

being. Think of the Israelis that were harmed. Realize that there are children in Gaza who have been harmed.

“Harmed” is a very kind, polite word for all of these innocent victims. It is a very polite way to say that children have lost their lives. It is a very polite way to speak of the inhumanity that the Israelis suffered. It is a polite way to talk about decapitations.

We are the United States of America. We hold within our hands the power to show the world that these kinds of circumstances can be addressed and that we plan to be a party to the effort to make right these injustices. Yes, injustices—injustice in Israel, injustice in Gaza.

Now, when it comes time for us to do what we can monetarily, there has to be aid for Gaza and aid for Palestinians. We cannot decide that our aid can only benefit some when we know that we have a duty to benefit others.

This is our duty and our responsibility. We must do what we can to ensure that the persons in Gaza receive aid and comfort. They are innocent victims, and all innocent victims have to be accorded the opportunity to have a brighter future.

I am always fond of quoting Dr. King. The quote that everybody knows is most applicable here: Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

It may not happen today, but if we leave these injustices unchecked, if we don't do what we can to provide aid and comfort to Palestinians, the injustice that we see in these distant places can haunt us because our fingerprints are on the bombs that created these circumstances.

I will go back to my district. On Saturday, I will continue this. I will continue this process on Saturday because I have scheduled a meeting with constituents at The Fountain of Praise. Those from Houston and my district know the location I speak of. It will be at 10 a.m. This is an indication of what I will talk about, but it is not a complete story of what I will reveal.

I ask persons who come to bring their video equipment. We will do it live, and they can video it so that the world may see there is nothing to hide.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can make the difference necessary to end the cycle of vengeance.

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

AID FOR PALESTINIANS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I could not help, with my good friend and colleague eloquently speaking about the children and the pain, to rise to the floor today, having just stood on the grounds of the United States Capitol, wondering why we have not been able to pass the \$95 billion that would aid in the crises in Ukraine, Israel, Tai-

wan, the southern border that they left out, and Gaza.

I rise today to associate and agree that we must have humanitarian aid for the Palestinians, for the children, for Gaza, and we must have it now.

This is no room to leave out these precious souls and to continue to leave them without homes, without food, without clothing, without refuge. It is clear that I stand today for aid to the Palestinians and humanitarian relief for the children.

I finish, Mr. Speaker, by saying it is important that the President gave TPS to those Palestinians who cannot return home. Let us bring humanitarian relief to human beings and to these children, and I know we can do this together as a Congress. Let's do it now.

FISA ABUSES

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, we have received a seemingly endless stream of reports of abuses by the FBI and other parts of our Federal police apparatus spying on Americans by abusing either section 702 or title I of FISA.

I want to review some of those today before I get to the border. Let's talk about the report issued April 21, 2022, by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Washington, D.C. Here's what some of them are.

Between late 2016 and early 2020, the FBI regularly queried unminimized FISA information using identifiers of individuals listed in local police homicide reports.

This wasn't people accused. This included victims. They were using illicit querying, which in my world, when I used to practice, we would call an illegal search. They were going after victims, the next of kin of the victim, and witnesses.

Guess what was found. Those queries were violating the querying standard because there was no reasonable basis to expect they would return foreign intelligence or evidence of a crime. That is just one.

The next one, June 2020, used identifiers of 133 individuals arrested in connection with civil unrest and protests between May 30 and June 18, 2020. Guess what they found. No specific potential connections to terrorist-related activity, and there was not going to be a reasonable likelihood that they would retrieve evidence of a crime. The FBI still conducted that illegal query.

Between June 11 and 15, 2020, another 156 queries were done. Guess what. No reasonable likelihood of finding evidence of a crime or international terrorism.

On the January 6 issue, an analyst ran 13 queries and couldn't even remember why she was doing this. There was no reasonable likelihood to receive

foreign intelligence or evidence of a crime.

On April 26, 2021, again, more going after political activist groups, and there were 330 queries and 697 queries. Again, there was no likelihood of foreign intelligence and no evidence of a crime.

□ 1630

They continued on, two more queries, another 360 queries here, another 400 here. None of these queries were reasonably likely to retrieve foreign intelligence or evidence of a crime.

How about this one. They conducted three batch queries. This is the FBI spying on Americans. They conducted three batch queries consisting of approximately 23,132 separate queries.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker?

Those are all related to January 6.

What did they find?

No basis to believe the queries were reasonably likely to retrieve foreign intelligence information or evidence of a crime from section 702 of FISA.

How about this one, this is a favorite, 19,000 people wanted to donate to a political campaign. So they donated to somebody's campaign.

What happened, Mr. Speaker?

The FBI queried all 19,000 of those people.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker?

They said that there were only eight of these 19,000 who had any ties whatsoever to foreign influence.

They abused the civil liberties of 19,000 individuals without a reasonable basis.

I could go on here. There are 2,000 more between April 1, 2020, and March 31, again, no likelihood of intelligence, no likelihood that they will find anything leading to a crime, and it goes on and on in this report.

People say to me: ANDY, why do you think we have to have a warrant before the Federal Government starts gaining access to your personal and private telecommunications data?

It is because the FBI has abused it time and time again.

So when we start looking at this, we see other things.

How about this one. This report literally came out yesterday on Valentine's Day. The U.S. intelligence community asked foreign spy agencies to surveil 26 associates of Donald Trump in the run-up to the 2016 election. They asked 26 foreign spy agencies of the Five Eyes to spy.

Now, who are the Five Eyes? They are intelligence gathering organizations in the U.S., U.K., Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

They asked them to spy on people working in Donald Trump's campaign. There was no basis for it. There was no indication that there was any wrongdoing going on and that they would find foreign intelligence, but they had something that they wanted to do, and that was to craft a narrative.

Do you know who knew about that, Mr. Speaker?

The highest levels of the Barack Obama Government.

When I say highest levels, it was President Obama, Vice President Biden, James Clapper, and James Comey.

In December of 2023, a letter was written by the chairwoman of the U.S. Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board. Now, this is important because my colleagues on the Intelligence Committee want to tell you that: Oh, my gosh, you can't have warrants. If you have warrants, we are not going to be able to spy on enough people, so we can't stop potential threats to the country.

By the way, when I asked them about this letter, because I had this letter, they said: We never heard of that person, and we never heard of that board.

Odd, isn't it, that that board is mentioned in the base bill that they signed off on?

It is mentioned in the base bill.

What is it for?

This is a group that is supposed to help monitor and make sure that we get everything we need to in order to cure and fix FISA going forward.

Now, I am going to take a brief break before I continue on with that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the redoubtable gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we truly live in an interesting time in our country when Americans watch this and they see two lone conservative Republicans, two members of the House Freedom Caucus, standing in an empty Chamber discussing some of the most challenging threats we have ever faced as a nation and what might we do.

So I think the answer lies in the simple acknowledgment of the fact that this is not our House. This House belongs to the people, and the people are always present because the people are watching.

Americans are quick to forgive and hesitant to condemn. It is in our nature. It is in our DNA.

Conservative Americans, particularly, find it difficult to believe that our own Federal Government has, in many instances and across several agencies and departments, become quite weaponized against the people in a regular course of events.

Every day, Americans read the headlines about the FBI violation of laws, a DOJ persecution of Americans that does not seem to comply with judicial righteousness. They see our former President's home raided by the FBI, they have friends and neighbors who are raided by the IRS and the ATF or the DOL or the EPA. Americans see this and acknowledge it, but we have been slow to condemn, again, because it is in our nature to be understanding and forgiving, compassionate, and supportive, certainly of some of the most historically admired agencies in the history of our country, like the FBI.

So although we, as a nation, as we look at men like Congressman BIGGS and myself, we oppose—how dare we—but we oppose the expansion of police state surveillance. This echoes across the land where gradually America is waking up, and it is certainly time to wake up because we don't have too much time left. We could lose this thing if we don't respond now and act now to protect American individual rights, liberties, and freedoms from an ever-encroaching oppressive government. If we don't act, we will lose this thing.

Men like ANDY BIGGS and I know that. That is why we are here alone, Mr. Speaker. That is why we cry out on behalf of the Nation that we love.

The moment is coming when Americans across the land from sea to shining sea will say: I understand what is happening, and I condemn it.

That moment is coming when Americans will realize that everything we have stored in the cloud is already in the possession of our FBI, DOJ, NSA, and CIA. That moment of awareness is coming, and conservative constitutionalist Republicans like me and my colleagues in the Freedom Caucus are standing in this moment of time not in opposition to Americans who disagree with us, but in support and love for the Americans whom we swore an oath to, to the freedom and the constitutional rights, the civil liberties, the protected right to travel the land and be secure in our persons, our effects, our papers, and our homes as stated by our Founders.

We stand for that right, and we are not going to allow American freedoms to be run over by out-of-control, rogue operatives within our Federal Government.

So I thank my colleague and friend, Representative BIGGS, for allowing me to speak on the floor this day. I support this vigorous debate, and I am confident that America will land on the right side of this thing, so that we can preserve and protect the freedoms that we enjoy in our Republic.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), who is very eloquent as he conveyed our passion and our sincere desire to curb and restrain an out-of-control, weaponized Federal Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I was talking before, how do you get there?

One of the solutions is you have a warrant before you are able to go and conduct that investigation, that basic query into my personal data. We have got some here who don't want to do that. They say: Oh, no, no, we need to expand our spying.

They actually want more authority when they have abused it, literally 278,000 times in the last few years, with what the Inspector General said were unlawful queries.

So we asked the head of the U.S. Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, whose job it is to watch the

FISA Court, to say: Look, tell us. We want to know if there is a warrant there, is it going to hinder collection of information that is necessary for the national security of the country?

Do you know what she said, Mr. Speaker?

She said: I strongly disagree that a requirement for FISC approval of U.S. person queries would amount to a de facto ban.

What is that requirement? It is a warrant.

As noted in my separate statement: Requiring FISC review of U.S. person query terms is necessary to protect Americans' privacy rights and, in my view, would neither cause an end to U.S. person queries nor undermine the overall efficacy of section 702 and protect the U.S. national security.

Especially assuming that Congress were to provide exceptions as outlined and we have provided those exceptions. Those exceptions in our warrant requirement are consistent with the canon of law which interprets the most controversial—I shouldn't say controversial—but the most contested of the Bill of Rights, which is the Fourth Amendment.

Moreover, not only is the exception there, I brought this just so you could see, Mr. Speaker, just so I could hold it up so everybody could see. Where these blue tabs are there are other parts of that same underlying base bill which would curb this abuse of FISA that actually have the same exceptions.

So to my colleagues who are complaining that: Oh, no, we can't go forward because we have to have carte blanche on it. The reality is they themselves know and they have approved those exceptions in other parts of the base bill.

Now, I am going to leave FISA for a second. I have to say one more thing. We were scheduled today, this week, we were supposed to be having right now the debate and vote on the rule to allow this base bill to go forward and on the amendments, three amendments from the Judiciary Committee and three from the Intelligence Committee, so we would have a true, regular order, open debate on this, on this very critical issue.

Something happened yesterday. We had the presentation by Judiciary and the Rules Committee, and about that time, there was an announcement that there was something going on, a top-secret, national security issue, come down to the classified room and you can read the documents.

At that time when that statement was released by the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, what happened to the Dow Jones?

It took a spike downward because it spooked our economy.

What happened around the world?

Nations wanted to know what in the heck is he talking about. He is the Intelligence Committee chairman. They were concerned and nervous about that.

Now, I went down and read that document. I can't talk about the document, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you what the ranking member said. The ranking member said: There is nothing to panic about. There is nothing new here.

I have never seen U.S. national security leveraged to prevent us from even being able to debate a bill or an amendment. In this case, it is not even the bill, it is just the amendment. It is outrageous.

Now, let's talk about something else that is outrageous. I just spent hours in a committee hearing. My Democratic friends always use the terms "fanatic MAGA Republicans, far-right MAGA Republicans."

They said that they, those far-right MAGA Republicans, they have to obey Donald Trump on the border. Donald Trump doesn't want anything done on the border.

I am going to tell you something right now, Mr. Speaker. My far-left fanatic Democrat friends are intent on obeying Joe Biden, President Biden, and they don't want the border secure. They say: Oh, my gosh. Joe Biden says: I have to have more authorities.

He didn't need more authorities when he issued dozens of executive orders within 72 hours of becoming inaugurated as President that basically emasculated all of our border security.

Title 8 has not been revised. Title 8 is still there. That is the title under which CBP and ICE operate and USCIS. Right there. That hasn't been changed.

Do you know what has been changed, Mr. Speaker?

This administration has basically said: We are not going to enforce the law.

Not only do they say that; when you go down to the border, and I go down often, and I talk to them: Where are you from?

I am from Senegal.

Really. What are you doing over here?

I am from Burkina Faso.

How about you?

I am from Guinea.

□ 1645

How about you?

Guatemala.

They are from all over the world—Mali, Mauritania. Down in Lukeville, for a while, Mauritania was the number one country of origin for these illegal aliens.

Why are you coming?

We were told it is easy to get into the United States today. That is why we are here.

You are from northeast Africa. Why are you coming to the U.S., into an out-of-the-way place like Lukeville, Arizona?

Well, I am here because the Office of Migration for the United Nations told me it is actually easier to get across the U.S. border than it is to get into Europe today.

Let me just tell you, we saw this today in our hearing. One of the Demo-

crats said: What authority do you think President Biden has today that he could actually shut the border?

Our witness correctly cited 8 U.S.C. section 1182(f), which confers upon the President the authority to close the border in response to a crisis. The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld that in *Trump v. Hawaii*. They noted that the statute entrusted the President with the decisions whether and when to suspend entry, whose entry to suspend, for how long, and on what conditions.

Don't tell me that this President can't close the border tomorrow.

I will give you another example. The Del Rio Sector, Del Rio—you will remember this. The Del Rio Bridge, that bridge that goes across the Rio Grande, there is a port of entry right up there on the bridge. Haitians were coming in, 15 to 20,000 a day. They have had 15,000 or so underneath that bridge.

The question at that point was this: Why is Mexico letting them organize? They were organizing down about 60 miles south of the border, bus caravans of Haitians, bringing them up. They would then wade across the Rio Grande River. What can we do?

The CBP sector chief said: I am closing that port of entry.

Now, when you close the port of entry, guess who gets stopped? That is right, legal traffic and the commercial legal traffic.

Do you know what happened? The town just across the river from Del Rio, they said: We can't take this. They lasted 2 days. They called the Federal Government of Mexico and said: We can't have this port of entry closed.

They stopped transporting those illegal aliens to the border to come across. That is what happens. When you close that border, you close that down and use that leverage, all of a sudden, Mexico becomes compliant, and they stop facilitating illegal aliens, that illegal border crossing. That is what happens when you have the will to do something.

I commend the sector chief there, because they kind of took it on their own on that. That is what goes on, and that is what has to go on.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in calling upon our leadership to do something that I think is critical.

What is it that we need? We need the leverage to get enforcement, not the leverage to enact policy. I believe this is a lawless administration. They are not going to enforce the policies that we invoke. They instead will go around them.

For instance, H.R. 2. When we go to H.R. 2, a lot of my colleagues say we need to stick H.R. 2 on everything. Well, the problem with sticking H.R. 2 on anything is, even if H.R. 2 passes—it is a great law, by the way. I have

written most of the provisions in that H.R. 2 one time or another, introduced those one time or another. It is a good law. I am the cosponsor of that bill. It takes care of a lot of issues, whether it is on asylum, whether it is on Flores, whether it is on any of these other technical issues we have. Guess what? Even if it becomes law, I believe that the administration will paper over it, and they will go around the law.

They will go around the law because they want an open border. That is what they want.

I thought I would share with you just a couple of other, I think, interesting anecdotes.

I got a call recently from a friend of mine down on the border. He is working in the area of the Tohono O'odham Nation Reservation. The Tohono O'odham Nation Reservation has 62 linear miles on the border between Arizona and Mexico.

In the middle of that area, you have the mountains that are coming on down, and then you have this area, what we call the San Miguel gate. This gate is really isolated. There is nothing else out there. A little bit—about a mile—I am thinking to myself—south, moving this way, so that would be west. You are going to have the wash. People can just flow across the wash. There is no fence, per se. There is a four-strand wire fence there.

A few months ago, when I was down there, we are driving down the road, and what do I see? I see what looks like five or six kids playing in the dirt road. I mean, there is nothing there. We had been driving for miles, didn't see anybody, no CBP agents or anything.

We get up there, there is a group of 25 people, mostly family units. We asked them where they came from.

They said: We were down in Caborca. That is about 40–50 miles south of the border. That is where we met up with our coyote.

Did you know any of these people?

No, we didn't know each other. We all had to hire this coyote. We came together. The coyote brings us up, drops us off several miles south of the border, points up and says: Just keep walking toward that mountain, and when you get across the wires, step across, sit alongside the road, and then, sooner or later, CBP agents will come.

We asked them how long they had been there. They had been there four hours, hadn't seen any agents. We happened to be down there. I had some Members of Congress with me.

I tell you that because that is how remote this place is, but do you know how many people they are getting there? Groups of 700 to 800 a day, with single groups. This is busloads that are being organized in Caborca. They are bringing them up, dropping them off, and here they come through the San Miguel gate.

Guess what happens at that point? Every agent that is on duty is now processing and moving those people up to a soft-sided facility to await further

processing and ultimately, within 72 hours, released into the United States of America, with parole status, which means they can work after 6 months' period of time. They are going to get legal papers, yet they entered the country illegally.

I asked them: What is happening otherwise?

It just so happens that that is the sector that has the highest rate of known and suspected unknown got-aways. Why don't they want to just surrender? It is so easy now. You just surrender. They are going to process you and release you and pay for you to go wherever you want to go in the country.

What the deal is, they are carrying drugs, or else they are Chinese and nationals of military age, or they are from other nations that are special interest, that sponsor terrorism.

They are coming through, and how do we know that they are coming through in these groups? We do have some sensors in some of those places. We still are using tracking. We have agents who still track. The score, if there is more than 20 in that group, they don't write 35. They write 20-plus, so even that is inaccurate.

I enjoin my colleagues. Please, we have to use the purse strings that we have and stop funding a government that is spying on us and is emasculating our southern border. We no longer have a border. That is the only way you are going to get enforcement on the border. Policy is good, but enforcement is the goal.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(z) of House Resolution 5, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 16, 2024, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-3169. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast Marketing Areas; Amendments to Marketing Agreements and to Orders [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-23-0003; 23-J-0019] received February 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-3170. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Responsibility, Administrative Capability, Certification Procedures, Ability To Benefit (ATB) [Docket ID: ED-2023-OPE-0089] (RIN: 1840-AD51,

1840-AD65, 1840-AD67, and 1840-AD80) received February 7, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-3171. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, ASPR/IBMSC/DPA-ERA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Health Resources Priorities and Allocations System (HRPAS) (RIN: 0908-AA00) received February 7, 2024, 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.

EC-3172. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Taconite Iron Ore Processing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0664; FRL-5925.1-01-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AV58) received February 5, 2024, 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.

EC-3173. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorpyrifos; Reinstatement of Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0523; FRL-5993-06-OCSP] received February 5, 2024, 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.

EC-3174. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Plans; Approvals and Promulgations: California; Amador Air District; New Source Review [EPA-R09-OAR-2023-0355; FRL-11176-02-R9] received February 5, 2024, 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.

EC-3175. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — South Dakota: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions and Incorporation by Reference [EPA-R08-RCRA-2023-0424; FRL-11356-01-R8] received February 5, 2024, 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.

EC-3176. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [EPA-R04-OAR-2022-0630; FRL-11582-02-R4] received February 5, 2024, 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.

EC-3177. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA; Miscellaneous Rule Revision [EPA-R04-OAR-2023-0232; FRL-11600-02-R4] received February 5, 2024, 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.

EC-3178. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Expedited Approval of Alternative Test Procedures for the Analysis of Contaminants under the Safe Drinking Water Act; Analysis and Sampling Procedures [EPA-HQ-OW-2023-0541; FRL-11620-01-OW] received February 5, 2024, 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.

EC-3179. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of Civil Rights and SAMHSA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Confidentiality of Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Patient Records (RIN: 0945-AA16) received February 7, 2024, 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.

EC-3180. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Guidelines for Lightning Protection for Production and Utilization Facilities [Regulatory Guide 1.204, Revision 1] received February 7, 2024, 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.

EC-3181. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Annual Report on the Interdiction of Aircraft Engaged in Illicit Drug Trafficking, 2023, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2291-4(c)(1); Public Law 103-337, Sec. 1012 (as amended by Public Law 107-108, Sec. 503); (115 Stat. 1405); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3182. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification, pursuant to Public Law 118-31, div. F, Sec. 6710; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3183. A letter from the Deputy Director, Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Entities to the Entity List (RIN: 0694-AJ51) received February 7, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3184. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-020, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3185. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-022, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3186. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-017, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3187. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2023 Inventory of Inherently Governmental Activities and of Commercial Activities, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3188. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Privacy Act Regulations for EPA; Correction [EPA-HQ-OMS-2023-0020; FRL-10620-04-OMS] received February 5, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3189. A letter from the National Listing Coordinator, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat