

back to the States; 50 percent goes directly to the States with no strings attached. So the Federal Government only gets 10 percent. The Federal Government only gets 10 percent, yet they didn't cut this program.

So I am struggling with how they have determined that these resources should be shared with all Americans, yet they are only doing it for this one program and leaving this other program entirely intact. Once again, the disparity cannot be defended.

Let's go ahead and take their idea that resources should be shared with all Americans, and let's apply it to other Federal resources. What about a national park? What about a national wildlife refuge? What about some BLM land somewhere?

These facilities that charge entrance fees, they take all those dollars, and they give it right back to that park. The State of Louisiana doesn't get any of it. It goes back to the park. We don't get any disparate benefit from that. The State that hosts the national park and hosts the national wildlife refuge, it benefits from that in the form of tourism and economic activity and a place for their citizens to recreate. Explain to me that disparity. Once again, it simply can't be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make note of the problem in coastal Louisiana and why it is so critical that these dollars be invested, that the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act be continued. In coastal Louisiana, prior to the Federal Government building levees on the Mississippi River, the Atchafalaya River, and our coastal region of the State, the State of Louisiana was growing to the tune of three-quarters of a square mile per year, on average. Our State was accreting; it was growing in land.

When the Corps of Engineers came in and built levees on our river system, we immediately went from growing, or accreting, to losing land. In some decades, we have lost an average of 16 square miles per year. In other decades, we have lost closer to 26 or 28 square miles per year. In 2005, we lost nearly 200 square miles of our coast per year. To add it all up, the total figure, we have lost 1,900 square miles of our State since the 1930s. To put it in comparison, if the State of Rhode Island lost 1,900 square miles, the State of Rhode Island wouldn't exist anymore. If the State of Delaware lost 1,900 square miles, it would consist only of its inland waters. Nineteen hundred square miles is an extraordinary amount of land. Then to watch this administration come out and say: You know what? We are going to propose this new waters of the U.S. definition, because waters of the United States are so important and wetlands are so important to us, we have got to protect them. Yet the Federal Government is causing the greatest wetlands loss in the United States—prospective, ongoing, and historic—the Federal Government, the same agency, the Corps of

Engineers, that actually is supposed to be enforcing wetlands laws.

So the State of Louisiana said, yes, we are going to take these dollars whenever they finally begin flowing in some degree in 2017 and 2018, we are going to take those dollars and we are going to invest them. We are going to protect them by constitutional amendment. We are going to complement them with billions of dollars and other State-controlled spending, and we are going to invest them in making the coast of Louisiana more resilient, making our communities more resilient, making the economy of this Nation more resilient.

I remind you, in 2005, because of hurricane impacts to the State of Louisiana, prices spiked 75 cents a gallon nationwide, on average. In 2008, when hurricanes hit the Gulf Coast and Louisiana, prices spiked \$1.40 a gallon, on average, nationwide. This is a national issue.

Mr. Speaker, following the 2005 hurricanes, the Federal Government expended over \$100 billion—by some estimates, perhaps close to \$130 billion or \$140 billion—responding to these disasters. If we had taken somewhere in the range of \$8 billion to \$9 billion, we could have prevented the 1,200 lives that were lost that I referenced earlier. We could have prevented the expenditure of well over \$100 billion in taxpayer funds, the majority of that going toward deficit spending.

It doesn't save money to cut the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. To the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it is going to cost our Nation more dollars; and history has proven that, studies by Congressional Budget Office, studies by FEMA, and many others have proven that this is penny-wise and pound-foolish. It will result in additional deaths. It will result in additional flooding. It will result in additional economic disruption in this Nation, and it is the wrong approach.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say it one more time. Onshore energy revenues are shared 90 percent between the Mineral Leasing Act and the Bureau of Reclamation funds, 90 percent; offshore energy revenues, we get well less than 1 percent, well less than 1 percent per year today. And as we try and slowly begin addressing the disparity but nowhere close to what happens for onshore production, when we try to do the right thing and make sure that these funds are constitutionally protected to be invested in making the communities more resilient, making the ecosystem more resilient, and addressing the wrongs of the Federal Government, addressing natural resource flaws of the Federal Government, we now have this administration who is supposed to be the environmental administration coming out and taking these dollars away, which is once again why the Environmental Defense Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Audubon Society, and many, many others came out against this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge, as we continue to move through the appropriations bills and continue to work on energy policy, that we truly seek to do what the President says in regard to an all-of-the-above policy, which includes conventional fuels, to ensure that the States that are producing these energies receive some type of mitigative funds or revenue sharing, to ensure that the State of Alaska, that the East Coast and other States that are bringing offshore production online are treated fairly, and to ensure that these dollars are reinvested back in the resilience of these communities and in the ecosystem.

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

□ 2030

#### CURRENT NEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot in the news recently about questions being asked of people running for President. It has been interesting. In taking that issue up, though, it is important to look at some of the current news.

Here is an article on May 17 by Bill Sanderson of the New York Post. It says: "Saudi Arabia to buy nuclear bombs from Pakistan."

It says:

Saudi Arabia will join the nuclear club by buying "off-the-shelf" atomic weapons from Pakistan, U.S. officials told a London newspaper.

Wow. Well, that was something that we weren't expecting back when President Bush went into Iraq when he made that call that some day, Saudi Arabia and others in the Middle East would become so nervous about the chaos created in the Middle East that they would determine: We may need to get nuclear weapons ourselves. In the past, we have always been comforted by the fact that the United States would keep peace in the Middle East. They wouldn't let anything get out of hand. They would keep other Middle Eastern countries, especially radical Islamist countries, from having nukes.

This administration has shown it is not capable of preventing nukes from proliferation in the Middle East, so therefore, our allies are getting quite nervous.

Here is an article from today by a brilliant prosecutor of the original bomber of the World Trade Center in 1993, Andrew McCarthy. It is dated today, May 18. The title of his article in National Review says: "The Iraq Question is the Iran Question—At Least It Should Be."

He goes on to point to the question that is being asked of some Republican Presidential candidates. Obviously, the mainstream media, those that donate

to the Clinton foundation, and those kind of folks—those that would take a hostile position against Republicans in debates, those who act as mediators or emcees in a debate would actually speak on behalf of the Democrat—they are not asking this question of Democrats, but it is a legitimate question.

This is what Andrew McCarthy brings up. He says: “Was it a mistake to invade, knowing what we know now?”

He is talking about Iraq.

Mr. McCarthy says:

It is a very fair point that the question should not be asked solely of Republicans—Hillary Clinton and other Democrats who supported the war should be grilled, too.

He says further down: “Many of us who supported the Iraq war based that support on the principles enunciated in the Bush doctrine.”

Then he sets out his take on the Bush doctrine. I think it is well set out.

It says: “Attack the jihadists wherever they operate and make rogue states understand that if they support the terrorists we will treat them as enemies. In that calculation, Iraq was an enemy regardless of whether it had weapons of mass destruction. It”—talking about Iraq—“obviously was not the worst such enemy—Iran was. And it obviously was a potentially more dangerous enemy if it had weapons of mass destruction that could have been shared with jihadists. Iraq, nevertheless, was surely in the camp of states that, using Bush’s ‘with us or against us’ metric, was against us.”

Then we have an article here from IJReview: “U.S. Special Forces Just Took Out a Top ISIS Leader—And Captured His Sex Slavery-Condoning Wife,” by Justen Charters.

It says: “While airstrikes continue to hammer ISIS positions, it turns out that that is not the only thing the jihadists need to worry about. U.S. Special Forces appear to be doing more than just training ‘rebels,’ they’re now engaging the enemy. And, they just put down a top Islamic State leader: Abu Sayyaf.

“USA Today reported further on the operation, which will be hurting the terrorists’ bankroll and morale.”

It goes out to set out something from USA Today.

That is such an intriguing story, Mr. Speaker. I find it very intriguing because I can’t remember how many times, but it was many times that the President and other members of this administration said: There will be no boots on the ground in Syria in this area—no boots on the ground.

We were told that over and over, which is really perplexing because we all trust the same people that told us. If you like your insurance, you can keep it; if you like your doctor, you can keep him—all these things—that they are not going to persecute people of religious beliefs, then they persecuted them.

Who would have thought that this administration would say there will be

no boots on the ground and then put boots on the ground?

Now, it could have been, in fairness to the administration, that they hovered and were able to lift up the wife of the ISIS leader without actually getting boots on the ground, or it is quite possible they didn’t wear boots. Maybe they were wearing moccasins or something like that; maybe they went barefoot, and that would explain why those in the administration would say: We will never put boots on the ground; no boots are going to be on the ground.

Maybe they really weren’t wearing boots. I know boots have come a long way since I was in the Army, and I never did understand why we had to wear those black boots that you had to spit-shine to shine them up. It made no sense to me.

I like the new boots the military is wearing now much better; but maybe they have got some other shoes they have figured out so they don’t have to actually put boots on the ground.

In any event, what happened in the Middle East is most intriguing.

Then we have a story today from Judicial Watch. Judicial Watch has now gotten documentation as a result of a court order on May 15. They have been able to get more documentation than Congress has been able to get because they are fighting this administration in court, and they are getting court orders to force the issues.

The only way you will get information out of this transparent Obama administration is if you bring them out kicking and screaming with the documents, under threat of what a judge can order and do; that is obvious because, as a Member of Congress asking for the documents that were provided in discovery in 2008 to the convicted terrorists in the Holy Land Foundation trial, I got on a Web site one time. I asked for the boxes of documents that the Justice Department gave to the terrorists.

I understand Attorney General Holder was saying there may be classification issues, but I keep coming back to the point they gave them to terrorists. Surely, you can give them to Members of Congress, but that also points to a problem that is ongoing in this administration. They keep helping the wrong people.

In Egypt, we have been told by the administration: Gee, President Morsi was elected in a very questionable election, and there were allegations of a great deal of fraud.

But I was told by Egyptians that it was made clear to the opponent of Morsi that, if he raised any issues about fraud in the election, the Muslim Brothers would burn the country down, and he chose not to contest what was some apparent fraud in the election.

Morsi allegedly got 13 million votes or so, and despite the fact—well, at least reported by many news organizations—there were over 30 million Egyptians out of their 90 million or so in the country that went to the streets peacefully.

It was the largest demonstration, peaceable or otherwise, in the history of the world, from the best I can find out. They went to the streets. They demanded a nonradical Islamist President. They demanded the peaceable ouster of Morsi, who they believed had committed treason and who they understood had basically torn up, figuratively, the constitution that the U.S. Government was helpful advising in, but somehow, our advisers did not persist in making sure they had a provision for a peaceful impeachment of the President of Egypt. They had no way to get him out.

These moderate Muslims—and I have talked to a number of them that were there demonstrating—these secularists, Christians, Jews, and the Coptic Pope himself told me how moved he was to have so many people from so many walks being an encouragement: We don’t want you persecuted in our country of Egypt anymore. It is not right.

Naturally, what would the Obama administration do? They would demand that the man that was figuratively shredding the constitution in Egypt, that was persecuting Christians, that was weaponizing the Sinai, which was building the radical Islamism organization within Egypt, this administration was giving them weapons, wanted to help them any way they could, which leads to the question that I have been asked by moderate Arab Muslim leaders in the Middle East: Why does this administration keep helping the Muslim Brothers? Do you not understand they are at war with you?

Well, it should have been clear, but this administration was helping the wrong side. It didn’t stop with pushing for the ouster of this country’s ally in Egypt, Mubarak. This administration decided to oust Qadhafi, a dictator with blood on his hands from the eighties and nineties.

□ 2045

After 2003, after the Bush administration ordered the taking out of Saddam Hussein, Qadhafi got scared, opened up his weapons, says he will not pursue nukes; he will do whatever the United States tells him with regard to his weapons.

As some in Israel have told me, he was really helping with information against terrorists more than anybody but maybe us; yet this administration undertook a bombing effort against Qadhafi.

Now, we find out confirmation from documents that have been acquired by Judicial Watch that this administration was actually helping with weapons, at least that is the way it appears; that is what we have been hearing all along.

Some have said even in my trip to Libya with friends STEVE KING and Michelle Bachmann, if it weren’t for the Obama administration bombing Qadhafi, they could not have gotten him out of office, and he would still be helping us find and kill terrorists.

Now, Libya is in chaos. There are Muslim Brothers doing the best they can to put Egypt in chaos. Syria is now in chaos. Iran is taking over more and more, including, just last September, this President referred to the success story in Yemen. Now, Iran is the power player in Yemen, not the United States. The Obama administration in Yemen basically has been whipped by Iran.

This is scary stuff, when you look at what has happened in the Middle East since this administration took over. The story from Judicial Watch dated May 18, it is pretty timely, includes information about the documentation that was ordered by the United States District Court and has now been obtained, even though the administration blacked out a lot of information that apparently would be embarrassing to it.

The story says: “Judicial Watch announced today that it obtained more than 100 pages of previously classified ‘Secret’ documents from the Department of Defense and the Department of State revealing that the DOD almost immediately reported that the attack on the U.S. Consulate in Benghazi was committed by the al Qaeda and Muslim Brotherhood-linked ‘Brigades of the Captive Omar Abdul Rahman,’ and had been planned at least 10 days in advance. Rahman is known as The Blind Sheikh”—that is the one that Andrew McCarthy had prosecuted as lead prosecutor—and is serving life in prison for his involvement in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and other terrorist acts. The new documents also provide the first official confirmation that shows the U.S. Government was aware of arms shipments from Benghazi to Syria. The documents also include an August 2012 analysis warning of the rise of ISIS and the predicted failure of the Obama policy of regime change in Syria.

“The documents were released in response to a court order in accordance with a May 15, 2014, Freedom of Information Act lawsuit filed against both the DOD and State Department seeking communications between the two agencies and congressional leaders ‘on matters related to the activities of any agency or department of the U.S. Government at the Special Mission Compound and/or classified annex in Benghazi.’

“A Defense Department document from the Defense Intelligence Agency, DIA, dated September 12, 2012, the very day after the Benghazi attack, details that the attack on the compound had been carefully planned by the ‘Brigades of the Captive Omar Abdul Rahman’ to ‘kill as many Americans as possible.’ The document was sent to then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, then-Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Obama White House National Security Council. The heavily redacted Defense Department ‘information report’ says that the attack on the Benghazi facil-

ity ‘was planned and executed by The Brigades of the Captive Omar Abdul Rahman.’ The group subscribes to ‘al Qaeda ideologies.’”

Now, that was part of the message of September 12, 2012.

Now, it is understandable why President Obama would not have gotten this message because, clearly, he had to get a good night’s sleep because he was going to a campaign event in Las Vegas on September 12. He surely didn’t have time to review this material in pursuit of his campaign. Here he was, just less than 2 months away from election day.

It is understandable that he would not get the information and would not know that this was not about a video; it was about a carefully planned attack by subscribers to al Qaeda.

The Defense Intelligence Agency knew that, and that message was sent to Hillary Clinton. It was sent to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and it was sent to those who were not out campaigning in Las Vegas at the White House.

The article goes on: “The attack was planned 10 or more days prior on approximately 01 September 2012. The intention was to attack the consulate and to kill as many Americans as possible to seek revenge for U.S. killing of Aboyahiyeh”—also lists him as Alaliby—in Pakistan and in memorial of the 11 September 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center buildings.”

This is quoting from the DIA report. It says: “‘A violent radical . . . the leader of BCOAR is Abdul Baset,’” also called Azuz. “‘Azuz was sent by Zawari’”—the leader of al Qaeda, that is—“‘to set up al Qaeda bases in Libya.’ The group’s headquarters were set up with the approval of a ‘member of the Muslim Brotherhood movement . . . where they have large caches of weapons. Some of those caches are disguised by feeding troughs for livestock. They have SA-7 and SA-2½ MANPADS . . . they train almost every day focusing on religious lessons and scriptures, including three lessons a day of jihadist ideology.’”

Mr. Speaker, I am very confused by that. I don’t understand how these Muslim Brothers, these jihadists, could be studying scripture, and this is quoting from the Defense Intelligence Agency report, when it says they are focused on religious lessons and scriptures, including three lessons a day of jihadist ideology because this Defense Intelligence Agency reports they are studying religious lessons and scripture, claiming to be Islamists.

That couldn’t possibly be because this administration has made clear these people are not religious. They are not Islamists. They have nothing to do with Islam. These people are just ne’er-do-wells. I don’t understand why the Defense Intelligence Agency would report that they were studying religious lessons when they are not religious at all, according to this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I take you back to that so-called Arab Spring, when this ad-

ministration was helping the Muslim Brothers, and I stood right here on this floor and pointed out: Look, we know that there are al Qaeda in these rebels. We don’t know what percentage; we don’t know how many, but we know there is some al Qaeda in these rebels that this administration is helping. We should wait and not keep militarily supporting people that we know include al Qaeda until we find out more.

But this administration went ahead.

As this story says: “The Defense Department reported the group maintained written documents in ‘a small rectangular room, approximately 12 meters by 6 meters . . . that contain information on all of the al Qaeda activity in Libya’”—wow, al Qaeda ties.

Anyway, “The DOD documents also contain the first official documentation that the Obama administration knew that weapons were being shipped from the Port of Benghazi to rebel troops in Syria.”

An October 2012 report also is confirming: “Weapons from the former Libya military stockpiles”—which word is we helped get there—“were shipped from the Port of Benghazi, Libya, to the Port of Banias and the Port of Borj Islam, Syria. The weapons shipped during late August 2012 were sniper rifles, RPGs, and 125-millimeter and 155-millimeter howitzers missiles.”

Anyway, it goes on. The DIA report said “the opposition in Syria was driven by al Qaeda and other extremist Muslim groups: ‘the Salafist, the Muslim Brotherhood, and AQI are the major forces driving the insurgency in Syria,’” which this administration wants to keep calling vetted moderate Syrian rebels, when their own report says they have got al Qaeda ties.

As this says: “The deterioration of the situation has dire consequences on the Iraqi situation,” and it goes on to set those out.

I think the big question that should be forcefully put to former President George W. Bush and anybody who is running for President the next time, they ought to be asked this question: If you had known before we went into Iraq, going after the brutal dictator Saddam Hussein, who had killed hundreds of thousands of people, including Kurds, with chemical weapons and other weapons, and you knew he could be ousted, and after a surge, the war could be won; but then that, after your victory in Iraq, following the surge, you would be followed as President with an administration that was too incompetent to negotiate a status of forces agreement with Iraq, and so you end up having—that administration is going to have to leave and actually commit other acts that will help create absolute chaos in the Middle East; and you are going to be followed by this administration that will help the Muslim Brothers that your Muslim allies in the Middle East say, The Muslims Brothers are at war with you, yet this administration that follows you will keep helping America’s enemies, and that, because of the creation of chaos by this

succeeding administration, Iran will be pursuing nuclear weapons; and that the succeeding administration will be so incompetent and clueless as to what is happening in the Middle East, they think it is okay to let them keep enriching uranium, pursuing nukes, and it gets so bad that this next administration will even cause our allies like Saudi Arabia, to go buy nukes; and then we end up with this subsequent administration that helps the Muslim Brothers create more chaos than we could have imagined, knowing all of that, would you go into Iraq?

That is a question.

□ 2100

But it is really a tough question. How in the world would President George W. Bush have known that he would be followed by such incompetence that would help our enemies and would just create chaos across the entire Middle East such that our friends would be in conferences with people like me going: We don't understand America anymore. You keep helping your enemies. We don't get it. We thought we were your friends, but you are helping the people at war with you.

I mean, how could President George W. Bush be expected to anticipate that that is the kind of thing that would follow his administration and completely destroy the situation in the Middle East and in Iraq and in the Sinai and in Gaza and in Libya, in Lebanon, in Syria, a massive migration into Jordan. Jordanian pilots now to the point they would be burned alive. Christians raped, persecuted, killed in all kinds of horrendous ways. Jews ostracized, killed.

Who would have ever dreamed that we would have an administration come in and take the success after the surge and turn it into the chaos it is today?

So I will be interested, Mr. Speaker, in the days ahead, as people seek to lead this country, to find out which leaders would have gone ahead into Iraq, knowing the chaos they would create in the subsequent administration.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today on account of flight delays.

Mr. LAMBORN (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today on account of a flight delay.

Mr. TIBERI (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today on account of flight delays.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 14, 2015, she presented to the President of the United

States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 651. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the "Sister Ann Keefe Post Office."

H.R. 1075. To designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the "Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry."

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 19, 2015, 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:

1491. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Strategic Economic and Community Development (RIN: 0570-AA94) received May 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1492. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Bruce A. Litchfield, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1493. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, on a transaction involving Gunes Ekspres Havacilik A.S. of Antalya, Turkey; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1494. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; NAAQS Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0819; FRL-9927-48-Region 5] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1495. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fragrance Components; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0821; FRL-9927-38] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1496. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Trichoderma asperelloides* strain JM41R; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0963; FRL-9926-87] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1497. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Trinexapac-ethyl*; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0340; FRL-

9926-62] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1498. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau/MD, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operations in the 3550-3650 MHz Band [GN Docket No.: 12-354] received May 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1499. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a transaction involving China Southern Airlines of Guangzhou, China; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1500. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1501. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Semiannual Report to Congress from the Office of Inspector General, of the Department of Health and Human Services, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, Pub. L. 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1502. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1503. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the Statement of Disbursements for the United States Capitol Police for the period of October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Pub. L. 109-55, Sec. 1005; (H. Doc. No. 114-38); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1504. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Trawl Rationalization Program; Catch Monitor Program; Observer Program [Docket No.: 130503447-5336-02] (RIN: 0648-BD30) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1505. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's modification of fishing seasons final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #1 and #2 [Docket No.: 140107014-4014-01] (RIN: 0648-XD868) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1506. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trawl Rationalization Program; Midwater Trawl Fishery Season Date Change [Docket No.: 141222999-5322-02] (RIN: 0648-BE72) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.