Mr. Speaker, we need to work together. Newt Gingrich, a former Speaker with whom I served, reached a compromise with President Clinton. There were a lot of people on his side of the aisle that didn't want to see an agreement between President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich. It was on the funding of government, the basic responsibility this Congress has, or any board of directors of any enterprise has.

Mr. Gingrich stood at that podium, Mr. Speaker, and talked to what he referred to as his perfectionist caucus, people who wanted it their way and were not prepared to compromise from a road other than their way. He said, Mr. Speaker, to that perfectionist caucus, Look, I know this is not exactly what you want, but the American people have elected a President of another party, Bill Clinton, and they've elected a Senate with a lot of Democrats in there who don't agree with us, and, yes, some Republicans who don't agree with us. They also elected a lot of Democrats to the House of Representatives. He said, Obviously, a majority of the Members of the House were Republicans. But if the country was going to move forward, if there was going to be a positive resolution to the conflict that existed between differing points of view, that there would need to be compromise. He admonished that perfectionist caucus to understand that this was a democracy, not a dictatorship, and that agreement and compromise was the essence of what democracy meant.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that over the 5 weeks that are to come that Members will reflect, communicate with our citizens, and come to an understanding of the necessity to act not just our way or my way, not just to reflect what I want, but to reflect what we as a country working together can accomplish. Mr. Speaker, if we do that, America will continue to be the greatest country on the face of the Earth, providing opportunity for our children and our families, our workers and our seniors, and continuing to be that shining city on a hill of which Ronald Reagan spoke so glowingly

Mr. Speaker, let us hope in these 5 weeks we learn how to work together. That's what our people want. As importantly, that is what our people need.

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

IN REGARDS TO BIPARTISANSHIP

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. Mr. Speaker, it's always such an honor to speak here on the floor. Some have said that you'll regret being in Congress. Well, it's where the fight for America is.

I appreciated so much the comments, as I sat here for some time listening to the former majority leader of the House, talking about the need for bipartisanship, the importance of bipartisanship, the importance of working together. The deepest regret I experienced in listening to that wonderful speech by my friend from Maryland was that I didn't have a transcript of that speech to read him every single week that the Democrats were in the majority here on this floor and every single time that they came forward with a closed rule allowing no amendments. In fact, each time that it came to the floor, the Democratic majority, during those 4 years between January of 2007 and January of 2011, it was the most closed Congress in the history of the country, with the least number of open rules, the least amount of bipartisanship. They rammed through the most destructive bill in American history in the last 100 years, that being the ObamaCare bill, without a single Republican vote. There was no bipartisanship.

Anyway, I thoroughly enjoyed the comments from my friend, the former majority leader. Gosh, I wish I could have read that back to him over and over during the 4 years they were in the majority. He has such a great sense of humor, Mr. Speaker. I know he would have laughed over and over as I read it to him. In fact, there was a time that the majority leader was coming down the aisle and we were about to vote on the card check bill, which was going to eliminate secret ballots for elections. The secret ballot would have been eliminated for elections to be a unionized group or not to be. I was kidding around with my friend from Maryland as he came by, and I said, Word here on the floor is that you're about to vote against your party and against the card check bill so that you're not going to be in agreement to eliminate secret ballots. He's so intelligent and has such a great sense of humor. He said, The odds of that happening are infinitesimal. I said, It's just that everybody here on the floor knows that before NANCY PELOSI became Speaker, she had promised John Murtha would be the majority leader. And if you hadn't had a secret ballot, John Murtha would have been the majority leader instead of you. He laughed. He has a great sense of humor.

So I'm sure if I were able to go back in time and read our former majority leader's comments today about the importance of bipartisanship, he would probably laugh as he did when he voted to end the secret ballot for union elections, even though the secret ballot is what got him elected as majority leader.

□ 1430

But are some amazing things going on. It was huge when this Congress did something a few weeks ago that people said couldn't be done and that was with regard to the agriculture bill and that was many years ago, the agriculture bill, which was quite small, comparatively, combined with the food stamp bill. And I wondered when I got here 8½ years ago why was food stamps part of the agriculture bill. It was explained to me that this is strictly for political purposes, because there are not enough farmers that have enough representation in Congress to ever get a farm bill passed by itself, and that there's enough people concerned about the waste in the food stamp program and the abuses in the food stamp program that it might have a hard time just passing on its own without having a lot of restructuring and efforts to clean up the waste, fraud, and abuse. So by putting them together, you combine enough votes from both sides of the aisle to get a farm bill with food stamps passed. But if you separate them, you won't pass either one, at least not in that current form.

So it was really historic what was done and why a number of us voted for the agriculture bill without the food stamps attached. But we kept making it very clear, we're not out to end the food stamp program. We know there are people who need food help and we want to help them, so we are not for taking food out of the mouths of children that can't feed themselves, even though we were continually told that by people on the other side of the aisle. It broke my heart because I had a bunch of good friends, even though they're at one end of the political spectrum and I'm at the other, but they'd come to the floor and say something that they surely, surely, I hope they didn't mean. But they did say it, that Republicans are trying to take food out of the mouths of children. Well, that was rather tragic of them to say that since that was simply not true. And the heartbreak of having friends come down and make allegations that absolutely, unequivocally were not true came rushing back as I heard our former majority leader say that we were trying to eliminate food to the hungry when we made the point over and over.

I know it is tough being in the leadership of either party. You're constantly doing stuff. He probably didn't hear where we said over and over, We're not eliminating the food stamp program; we're separating it from the ag bill, that's all. So I will make sure that our friend understands and gets the message. We actually were not out to eliminate the food stamp program, but we sure do need to clean it up.

I took grief for just telling of a constituent that had mentioned that he was standing in line at the grocery store behind somebody who had crab legs, and he was wishing he could afford to have crab legs and he was looking at his ground meat. Anyway, then when that person in front of him got ready to pay for the crab legs, he pulled out a food stamp card.

I forget which Washington rag it was, but one of them—and it may not have been a Washington rag. But the left wing went nuts talking about how I am accusing people of squandering precious food stamp money on crab legs

when that was not the case at all. Then right after that, one of the Washington papers did have a front page story, and in part of that story was a picture out here where seafood is sold, a massive amount of crabs for sale with a big red sign saying, ''Food stamp cards welcome.''

Breitbart, I've got so many great friends there, brilliant people, and even though they're really brilliant, they like me okay. They ran with the story about how the left wing made a big deal out of it, and all they had to do was go to a seafood place.

Anyway, I also saw a picture that was not in the paper, massive crab legs, and there was that red sign that they take food stamps. So, obviously, it would seem that the left wing blogs, in their attempt to smear me, actually exposed, once again, their ignorance.

So there are a lot of things that need to be fixed up. We want to help people that need food that can't provide for themselves. But if they can work, it is a good thing to push people to reach their God-given potential.

The problem with that, especially for African Americans—and I think they're the worst hit group in all of America with regard to unemployment. This President's policies have absolutely devastated African American communities in this country with a massive, high unemployment rate. And so I sure hope that we can change things because the unemployed of whatever race, creed, color, gender, they deserve an opportunity. They deserve a chance at pursuing happiness. But these policies of this administration are making that increasingly difficult.

That's why it really focused people's attention recently when the President came out in full support and actually made it happen and said: You know what, I am just going to speak into being new law and cancel old law. I've said before, some of the things that this administration, this President have done are so unconstitutional. One of the things that ought to end up resulting is a massive class action by all of the people who took his constitutional law course to want their money back, because for any President to say I rammed through ObamaCare without a single Republican vote, we didn't get any input from those people, we didn't want it. But you know what, it is such a disaster, and I'm hearing from people that I've called fat cats before, big business folks, they're saying it's going to devastate their businesses. So tell you what, I am going to postpone for a year the big business requirement, big business being anything over 50 employees, I'm going to postpone their requirements to follow the law, just choose not to enforce the law so they can get away with not following it for a year.

Well, I have listened to some of the President's incredible, amazing eloquence, some right here from this second podium here, expressing concerns for Americans, but especially the poor and downtrodden. Now to me, somebody that's making $11,000 has got it tough. It's tough to live on $11,000 right now, but that's considered the poverty rate. It's right about $11,000. So under the ObamaCare bill that was shoved through the House and Senate, unconstitutionally because it included a tax and raised revenue that did not originate in the House, and hopefully we'll get the Supreme Court's action on that and they'll do the right thing unless somebody knows something about Chief Justice Roberts that I don't. Anyway, it didn't originate in the House. I think we should ultimately get it struck down for that reason. They took a bill from the House, deleted every single word and substituted therein about 2,500 pages is what my copy was, for a tax credit for first time home buyers who were veterans or in the military. So, obviously, it was not germane, and hopefully the Supreme Court will still do the right thing and strike it down.

But in the meantime, people are having to make preparation to live under it. That includes Congress. Except for the leaders and the committee staff members, all of us in Congress are going to be forced into the ObamaCare exchanges come January.

So I've heard the President's speeches about caring so deeply about the middle class, and our former majority leader was talking about the middle class and what we need to do for them. But here again, I keep coming back to ObamaCare. I was shocked when I read in the ObamaCare bill that if you cannot afford to buy the minimum health care mandated by the Federal Government in ObamaCare, then you're initially going to have a 1 percent income tax, but then it is going to go to 2.5 by 2016. I thought, that's crazy. My friends across the aisle, President Obama, they're always talking about how they care so deeply about those who are struggling and doing everything they can to get by. It just is shocking to come to realize they have no clue about the suffering that somebody making $14,000 is going to have thrust on them by ObamaCare when they can't—if they're only making $14,000, it is unlikely their employer is going to be able to pay $7,000 for an insurance policy, so they will be on their own.

We have heard over and over that employers are trying to get down below 50 employees. I know a restaurant back in Tyler, my hometown, they indicated they are going to sell off a couple of their restaurants to get under 50 because they can't afford to meet the mandate. So a lot of people are losing their insurance, despite the President's assurance you wouldn't. That's happening all over the place.

And it is happening, ironically—and this is kind of rich. It really is rich, and I hope America can see the humor. So many of our friends across of the aisle said over and over at these microphones, If you like your insurance, you can keep it. And then they passed a bill without a single Republican vote that says all those people that said that, you can keep your insurance, they're not keeping, not one of them is going to keep their insurance. So it's kind of rich. It's a little humorous if you like sick irony. All these speeches about if you like your insurance—they're just quoting the President—you can keep it, turns out they're all wrong and every Member of Congress is going to lose their insurance come January 1, unless they retire before January 1, then they actually can keep their insurance.

And then we find out today that actually there is an issue because the way ObamaCare was addressed, it did prevent the leaders of both parties, as I read it, and committee staffs from having to be under ObamaCare. So the leaders, they're protected. They don't have to be under ObamaCare, and the committee staffs won't have to. But all the rest of us, all the rest of the Members of Congress, the rank and file, we'll be under it.

And now we find out there is a huge ambiguity because it doesn't say whether or not the Federal Government can continue to pay the 72 percent of the health care costs, the health insurance costs for Members of Congress. Right now Members of Congress, we are on Social Security, despite what the email that has been going around for 20 years says. We pay Social Security tax. Despite all this stuff about a golden parachute and you can retire and get every dime you make, I think that changed during Ronald Reagan's time as President. So you don't have a golden parachute. I think most Members have a 401(k)-type thing where the government will match up to 5 or 6 percent of what you put in, but it is the same retirement program that every single Federal worker across America has.

People forget that Newt Gingrich—and I appreciate my friend from Maryland bringing up Newt Gingrich. He's an amazing guy. He is a big idea guy, and I like the way he thinks. We don't agree on all his big ideas, and he doesn't agree with all of my big ideas, but he comes up with some good ideas. In the Contract With America, one of the big ideas that was immensely popular, way over 70 percent popular, was that Members of Congress ought to live under the same laws that everybody else in America does. And that passed. That was part of the contract, and they lived up to it. It became law, and so Members of Congress have to live under the same laws as everybody else does.

That's why, after I've been cooking ribs to share in a bipartisan manner—and not many days go by when I don't have somebody on either side of the aisle ask, Louie, when are we going to get ribs again? Well, the Architect of the Capitol found out. I thought he was a little overzealous, but he feels like I violate some of the codes that everybody else in America has to live under,

and so I can't cook ribs. We've had all kinds of things. The media wanted to come do something on me cooking ribs. President Bush liked my ribs.

□ 1445

People on both sides of the aisle do. They may not vote for anything I'm for, but they love my ribs. And it was a nice time.

But the reason I can't cook ribs anymore is because we're living under the same laws as everybody else did. And apparently there's a law that said you can't have a fire within 10 feet of wood in a building structure, so they shut me down. We're living under the same law as everybody else is.

And then it comes to ObamaCare, and the decision by the—and it wasn't by Congress. I was grilling our Republican leaders just earlier about exactly what's happening.

The Office of Personnel Management, under the Obama administration, has decided that the Federal Government will go ahead and, come January, we won't keep our same insurance. I've got a health savings account. They made sure I'm not going to get to keep my insurance, and we can't figure out what happens to the HSA.

I'd like to drop ObamaCare insurance and just put money into a health savings account. But they've even screwed us over with ObamaCare to prevent that kind of thing from happening.

So, anyway, it looks like the decision by the Obama administration will be that Members of Congress will have 72 percent of our health insurance paid by the taxpayers, and what we have to borrow from China, of course, or other places.

Well, that's nice, but if America is not playing under those same rules, it doesn't seem fair for us. And I'm hopeful, when we get back, maybe we can get a bipartisan bill through that just says everybody in America can opt out of ObamaCare and not pay a fine, not pay a tax or whatever you want to call it, and provide what they feel like is appropriate. But it all ought to be fair across the board.

And now, the issue has gotten rather large since we find out the IRS truly has been targeting, after 2010, when the President said, you know, how much they wanted to stop the Tea Party; he felt they were a threat to America. They were a blessing to America. They were a threat to an oppressive government, because everybody I've run into, I've talked to people of all kinds of national origins, all races, from both genders, I mean, all kinds of folks at Tea Party events. And the only thing I can find they have in common: they're all paying income tax. They're all paying income tax.

And the President felt like this group needed to be gone after, and he made comments to that effect. And somebody, and we need to find out whom, was the top person in the administration, but it appears it at least goes back to the President's own hand-picked council, as far as who knew, who participated.

And of course there's been a denial, just like there was during Watergate, but we'll see what the truth is, even though there's a lot of obfuscation in the process.

But with regard to the IRS, the thing's very clear: we should not have the IRS involved in our health care at all, ever. And yet they are a central part of ObamaCare.

And then we find out this week, reading the story, it's changed some, but basically, a couple were wondering why law enforcement showed up at their home, when they had just looked online for a pressure cooker and a back pack. Turns out, apparently, at work one of them had looked at something else. They were no threat to anybody.

But the question keeps arising, wait a minute; who's monitoring every Web site that every American goes to?

Well, must be the NSA, apparently. But I did attend a classified briefing, so I can't go into anything there.

But it appeared, before the briefing, very clear to me, and I still feel this way, that when you blind yourself as to who the enemy is, as we have, purging all kinds of material from our FBI training material, State Department, intelligence material, as to who radical Islamists really are and what they actually believe, you blind our law enforcement, our security people, from the ability to see our enemy, we're not protected.

And then when you have an open border where people are coming across at will, and Border Patrolmen have told us three to five times faster than they ever have since we started talking about just handing out legal status, anybody that happened to be here by a certain date, all this talk about amnesty, citizenship, all these other things being talked, do they get benefits, not get benefits, all this talk has increased the number of people coming in by about three to five times.

The border's not secure. When you don't control what kind of terrorists may be coming into your country, and you don't train your law enforcement, your terrorist-discerning folks who it is that are the terrorists, and you keep pulling back our ability to see who our enemy really is, then it appears the solution is to have the Federal Government more intrusive than any of us ever dreamed it would be.

And then, you couple that with what we found out yesterday, and this article's dated August 1, 2013, and it's titled ''Exclusive: Dozens of CIA Operatives on the Ground During Benghazi Attack.'' And in part it points out CNN has learned the CIA is involved in what one source calls an unprecedented attempt to keep the spy agency's Benghazi secrets from ever leaking out:

Since January, some CIA operatives involved in the agency's mission in Libya have been subjected to frequent, even monthly polygraph examinations, according to a source with deep inside knowledge of the agency's workings. The goal of the questioning, according to sources, is to find out if anyone is talking to the media or to Congress.

It is being described as pure intimidation, with the threat that any unauthorized CIA employee who leaks information could face the end of his or her career.

In an exclusive communications obtained by CNN, one insider writes, ''You don't jeopardize yourself, you jeopardize your family as well.''

Another says, ''You have no idea the amount of pressure being brought to bear on anyone with knowledge of this operation.''

Agency employees typically are polygraphed every 3 or 4 years, never more than that,'' said former CIA operative and CNN analyst Robert Baer. In other words, the rate of the kind of polygraphs alleged by sources is rare.

So says the CNN article.

''If somebody is being polygraphed every month or every 2 months, it's called an issue polygraph, and that means the polygraph division suspects something, or they're looking for something, or they're on a fishing expedition, but it's absolutely not routine at all to be polygraphed monthly or bimonthly,'' said Baer.

A source now tells CNN that the number, talking about the number of people at Benghazi mission, was 35, with as many as seven wounded, some seriously. While it is still not known how many of them were CIA, a source tells CNN that 21 Americans were working in the building known as the annex, believed to be run by the agency, talking about the CIA.

He goes down, and he talks about Congressman FRANK WOLF, a dear friend. He says, WOLF has repeatedly gone to the House floor asking for a select committee to be set up, a Watergate-style probe involving several Intelligence Committee investigators assigned to get to the bottom of the failures that took place in Benghazi, and find out just what the State Department and CIA were doing there.

More than 150 fellow Republican Members of Congress have signed his request. And just this week, eight Republicans sent a letter to the new head of the FBI, James Comey, asking that he brief Congress within 30 days.

In the aftermath of the attack, WOLF said he was contacted by people closely tied with the CIA operatives and contractors who wanted to talk. Then suddenly, there was silence. And I can verify that problem as well from some of the people that were going to talk to me and then all of a sudden they went silent and said, no, I'm not going to talk.

''Initially they were not afraid to come forward. They wanted the opportunity, and they wanted to be subpoenaed, because if you're subpoenaed it sort of protects you. You're forced to come before Congress. That's all changed,'' said WOLF.

Speculation on Capitol Hill has included the possibility that U.S. agencies operating in Benghazi were secretly helping to move surface-to-air-

missiles out of Libya, through Turkey, and into the hands of the Syrians rebels. It's clear that two U.S. agencies were operating in Benghazi. One was the State Department. The other was the CIA.

The State Department told CNN in an email that it was only helping the new Libyan government destroy weapons deemed ''damaged, aged, or too unsafe to retain,'' and that it was not involved in any transfer of weapons to other countries.

But the State Department also clearly told CNN they ''can't speak for any other agencies.'' And the CIA would not comment on whether it was involved in the transfer of weapons or not.

So perhaps that was going on, but we still have got to get to the bottom of why four great, heroic Americans were allowed to be killed, were put in a situation like that.

What difference does it make at this point?

It makes a difference at this point, or a year from now, or 2 years from now, or 3½ years from now because people need to understand, they need to understand clearly.

When somebody's life is taken, normally, if a criminal law is involved, the statute of limitations are a lot longer. And Eric Holder, I can assure you, will not be Attorney General for the next 4 years. Three and one-half years from now we'll have a new administration. And we will hopefully get to the bottom of these scandals.

And they're not phony. We know that because the President has assured us, back when they first arose, he was going to get to the bottom of it. And unlike what one of the family members of those killed at Benghazi told me, there, at the ceremony, Secretary Clinton said we're going to get the guy that did the video. And all they wanted was to get justice from those who caused the death of their loved one.

We owe that to them, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 233. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''; to the committee on Oversight and Governemtn Reform.

S. 256. An act to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa; to the committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the committee on Education and the Workforce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 668. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the ''Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building''; to the committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 796. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the ''James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building''; to the committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 885. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the ''Thaddeus Stevens Post Office''; to the committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1093. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the ''First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building''; to the committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, 113th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, September 9, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2551. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulation Revision: Removal of the Pesticide Discharge Permitting Exemption in Response to Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals Decision [EPA-HQ-OW-2003-0063; FRL-9829-2] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2552. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Streptomycin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0852; FRL-9385-3] received May 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2553. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions; Technical Amendment [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0755; FRL-9384-9] recevied August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2554. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Data Requirements for Antimicrobial Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0110; FRL-8886-5] (RIN: 2070-AD30) received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2555. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-QPP-2012-0204; FRL-9387-9] received June 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2556. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for fiscal year 2014 and the OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2557. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral William E. Landay III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2558. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bereau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Amendments to the 2013 Mortgage Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) [Docket No. CFPB-2013-0010] (RIN: 3170-AA37) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2559. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E) [Docket No.: CFPB-2012-0050] (RIN: 3170-AA33) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2560. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Broker-Dealer Reports [Release No.: 34-70073; File No. S7-23-11] (RIN: 3235-AK56) received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2561. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Financial Responsibility Rules for Broker-Dealers [Release No.: 34-70072; File No. S7-08-07] (RIN: 3235-AJ85) received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2562. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2563. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report to the President and the Congress on Medicaid Home and Community-Based Alternatives to Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities Demonstrations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2564. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2012 Performance Report to Congress for the Food and Drug Administration's Office of Combination Products required by the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2565. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Thrid Progress Report of the Implementation of Section 3507 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2566. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Turtles Intrastate and Interstate Requirements [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0639] received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2567. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on Premarket Approval of Pediatric Uses of Devices — FY 2009-2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2568. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting