

29. E D FITZGERALD, End of Watch: September 30, 1930, Houston, Texas, P.D.
30. C EDWARD FOLLEY, End of Watch: March 10, 1860, Houston, Texas, P.D.
31. JOSEPH ROBERT FREE, End of Watch: October 18, 1912, Houston, Texas, P.D.
32. GUY P GADDIS, End of Watch: January 31, 1994, Houston, Texas, P.D.
33. JAMES T GAMBILL, End of Watch: December 1, 1936, Houston, Texas, P.D.
34. FLORENTINO M GARCIA JR, End of Watch: November 10, 1989, Houston, Texas, P.D.
35. BEN EDDIE GERHART, End of Watch: June 26, 1968, Houston, Texas, P.D.
36. G Q GONZALEZ, End of Watch: February 28, 1960, Houston, Texas, P.D.
37. CHARLES R GOUGENHEIM, End of Watch: April 30, 1955, Houston, Texas, P.D.
38. CARL GREENE, End of Watch: March 14, 1928, Houston, Texas, P.D.
39. LEON GRIGGS, End of Watch: January 31, 1970, Houston, Texas, P.D.
40. MARIA MICHELLE GROVES, End of Watch: April 10, 1987, Houston, Texas, P.D.
41. GARY ALLEN GRYDER, End of Watch: June 29, 2008, Houston, Texas, P.D.
42. ANTONIO GUZMAN JF, End of Watch: January 9, 1973, Houston, Texas, P.D.
43. HOWARD B HAMMOND, End of Watch: August 18, 1946, Houston, Texas, P.D.
44. JAMES DONALD HARRIS, End of Watch: July 13, 1982, Houston, Texas, P.D.
45. DAVID MICHAEL HEALY, End of Watch: November 12, 1994, Houston, Texas, P.D.
46. TIMOTHY AHEARN, End of Watch: June 8, 1978, Houston, Texas, P.D.
47. OSCAR HOPE, End of Watch: June 22, 1929, Houston, Texas, P.D.
48. ELSTON M HOWARD, End of Watch: July 20, 1988, Houston, Texas, P.D.
49. DAVID HUERTA, End of Watch: September 19, 1973, Houston, Texas, P.D.
50. JAMES BRUCE IRBY, End of Watch: June 27, 1990, Houston, Texas, P.D.
51. BOBBY L JAMES, End of Watch: June 26, 1968, Houston, Texas, P.D.
52. JOHN C JAMES, End of Watch: December 12, 1901, Houston, Texas, P.D.
53. RODNEY JOSEPH JOHNSON, End of Watch: September 21, 2006, Houston, Texas, P.D.
54. ED JONES, End of Watch: September 13, 1929, Houston, Texas, P.D.
55. P P JONES, End of Watch: January 30, 1927, Houston, Texas, P.D.
56. FRANK L KELLOGG, End of Watch: November 30, 1955, Houston, Texas, P.D.
57. S A BUSTER KENT, End of Watch: January 12, 1954, Houston, Texas, P.D.
58. JAMES F KILTY, End of Watch: April 8, 1976, Houston, Texas, P.D.
59. KENT DEAN KINCAID, End of Watch: May 23, 1998, Houston, Texas, P.D.
60. LOUIS R KUBA, End of Watch: May 17, 1967, Houston, Texas, P.D.
61. J D LANDRY, End of Watch: December 3, 1930, Houston, Texas, P.D.
62. ROBERT WAYNE LEE, End of Watch: January 31, 1971, Houston, Texas, P.D.
63. FRED MADDOX JR, End of Watch: February 24, 1954, Houston, Texas, P.D.
64. EYDEL MEN MANI, End of Watch: May 19, 2010, Houston, Texas, P.D.
65. A P MARSHALL, End of Watch: November 8, 1937, Houston, Texas, P.D.
66. CHARLES R MCDANIEL, End of Watch: August 4, 1963, Houston, Texas, P.D.
67. E G MEINKE, End of Watch: August 23, 1917, Houston, Texas, P.D.
68. HARRY MERENESS, End of Watch: October 18, 1933, Houston, Texas, P.D.
69. NOEL R MILLER, End of Watch: June 6, 1958, Houston, Texas, P.D.
70. KENNETH L MOODY, End of Watch: November 26, 1969, Houston, Texas, P.D.
71. HORACE MOODY, End of Watch: August 23, 1917, Houston, Texas, P.D.
72. WILLIAM MOSS, End of Watch: September 12, 1983, Houston Airport Police, Texas.
73. DAVE MURDOCK, End of Watch: June 27, 1921, Houston, Texas, P.D.
74. WILLIAM E MURPHY, End of Watch: April 1, 1910, Houston, Texas, P.D.
75. DAVID FRANKLIN NOEL, End of Watch: June 17, 1972, Houston, Texas, P.D.
76. M E PALMER, End of Watch: March 24, 1938, Houston, Texas, P.D.
77. ISAAC PARSON, End of Watch: May 24, 1914, Houston, Texas, P.D.
78. ROSS PATTON, End of Watch: August 23, 1917, Houston, Texas, P.D.
79. W B PHARES, End of Watch: September 30, 1930, Houston, Texas, P.D.
80. HERBERT N PLANER, End of Watch: February 18, 1965, Houston, Texas, P.D.
81. IRA RANEY, End of Watch: August 23, 1917, Houston, Texas, P.D.
82. WINSTON J RAWLINGS, End of Watch: March 29, 1982, Houston, Texas, P.D.
83. JERRY LAWRENCE RILEY, End of Watch: June 18, 1974, Houston, Texas, P.D.
84. JOHN CHARLES RISLEY, End of Watch: October 23, 2000, Harris County, Texas, S.O.
85. SANDRA ANN ROBBINS, End of Watch: March 17, 1991, South Houston, Texas, P.D.
86. GEORGE G ROJAS, End of Watch: January 28, 1976, Houston, Texas, P.D.
87. MICHAEL P ROMAN, End of Watch: January 6, 1994, Houston, Texas, P.D.
88. JOHN ANTHONY SALVAGGIO, End of Watch: November 25, 1990, Houston, Texas, P.D.
89. LOUIS L SANDER, End of Watch: January 21, 1967, Houston, Texas, P.D.
90. JEFFERY SCOTT SANFORD, End of Watch: September 14, 1991, Harris County, Texas, S.O.
91. KATHLEEN C SCHAEFER, End of Watch: August 18, 1982, Houston, Texas, P.D.
92. ROBERT SCHULTEA, End of Watch: August 25, 1956, Houston, Texas, P.D.
93. DARYL WAYNE SHIRLEY, End of Watch: April 28, 1982, Houston, Texas, P.D.
94. RICHARD SNOW, End of Watch: March 17, 1882, Houston, Texas, P.D.
95. BRUNO DAVID SOBOLESKI, End of Watch: April 12, 1991, Houston, Texas, P.D.
96. JERRY LEON SPRUILL, End of Watch: October 27, 1972, Houston, Texas, P.D.
97. R H SULLIVAN, End of Watch: March 9, 1935, Houston, Texas, P.D.
98. JOHN W SUTTLE, End of Watch: August 3, 1959, Houston, Texas, P.D.
99. CUONG HUY TRINH, End of Watch: April 6, 1997, Houston, Texas, P.D.
100. ALBERTO VASQUEZ, End of Watch: May 22, 2001, Houston, Texas, P.D.
101. JAMES T WALKER, End of Watch: March 8, 1963, Houston, Texas, P.D.
102. VICTOR R WELLS III, End of Watch: October 2, 1980, Houston, Texas, P.D.
103. R O WELLS, End of Watch: July 30, 1927, Houston, Texas, P.D.
104. ALBERT CHARLES WILKINS, End of Watch: January 6, 1978, Harris County, Texas, C.O.
105. KEVIN SCOTT WILL, End of Watch: May 29, 2011, Houston, Texas, P.D.
106. HENRY WILLIAMS, End of Watch: February 8, 1886, Houston, Texas, P.D.
107. WILLIAM C WILLIAMS JR, End of Watch: April 16, 1930, Harris County, Texas, S.O.
108. EDD WILLIAMS, End of Watch: January 12, 1974, Harris County, Texas, S.O.
109. JAMES FRANKLIN WILLIS, End of Watch: July 1, 1964, Houston, Texas, P.D.
110. MARVIN ALTON WINTER, End of Watch: December 4, 1937, Harris County, Texas, C.O., Pct. 4
111. ANDREW WINZER, End of Watch: February 18, 1988, Houston, Texas, P.D.
112. JETER YOUNG, End of Watch: June 19, 1921, Houston, Texas, P.D.
113. HERMAN YOUNGST, End of Watch: December 12, 1901, Houston, Texas, P.D.
114. JOE A ZAMARRON, 60-W: 2, End of Watch: April 18, 1981, Houston, Texas, P.D.

RECOGNIZING LAUREN MORRIS SCHULMAN

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to recognize the remarkable career of Lauren Morris Schulman. After more than 13 years, Ms. Schulman is retiring as the Florida political director of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, AIPAC, the largest pro-Israel advocacy organization in the country.

Lauren began her political career 26 years ago and served in a variety of positions with the late Congressman Bill Lehman, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Florida State Senator Gwen Margolis, and Miami-Dade County Commissioner Sally Heyman.

Lauren has adroitly mobilized and engaged Florida's pro-Israel community. She has led our citizen activists in building relationships with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, key to the success of the pro-Israel movement.

Lauren has helped all Floridians understand how, against all odds, Israel has become a prospering democracy whose groundbreaking contributions in technology, medicine, and environmental innovation have benefited the world.

Lauren's commitment to our community and the State of Israel is exemplary, and I am proud to call her my constituent and good friend. Our loss is her husband Cliff's and her family's gain. I wish a hearty mazel tov to Lauren and thank her for her invaluable work.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2016, TO MONDAY, MAY 23, 2016

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, May 23, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing sometimes the way, in the heat of dispute, argument—sometimes

any of us can have it happen to us—people don't think clearly.

I have been here for nearly 11½ years in Congress. It is a tremendous honor to get to be the servant for the people of east Texas. But in that 11½ years, 4 of them the Democrats were in the majority, and my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) was the majority leader during those 4 years, and the rules never changed with regard to how the electronic voting worked.

For the last 11½ years, it has always been the same. And that is, we could take our voting card—and it has a little computer chip in it. It doesn't matter which way we put our card in the box. If the blue light on the box is lit, it means that box is open for voting. Most every other row has a voting box on the back.

We take our card, and we put it in the slot whichever way. It recognizes the one-of-a-kind computer chip that belongs to that 1 of 435 Members, and then you can hit the green button for “yea,” the red button the “nay,” the yellow button for “present.” The blue light is on there. It is next in order on the box, but it can't be pushed. It just lets you know the box is open for voting.

Toward the end of a vote, particularly a 15-minute vote, the Speaker will not have gaveled the vote dead, but oftentimes the box goes dead right before the gavel comes down. Even to that point, you can still change your vote, but it is just when the blue light goes out, you can't do it at the box. You have to come down to the well.

What I have noticed every year for the last 11½ years that I have been here, if we are voting on a 15-minute vote—and all of us have probably done it at one time or another—if you need to change your vote, maybe you looked up and, for example, sometimes one person has multiple amendments, and you see their name and it is their amendment, and you say, “Oh, I was not going to vote for that,” and you vote “no” and you need to change your vote to “yes,” you can still change your vote at the box.

On a 15-minute vote, once you get past 5 minutes, you normally have to come down to the well and get a green card for “yea,” a red card for “nay,” or a yellow card for “present” or “abstaining” and change your vote that way. But on a 5-minute vote or a 2-minute vote, if you need to change your vote, you didn't understand the significance, it constantly happens that people change their vote.

□ 1245

But to change their vote, if you have your voting card, you have been able to change it at the box on a 5-minute vote or a 2-minute vote. Every now and then, before the gavel comes down, the blue light will go off on the box, so you can no longer change your vote or vote at that box. That is when you hear someone yelling, “One more, one more,” and they come rushing down

the aisle to get the vote in before the gavel comes down.

Now, in 11½ years, only one time has there been a massive and gross violation of the rules the way we have followed them in bringing a vote to a conclusion. I can understand my friend from Maryland being sensitive, because this happened on his watch as majority leader. But Republicans were in the minority, and yet there was a vote. I don't even remember if it was a bill or an amendment. I think it was an amendment. But the Republicans voting against the amendment had enough Democrats voting with us that we were bringing down a Democratic amendment or bill, and it was left open for enough time that anybody that wanted to change could have changed.

When the Democrat in the chair felt that enough time had passed, no other changes were being made, and the measure being voted on had failed, then the gavel came down. The rule has always been that when the gavel comes down, there can be no further changing of the vote.

Perhaps, the majority leader, at that time HOYER, had forgotten. But that was the time they violated their own rules. A subsequent investigation confirmed that. They violated the rules and allowed someone whose arm they were twisting to vote after the gavel came down to change the vote, change the outcome of the vote.

That didn't happen here today. And the vote wasn't held open very long at all after the end of the time running out. Sometimes, whether it is Democrats or Republicans in the majority, it runs to zero. But if, in the opinion of the Chair or the Speaker, there is somebody wanting to change their vote or somebody that is making a good faith effort to get here to vote, they will leave the vote open.

Sometimes, like when Speaker PELOSI was meeting with President Obama at the White House and wasn't getting back in time, or Majority Leader HOYER, and they weren't getting back in time, well, that vote would be held open to give them time well beyond the zero, zero, zero, so they could cast that vote. Nobody objected because we knew they were making a good faith effort to get here.

I understand sometimes we forget things that we have been doing for a number of years. And especially in the heat of debate and a verbal battle here on the floor, people can forget what they have been doing for many, many years. But that has been the way the voting and the rules on voting have worked and been interpreted for many years.

So I was greatly surprised to hear the former majority leader challenging on the basis that people didn't come into the well to change their vote on either a 5-minute or a 2-minute vote. Well, they have always been able to change their vote. The voting boxes were open.

Anyway, we all have those mental lapses where we forget things that we

have been doing for years. I mean, it just happens, and especially here on the floor. There is nothing to be taken from former Majority Leader HOYER forgetting how the rules were when he was majority leader and forgetting how they have been all these years since, so no hard feelings. He just had a mental lapse and forgot how the rules have been ever since he has been here the entire time.

There has been a great deal of to-do and a lot of wailing and gnashing of teeth about what I would term the “Iranian crisis” because it truly is a crisis that this administration has enabled Iran to go ahead and develop nuclear weapons to continue down that path. Even though they are supposed to be prohibited, they continued to develop missiles that eventually will be capable of delivering nuclear weapons onto the United States. They have got missiles to deliver them on to Israel right now.

But as Prime Minister Netanyahu so ably has pointed out from this very rostrum right up here, those missiles they are developing now are not for Israel. They can already reach Israel. Those are for the Great Satan.

So it was deeply troubling to hear the confessions and admissions of the White House adviser consultant mouthpiece, Ben Rhodes, reveal that the administration—and I am being careful not to use any specific names. I am addressing generally the administration—that the administration had to lie to the American people and had to lie to the House and Senate about how evil Iran really was and had to talk about how moderate they were when, actually, the fact is, apparently, under the so-called moderate President Rouhani, there have been more people put to death than even under the former President Ahmadinejad. This man is no moderate.

Though the American people were fed lies about the negotiations, they were having to negotiate, either directly or indirectly, with the Ayatollah Khamenei. They don't make big decisions like a nuclear weapons deal, unless the religious leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei, actually agreed, just like his predecessor, the Ayatollah Khomeini.

So just like with the revelations about ObamaCare, now that we have had someone working behind the scenes with the administration who revealed, yes, the reason ObamaCare passed was because people are such fools, they were able to fool them into voting for a bill that was really not anything like what was being represented. And yet along comes Ben Rhodes, and he admits they did the same thing on ObamaCare that they did on the Iranian treaty.

Now, I understand the administration has never called it a treaty, and there are people in the Senate who have not had the courage to call it a treaty, but it is a treaty. You can't change a nuclear proliferation treaty

with an executive agreement or an executive order. It can't be done. It has to be done with another treaty. So, clearly, there are a number of things that made clear that the Iranian deal was a treaty.

It should have been brought to the floor of the Senate. It still should be. It is time. You can do it any time this year. You could do it with 51 votes of the Senate setting aside cloture and saying, the Iranian treaty is a treaty, it is going to allow Iran to have nuclear weapons that will allow them to devastate both the Little Satan, in their opinion Israel, and the Great Satan, the United States, and it needs to be stopped.

So, hopefully, the courage will abound eventually in the Senate and we will get that vote. And therefore, people with standing could go to court and stop the flood of millions of dollars to Iran, which has already said that with the billions of dollars, \$100 billion to \$150 billion in the first year this administration is going to make available, they are going to commit so much more to terrorism than they ever had.

Then we get this story just a few days ago from the Washington Free Beacon entitled, *Iran Shows Off Third Underground Missile Site*. It says:

"Iran's military recently publicized a third underground missile facility and showed the launch of a new ballistic missile through the top of a mountain.

"It was the third time since October that Tehran showed off an extensive network of underground missile facilities. The new video, however, for the first time, shows a missile launch from one of the country's underground launch facilities.

"Disclosure of the new video comes as Iran this week conducted the third launch of a ballistic missile since January, when the nuclear deal aimed at curbing Iran's nuclear weapons development went into effect."

And I would submit, that part of the story is inaccurate. It is being considered to have gone into effect, but it is a treaty that was never ratified by the U.S. Senate, and it is an ineffective treaty. But the Obama administration is choosing to act as if the Iranian agreement really is an effective treaty. Iran has shown they have no intention of following that agreement. They have violated it a number of times.

And the only reason Iran would have the gall to go forward and say, Hey, look, we have got a third underground missile site, we are going to let you see a launch, we don't care that the world knows that we are violating this last agreement with Obama and Kerry and Wendy Sherman that helped give North Korea nuclear weapons in the Clinton administration, we don't care that they know because we have now seen that this administration will not stand up to us, they will let us push them around, they will even let us take their soldiers or their naval officers, their naval seamen captive, violate virtually

every treaty on the treatment of prisoners, humiliate the American sailors, force them to lie on camera, and after all that is said and done, we will get the Secretary of State to come back and thank us.

I mean, it is like from "Animal House," Kevin Bacon being beaten saying, Thank you, sir, may I have another? Iran has figured out they are the senior pledges, and this administration will take a beating and keep asking, Thank you, sir, may I have another? And Iran is all that willing to give them another and another.

The trouble is this isn't a comedy movie, this is real life. Christians and Jews are being targeted, persecuted, and killed in greater numbers than at any time in the history of the world. The Middle East is on fire, except Israel is a place of stability. But if this administration has its will, it will become a powder keg before long as well.

Libya had become more stable. And after the United States went into Iraq, because Saddam Hussein continued to refuse to abide by the orders of the U.N. that were passed by huge majorities, requiring them to disclose what they had, he wouldn't comply, most everybody was—including those who now say, I voted for it, I really wasn't for it—but, at the time, people thought, look, this guy must have something to hide because he is certainly not letting us get in to see what weapons he has. Other reports indicate that they had been taken from Iraq and were no longer present.

But either way, it scared Qadhafi enough that, as some of the Israeli leaders have told me, we were shocked when you provided the firepower, the planes, and the bombs that made it possible to eliminate Qadhafi because, yeah, he had blood on his hands before 2003, but after 2003, he helped you more in fighting terrorism than anybody but us, and you took him out, and look what happened as a result.

□ 1300

It turned Egypt upside down. There are problems in Albania, problems all over North Africa, problems for the Middle East and North Africa both, problems coming down now of radical Islamists in Nigeria and other, more central African countries. They have paid a heavy price for the improper leadership of this administration here in the United States. It is just tragic how many have lost their lives already.

Then we hear reports that in Nigeria—and I heard it when I was in Nigeria—and was trying to help the Nigerian families whose daughters had been abducted—that this administration, behind the scenes, was saying: Look, we will help you with Boko Haram, with the terrorism—although they don't like to use that word—with the radical extremism that is occurring in Nigeria. If you will change your laws, violate your religious beliefs, allow same-sex marriage, and pay for abortion, then we will help you.

As one Nigerian Catholic bishop said: Our religious beliefs are not for sale, not to the U.S. President, not to anybody.

I have an article that goes on about the situation with Iran. This is also from May 12: "Kerry's Peculiar Message About Iran for European Banks."

It reads:

"U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry met Thursday in London with a group of European financial institutions for a discussion about 'Iranian banking matters.' The meeting, which followed repeated complaints by Iranian officials that they aren't getting the benefit of the bargain under the nuclear deal, was an effort by the State Department to persuade major non-U.S. banks that doing Iran-related business is not only permitted following the relaxation of Iran sanctions, but is actually encouraged.

"The irony will not be lost on these financial institutions. Most of them were similarly gathered almost 10 years ago by U.S. Treasury Henry Paulson to discuss Iranian banking matters, but that discussion focused on protecting the integrity of the global financial system against the risk posed by Iran.

"In the decade that followed, the George W. Bush and Obama administrations, as well as the U.K. and other governments, the European Union, and the United Nations, all imposed extensive sanctions targeting Iran's illicit and deceptive conduct. Banks were briefed extensively and repeatedly by the U.S. Treasury Department on the details of Iran's conduct. The Financial Action Task Force, the global standard-setting body for anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing, warned about the financial crime risks posed by Iran as a jurisdiction. The result: Iran became a financial pariah.

"No one has claimed that Iran has ceased to engage in much of the same conduct for which it was sanctioned, including actively supporting terrorism and building and testing ballistic missiles; but now Washington is pushing non-U.S. banks to do what is still illegal for American banks to do.

"This is a very odd position for the U.S. Government to be taking."

It is shocking that this administration continues to be complicit with the largest supporter of terrorism in the world.

How many lives will be lost because of this complicity?

There was a time when America would not tolerate the kind of treatment of Americans that occurred to our seamen when they were taken captive. Not only did we not come to their defense, we praised Iran and thanked them for being so gracious for the manner in which they abused our sailors.

This article goes on. It reads:

"On the one hand, Washington is continuing to prohibit American banks and companies from doing Iran-related business. In February, the FATF"—that is the Financial Action Task

Force—“reaffirmed its prior concerns about the ‘serious threat’ Iran poses to the international financial system, urging countries to apply effective countermeasures. The U.S. Treasury Department’s designation of Iran, including its central bank and financial institutions, as a primary money laundering concern also still stands. As part of that designation, Treasury determined that ‘the international financial system is increasingly vulnerable to the risk that otherwise responsible financial institutions will, unwittingly, participate in Iran’s illicit activities.’

“On the other hand, Mr. Kerry wants non-U.S. banks to do business with Iran without a U.S. repudiation of its prior statements about the associated financial crime risks. There are no assurances as to how such activity would subsequently be viewed by U.S. regulatory and law enforcement authorities, which might seek to take enforcement action against banks that enter the Iranian market and run afoul of complicated U.S. restrictions. The State Department neither controls nor plays any meaningful role in the enforcement decisions of these authorities.

“Washington has warned repeatedly that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps controls broad swaths of the Iranian economy. The IRGC remains sanctioned by both the United States and the European Union because of the central role it plays in Iran’s illicit conduct. When the U.S., EU, and U.N. removed sanctions from several hundred Iranian banks and companies, there were no assurances that the conduct of those banks and companies had changed.

“This will present a challenge for European banks. HSBC is endeavoring to implement consistent and high standards across its global operations, designed to combat financial crime and prevent abuse by illicit actors. We have more work to do, but achieving that objective is one of our highest priorities. This approach is rightly expected by our regulators, including in the U.K. and the U.S.

“Our decisions will be driven by the financial crime risks and the underlying conduct. For these reasons, HSBC has no intention of doing any new business involving Iran. Governments can lift sanctions, but the private sector is still responsible for managing its own risk and, no doubt, will be held accountable if it falls short.”

That was from May 12, and it appears to be somebody who certainly knows the banking business.

I would like to comment a bit about, again, our illegal immigration problems and our porous borders because the administration continues to act as if all is well—all is well—when it is not well.

An article from May 19: “Previously Deported Illegal Alien Allegedly Killed Prom Teen.”

“The man that Houston police say was driving drunk and evading arrest

when he crashed into a car, killing a young woman on her way home from the prom, is listed by Federal officials as a previously deported illegal alien.”

“Edin Palacios-Rodas, a 27-year-old previously deported illegal alien from Guatemala, has now had an immigration detainer placed on him after being processed into the Harris County Jail on one count of felony murder and one count of felony evading resulting in death and serious bodily injury.”

It is still going on. With that going on, this administration continues to push for and has allies in Congress pushing for what they are calling sentencing reform when, actually, it won’t be reform as much as it will be rather devastating. The pendulum on criminal justice swings back and forth. Most history shows that it has always been and probably will always be, whether a totalitarian government or a democratic republic such as ours.

My friend in the Senate, Senator JEFF SESSIONS, has an article, again, from May 19 that reads:

“Senator JEFF SESSIONS warns that Congress must be careful to ensure the sentencing reductions bills pending before Congress did not boost already rising crime rates and ‘sign death warrants’ for innocent victims.”

“The Sentencing Reform and Correction Act, which the Alabama Republican opposes, hews to Obama’s anti-law enforcement agenda and could cost an enormous human toll, Senator SESSIONS said. ‘Frankly, this is Obama’s policy and the Attorney General who he’s appointed, Loretta Lynch’s policy, and Eric Holder’s before her, to basically cut people’s sentences that have been lawfully imposed throughout this country, and it’s impacting public safety and will continue to do so in the future.’

“The Senator also highlighted many high-profile cop killings as the Obama administration makes police work more difficult.

“He said, ‘In the last year, we’ve lost 123 police officers, 35 in the first 4 months of 2016. Violent crimes and murders have increased across the country at alarming rates. Let me just share with my colleagues some of the things we’re seeing in violent crime. Recently, the Major Cities Chiefs of Police Association, a long-established group, called an emergency meeting to deal with the numbers I’m going to share with you today.’

“The numbers I will quote represent the percentage increase in total murders in the first quarter of this year, 2016, over the first quarter . . . of 2015. Las Vegas: 82 percent increase.”

This is the murder increase.

“Dallas, Texas: 73 percent increase. Chicago: 70 percent. Jacksonville, Florida: 67 percent. Newark, New Jersey: 60 percent increase. Miami-Dade: 38 percent. Los Angeles: 33 percent.”

And on and on.

“These are substantial increases in crime. According to FBI statistics released just this year, the number of

violent crimes committed across the country was up in the first half of 2015 compared with the same period of 2014.”

So, actually, we are going up and up, and the percentage increase in these cities of 82 percent, 73 percent, and a 70 percent increase is even more dramatic than that when you go back 2 years.

Sessions also quoted FBI Director James Comey’s concerns about the rising tide of crime.

“I was very worried about it last fall, and I am, in many ways, more worried because the numbers are not only going up, they’re continuing to go up in most of those cities faster than they were going up last year. Something is happening. I don’t know what the answer is, but, holy cow, do we have a problem.”

Yes, we do have a problem. One of the answers I mentioned in this article, again, from May 19, entitled: “Obama doesn’t think rapists, armed robbers, drug dealers are criminals.” I think I found the euphemism of the year.

“According to Team Obama, criminals should now be declared ‘justice-involved individuals.’

“The neo-Orwellianism comes to us from the bizarre flurry of last-minute dictates, regulations, and bone-chilling threats, collectively known to fanboys as Obama’s Gorgeous Good-bye.

“In another of those smiley faced but deeply sinister ‘dear colleague’ letters sent to universities and colleges this week, Obama’s Education Secretary, John King, discouraged colleges from asking applicants whether they were convicted criminals.”

□ 1315

It used to be a matter of common sense. Most Americans wanted to know.

Especially in dormitories that have now become co-ed, where you have men and women living in and with and around each other, it was considered valuable information to know if your daughter was going to be living in, around, or with a convicted rapist. That was thought to be good information, but apparently that is no longer considered by this administration as good information.

People all across America have shown an interest in knowing whether there are child molesters in their neighborhood where their children are growing up and children are playing around the area. They want to know if their child is at risk because they know there is a significant recidivism rate, particularly among child molesters.

Yet, this administration says it is time to stop calling criminals criminals. Again, that is in keeping with the unwillingness to call radical Islamist, as the Muslim leader of Egypt, our friend, President el-Sisi, calls it—I mean, it is radical Islamists. He has had the courage to tell imams themselves that we have to get control again of Islam and wrestle it back away from the radical Islamists.

As my friend, Carolyn Glick, pointed out in *The Jerusalem Post*, by this administration's refusal to call radical Islam radical Islam, it betrays our allies who are Muslim—like President el-Sisi in Egypt—who are wanting Muslims to stand up and say that these Islamists should not be allowed to represent our religion because they know that they do.

When you have a man with multiple degrees in Islamic studies saying that, yes, radical Islam is the ultimate Islam and, on the other hand, you have a President who did go to school in Indonesia in Muslim schools and elementary school but does not have any degrees in Islamic studies, like the world expert in Islamic studies, al-Qaradawi, well, one is President of the United States with no degrees in Islamic studies, and he says it is not Islam. But a man who has studied Islam his whole life and has multiple degrees, including a Ph.D., says not only is it Islam, as the head of ISIS as he is, this is Islam the way it should be.

We should be giving assistance to our allies, giving them cover by not going on with this facade where this administration refuses to call radical Islam radical Islam. They call radical Islamic terrorism exactly what it is. They are not helping our friends around the world that are trying to stand up and do the right thing.

You could go back to Libya, the attack of Benghazi. We now know from what has been gathered from emails and information that Secretary Clinton basically told the President of Libya: We know that this Benghazi attack was not on a video, in essence, and that it was a planned attack. She told her daughter.

Yet, she went out, as did Susan Rice, representing this administration and told us all, oh, it was all about the video; telling victims families that we are going to get the guy who did the video. Victims families from Benghazi have told me personally, when Secretary Clinton said we are going to get the guys that did the videos, which she now says she didn't say—how tragic is that?

So basically calling these victims' families liars. But the families say, when she said we will get the guy that did the video, they were infuriated. They said: We didn't care about the guy that did some video. We wanted our government to get the guys that killed our loved one, and that was not the message.

You have to understand that there were a lot of things to do, there were promises to keep, and miles to go before they slept. But we don't know if they just went to bed and slept.

When they found out the personal ambassador of the Secretary of State was missing, Clinton and President Obama, did they just go to bed?

They won't tell us.

We know President Obama had a very important engagement the next day. He had to fly out early to Las Vegas for

a big campaign speech. We know. We understand. Hey, that was more pressing. We got that. We understand. To him, that was more pressing.

What do you do? Do you go to sleep when you get word that your personal ambassador is missing?

For the first time since 1979, an ambassador ends up being killed. He wasn't given adequate protection.

Now, we are hearing more and more reports from people that the assets were there to go help. They could have saved at least two, maybe more of the four, but they were not allowed to go and save the American heroes.

Well, there is an article from *Conservative Review* entitled "Busted: The 10 Most Dangerous Myths About Criminal Justice Reform" that is being pushed especially by this administration. And we do have some colleagues here in the House and Senate that are as well.

"Myth number one: The prison population keeps growing, even though crime is declining."

"Fact: The D.C. intelligentsia argues our criminal justice system is in dire need of reform. But ask anyone outside the beltway, and they'll give you a different definition of 'broken.' Many Americans would agree that current laws are too lenient on criminals and disregard the victim all too often. It was the tough reforms put into place during the Reagan years and in the '90s that produced the sharpest decline in violent crime on record. Those reforms, coupled with more aggressive policing, led to the only positive social trend in public policy in recent memory. That trend is now being reversed precisely as incarceration rates decline and Obama and his allies ratchet up the war against law enforcement. While correlation doesn't necessarily prove causation, the correlation is indeed striking and in conjunction with the defanging of local police departments, the release of tens of thousands of Federal prisoners can only result in exacerbating this negative trajectory."

From the information that the FBI provided to Senator SESSIONS, we know about maybe less than 1 percent of Federal inmates in Federal prison are there for possession of a controlled substance; that most are there for more. Ninety-nine percent or so are there for more than that.

But those that have been involved in the criminal justice system, both in the State side, as I was, and on the Federal side—I mean, we work with each other. And we know the Federal Government never had interest, that I ever saw, in simple possession cases.

Where the Federal Government had interest is if a real bad guy—maybe he had been involved in a shooting, a killing, a robbing, a possession—but they wanted him to turn on his boss so they could get the bigger fish. They had to offer something to get him to turn, and they would offer—I have seen it many times—okay, we can't have a plea agreement where we set a certain sen-

tence, as they do in State court, but what we can do is agree to drop all the charges, except this one possession.

So the sentence is not that great. Whatever the judge does won't be that great. It won't have the weapons charge in there, even though he used a weapon and engaged in violent activity, if he will help us get Mr. Big. That happens. I have seen it happen.

Back in the early '80s, when I was court appointed in Federal court, I had approaches like that with regard to my clients: What can you help us with, and here are the charges we are willing to drop, even though we know we can prove them.

Yet, this administration acts like that never happens and that, obviously, all these people in prison because of drug charges are really non-violent. That is garbage. That is why the crime rate keeps going up as this administration forces the release of more and more people.

This article points out another myth: "There are millions of people incarcerated in American prisons for no good reason."

"Fact: While there are approximately 1.5 million people incarcerated in American jails, prisons, and other institutions, only 195,900 are Federal inmates (a 10-year low). And only 159,000 in the Federal system are housed in actual prisons. The rest are in privately managed facilities, home confinement, short-term detention, long-term boarders, residential reentry centers, pre-trial/presentence holding, et cetera. At least 25 percent of the Federal prison population is comprised of illegal aliens and possibly more who are non-citizens. We should save money by releasing those criminals and deporting them."

What good does it do to deport somebody now when the border is so wide open?

"Myth number 3: Incarceration costs so much money and criminal justice reform will save billions."

Well, without reading through the whole article, I can tell you that is garbage as well.

Myth number 4: "This bill will only release low level, nonviolent drug offenders."

As I pointed out, that is simply not the case. It is a good article.

Myth number 5: "We have a big government culture of overcriminalization that threatens liberty."

Well, the biggest problem of overcriminalization is when Congress has passed a law that says you can go to prison for violating any of the regulations regarding this subject, and then bureaucrats in some cubicle somewhere put some regulations in place under this administration—sometimes 80,000 pages of new regulations a year—and people, as the Heritage Foundation has said before in one of their books, are probably all violating three or four Federal laws a day.

One other thing I wanted to touch on because it has been debated and a lot of

allegations made, people are trying to assert that Republicans somehow are supportive of the old ways of slavery.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to read from the Democratic Party Platform of 1856. This is a part of the platform. This is the belief of the Democratic Party, the national party:

“That Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the abolitionists”—that is those who wanted to end slavery—“or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery . . . are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts”—talking about the end of slavery—“have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.”

The Democratic Party Platform of 1856 also declares that “new States” to the Union should be admitted “with or without domestic slavery, as the State may elect.”

The Platform that year also says that “we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories . . . to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery.”

□ 1330

The platform of 1860 of the national Democratic Party, in seeking to uphold the Fugitive Slave Act, states: “The enactments of the State legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Act are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect.”

The 14th Amendment, giving full citizenship to freed slaves, passed in 1868 with 94 percent Republican support and zero percent Democratic support in Congress. The 15th Amendment, giving freed slaves the right to vote, passed in 1870 with 100 percent Republican support and zero percent Democratic support in Congress.

The Constitution of 1902 in the State of Virginia disenfranchised about 90 percent of the Black men who still voted at the beginning of the 20th century and nearly half of the White men. The number of eligible African American voters fell from about 147,000 in 1901 to about 10,000 by 1905. The measure was supported almost entirely by Virginia State Democrats.

In 1924, the Democratic National Convention convened in New York at Madison Square Garden. The convention is commonly known as the Klanbake due to the overwhelming influence of the Ku Klux Klan in the party.

In 1964, the Democratic Party led a 75-day filibuster against the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Leading the Democrats in

their opposition to civil rights for African Americans was a member of the Democratic Party, Senator Robert Byrd from West Virginia, who was known to be a recruiter for the Ku Klux Klan. Senator Byrd spoke directly about the Civil Rights Act in a 14-hour filibuster, proclaiming: “Men are not equal today, and they were not created equal in 1776, when the Declaration of Independence was written. Men and races of men differ in appearance, ways, physical power, mental capacity, creativity, and vision.”

The Democratic Party identified itself as the “White man’s party” and demonized the Republican Party as being dominated by African Americans.

So it is interesting to hear these rewritten parts of our history. When you know the hearts and minds of the people on the Republican side of the aisle, you find out there is nobody who wants slavery. We wish that slavery that held this Nation back—because as DANIEL WEBSTER used to preach and John Quincy Adams used to preach, how was a good God going to keep blessing America when we were treating brothers and sisters in Christ this way, putting them in chains and bondage? America was harmed. It was devastating to African American lives to be placed in slavery—the degradation, the humiliation. I am grateful to be part of the party that stood up and made the change.

But more than the Republican Party, the Judeo-Christian beliefs, especially in the 1700s after the Great Awakening, the First Great Awakening in America, revival in America where people turned to God, became Christians, they understood travesties better by understanding the Bible. They stood up, and they demanded equal rights for people, and it led to a revolution.

In the 1800s, there was a lot of debauchery, but during the Second Great Awakening, churches were really the core behind the abolitionist movement. We should never be putting brothers and sisters in chains. That is an abomination. It held America back. It helped greatly prevent America from reaching the heights that it would once slavery was gone.

But then even after slavery was gone, as a result of the great Republican father of our party, Abraham Lincoln, as he is sometimes referred to, people were not treated equally. As I just read, even in Virginia, this great State of Virginia, Democrats were determined to prevent African Americans from voting, and they were successful in large degree.

Mr. Speaker, I think a good way to finish today is to go back to the final argument. We have the entire final argument from John Quincy Adams. He was elected President in 1824. He was defeated by Andrew Jackson in 1828. But in 1830 he did an incredible thing that no one has ever done since. After being President, he ran for Congress, for the House of Representatives. He didn’t even run for Senate. He ran for

the House of Representatives. He believed God was calling him. As William Wilberforce believed God had called him to bring an end to slavery in Great Britain, Adams believed God was calling him back into government after being defeated as President, that he would lower himself to run for the House of Representatives. He got elected in 1830.

Speech after speech was against slavery. How can we expect God to bless America when we are treating brothers and sisters with chains and bondage? Sermons were so powerful that those sermons given against slavery, as he filed bills to end slavery, to free specific slaves over and over, those sermons he preached on the floor of the House right down the hall had a powerful impact on a homely-looking guy with an unpleasant sounding voice named Abraham Lincoln. He overlapped briefly before the massive stroke that took John Quincy Adams out.

Adams knew when he died back in the Speaker’s suite that he had not done what he thought God had called him to do—end slavery. It was 1848. But we now know, and Lincoln knew and said as much, as Steve Mansfield was telling me. He wrote a great book on Lincoln’s struggle with God. He knew that those speeches on the House floor down the hall, they didn’t end slavery, but they materially changed the attitude and affected that man named Abraham Lincoln that, 13 years after Adams would die, he would see to slavery’s end.

At the end of his argument, he was afraid he had not prevailed on behalf of Africans who were taken as captives by another African tribe, sold into slavery, and taken to the African coast. They were put on a ship and taken to the Caribbean, where they were put on a smaller ship called the Amistad.

“Amistad” is a great movie. Longview, Texas, native Matthew McConaughey plays the trial lawyer representing the Africans. Their position was: We are not anybody’s property. When the Africans took over the ship, landed accidentally in America, the Spanish said: These people are our property, and this ship is ours. Let us go. The Africans’ version: Hey, we are not anybody’s property. We want to go home.

That case was argued downstairs in the old Supreme Court Chamber. Adams knew if he didn’t do an adequate job, those Africans would leave in chains, their children would wear chains; and he was scared to death that he would not have been up to the job, and, as a result, there would be more suffering.

We have his exact argument. He finished like this. This is after he had been President.

He said: “Little did I imagine that I should ever again be required to claim the right of appearing in the capacity of an officer of this Court; yet such has been the dictate of my destiny—and I

appear again to plead the cause of justice, and now of liberty and life, in behalf of many of my fellow men, before that same Court, which in a former age I had addressed in support of rights of property I stand again, I trust for the last time, before the same Court.”

He goes on to say: “I stand before the same Court, but not before the same judges—nor aided by the same associates—nor resisted by the same opponents. As I cast my eyes—“ he stood looking at the judges—“along those seats of honor and of public trust, now occupied by you, they seek in vain for one of those honored and honorable persons whose indulgence listened then to my voice. Marshall—Cushing—Chase—Washington—Johnson—Livingston—Todd—where are they? Where is that eloquent statesman and learned lawyer who was my associate counsel in the management of that cause, Robert Goodloe Harper? Where is that brilliant luminary, so long the pride of Maryland and of the American bar, then my opposing counsel, Luther Martin? Where is the excellent clerk of that day, whose name has been inscribed on the shores of Africa, as a monument of his abhorrence of the African slave-trade, Elias B. Caldwell? Where is the marshal—where are the criers of the Court? Alas. Where is one of the very judges of the Court, arbiters of life and death, before whom I commenced this anxious argument, even now prematurely closed? Where are they all? Gone. Gone. All gone—gone from the services which, in their day and generation, they faithfully rendered to their country. From the excellent characters which they sustained in life, so far as I have had the means of knowing, I humbly hope, and fondly trust, that they have gone to receive the rewards of blessedness on high. In taking, then, my final leave of this Bar, and of this honorable Court, I can only . . . “a fervent petition to Heaven, that every member of it may go to his final account with as little of earthly frailty to answer for as those illustrious dead, and that you may, every one”—talking to the judges—“after the close of a long and virtuous career in this world, be received at the portals of the next with the approving sentence—“Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.””

We should all hope as such.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1635. An act to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 18, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4957. To designate the Federal building located at 99 New York Avenue, N.E., in the District of Columbia as the “Ariel Rios Federal Building”.

H.R. 4923. To establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for temporary duty suspensions and reductions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 23, 2016, at noon 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:

5391. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Legal, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Registration of Securities Transfer Agents (RIN: 3064-AE41) received May 17, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5392. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regulations under the Americans With Disabilities Act (RIN: 3046-AB01) received May 17, 2016, 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.

5393. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Deeming Tobacco Products To Be Subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as Amended by the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act; Restrictions on the Sale and Distribution of Tobacco Products and Required Warning Statements for Tobacco Products [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0189] (RIN: 0910-AG38) received May 16, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5394. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Exempt External Power Supplies Under the EPS Service Parts Act of 2014 [Docket No.: EEERE-2015-BT-CRT-0013] (RIN: 1904-AD53) received May 17, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5395. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-393, “Home Purchase Assistance

Program Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5396. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-391, “Marijuana Possession Decriminalization Clarification Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5397. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-390, “Notary Public Fee Enhancement Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5398. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-389, “Closing of a Public Alley in Square 697, S.O. 15-26230, Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5399. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-387, “Closing of a Public Alley in Square 342, S.O. 14-21629, Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5400. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-386, “Tree Canopy Protection Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5401. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-380, “Higher Education Licensure Commission Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5402. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-381, “Business Improvement Districts Sunset Repeal Temporary Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5403. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-382, “Civic Associations Public Space Permit Fee Waiver Temporary Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5404. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-383, “Tax Sale Resource Center Clarifying Temporary Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5405. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-384, “Revised Synthetics Abatement and Full Enforcement Drug Control Temporary Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5406. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-379, “DMPED Procurement Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5407. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-385, “Caregiver Advise, Record, and Enable Amendment Act of 2016”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87