

Mr. Dingell said: Well, son, be careful what you wish for. Remember LBJ. We had LBJ over at the Library of Congress, a book study just this week.

Different Presidents handle their relationship with Congress in different ways. Some are involved too much, some are involved not enough, but everyone is involved.

Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be a battle of ideas, not a battle of ideologies. This is supposed to be a battle of policy, not a battle of partisans.

This is supposed to be an opportunity to succeed on behalf of folks back home; and I will tell you, it is an opportunity that we are losing when we unite ourselves based on red and blue as opposed to uniting ourselves based on Article I and Article II.

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

#### THE RETURN TO PRUDENT BANKING ACT

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage you to join with me and 69 of our colleagues, a total of 70 already, who have signed on to cosponsor H.R. 381, the Return to Prudent Banking Act. This bipartisan bill would restore the provisions of the Glass-Steagall banking law that separated prudent banking from wild speculation in the financial realm.

Yesterday marked the 16th year, to the day, that Congress repealed the Glass-Steagall Act in 1999, bestowing on financial institutions and investment firms the ability to put the life savings and deposits of the American people at greater risk.

I was one of the 57 Members of this Congress who voted against that repeal of Glass-Steagall. At that time, my colleagues and I were told by Wall Street that the banks were strangled by outdated restrictions, that the repeal was a modern experiment in deregulation; so Congress repealed this bedrock law, over our objections.

Look where that decision took America. We witnessed a terrible market crash in 2008; now, slow growth and the outrageous enormous accumulation of banking assets in a handful of institutions like JP Morgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, Bank of America. They are raking in record-shattering profits while paying depositors almost nothing on their interest or on certificates of deposit as wages for working-class Americans continue to flatline.

The original Glass-Steagall Act served our country well. It laid the foundation for an unprecedented half century without financial panics or crises. Just as important, it contributed to a right-sized banking system focused on serving our economy and society as a whole rather than enriching itself at everyone else's expense.

This Congress must reinstate the regulatory prudence of the Glass-Steagall

Act. Without these proper safeguards, it is only a matter of time before Wall Street's greedy operatives once again steer the American economy over the precipice.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 381, the Return to Prudent Banking Act of 2015. Help restore prudence, discipline, and sanity to our financial system and, in turn, real economic growth to America.

#### PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 92

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, November 5, 2015, through Thursday, November 12, 2015, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, November 16, 2015, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Tuesday, November 10, 2015, through Friday, November 13, 2015, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, November 16, 2015, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.*

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after concurrence with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015, TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today on a motion offered pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Monday, November 9, 2015, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 92, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGES THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NEED TO HEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, I do want to commend my friend from Georgia. He speaks eloquently.

I hated to lose dear friend, John Linder, from here in this body. He was a brilliant man, with great class. But since he is gone, I am delighted to have ROB WOODALL here in his stead—just clear-thinking, articulate, and makes the case that the American people need to hear.

□ 1330

Speaking of messages, Mr. Speaker, the American people need to hear, this is November 5, 2015. It was November 5, 2009, when a major in the United States Army at Fort Hood, Texas, killed Americans.

He had given plenty of warning signs that he was a ticking time bomb who was going to kill Americans, particularly American soldiers, especially if he were ordered to go overseas because he would much prefer to kill American soldiers than he would go overseas and risk killing a fellow Muslim.

Having heard about people in the United States Army, as I was in for 4 years, who had to deal with Major Hasan, it is appalling that political correctness led to this man's being allowed to remain in the military, ever being promoted, and being assigned to counsel troubled soldiers. Incredible. But political correctness has become more and more prominent.

It was November 5, 2009. President Obama had been in office since January of that year. Major Hasan had been in the military during the Bush administration. He should never have been promoted.

There were warning signs that we heard about after the fact, but nobody wanted to be the one to stand up and say: "This man is a threat. He is a radical Islamist. He is a threat not only to the good order and discipline of the United States military, he is a threat to the very lives of our military members."

Mr. Speaker, our military let those victims down at Fort Hood, Texas, before the shooting ever occurred. That is almost unbearable. But what becomes

unbearable is the fact that 6 years later victims of Major Hasan who are still alive are still being mistreated by this administration.

An article by Jacob Brooks and J.C. Jones in the Killeen Daily Herald today in the paper said: "Six years after the November 5, 2009, shooting at Fort Hood, at least one victim is still fighting for overdue benefits. Former Fort Hood Staff Sergeant Alonzo Lunsford, Jr., said pain, betrayal, disrespect, and patriotism all come to mind when he thinks about that tragic day. He said, 'It is a lot. It is really a lot that goes through my head.'"

He was shot seven times by Nidal Hasan, the Army psychiatrist who opened fire on unsuspecting fellow soldiers at a Fort Hood medical processing building for deploying soldiers.

Six years later, the building has been torn down. Many of the soldiers who were there have since moved on, are either no longer in the Army or stationed elsewhere.

Hasan, an Army major at the time of the shooting, was found guilty of killing 12 soldiers and 1 civilian on August 23, 2013, following a 12-day court martial at Fort Hood. Days later he was sentenced to die and is currently on death row at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, awaiting automatic appeals.

Mr. Speaker, it took Congress battling and finally putting language in a bill that the Army and the Defense Department finally could not ignore that finally put enough pressure on the Army to do the right thing by these victims, and that is—for Heaven's sake, they were victims of an attack in the war against America by radical Islam.

As Muslim friends in the Middle East, leaders in the Middle East who are Muslims, have asked on different visits I have had in the Middle East: Why is it that this administration does not understand radical Islamists, particularly the Muslim Brotherhood, is at war with the United States? You keep helping the people who are at war with you, the Muslim Brotherhood.

They recognize it all over the Middle East. Muslims over there scratch their heads—moderate Muslims—and wonder what is wrong with America.

I met a number of the survivors of the shooting 6 years ago today when the Purple Hearts were finally awarded. A number of us were there from Congress because it was an important day and they needed to know Members of Congress do care.

So we were there as representatives of this body and all of those within it who recognize the loss and the sacrifice occurred at the hands of someone who is at war with the United States, a part of the bigger radical Islamist movement.

It is rather ironic that, as we think about and talk about the violations of the Iran treaty—yes, it is a treaty, despite the Senate's unwillingness to call it what it is and the administration obviously won't call it what it is—but the violations of the Iran treaty by Iran

are still resulting in this administration's sending billions and billions and billions of dollars to people who want to kill us and to eliminate our way of life.

Yet, this same administration that is sending billions and billions and billions of dollars to our enemy can't scrape together mere hundreds of dollars to send to someone like Staff Sergeant Alonzo Lunsford.

The article says he is now in North Carolina. I was impressed when I met him. He seems to be a very sharp man, a patriot, someone who cares about America. But like many of the victims, the wounds go even deeper than the shots that were fired. In his case, seven times he was shot. Oh, what a horrible day.

And, yet, this administration becomes accomplices to the after-the-crime episode and damage by still refusing to acknowledge it for what it was and pay these patriotic service-members the money they have coming as people who were wounded in the line of duty.

It is ridiculous that this administration will send billions and billions to our enemies who have already said that, with all the billions Obama is going to make sure that we get, we are going to be able to finance more, help Hamas more, help Hezbollah more. We are going to be able to help those who kill Americans.

What does the administration do? They want to make sure that nothing gets in the way of their sending money to people that want to kill Americans and people who have killed Americans.

A report out just this week indicates that Iran may be responsible for at least 12 percent of the Americans killed in Iraq. I can't help but think, based on those I have talked to in trips to Iraq and those who have researched even further, that when we get to the bottom line, it will likely be a lot more than 12 percent.

But even so, the country, the radical Islamist leaders in charge, are guilty of killing Americans, and this administration rewards them by sending them money and, whether it is intentional or sheer intentional neglect, refuses to acknowledge the patriotism and the act of war against our members of the United States Army and the United States military and the one civilian that was killed, refuses to acknowledge and adequately appreciate those patriots that were killed or wounded in the line of duty in an act of war by Major Nidal Hasan.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question arises: If this administration, either through neglect or intent, is so calloused and uncaring towards its own military members, then what is going on now that is going to result in future Americans, military members, being killed? How many more Major Nidal Hasans are there in the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marines?

God, I hope and pray that people like Nidal Hasan are not still being pro-

moted because nobody wants to—in this administration, under this administration, under this Commander in Chief—rise up and say: This guy is giving all the indications of being a radical Islamist that will one day explode and kill Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen record numbers of generals—officers with stars on their epaulets—being fired. Personally, I recognize Edward Snowden to be a traitor. I have tried felony cases, including death penalty cases.

Coupled with my experience here in Congress of trying to advise and help whistle-blowers and having seen this administration turn against whistle-blowers, use their own department they work in to destroy their careers, use the Department of Justice to harass them, and if it is somebody that has very damaging evidence about wrongdoing by this administration, then they will convene a grand jury to investigate and harass, never mind that it drives a spouse to the hospital near breakdown, never mind the damage that it does to those patriotic whistle-blowers who just want the government to do the right thing in all things.

I have to recognize, if I were sentencing Edward Snowden for his treason, that in this administration someone that were to come forth—if Edward Snowden had done this and come before superiors in this administration, he would likely have been destroyed, a grand jury convened, attempts to put him in jail, attempts to destroy his evidence.

That would have to be taken as evidence in mitigation of whatever the sentence was for the treason because, under this administration, I have struggled with people who wanted to get the truth out.

Where do you go? Eric Holder, as Attorney General, was not going to help a whistle-blower if they had information that was damaging to the administration. No. He was the head of the largest criminal defense firm in America defending the actions in this administration and going after and trying to destroy anybody who came forth with damaging evidence, particularly if it could have come before the election in 2012.

Loretta Lynch will always be a blot on the reputation of the United States Senate because she made clear she thought that the things Eric Holder did in violation of the Constitution, in contempt of Congress, the disingenuity and dishonesty, were okay in her book, and they confirmed her anyway. So the indications are things haven't gotten any better than they were.

□ 1345

What do you do if you are a patriotic whistleblower in this administration and you want to out Nidal Hasan, you want to come forward with documentation that shows this administration has acted inappropriately? It has been

made clear to people, you raise your head up to try to speak up and speak truth, then we will make you rue the day you ever worked for the government.

We won't help with mere hundreds of dollars to American patriots who were wounded in an act of war, and, obviously, 13 killed in an act of war by radical Islamists. We won't even call radical Islam what moderate Muslims in the Middle East recognize that it is. And a man of great courage I think will end up being recognized as one of the great leaders in the Middle East of any age. President el-Sisi gets the back of the hand most of the time from this administration. When he has had the courage to stand up to imams in a room, looking them in the eye, and say: It is time to take back our religion from the radicals.

Because of his courage, because of his recognizing the threat that radical Islam is, not only to Christians and Jews, but to moderate Muslims, then there is no doubt there are people that want to kill him, when this administration ought to be doing everything they can to help them.

I was asked by Egyptian leaders: Does your President not understand that the Apache helicopters that he promised the Muslim Brother Morsi that he withheld for so long, that we used those to keep the Suez Canal open, does he not want the Suez Canal open? Does President Obama not care? Well, that would certainly be the indication if you look at the actions of his administration.

When I was in Egypt in September, people who desperately want to be friends with the United States, they yearn for freedom, they yearn for a free Egypt, free of radical Islam, even though they are Muslims themselves, they want to be friends with freedom-loving Americans, and yet with dozens and dozens and dozens of leaders from countries around the world, including Russia, top leaders from countries around the world, being there to note the incredible historic event in world history when Egypt, after having gotten rid of the radical Islamist Muslim Brother Morsi, who was refusing to keep his conduct within the requirements of their Constitution, was removed after the biggest peaceful demonstration in the history of the world. Over 30 million people are said to have gone to the streets to demand his removal.

After Morsi is removed, people of vision like el-Sisi took over and they dug another lane to the one Suez Canal, so there are two lanes for a big part of it there. That was a historic day in June. The people of Egypt should have been lauded by all of those in this administration.

Yet, not only did this administration not care to recognize the great historic fete of Egypt struggling as it is to achieve greatness once again, they didn't even send anybody from Washington. My friend DARRELL ISSA went. Congress was represented.

I was not allowed to go, of course, because Speaker Boehner wasn't allowing people like me who spoke up for what we believe is right to travel. And, according to his staff, Speaker Boehner saw taxpayer-funded travel as a reward for people that apparently voted like he wanted them to, which kind of sounds like it would be a crime.

But, nonetheless, we were represented. Congress was represented there, but not the administration. Leaders from around the world were there. Not this administration.

It is time to recognize the good Muslims, the moderate Muslims in the world, with whom we can be friends, who want to be our friends, who want to work with us, and recognize those, like the Muslim Brotherhood, who want to destroy our way of life. And it is time to stop the political correctness that got 13 people killed at Fort Hood 6 years ago today and got so many more wounded.

Since this administration doesn't want to properly recognize efforts to keep the Middle East peaceful and out of the hands of radical Islamists, like the Muslim Brotherhood, well, we had the Iran treaty that this administration pushed and the Senate refused to take up and vote on as a treaty.

The Corker bill clearly didn't apply because the Iranian treaty did include terms about ballistic missiles, about weapons buying, about release of money under the sanctions. It did change the terms of the nonproliferation treaty. It was clearly a treaty.

It really will be another blot on the Senate's reputation that they did not stop that. By taking a vote on ratification, it wouldn't have gotten the two-thirds required. And then we could have prevented the \$100 billion plus—we are told \$100 billion or so each year thereafter—that will be going to a country that, according to this news this week, where “‘Death to America’ Stands Despite the Nuclear Deal.” This report from AFP, dated November 2, from Tehran, says, “the Islamic Republic will not abandon the slogan of ‘Death to America’ despite its July nuclear accord with world powers.”

“The martyr-nurturing nation of Iran is not at all prepared to abandon the slogan of ‘Death to America’ under the pretext of a nuclear agreement,” 192 members of Iran's 290-seat parliament said in a statement carried by state news agency IRNA.

“They said the slogan, chanted at the weekly Friday prayers in mosques and at protests, had ‘turned into the symbol of the Islamic republic and all struggling nations.’”

So let's look, Mr. Speaker, at what has occurred since the Iran treaty that was not ratified was placed into being by this administration and by the Senate looking the other way.

Well, they have had ballistic missile tests. They have had joint military operations with Russia and Syria.

Those certainly violate the terms of the Iran deal.

They have had open violations of international travel bans. We have had a cyber attack from there. We have had an arrest of a U.S. resident, Nazar Zaka. “Death to America” is still their chant.

And yet here is this story from October 21 by Reuters. It says:

“The United States, Britain, France and Germany called on Wednesday for the United Nations Security Council's Iran sanctions committee to take action over a missile test by Tehran that they said violated a U.N. ban.

“In a letter containing details on the launch, they said the ballistic missile was ‘inherently capable of delivering a nuclear weapon.’

“The letter, seen by Reuters, was sent to the committee after the United States raised the issue in the 15-member Security Council.

“‘We trust that this information will assist the Committee in its responsibility to examine and take appropriate action in response to violations of U.N. Security Council resolutions,’ they wrote.”

“Diplomats have said it was possible for the sanctions committee to blacklist additional Iranian individuals or entities if it determined that the missile launch had breached the U.N. ban. However, they said Russia and China, which have opposed the sanctions on Iran's missile program, might block any such moves.

“‘The United States will continue to press the Security Council to respond effectively to any future violations . . . Full and robust enforcement of all relevant U.N. measures is and will remain critical,’ U.S. ambassador of the United Nations Samantha Power said in a statement on Wednesday.”

Now, the reason that the United States has sent this letter, participated in it, asking the U.N. to take appropriate action, is because this administration is gutless to do what needs to be done. You have Iran, it has been confirmed, that killed so many hundreds responsible for the death of so many Americans. And this administration struck a bad deal with them that could never get two-thirds of the Senate to ratify it, so we just act like it is a treaty that is ratified, even though it isn't.

But it is gutless to stand up to Iran and say: You violated the deal. We are not going to allow \$100 billion to \$150 billion to go to you while you continue to say “death to America”; you continue to have ballistic missile tests; you continue to have joint operations, in violation of our deal, with Russia and Syria; you continue in open violation of international travel bans; you continue to attack us or have cyber attacks from your country; and you continue to stir up violence against the United States. You are not getting any money.

How about giving just a little bit of that \$100 billion to the victims of Nidal Hasan? How about giving it to the victims of radical Islamist violence? How

about giving it to the victims of over 400 days in captivity in Iran under the Ayatollah Khamenei's leadership?

This administration has got to act. This is outrageous.

And then we have an International Business Times report, "Iranian Airline Violates Terms of Nuclear Deal By Purchasing Planes To Use In Syrian War." This says:

"One of Iran's commercial airlines last week bought a UK-manufactured jet with the aim of using it to deliver Iranian soldiers and weapons to Syria . . . The purchase of the aircraft by an Iranian concern represents a clear violation of the deal brokered by the administration of U.S. President Barack Obama."

It is outrageous. The Iran deal needs to be brought to an end. No more money needs to go to Iran. No money for killers, for terrorists, but money to the victims in our United States military.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today regarding House Concurrent Resolution 92, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 9, 2015, at 3 p.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 92, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3380. A letter from the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Agriculture Priorities and Allocations System (RIN: 0560-AH68) received November 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3381. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Docket No.: FEMA-B-1089] received November 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3382. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; St. Charles County, Missouri, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] received November 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3383. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acquisition Regulations: Export Control (RIN:1991-AB99) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3384. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2014-C-1552] received November 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3385. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorizations in the People's Republic of China [Docket No.: 150825776-5776-01] (RIN: 0694-AG69) received November 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3386. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-098; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3387. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-055; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3388. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3389. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-067; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-068; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3391. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-090; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3392. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-079; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3393. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-078; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3394. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-076; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3395. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-172, "Higher Education Licensure

Commission Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3396. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-173, "Sexual Assault Victim Rights Task Force Report Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3397. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-175, "ABLE Program Trust Establishment Temporary Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3398. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-192, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 369, S.O. 13-07989, Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3399. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-193, "Testing Integrity Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3400. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-194, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 197, S.O. 15-23895, Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3401. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-195, "James Bunn Way Designation Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3402. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-171, "Fiscal Year 2015 and Fiscal Year 2016 Revised Budget Request Adjustment Temporary Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3403. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-174, "Rent Control Hardship Petition Limitation Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3404. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XE168) received November 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3405. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measures and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XE182) received November 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.