

going out of their way, due to the pressure to be all DEI, to not hire White people. I do believe somebody should look into this further and see why only 6 percent of the new hires were White.

The next issue that was not debated last night, but it is what I thought, was the number one issue facing America when I ran for this job 10 years ago—sadly, we are not talking about it—when you talk to people my age, they uniformly feel that America is not as great a country or as favorable a country to live in as the country we grew up in.

When you ask them why, one of the top two or three reasons—frequently, the number one reason—is the breakdown in the family. The breakdown in the family did not just happen. There are people who have never wanted the old-fashioned nuclear family to succeed or be dominant in the United States.

This goes back to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who wrote at length about the fact that they wanted to get rid of the family. They wanted the dominant unit to be the government. They wanted the government to raise people. They wanted the government to brainwash people or teach people how to think. It is, unfortunately, apparently not uncommon for people in American universities to follow or be a little bit entranced by the writings of Marx and Engels.

As a result, we see Americans, say, in the 1960s, some of the leading feminists, some of the people involved in the Black liberation movement, were outright opponents of the old-fashioned nuclear family. Angela Davis was an example of somebody well known by people of my age who was a very important revolutionary figure in the 1960s who eventually came out for the breakdown of the family.

There are right now approximately 78 programs in which your eligibility for the program is based on the income level of your household. Due to the way they calculate poverty, it means that if you have one decent wage earner in the household, you probably aren't eligible for these programs. This means, as a practical matter, if you have one parent, frequently the mother, in the household, she is eligible for all sorts of benefits—free housing, free food, free healthcare, and free Pell grants to go to college. If she would marry someone with a decent income, she would lose all of these benefits.

Another benefit that can easily be \$6,000 to \$8,000 is the earned income tax credit. If she decides to work a little, she also may be eligible for free daycare.

You add up these benefits, and it is not unusual to find hypotheticals in which someone can be penalized by \$25,000 or \$30,000 in tax-free income if you decide to be married. Conversely, you can lose \$25,000 or \$30,000 if you decide to be married.

This is a problem that has been pointed out since Senator Moynihan in the late 1960s, so nothing has been done

about it. The rate of children born without a mother and father at home has skyrocketed since the middle 1960s when these programs were put into effect.

As a matter of fact, usually what we do is throw more money into these programs. In the current budget that Congress is working through for the year beginning October 1, President Biden did try to increase the number of these programs, which, in other words, is to put more of a bribe on people to not live in what they call the old-fashioned nuclear family.

By the way, another group that does not like the nuclear family or what they describe as the so-called Western-prescribed nuclear family was the original founders of Black Lives Matter. It is shocking the number of people who work in this Chamber who were happy even after Black Lives Matter came out against the nuclear family and who would stand by it, who would attend rallies with those signs out there. It just shows the power of people who have this antifamily agenda.

In any event, I am very interested in, when the new Congress is sworn in next January, what the new President who will work with that Congress thinks about the huge marriage penalties we have in our society. Seemingly, in this country, we seem to have a goal of having more and more people raised in single-parent families rather than married couples.

A variety of problems come from this. There are wonderful children raised by all parents, but statistically, it would be better in many cases, probably most cases, to have both a mother and father at home. The current system, which frequently discourages, in particular, the father from being at home, takes away the purpose in a lot of these men's lives.

I think a lot of the problems we have in society—depression, crime, drugs—can be attributed to the fact that the American Government today seems to not want to give men a purpose in life by encouraging them to be part of an old-fashioned nuclear family.

In any event, I ask the press corps, as they cover the Presidential race, to see where the candidates stand on the idea of racial preferences. Should we continue to say, for example, that if somebody is one-quarter Peruvian, they, therefore, can fill out the form and say they are an aggrieved minority? I wonder, do they agree with the idea that immigrants who come here from Iran or Gaza are immediately entitled to preferences in government employment or preferences in hiring by corporations? I would like to know that.

I would like to know where the candidates stand on the huge marriage penalties we have in effect, which appear to be put in place by people who do not want children raised with both parents at home. Do they plan on doing something about it? I would like to know because it is one of the biggest problems we are facing in America. It is not talked about.

Then, when it comes to illegal immigration, I would like a little more discussion of numbers. If we are going to begin to take people outside the normal pathway to become a citizen, how many people should that be every month? Should it be 5,000 a month, like we had under President Trump? Should it be 200,000? Should it be 300,000? Should it be over 400,000? I don't know, but I think the press should try to nail down the candidates on that.

In any event, those are three issues that I think a competent press corps would be putting out there in the newspapers so that people can analyze those issues and decide which way the government wants to handle each one of those issues.

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

□ 1315

#### A TURNING POINT FOR CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KIM of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, today is a new day for California.

The United States Supreme Court has just issued a landmark decision relating to homelessness and has taken the course of action that I asked it to in an amicus brief that I organized on behalf of myself and several other Representatives from California and other Western States.

This decision gives our communities back the power to regulate homelessness in a smart, commonsense, and compassionate way.

Right now, homelessness in California is a crisis. It is a tragedy. It is a national disgrace. Half of the unsheltered homeless in the entire country are in California, and the consequences of that throughout our State have been profound.

The unchecked growth of homeless encampments is causing many of our communities to deteriorate. It is associated with crime, disease, open drug use, and many other problems.

Businesses are closing in California seemingly every day because of this problem. You have families that have to walk around tents or dodge needles just walking their kids to school or going out to get groceries. The problem has only continued to get worse and worse.

It is rooted, in many respects, in an extremely misguided and unique, across the country, decision from the Ninth Circuit, which covers California and some other States in the West. This decision, known as *Martin v. Boise*, tied the hands of States, cities, counties, and local communities in being able to deal with homeless encampments. It effectively has made it impossible to ban camping in public

places or to regulate encampments in our parks, streets, and sidewalks in a commonsense way, and limit the ability to set up tent encampments. This decision came from the Ninth Circuit in California covering law in California. Such a decision does not exist anywhere else in the country, yet our communities have been subject to it for several years now.

Today's decision from the U.S. Supreme Court finally looked at whether that local, lower court decision in the Ninth Circuit was correct. I wrote an amicus brief urging the U.S. Supreme Court to overturn the Boise decision. That is precisely what the Court did today.

This is an incredibly significant moment for our State. It is restoring the power to local communities that should never have been taken away, and it is a chance to truly turn things around. It presents an opportunity for a much better future in California.

We can now reclaim our public spaces, restore order, and reduce crime. We can make our communities safer and healthier. Our streets and sidewalks can become walkable and safer again. Businesses can return, and local economies can flourish. Our parks can become places for recreation and can be safe and pleasant for kids and families. Maybe most important of all, we can get homeless individuals into shelters and connect them with the services that they need to get back on their feet and turn their lives around.

This is the true tragedy of the situation that has been allowed to exist and fester and get worse and worse in California. We have so many people living on our streets and, all too tragically, nearly every day dying on our streets; who have substance abuse problems and who have mental health issues. Yet, because of the state of the law, they are not getting access to the help they need. These are folks that could lead great, happy, fulfilling lives, but because of the state of the law, they are stuck living in terrible conditions, unable to turn their lives around.

This decision also comes just one day after the California Secretary of State has certified for November a ballot initiative that would, in large part, overturn and amend proposition 47, which has also been linked to the rise of homelessness and crime in California. This initiative will restore appropriate consequences for repeat thieves. It will enable us to get treatment for repeat drug offenders, and it will toughen penalties for fentanyl dealers and help us get that crisis under control.

These two things, the reversal of the Boise decision and the opportunity to reform proposition 47, truly are a turning point for California. For those who look around and wonder every day what became of our beautiful State, today is a new day.

Our State has been heading in the wrong direction for some time, but I believe this is a chance to move in a totally different direction. This is a

chance to restore common sense and improve the quality of life for all Californians. This is a chance to make our communities a better place to live, work, raise a family, and retire. It is a chance to become the State that leads the Nation in the right ways again.

California has so much to offer, so much potential, so much possibility. Today, I am as hopeful for our State as I have been in a very long time.

#### PRESIDENT BIDEN SHOULD RELEASE INTERVIEW RECORDINGS

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, today, I am calling, once again, on President Biden to release the tapes of his interviews with Special Counsel Robert Hur.

The House Judiciary Committee has issued a subpoena asking for these recordings, and Biden and his Justice Department have unlawfully refused and exerted executive privilege in a situation where that privilege is totally inapplicable.

We don't need to speculate as to why the administration is doing this. They have told us so directly. In a letter to the Judiciary Committee, the White House stated that they are afraid that the recordings would be used against the President and damage him politically. The thing is that is not an appropriate basis for defying a congressional subpoena.

Let's remember how this all started. After it was discovered that the President was unlawfully in possession of classified documents, Attorney General Merrick Garland appointed Special Counsel Robert Hur to investigate the matter.

After a monthslong investigation, Mr. Hur issued a report in which he found substantial evidence that the President had committed the crime of willfully retaining classified documents and his purpose for doing so was to assist him in writing a book that was going to be sold for personal profit.

Special Counsel Hur reported the significant evidence of crimes, but he did not charge the President. One of the reasons he said he did not do so, even though he testified that a reasonable juror could have voted to convict, is because he found, based on his experience with the President in the interviews, that he would come across to a jury as a—I believe the quote was—"a sympathetic, well-meaning, elderly man with a poor memory."

The Judiciary Committee has multiple legitimate grounds for getting access to the materials surrounding this investigation. This is a basic oversight function. This is how it works when it comes to the separation of powers and checks and balances.

The committee has clearly articulated the rationale for being entitled to the recordings, yet the Justice Department has refused to hand them over. Then on the very day that the Judiciary Committee convened to issue a contempt citation against the Attorney General for defying the subpoena, suddenly there was an assertion of executive privilege.

However, there are several reasons that this is invalid. Number one is that the privilege has been waived, if there ever was a privilege. The White House has already released transcripts of the interviews, and so there is no rational basis for saying that the transcripts are not privileged but the interview itself, the recordings themselves, are privileged.

Secondly, the administration has now presented contradictory arguments for withholding the recordings. At first, they said we are not going to give them to you because we have already given you the transcripts and that is cumulative, meaning they are the same thing. Now the administration is arguing that they are so different that one is privileged and the other is not.

The main basis they have given for withholding the recordings is that this will somehow discourage witnesses in future investigations from cooperating with the investigation, but this argument has no merit whatsoever. Again, they have already handed over the transcripts. Whatever deterrent effect might exist, surely it would apply to the possible revelation of the interviews in printed form just as much as it would in oral form.

That being said, we also need to remember that the President was not just a witness in this case; he was actually the target of the investigation. If we are really looking at what effect this would have on future investigations, it would only apply to that very narrow set of investigations where a President is being investigated by his own administration.

Apparently, the argument that the President and Attorney General are making is that in that future, very narrow circumstance, if the President knows that the transcript of his interviews will be released, he will be okay sitting for the interview, but if he knows that the recording will be released then he won't. Obviously, this makes no sense whatsoever.

The reason that the White House is grasping for completely frivolous arguments is because they have actually already revealed their true motivation. They put it in print. They put it in writing. They said they are afraid this will be used against the President politically.

That is not the way the rule of law works. I find it offensive, as a Member of the House, that the White House and the Attorney General have so little respect for the separation of powers and checks and balances and are willing to put politics before the rule of law.

Today, I am once again calling upon the President and the Attorney General to follow the law, comply with the subpoena, and release those recordings to the public.

#### VEHICLE CHOICE FOR CONSUMERS

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, following the testimony before our committee, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, yesterday by

Secretary of Transportation Pete Buttigieg, I am again calling for the Senate to pass legislation that has already passed this House to stop California from banning gas-powered vehicles.

California has announced this ban, and now some 18 other States are going along with it, States that have linked their emissions policies to California. The ban is set to go into effect by 2035. This was done, by the way, simply by regulation, not even by a vote of the legislature.

Now, I am all for electric vehicles. I have many constituents who drive them. However, I think that it should be a matter of choice, that folks should have the chance and the opportunity to select what vehicle they want to drive.

The interesting thing about yesterday's testimony by Secretary Buttigieg is that he actually agreed with me. He testified several times, and confirmed in response to my questioning, that he does not favor a ban on gas-powered vehicles. He said that this should be a matter for consumers to choose. Supposedly that would appear to be the same position that I have, that this should be a matter of consumer choice.

Then I asked him whether he is against California's attempt to ban gas-powered vehicles, and the Secretary responded: This is a matter of States' rights. The State should be able to do whatever it wants.

Here is the problem. The Federal Government, the Biden administration, is actually enabling California to do this. California would not have the ability to ban gas-powered cars if it were not for the Biden administration giving it special authority to do so, giving California a waiver under the Clean Air Act.

This is something that California asked the Biden administration for and the Biden administration granted. Saying they are just deferring to what the State is doing, that argument has no merit. In fact, it is precisely the actions of the Biden administration that is allowing California to take this completely overreaching action of saying we are going to ban all gas-powered vehicles within about a decade.

□ 1330

I was very happy that legislation that I am supporting, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, passed the House of Representatives.

This would simply rescind the authority that the Biden administration gave California to ban gas-powered cars. It passed the House of Representatives, but it has been languishing in the Senate.

I think it is incredibly important that the Senate take action so that we restore the confidence on the part of consumers in California and now in many other parts of the country that their right to choose which vehicle to buy will not be taken away.

HIGH-SPEED RAIL BOONDOGGLE

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, following yesterday's testimony by

Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg, I am, again, calling for oversight and, ideally, the end of the high-speed rail projects in California.

The Biden administration recently awarded California high-speed rail \$3.1 billion, and Secretary Buttigieg stood behind the project in his testimony yesterday.

However, this project has now been going on for 16 years. Its cost has multiplied many times over. Estimates are it is now around \$128 billion, and The L.A. Times reported that there is a \$100 billion funding shortfall even with the \$3.1 billion that the Biden administration provided.

Yet, nevertheless, despite this enormous increase in cost and despite the fact that essentially nothing has been built for 16 years, the Biden administration is giving life support for the project in a way that will cause Californians to have to keep paying taxes to support it going forward and in a way, as well, that takes money and funding away that could have gone toward maintaining our roads and providing the transportation services that California so desperately needs.

I asked Secretary Buttigieg about a report from The New York Times that the bullet train actually is not even on track to be finished this century. It is not on track to be finished this century, and the Secretary disagreed with The New York Times. He said that it will be finished this century. In fact, he said that it would be finished by 2050, by mid-century, although he would not provide any further estimate other than to say that it should be completed within the next 26 years.

However, Madam Speaker, if you look at people who have been directly involved in the project, they say it is not going to be finished at all.

Michael Tannenbaum, who was the first leader of the High-Speed Rail Authority, said: I realize the system didn't work. I don't know how they can build it now.

Dan Richard, who was also chairman of the High-Speed Rail Authority, in fact, he was the longest serving chairman, said: I don't think it is an existing project. It is a loser.

Rich Tolmach, who is head of the nonprofit California Rail Foundation, said that it will never be operable.

Why is the Biden administration giving it \$3.1 billion?

Moreover, why is a project that has a \$100 billion funding shortfall allowed to continue?

The reality is that high-speed trains have been built in many parts of the world, and folks who travel abroad in America see it work. Indeed, one of the first operators of the High-Speed Rail Authority worked on it here in California for several years and then said: We are out. Enough is enough.

They left. They said that it is too politically dysfunctional here, so they decided to go to North Africa where they said it was less politically dysfunctional. Indeed, they did bring a high-

speed rail train on line in Morocco in 2018.

This project has failed not because of the limits of the technology or even necessarily because of a lack of demand, it has failed because of political failures. At this point, our State would be much better served if we stopped throwing good money after bad.

I am fortunate and I am glad to see that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee led by Chairman GRAVES has opened up an investigation into the High-Speed Rail Authority. I believe it is about time there was finally some accountability for what might be one of the biggest boondoggles in the history of the United States.

RECOGNIZING POTTERY WORLD

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I now wish to recognize a few outstanding organizations in my district.

Madam Speaker, I wish to mark and celebrate the 50-year anniversary of Pottery World, a valued retailer in California's Third Congressional District.

Throughout the years, this business enterprise has served as a premier destination for one's home and garden design needs.

In 1974, Jim and Sharon Rodda started the business by setting up shop at an open-air market, Denio's Auction, in Roseville.

Their first outlet was on Auburn Boulevard where they sold salt and pepper shakers, dinnerware, and cookie jars.

While the style, times, and types of items sold at the store have changed, one constant has remained, and that is their commitment to selling pots.

Marked by the American entrepreneurial spirit, a passion for beautiful design, and tireless devotion, working 7 days a week for 7 years, the Rodda family's dream blossomed into a thriving business and became a family legacy.

In 2000, their second retail location in Rocklin opened, featuring a spectacular 30,000-square foot indoor showroom and a 3-acre outdoor display area.

The Rocklin retail complex is completed by the highly acclaimed restaurant, the Pottery World Cafe. In 2008, they opened their third store in El Dorado Hills.

Through this growth, their family business now employs over 80 people and offers thousands of unique luxury items, including pottery imported from seven different countries.

Pottery World is known not only for having a large selection of indoor and outdoor living amenities, fountains, pottery, and a boutique, but also for their generous spirit and participation in their community.

I applaud Pottery World for their five decades of contributions to our local economy and dedication to inspiring luxury home decor and design.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives and California's Third Congressional District, I am proud to recognize and congratulate Pottery World for reaching

this significant milestone, and I wish them continued success in the years to come.

#### RECOGNIZING FLIGHTS TO FREEDOM

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize Flights to Freedom for their significant contributions toward fighting human trafficking.

Sadly, human trafficking occurs across our country in all 50 States, and it has become one of the fastest growing criminal activities in the world as an approximately \$150-billion-a-year global criminal industry.

This form of modern-day slavery can include sexual exploitation, domestic servitude, child soldiers, forced labor, organ selling, financial bonding, forced marriage, and extortion.

However, Flights for Freedom is dedicated to partnering with law enforcement and government agencies to provide rescued human trafficking victims with private and safe air transportation to transport them to safety and reunite them with their family, loved ones, and support groups.

It is because of organizations like Flights to Freedom that children and other victims are able to find a way out of these horrific situations, recover, and lead a successful life.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives and California's Third Congressional District, I am honored to recognize Flights to Freedom today for their dedicated efforts toward ending human trafficking and providing hope, as well as a way home.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALICE PIPER DECISION

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the Piper v. Big Pine School District of Inyo County decision which led to the desegregation of Native American youth in California public schools.

At a young age of 15 years old, Alice Piper, a member of the Big Pine Paiute Tribe of California, was joined by six other Native American students from Inyo County who sought to enroll in the new, local public school.

When they were denied entry due to their Native American heritage, these young students courageously fought for equality by taking their case to the California Supreme Court. On June 2, 1924, the Supreme Court of California unanimously ruled in Piper's favor, opening the door for Native American students in the State of California to attend public schools.

This ruling was cited as precedent in the landmark U.S. Supreme Court Brown v. Board of Education case, which, of course, established racial segregation in public schools as unconstitutional.

Alice Piper was a trailblazer in California history whose bravery and tenacity was instrumental toward expanding the civil rights and educational opportunities available to millions of students across the State, and eventually the country, for generations to come.

As a former educator myself, I am proud to stand on behalf of the United States House of Representatives and join the Big Pine Paiute Tribe and Native American communities throughout the State of California in commemorating, 100 years later, this landmark decision that changed the course of history and ended the racial segregation of Native American students in California schools.

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

#### HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

March 23, 2024:

H.R. 2882. An Act making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

April 20, 2024:

H.R. 7888. An Act to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

April 24, 2024:

H.R. 815. An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4389. An Act to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes.

May 7, 2024:

H.R. 292. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 24355 Creekside Road in Santa Clarita, California, as the "William L. Reynolds Post Office Building".

H.R. 996. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3901 MacArthur Blvd., in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "Dr. Rudy Lombard Post Office".

H.R. 2379. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 616 East Main Street in St. Charles, Illinois, as the "Veterans of the Vietnam War Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 2754. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2395 East Del Mar Boulevard in Laredo, Texas, as the "Lance Corporal David Lee Espinoza, Lance Corporal Juan Rodrigo Rodriguez & Sergeant Roberto Arizola Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 3944. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Church Street in Mount Vernon, Georgia, as the "Second Lieutenant Patrick Palmer Calhoun Post Office".

H.R. 3947. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 859 North State Road 21 in Melrose, Florida, as the "Pamela Jane Rock Post Office Building".

May 10, 2024:

H.R. 8289. An Act to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

May 13, 2024:

H.R. 593. An Act to rename the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Hinesville, Georgia, as the "John Gibson, Dan James, William Sapp, and Frankie Smiley VA Clinic".

H.R. 1042. An Act to prohibit the importation into the United States of unirradiated

low-enriched uranium that is produced in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

May 16, 2024:

H.R. 3935. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

March 22, 2024:

S. 992. An Act to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Texas and New Mexico portions of the future Interstate-designated segments of the Port-to-Plains Corridor as Interstate Route 27, and for other purposes.

S. 1278. An Act to designate the Federal building located at 985 Michigan Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Rosa Parks Federal Building", and for other purposes.

April 19, 2024:

S. 382. An Act to take certain land in the State of Washington into trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation, and for other purposes.

May 7, 2024:

S. 474. An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen reporting to the CyberTipline related to online sexual exploitation of children, to modernize liabilities for such reports, to preserve the contents of such reports for 1 year, and for other purposes.

May 24, 2024:

S. 546. An Act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize law enforcement agencies to use COPS grants for recruitment activities, and for other purposes.

June 17, 2024:

S. 2051. An Act to reauthorize the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTZ). Pursuant to section 3(z) of House Resolution 5, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Tuesday, July 2, 2024.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 2, 2024, at 11 a.m.

#### OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Michael A. Rulli

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-4640. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Market Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Large Trader Reporting Requirements (RIN: 3038-