process in this Congress because they are not going to allow a legitimate vote, and the language that is out here is bad.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" on this bill that has come before us, and I am going to have to consider what I do on the rule, but if this House sends a message to support cutting off all funding to enforce or implement DACA, that will be constructive because it will say to the President: these are the Republicans that have at least a chance of standing up against you if you decide that you are going to function in a lawless, unconstitutional manner in the month of August—or any other month—with regard to this granting any expansion of the lawlessness that we have seen today.

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

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2338

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 11 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTIONS FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5021, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-567) on the resolution (H. Res. 696) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### 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. 2577. An act to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to \$5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4028. An act to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1799. An act to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 31, 2014, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6678. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Change in Size and Grade Requirements for Grapefruit [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0015; FV14-906-2 FIR] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6679. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations Governing Issuance of Additional Allotment Base [Doc. No. AMS-FV-13-0088; FV14-985-2 FR] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6680. A letter from the Supervisory Financial Program Specialist, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Government participation in the Automated Clearing House (RIN: 1530-AA05) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6681. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tobacco Products, User Fees, Requirements for the Submission of Data Needed to Calculate User Fees for Domestic Manufacturers and Importers of Tobacco Products [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-0920] (RIN: 0910-AG81) received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6682. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to Compliance Certification Content Requirements for State and Federal Operating Permits Programs [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0162; FRL-9913-88-OAR] (RIN:2060-AQ71) received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6683. 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; Maine; Nitrogen Oxides Exemption Request [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0895; A-1-FRL-9913-56-OAR] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6684. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Nitrogen Compounds [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0400; FRL-9914-44-Region 6] received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6685. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: The 2014 and 2015 Critical Use Exemption From the Phaseout of Methyl Bromide