

minute conversation, the majority of which was spent answering questions I had about the legal system. The context is also important. Brock had yet to issue a statement, and I had not read his remarks.

"My life has been on hold for over a year, a year of anger, anguish and uncertainty, until a jury of my peers rendered a judgment that validated the injustices I had endured. Had Brock admitted guilt and remorse and offered to settle early on, I would have considered a lighter sentence, respecting his honesty, grateful to be able to move our lives forward. Instead he took the risk of going to trial, added insult to injury and forced me to relive the hurt as details about my personal life and sexual assault were brutally dissected before the public. He pushed me and my family through a year of inexplicable, unnecessary suffering, and should face the consequences of challenging his crime, of putting my pain into question, and of making us wait so long for justice."

Mrs. DAVIS of California. "I told the probation officer I do not want Brock to rot away in prison. I did not say he does not deserve to be behind bars. The probation officer's recommendation of a year or less in county jail is a soft time-out, a mockery of the seriousness of his assaults, an insult to me and all women. It gives the message that a stranger can be inside you without proper consent and he will receive less than what has been defined as the minimum sentence. Probation should be denied. I also told the probation officer that what I truly wanted was for Brock to get it, to understand and admit to his wrongdoing.

"Unfortunately, after reading the defendant's report, I am severely disappointed and feel that he has failed to exhibit sincere remorse or responsibility for his conduct. I fully respected his right to a trial, but even after twelve jurors unanimously convicted him guilty of three felonies, all he has admitted to doing is ingesting alcohol. Someone who cannot take full accountability for his actions does not deserve a mitigating sentence. It is deeply offensive that he would try and dilute rape with a suggestion of 'promiscuity'. By definition rape is not the absence of promiscuity, rape is the absence of consent, and it perturbs me deeply that he can't even see that distinction."

Mr. GOSAR. "The probation officer factored in that the defendant is youthful and has no prior convictions. In my opinion, he is old enough to know what he did was wrong. When you are eighteen in this country you can go to war. When you are nineteen, you are old enough to pay the consequences for attempting to rape someone. He is young, but he is old enough to know better.

"As this is a first offense I can see where leniency would beckon. On the other hand, as a society, we cannot forgive everyone's first sexual assault or

digital rape. It doesn't make sense. The seriousness of rape has to be communicated clearly, we should not create a culture that suggests we learn that rape is wrong through trial and error.

"The consequences of sexual assault needs to be severe enough that people feel enough fear to exercise good judgment even if they are drunk, severe enough to be preventative. The probation officer weighed the fact that he has surrendered a hard earned swimming scholarship. How fast Brock swims does not lessen the severity of what happened to me, and should not lessen the severity of his punishment. If a first time offender from an underprivileged background was accused of three felonies and displayed no accountability for his actions other than drinking, what would his sentence be? The fact that Brock was an athlete at a private university should not be seen as an entitlement to leniency, but as an opportunity to send a message that sexual assault is against the law regardless of social class."

Ms. KUSTER. "The Probation Officer has stated that this case, when compared to other crimes of similar nature, may be considered less serious due to the defendant's level of intoxication. It felt serious. That's all I'm going to say.

"What has he done to demonstrate that he deserves a break? He has only apologized for drinking and has yet to define what he did to me as sexual assault, he has revictimized me continually, relentlessly. He has been found guilty of three serious felonies and it is time for him to accept the consequences of his actions. He will not be quietly excused.

"He is a lifetime sex registrant. That doesn't expire. Just like what he did to me doesn't expire, doesn't just go away after a set number of years. It stays with me, it's part of my identity, it has forever changed the way I carry myself, the way I live the rest of my life.

"To conclude, I want to say thank you. To everyone from the intern who made me oatmeal when I woke up at the hospital that morning, to the deputy who waited beside me, to the nurses who calmed me, to the detective who listened to me and never judged me, to my advocates who stood unwaveringly beside me, to my therapist who taught me to find courage in vulnerability, to my boss for being kind and understanding, to my incredible parents who teach me how to turn pain into strength, to my grandma who snuck chocolate into the courtroom throughout this to give to me, my friends who remind me how to be happy, to my boyfriend who is patient and loving, to my unconquerable sister who is the other half of my heart, to Alaleh, my idol, who fought tirelessly and never doubted me."

Mr. GOHMERT. "Thank you to everyone involved in the trial for their time and attention. Thank you to girls across the nation that wrote cards to my DA to give to me, so many strangers who cared for me.

"Most importantly, thank you to the two men who saved me, who I have yet to meet. I sleep with two bicycles that I drew taped above my bed to remind myself there are heroes in this story. That we are looking out for one another. To have known all of these people, to have felt their protection and love, is something I will never forget."

□ 2045

Mr. SPEIER. "And finally, to girls everywhere, I am with you. On nights when you feel alone, I am with you. When people doubt you or dismiss you, I am with you. I fought everyday for you. So never stop fighting, I believe you. As the author Anne Lamott once wrote, 'Lighthouses don't go running all over an island looking for boats to save; they just stand there shining.' Although I can't save every boat, I hope that by speaking today, you absorbed a small amount of light, a small knowing that you can't be silenced, a small satisfaction that justice was served, a small assurance that we are getting somewhere, and a big, big knowing that you are important, unquestionably, you are untouchable, you are beautiful, you are to be valued, respected, undeniably, every minute of every day, you are powerful and nobody can take that away from you. To girls everywhere, I am with you. Thank you."

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

VICTIM STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). 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 want to first thank my friend. I am very grateful to my friend from California, Congresswoman SPEIER, for having the idea and doing this. Powerful. As a former judge who heard cases like this, it is a powerful reminder of the evil or, as the poet said, the inhumanity of man to man. It is such an outrage.

This was a special evening to bring attention to a grave injustice, so I am very grateful that Congresswoman SPEIER did what she did.

It also brings to mind the fact that there is grave injustice. Nobody should get 6 months in prison for what was done in that case. In Texas, the minimum would be 5 years. I saw Judge POE, a former district judge, also reading part of the statement of the victim in the case. And I just cannot imagine Judge POE or myself giving a sentence anywhere close to 5 years. We would have been heading for the top, if not the top. It is just so outrageous.

In considering an appropriate sentence, a judge—we were taught and the rule was—considered punishment just for what was done. You considered deterrence to the individual who committed the act. You considered general deterrence to the public at large and

the message that would be sent with the sentence that was assessed. And you considered the protection of the general public.

The sentence in this case was just outrageous beyond measure. It is no deterrence to the defendant, criminal actor. It is no general deterrence to the public at large. Somebody thinks they could get away with what he did and get the kind of light sentence he did; it is no deterrence at all.

It certainly didn't protect the public. If he had done 30, 40 years in prison, the public would have been protected all that time. It certainly wasn't much punishment for punishment's sake.

ORLANDO SHOOTING

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to the issue of the Orlando shooting. There is an article from *The Daily Caller* from June 12, "Did FBI Training Material Purge Cause Agency to Drop the Ball on Orlando Shooter?" I would submit that it absolutely did.

The FBI agents who questioned or investigated this matter I do not believe are at fault for shortcomings. I don't see them. Because I know, Michele Bachmann knows, LYNN WESTMORELAND knows, as we went over and were going through material that the FBI had classified—I thought it was ridiculous; the public should know—the documents about radical Islam that have been purged from the FBI training. Some were ridiculous, cartoon, this or that. But they classified them so that none of us could tell you, Mr. Speaker, or anyone publicly how ridiculous some of the purging was.

According to this administration and Homeland Security, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, is an honorable organization. So are they all—all—honorable organizations? The Islamic Society of North America, all organizations that were named as co-conspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial: there were coconspirators named, and the judge found plenty of evidence to keep the named co-conspirators in the pleading, though some of them tried to have them removed. But they say they are offended.

They convince people in this administration that somehow the fact that nothing emboldens ISIS more than seeing a weak America and a weak American response is made to be somehow false, though it is absolutely the truth.

Somehow, with the help of some of the media, some in this administration have been able to convince a lot of people that somehow, if you describe radical Islamist terrorists as what they are, you somehow are the reason that there is terrorism. They forget so quickly.

Bill Clinton as President of the United States did more to try to help Muslims around the world, Eastern Europe than most any President. What happened? They tried to bring down the World Trade Center in 1993 on his watch. Not only that, it turns out that the whole time President Clinton was sacrificing American life and limb and

treasure to protect Muslims, they were plotting to try again to bring down the World Trade Center.

No, Mr. Speaker, calling radical Islam is not what evokes terrorism. There are a number of factors, but weakness is definitely one of them. And this is a paraphrase, but Ronald Reagan pointed out that, in his lifetime, there was no war that was begun because the country was too strong. That prevents wars. It doesn't cause them. It doesn't cause terrorist attacks.

I go again and again back to the comment from the African gentleman. My wife and I were visiting the Mercy Ship there and the good they were doing treating the thousands and thousands there in West Africa who didn't have proper medical care. This wonderful charitable institution was doing great things. We were there for a week, washed dishes, assisted any way I could in surgery, anything I could do.

But it was the Africans, at the end of the week, who wanted to meet with me and told me: Look, we were so excited when you elected your first Black President, but we have seen, since he has been President, you have gotten weaker and weaker in America. And when America gets weak, we suffer.

Basically, we know where we are going when we die, but our only chance of having peace in this life is if America is strong. And this country has been weakened.

As Muslims leaders have asked in the Middle East, North Africa, Asia: How do you not understand the Muslim Brotherhood has been at war with you since 1979? We don't understand. You placate, you help the Muslim Brotherhood, and you turn on your Muslim friends. We don't understand it. All around the world, they don't understand it.

Iran is an enemy of the United States. They continue to say that. They continue to say that they lied and they would never submit to the terms that this administration said they agreed to. And it is one more thing that makes the radical Islamists or Islamists who are thinking about radicalizing, it helps them realize America is weak and they are stupid and they need to be wiped off the map.

So what does this administration do? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken from the floor here about a fellow Texan, Mr. Eliibary, who was a featured speaker at the 20th Century Man of Peace, the Ayatollah Khomeini, big closed-door event. He was a featured speaker to honor the Ayatollah Khomeini. When the convictions came through for supporting terrorism in the largest, most important terrorist case in America, he took up for the defendants. He said they were wrongly treated.

We know that Osama bin Laden said that the writings of the Muslim brother Qutb—Q-U-T-B is how it is spelled—that Qutb, especially his booklet, "Milestone," helped radicalize him.

Mr. Eliibary was online encouraging people to read "Milestone," that it was a great thing to read, that it was very helpful. And Osama bin Laden said it sure helped radicalize him.

With all the warning signs, Janet Napolitano didn't care. She wanted to show the Muslim world that she was so above the fray and above these silly mortals, what fools these mortals be, that she was above all of that, that she could bring someone who named his foundation the same name as the political party of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. And he never would disclose—as far as I have seen, he still has not disclosed—where he got all the money for what he did.

And yet she made him part of the Countering Violent Extremism advisory committee and then promoted him to the Homeland Security Advisory Council and gave him a classification so he could get online and review classified information.

And Janet Napolitano, as Secretary of Homeland Security, testified falsely before our committee, first, that she didn't know anything about what I was talking about, him downloading documents and trying to offer them to news media, specific national news media, to publish. Thankfully, they turned it down.

□ 2100

She said she didn't know anything about it, yet the night before, her chief told the director of the Department of Public Safety in Texas—because he called me right after the call—I just got a call from Napolitano. He says he has just finished fully briefing Secretary Napolitano on what Eliibary did on his own laptop at his home downloading this information.

She said the next day: I have no idea, basically, what you are talking about.

The next time, I told her: You said you would investigate.

She said: We investigated. There was nothing to it.

None of that was true. When documents were sought to show what was done in the investigation, it turns out there was no investigation. She was testifying falsely about that as well.

So what are radical Islamists supposed to take from all this?

You have an administration that is protecting them. When you review documents that have been cleaned out, taken, purged out of the training material for the FBI, for the State Department, for the Defense Department, for the CIA, for our intelligence, Department of Defense, it is no wonder FBI agents cannot discern that Tsarnaev had been radicalized even though Russia told us twice. And still this administration, they had so miseducated and undereducated our agents, they didn't know what to ask.

How do you establish that somebody had been radicalized?

My dear friend, Philip Haney, one of the original members of Homeland Security, it probably was a record the

number of people that he put together the information to show their terrorist ties. He got a commendation for it. But when he started showing there were ties that people with this administration were having with known terrorists, they deleted thousands of pages of entries of what he had done. When he filed an IG report, they came after him. They impaneled a grand jury to try to destroy him, and he was so squeaky clean. Even though it put his wife in the hospital, nearly killed her, this patriot who has given his life and the opportunity to make millions of dollars with the kind of brilliant mind he has gave it all for his country.

And what did this administration do in return?

This award-winning, wonderful patriot was harassed and investigated, had rumors spread so that they could make sure that the other agents within Homeland Security knew that you don't want to say anything about people with terrorist ties because this will happen to you next.

You know, he has been run through the wringer with a grand jury, and now we are going to take away his gun, his weapon in front of others—terrible humiliation—and then basically put in a closet to push him into retirement. Thank God he was close to retirement. Now he is where he can tell all that was not classified. And we find out just how bad things have been, as this administration did more to protect radical Islamists than it has done really to help keep America safe.

I know I am critical a lot, but I am grateful. I am very grateful that after this terrorist attack, the President didn't go play golf this time. He didn't call the Governor of Florida, but I am very grateful he didn't go play golf. He didn't go to a baseball game. He wasn't on the kiss camera somewhere. I think he is making progress now after 7½ years, and I am grateful for that. I thank him for that, Mr. Speaker, through you.

But this article from the Daily Caller by Peter Hasson says: "Syrian Immigrant Who Said 9/11 'Changed the World for Good' is a Homeland Security Adviser." It goes through and it talks about, you know, that she was picked by Jeh Johnson to help advise him. And here are some of the tweets—oh, and by the way, Mr. Elibary, like I said, they finally let him end his term after he said the international caliphate was inevitable. Obviously, the United States, by his comments, will have to fall on our knees in front of the ultimate caliph, perhaps the 12th Imam in his mind. But he said Americans need to get used to it.

Well, here is a new replacement. It looks like she has some of the views of Mr. Elibary. This is a lady with the last name Alawa. So Ms. Alawa, on February 4, 2013, tweeted out: "I can't deal with people saying America is the best nation in the world. Be critical. Be conscious. Don't be idiots."

Well, this Nation has previously been the best nation in the world. It has

been the freest nation in the world, and that has been shown. But in recent years, we have fallen further and further down the list of the most free nations in the world. So we are certainly not the most free nation anymore, although we have been the most blessed nation with personal freedoms and personal assets. The only nation in history, that I am aware of, where the number one health problem for the Nation's poor involved obesity.

This adviser to Jeh Johnson also tweeted out that "The US has never been a utopia unless you were a straight white male that owned land. Straight up period go home shut up."

Isn't that great, Mr. Speaker, that we have people with this mentality and hatred from Americans and bigoted racial positions that she can advise our Secretary of Homeland Security?

Here is another one, September 17, 2014: "9/11 is your day to pull out your flag themed clothing, and my day to look behind my back as I walk home."

Well, actually, I don't see a lot of attacks on Muslims in America, especially by true Christians because that is not a Christian thing to do. It is a radical Islamist thing to do.

That is actually quite confirmed by this tweet on 26 April of 2013. She says: "You can't say something intolerant and not expect consequences. Not on my watch."

Well, what she is advocating there, in America, under our Constitution, under every law of every State, is called a crime. She is advocating a crime.

Our American Revolution saw the quoting, usually attributed to Voltaire—some differ for the proper attribution, perhaps Voltaire, but the saying was, "I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Now, according to this high-flying adviser to our own American Homeland Security Department, that is now being changed. Basically, to put it more in Voltaire's potential terms, Miss Alawa is saying: I disagree with what you say, and I am going to cause hell to come down on you. There will be consequences because I disagree with what you say, and I am going to make you suffer for it.

Well, see, that is under sharia law, and we find, obviously, she follows sharia law. She doesn't believe in the United States Constitution, she doesn't believe in freedom of speech, and yet here she is, a top adviser to our own Homeland Security Secretary.

Here is another tweet. This was after Pamela Geller was exposing the lies and hypocrisy of radical Islam and had a drawing contest about Mohammed, and she says: How the blank is—and she fills in blanks. How the blank is the S blank @PamelaGeller is spewing "free speech"? It's straight up warmongering hate speech. It's xenophobia.

No. The hatred is belonging to Miss Alawa.

Here is another to show her racism. She says: "Because, Ya know,

@TheBachelor, white people in America? They're not gonna be dominant majority for much longer."

So it is wonderful that Secretary Johnson feels that the way to protect America is to have racist, sharia-loving, above-the-Constitution advisers telling him that you have to go easy on the radical Islamists and not call them what they are, and be mean and tough on people who are concerned about their physical safety, and you need to take the guns away.

I mean, I found this statement. This is consistent. This administration says, when radical Islam attacks, it is time to take guns away from law-abiding Americans. And he keeps proposing this idea that this list that only this administration can compile—nobody in Congress is allowed to even know how they put their list together, potential watch list, terrorist list. We don't know how they put it. They won't tell us. They won't tell people how you get off the list. And yet this unconstitutional way of depriving people of their constitutional rights is being advocated by mostly everybody in this administration. We have to take away Americans' right to keep and bear arms if the President puts them on a list that says he doesn't want them to have guns.

I mean, we have already seen what this administration has done to seniors. Okay. If you are a senior citizen and you have found—because of arthritis in your hands, whatever reason—it is easier for a family member to take care of your checking account and pay your bills so you don't have to suffer the problems—I know, I have had relatives deal with this, and it is happening now.

So somebody is taking care of your checking account, you lose your Second Amendment right to protect yourself with a gun. But what I have seen repeatedly is seniors who may have a family member take care of their checking account, but they sure do know when somebody is breaking into their home, and they need to defend themselves. They know that. It is instinct. But apparently not in this administration.

And how about this?

The security firm that employed the Orlando gunman guards U.S. nuclear sites. Well, we had heard he worked for this—I believe it was G4S, something like that. Yeah, G4S. They have thousands of employees, and they guard nuclear sites.

I have read before publicly from the request for proposal to provide security for Dulles Airport right out here from Washington. Such an important airport to our Nation's government. It is a request for proposal for independent contractors to provide security. The only qualification to providing the security for Dulles Airport, for the toll roads, for the perimeter around Dulles where you don't want somebody that might leave a gate open for a terrorist friend, well, your only qualification is you

have to be over 21 and legally allowed to work, which means you can be a Syrian refugee and have gotten one of the work permits this administration hands out as a basic form of amnesty or maybe be part of a gang bang group that came up from Central America and lied about who you were, where you were coming from, and got a work permit through this President's amnesty bill, you are welcome to go to work at Dulles providing security. Great stuff.

And then this article: "American-born children of immigrants proving fruitful recruiting ground for jihad in the U.S." It seems like I have been talking about that for 6 years. People come over here on visas, they have children, and then the children are taught to hate America.

In fact, our own al-Awlaki, the first American citizen to have been killed by presidential order with a drone strike, even though he had worked with the administration, he has led prayers. He is so dangerous, the Muslim staffers here on Capitol Hill had him lead their prayers a number of times. So dangerous, the President had to take him out with a drone strike, and yet he was an American citizen only because his parents came over on college visas, had him here, took him back to Yemen and taught him to hate America.

□ 2115

"Orlando Terrorist Worked for Same Security Contractor That Has Been Moving Illegal Aliens Into the United States by the Vanload." This is from Debra Heine, June 13, from PJ Media.

"FBI Twice Probed Orlando Gunman," from Devlin Barrett, June 13, The Wall Street Journal.

The FBI, the government, and homeland security had all kinds of warnings, but they chose to keep playing patsy with people that hate America, who are bigoted, racist Islamic supremacists, and the Nation has suffered as a result.

So what are we going to do? We are supposed to take up a bill. And I applaud our party's leaders. They have made very clear that the President is making a severe mistake by not using the term "Islamic terrorists." So we are taking up a nine-page bill tomorrow that uses the President's term repeatedly, over and over, "countering violent extremism." We never use the term "Islam."

We require reports and training, basically, in the Secretary's discretion, if he wants to. The bottom line is it gives cover for countering violent extremism when we are supposed to be pointing out radical Islamists are our enemy.

This is not the bill we should be passing.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 16, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5687. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Biennial Core Report to Congress, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2464(d); Public Law 112-239, Sec. 322(d); (126 Stat. 1695); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5688. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report to Congress entitled "Distribution of Department of Defense Depot Maintenance Workloads for Fiscal Years 2015 through 2017", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2466(d)(1); Public Law 100-456, Sec. 326(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-65, Sec. 333); (113 Stat. 567); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5689. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James F. Jackson, United States Air Force Reserve, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5690. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing four officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5691. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0119; FRL-9945-72-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS11) June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Secondary Aluminum Production [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0544; FRL-9947-30-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS94) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5693. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hazardous Chemical Reporting: Community Right-to-Know; Revisions to Hazard Categories and Minor Corrections [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2010-076 3; FRL-9945-07-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AG85) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5694. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — D-glucurono-6-deoxy-L-manno-D-glucan, acetate, calcium magnesium potassium sodium salt (diutan gum); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0350; FRL-9946-48] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5695. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Completeness Findings for 110(a)(2)(C) State Implementation Plan Pertaining to the Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) NAAQS; California; El Dorado County Air Quality Management District and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0300; FRL-9947-35-Region 9] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5696. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; California Mobile Source Regulations [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0622; FRL-9947-59-Region 9] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5697. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alpha-2,4,6-Tris[1-(phenyl)ethyl]-Omega-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene) poly(oxypropylene) copolymer; Tolerance Exemption; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0485; FRL-9946-43] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5698. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alcohols, C>14, ethoxylated; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0858; FRL-9946-16] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5699. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Sulfur Dioxide [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0136; FRL-9947-48-Region 5] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5700. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Removal of Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0315; FRL-9947-39-Region 5] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5701. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; NAAQS Updates [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0009; EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0314; FRL-9946-80-Region 5] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the text of Recommendation