

that represent all of the American citizens will have an opportunity to vote on whether we believe that, if you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun.

So today my fellow Democratic representatives and I—about 135 of us thus far—have signed what is known as a discharge petition so that a bipartisan piece of legislation introduced by Representative KING of New York, who is a Republican, could be brought to the floor and all of us face the responsibility of selecting whose side do we stand on. Do we stand for the safety of Americans and prevent people that are too dangerous to fly from being able to buy a gun, or do we stand with those on the no-fly list that are presumably dangerous and say: “Oh, yeah, you ought to be able to buy a gun even though you are too dangerous to fly”?

Now, for my American friends out there, all of you, voters and nonvoters, don't you think it is time for your Representatives, 435 of us, to stand before you in this House and say: “We agree that if you are too dangerous to fly, then you are too dangerous to buy a gun, and you cannot buy a gun,” or stand here before all the American public and say: “No, no, no. If you are too dangerous to fly, go ahead and buy a gun”?

So, Mr. Speaker, that is what a discharge petition will do. It will take our Republican friend's bill, Mr. KING of New York, bring it to the floor and put the issue before your Representatives, before the representatives of the American people, and cause us to make a choice for your safety or for the presumed right of a person who is too dangerous to fly to be able to buy a gun. It is pretty simple stuff. We will see what happens.

That issue is now bubbling around here on the floor. Today there were four motions to adjourn, which is a way of disrupting the normal procedures of the House—which are terribly abnormal to begin with—and causing the attention of the membership of the House and the press from the press box, or wherever they happen to be, to focus on this one—one—issue: whether those 16,000 or so people that are on the no-fly list can also go out and buy a gun. Two thousand already have.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we ought to quickly discuss this issue of, well, there is a constitutional issue here, an issue in which these people are on a list but they have no ability to get off—no. Not so. Not so. When the no-fly list was first put together following 9/11, the issue was raised of the constitutionality of it by the American Civil Liberties Organization. It went to a Federal court, and the Federal court said: No, we disagree with you. We believe this is a constitutionally authorized protection of the American public, and there is a procedure for an individual to petition to get off the list. So this issue of constitutionality was decided some years ago by a Federal court.

So, Mr. Speaker, the arguments that you will undoubtedly hear here about this being, oh, an infringement of the constitutional right for an individual to buy a gun, no. This issue has already been resolved. If you are on the no-fly list and you think you shouldn't be there, you have got a procedure, a program underway and available to you to remove yourself from the no-fly list, and the court said it meets constitutional muster.

So, taking it a step further, we know a lot of Americans of certain classes that cannot buy a gun: criminals, convicted felons, people that in some States have been involved in domestic violence, and people that have exhibited mental health issues. Those people are barred in many cases from not being able to buy a gun. So we would add to that category people that our law enforcement agencies have deemed to be dangerous, quite possibly terrorists, or abiding and assisting terrorist organizations. If you can't fly, we just simply say that you can't buy a gun also—pretty simple.

My Republican colleague, Mr. KING, is correct. The issue is not resolved. The issue will be back before us tomorrow, the 9th day of December, for those of us that believe that if you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun. Those of us that believe this to be the right policy will continue to push this issue for the safety of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, 16,000 people may not be able to buy a gun if this becomes law, and that is a good thing, because we know already 2,000 people that are on that no-fly list—actually, more than 2,000—have been able to buy a gun. What did they do with it? Well, maybe they went out and shot quail, or maybe—we pray not, but we don't know, do we?

So, Mr. Speaker, the issue is before us, as are many, many important issues, but I don't think there is any issue more important than the safety of the American people. We know that if somebody is thought to be dangerous, then they ought not have a gun.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House will see the wisdom of taking a small step and denying some 16,000 people, many of whom are probably not even American citizens, the opportunity to buy a gun.

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

TERRORISM AND OUR RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much in the news, and our friends here on the floor have been raising questions about responsible, reasonable gun control. We want gun

control that does not violate the Second Amendment of the Constitution, the purpose of which is to allow citizens to protect themselves. It is not just for hunting, but to allow citizens to protect themselves.

The thing that I noticed, Mr. Speaker, in my decade as a judge, the criminals that came before me for crimes involving a gun, I can't remember any of them—I think I handled around 6,000 felony cases that went through our court. I can't remember any where they went down to a gun store and bought a gun. They stole them or they bought them from other criminals. With the 100 million guns that I understand have been purchased in recent years, it doesn't look like there will be any chance to remove guns from anyone except law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting. We inquired, my Republican friends, my colleagues here, we inquired over and over, and still 7 years after President Obama took office, we know that shortly thereafter there was a scheme hatched within his administration to sell guns to criminals that would get to Mexico and fall into the hands of drug cartels. They didn't adequately monitor them. There was nothing put on the guns so they could be traced exactly where they were going. We know one of them was used to kill one of our own government agents. So whether it was intentional, reckless disregard for an American Government agent's life who was working for the President to have one of the President's subsidiaries or employees provide guns in such a way that they would end up killing one American agent and, apparently, hundreds of Mexicans—and we don't even know the full extent because we can't get answers from this administration.

Eric Holder intentionally withheld evidence. He refused to provide information. I felt like he should have been impeached and thrown out of office. We never got answers about Fast and Furious, but we did see emails where, within this administration, even after they got caught, that this administration had facilitated weapons being provided and sold to people who would take them to the drug cartels of Mexico. Even after they got caught, they were still wondering if it might be possible to use the fact that these guns were being used to create violence to justify attacks on the Second Amendment and taking away Americans' gun rights.

Apparently, November was a huge month for the sale of guns; and apparently, Black Friday, in the past week, has been a record for—not a record, but just a massive number of guns being sold. I believe I saw there were 185,000 requests for gun purchases on Friday after Thanksgiving. Regardless of what the number was—that is not completely accurate—it is staggering. How many people are now in fear for themselves and their families because of the policies of this administration?

Now, because of Fast and Furious and how there were people in the administration that were contemplating the

sale of guns to drug cartels that this administration facilitated as a reason to have more gun control, it does make you question the motivation of some of the administration's policies. We know that, especially in the last 5 years of George W. Bush's Presidency, his administration was vigorously prosecuting gun violations. But in 7 years, this administration has never prosecuted as vigorously as the Bush administration did in those times. Then we find out that not only were they not prosecuting as vigorously as they did in those last 5 years of the Bush administration, but in recent years, they have been cutting back on the prosecution of gun violations.

So we find out that, in 2013, gun violation prosecutions by this administration diminished. Then we find out that in 2014, they diminished even further by this administration. Then we find out that in 2015, this administration set a record for the last 7 years of prosecuting fewer gun violation crimes than any administration—well, this was the lowest year, this year, any of his last 7 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, the administration, as they have increased the demand for more gun control to take guns away from law-abiding citizens, they have been decreasing the number of gun violations they have prosecuted. In the wake of this administration's involvement in *Fast and Furious* and trying to use it to promote more gun control on law-abiding citizens, it makes you wonder what is the reason this administration continues to prosecute fewer and fewer gun crimes?

□ 1915

It is as if this administration—and I am not saying, Mr. Parliamentarian, through the Speaker, I am not saying a specific person or the President. I am not violating the House rules. But I am saying this administration in bulk, which doesn't violate the House rules, somehow has had this policy of prosecuting fewer and fewer gun crimes at the same time they are increasing rhetoric to have more gun control. It is as if—and I am not alleging; I am just saying. It is as if they wanted gun violence to increase so that they could get more gun control, as it appears their motivation was in using what happened with gun violence as a result of the 2,000 weapons they forced gun dealers to sell to people they shouldn't have.

Well, when I first heard the proposal, gee, nobody who is on the no-fly list, can't even fly on a plane, should be able to go buy a gun, seemed reasonable. I was talking to my friend, TOM PRICE from Georgia, back here earlier, Mr. Speaker, and he said the same thing, well, that seems reasonable, until you start considering how one gets on the no-fly list, who has been on the no-fly list, the massive abuses of individual constitutional rights by this administration, the abuses of the IRS of law-abiding citizens that Richard Nixon could have only dreamed of

abusing the way this administration has.

But the trouble is there is no due process for someone to be adjudicated to put on the no-fly list. There is no due process to get off the no-fly list. And, in fact, one of the men I respect as much as anybody I know—he is a constituent; he is an Army veteran; he is a retired general, lives in east Texas—we have had to help him a number of times, once again, to get off the no-fly list.

And, unfortunately, we never can find out why he is ever put on the no-fly list in the first place. The only thing I know, he is a devout Christian. He is a supporter of mine. He would never knowingly violate the law of the United States.

So, I don't know. Is it because he is a supporter of mine? I mean, a year ago, I was trying to fly back from London and an official there in London airport with their security said: Sir, I understand you are very sorry, but your homeland security says you are somebody that has to be personally, physically searched along with everything that you have.

Gee, maybe somebody didn't like the way I cross-examined them in the judiciary hearing.

But when you know that this administration has abused its power repeatedly and you find out that actually the no-fly list is so obscure, it is like something from a Kafka novel. I never really enjoyed his novels. But the trial, it makes you think of, wow, you mean this obscure government entity can charge you with something, but you can't—just like in a trial, you can't find out what you are charged with. You can't find out why you are on the no-fly list. You can't find out if it is part of an enemies list. You can't find out what is the best way to convince the government to get you off.

Are there mistakes made? Well, gee, Mr. Speaker, could it be that a mistake was made when one of my constituent families from Lufkin was going to take their dream vacation to Disney World? They felt like the kids were old enough to enjoy it now. And when they tried to check their bags, they couldn't because, of their five children, their middle child was on the no-fly list. He was a potential terrorist.

Now, I come from a family of four kids, and if I was going to pick one of my siblings, including me, to be a terrorist, I would say it is probably the young one. Well, this child was 5 years old. He was the middle child, not the youngest. They pulled him aside thinking: Well, gee, his name is on the no-fly list. He must be a terrorist.

Well, thankfully, in Houston, they had some common sense and quickly figured out this is not a terrorist; this 5-year-old kid. He is not. Not so when they tried to leave Orlando to fly back home. He was pulled aside, the 5-year-old. He was separated from his parents. His parents were fit to be tied. They were threatened. They were not allowed to be with their child.

They take him off to interrogate him, a 5-year-old child; but he is on the no-fly list, and they couldn't figure this out. They think he is a terrorist. They ask him his date of birth. He is freaking out. He is separated from his parents and his other siblings. He knows the month and day. He can't tell them the year. So now they think he is withholding information.

They endured a lot of counseling and nightmares because of the abuses of this administration's policies. And yes, mistakes are made like that; and sometimes when people's names get put on the no-fly list, you don't know what it is for.

Here is an article, and I sure don't read from these folks very often, but the Los Angeles Times says:

“It seems simple enough: If the Federal Government, based on intelligence or policing, puts a person on its watch list of suspected terrorists or decrees that he or she is too dangerous to be allowed on an airplane, then surely it would also be foolish to let that person buy a firearm in the United States. Makes sense, doesn't it?”

That was the thrust of a proposed law by Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN.

It goes on down:

“One problem is that the people on the no-fly list, as well as the broader terror watch list from which it is drawn, have not been convicted of doing anything wrong. They are merely suspected of having terror connections.”

I thought it was outrageous that Senator Ted Kennedy was on the no-fly list. I don't know. Maybe Homeland Security knew something the rest of America didn't know, but it seemed silly to me. Senator Ted Stevens, the late Senator's wife, Catherine Stevens, her name was on the no-fly list. She had those problems.

So it could be that you are guilty of only having a name similar to somebody that was put on the list for who knows why. But that is not a good way to take people's guns away, to say: Yes, we want to pass a law so that this administration, behind closed doors, with the lowest learners of this administration, can put people's name on the list that can never buy a gun, can never fly on a plane. That is a scary proposition.

And how about the 72 Department of Homeland Security employees that are on the no-fly list? And then we find out also, thanks to Senator JEFF SESSIONS, that we have had two—two—refugees in this country who, this year, have been either charged or convicted of terrorist activities. One worked around O'Hare airport and another one worked around here, I believe, as a cab driver working around Reagan airport. How about we take care of the people that we know for sure are a threat to America?

Anyway, the article from The Washington Times says: “According to the technology website TechDirt.com, 40 percent of those on the FBI's watch

list—about 280,000 people—are considered to have no affiliation with recognized terrorist groups. All it takes is for the government to declare it has 'reasonable suspicion' that someone could be a terrorist. There is no hard evidence required, and the standard is notoriously vague and elastic."

An article from Adam Kredo, from Free Beacon, about the 72 employees. A tip of the hat to Congressman STEPHEN LYNCH for finding that information.

This article from Neil Munro, Breitbart, "California Shooting Shows Jihad Risk From Muslim Migrants' U.S.-Born Children":

"The San Bernardino shooter who killed 14 Americans is yet another name on the growing list of U.S.-born children of Muslim migrants who grew up to embrace violent jihad."

It seems like somebody has talked about that before.

"Before Syed Rizwan Farook, the most notorious example was Anwar al Awlaki, born in New Mexico in 1971 to accomplished, professional-class Yemeni parents. He subsequently embraced the violent commandments of Islam, complete with its many calls for attacks on kaffirs, or non-Muslims. His career as a jihadi adviser, recruiter cheerleader ended when he was killed by a U.S. missile strike in Yemen in September 2011.

"Another example is Nidal Malik Hasan, the Virginia-born son of Arab migrants, who murdered 13 Americans in Fort Hood, Texas, in 2009. That attack was downplayed by Federal officials as 'workplace violence,' even though Hasan had described himself as a 'Soldier of Allah' on his U.S. Army business cards . . . The problem is worse among Muslims, because Muslim culture and religion is hostile to integration, Spencer says. 'Islamic law announces itself as a superior model for society and government so you've got no community-driven reason for Muslims to integrate or adopt American values, because their way is better,' he said."

Now, that is what Spencer says.

But I do know Muslims here in the United States that don't believe that they should adopt sharia law. I have got Muslim friends in Afghanistan and all over North Africa and the Middle East. They don't want radical Islam. And, in fact, in Egypt—so proud of the people of Egypt—they rose up and said: We don't want radical Islam. Of course, this President, this administration, wants to punish them for throwing out the Muslim Brother president.

But this article—back to Neil Munro's article—he says:

"In August 2015, the FBI arrested the U.S.-born son of a supposedly moderate Imam as he began his journey to join ISIS in Syria. Mohammad Oda Dakhalla was accompanied by his young, university-educated American wife, who was a convert to Islam. "That is the quintessential example of the risks involved because the father is supposed to be a moderate and we're

supposed to think the son subscribes to a violent Islam completely different from the father . . . but there is no evidence of a rift between father and son," Spencer said.

"In October 2014, two U.S.-born teenage girls were nabbed by the FBI as they began their journey to Syria.

"The left-wing Southern Poverty Law Center lists at least five additional U.S.-born jihadis, or would-be jihadis, at its site, including James Elshafay who tried to detonate a bomb in 2004, Ehsanul Sadequee, Tarek Mehanna, Walli Mujahid—his family name comes from the Arab term for 'Holy Warrior'—and Naser Jason Abdo, who planned to attack Fort Hood in 2011."

So I also would like a tip of the hat, Mr. Speaker, to Secretary Jeh Johnson that went back out to the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, ADAMS for short. I am sure John Adams appreciates that very much. I don't know if the President's friend, Imam Magid—oh, wait. Let's see. Well, this article mentions him.

"One of the 'most meaningful discussions' on his 'tour'—talking about Jeh Johnson—"he called it, was in June with the ADAMS Center imam, which began with a Boy Scout Troop leading meeting participants in the Pledge of Allegiance. That imam, Mohamed Magid, is a past president of the Islamic Society of North America, an organization linked to the Holy Land Foundation in its terror-financing trial and to the Muslim Brotherhood."

And, by the way, it was listed as a co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial for supporting terrorism. And once they got the convictions of the five main people being prosecuted, ISNA, CAIR, and some other folks tried to get their names withdrawn from the pleadings being specifically named as co-conspirators in support of terrorism. But the Federal district judge and also the U.S. Federal Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, said: No, there is plenty of evidence to support that you are co-conspirators in supporting terrorism.

□ 1930

I was told by a lawyer that the plan was, once they got those first five convictions, they would go after ISNA, Imam Magid, and all of these other people. Fortunately, for Imam Magid and ISNA and CAIR and all of these groups, President Obama got elected, and Eric Holder immediately made clear that nobody was going to prosecute the rest of those named co-conspirators in supporting terrorism.

There was also a headline in the news today from The Washington Times that reads: "Huma Abedin taunts Donald Trump: 'I'm a proud Muslim.'"

"Huma Abedin, the longtime confidant to Democratic Presidential front runner Hillary Clinton, took aim at Donald Trump's proposal to ban Muslims from entering the United States in an email with the subject line: 'I'm a proud Muslim.'

"'Donald Trump is leading in every national poll to be the Republican nominee for President; and earlier today, he released his latest policy proposal: to ban all Muslims from entering our country,' wrote Ms. Abedin—"or Ms. Weiner, anyway"—in an email Monday evening to Mrs. Clinton's supporters. 'I'm a proud Muslim, but you don't have to share my faith to share my disgust. Trump wants to literally write racism into our law books. His Islamophobia doesn't reflect our Nation's values.'"

Here is an article from July 27, 2012, by Andrew McCarthy in which he talks about Senator JOHN MCCAIN's claim that concerns about Huma Abedin are smear-based on a few unspecified, unsubstantiated associations.

Actually, Michele Bachmann and I and three others signed letters in which we just said, Here are some things we know. Would you do an investigation to see the extent of the Muslim Brotherhood's influence in your department? There were five different departments that had five different specific letters, and there were not any vague allegations. We just said, We know these things are true. Would you investigate?

We come to find out a lot in this article, which reads:

"The letter averred that Abedin 'has three family members: her late father, her mother, and her brother, connected to Muslim Brotherhood operatives and/or organizations.'

"It turns out, however, that Abedin, herself, is directly connected to Abdullah Omar Naseef, a major Muslim Brotherhood figure."

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the Muslim Brotherhood has been named as a terrorist organization by both Egypt and the UAE. They have asked officials in both of those countries when I have been over there: Why do you not recognize that the Muslim Brotherhood has been at war with you since 1979? You keep helping them. You have got people advising the President. They are all Muslim Brothers. Why do you keep doing that? I don't have an answer for them.

The article goes on:

"It turns out Abedin, herself, is directly connected to Abdullah Omar Naseef, a major Muslim Brotherhood figure involved in the financing of al Qaeda. Abedin worked for a number of years at the Institute for Muslim Minority Affairs as assistant editor of its journal. The IMMA was founded by Naseef, who remained active in it for decades, overlapping for several years with Abedin. Naseef was also secretary general of the Muslim World League in Saudi Arabia, perhaps the most significant Muslim Brotherhood organization in the world. In that connection, he founded the Rabita Trust, which is formally designated as a foreign terrorist organization under American law due to its support of al Qaeda.

"You ought to be able to stop right there," but he doesn't. It goes on. Further down, it reads:

“In this instance, however, before you even start probing the extensive, disturbing Brotherhood ties of her family members, Huma Abedin should have been ineligible for any significant government position based on her own personal and longstanding connection to Naseef’s organization.

“Specifically, Ms. Abedin was affiliated with the Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs, where she was assistant editor of the Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs. The journal was the IMMA’s *raison d’être*. Abedin held the position of assistant editor from 1996 through 2008, from when she began working as an intern in the Clinton White House until shortly before she took her current position as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s Deputy Chief of Staff.”

Again, this article was written in 2012.

“The IMMA was founded in the late 1970s by Abdullah Omar Naseef, who was then the vice president of the prestigious King Abdulaziz University in Saudi Arabia.”

It goes on to talk about all of his ties with civilization jihad and with the Muslim World League, over which he presided and with whom Huma Abedin had this relationship in this publication for all of those years that she worked with Hillary Clinton.

“The Muslim World League manages the ‘civilization jihad’—the Brotherhood’s commitment to destroy the West from within and to ‘conquer’ it by sharia proselytism, or *dawa*, as Sheikh Yusuf Qaradawi, the Brotherhood’s top sharia jurist, puts it.

“Nevertheless, the Muslim World League has a long history of deep involvement in violent jihad as well.”

Then we have this article today: “‘Spinning up as we speak’: Email shows Pentagon was ready to roll as Benghazi attack occurred.”

We still don’t know who stopped the military. The email shows they were ready to go help our people in Benghazi. Somebody stopped them. Was that advice Huma Abedin gave to Secretary Clinton? We don’t know. Was this advice that reached the President? We don’t know. We don’t know whether he went to bed and said, “You take care of it,” or whether he went next-door, like was reported, until Osama bin Laden was taken out. He went in the next room and didn’t watch and played cards. We don’t know what they were doing.

This report from Robert Windrem: “The ISIS Trail of Death” goes on to point out all that ISIS is doing. We know there are 1,000 cases being investigated right here.

Look, I am not advocating we get rid of all Muslims in the United States, we have got Muslim friends here in the House, but we do need to take a look to see whether people want to replace our U.S. Constitution with sharia law. We need to take a harder look at who we allow to come into this country and have a child who they will take back to

Yemen, or wherever, to teach their child to hate America.

People can make fun of me still, but we know Americans have died because we have allowed this to happen. They come back as American citizens whenever they want, and it gets so bad that even President Obama has to take out an American citizen, who was born here, to parents who trained him to hate America after they went back to Yemen.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today until 4:30 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 9, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3694. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3695. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule — Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food; Clarification of Compliance Date for Certain Food Establishments [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0920] (RIN: 0910-AG36) received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3696. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule — Accreditation of Third-Party Certification Bodies To Conduct Food Safety Audits and To Issue Certifications [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0146] (RIN: 0910-AG66) received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3697. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule —

Foreign Supplier Verification Programs for Importers of Food for Humans and Animals [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0143] (RIN: 0910-AG64) received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3698. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule — Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0921] (RIN: 0910-AG35) received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3699. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; SC; Redesignation of the Charlotte-Rock Hill, 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0298; FRL-9939-66-Region 4] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3700. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Transportation Conformity Procedures [EPA-R05-2015-0563; FRL-9939-80-Region 5] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3701. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Wisconsin State Board Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0464; FRL-9939-78-Region 5] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3702. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Polyamide ester polymers; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0451; FRL-9939-28] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3703. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s Major final rule — Renewable Fuel Standard Program: Standards for 2014, 2015, and 2016 and Biomass-Based Diesel Volume for 2017 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0111; FRL-9939-72-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS22) received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3704. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Wisconsin; Disapproval of Infrastructure SIP with respect to oxides of nitrogen as a precursor to ozone provisions for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0805; FRL-9939-77-Region 5] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3705. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of