

Can we wipe out the environmental laws and simply turn the pumps on? Yes, if that legislation were to pass that has been offered by my colleagues from the San Joaquin Valley. Or we can work within the environmental laws, achieving maximum flexibility, understanding the science: Where are the salmon or the salmonoids? Those are the salmon that have hatched and are coming back down the river, little, tiny salmon. Where are they? Are they coming down the river and getting sucked to the pumps, or are they coming down the river and heading out to the bay? We don't know today. We are not doing real-time monitoring.

If we did real-time monitoring, we would know where they are. We would know where the delta smelt are and other species, and we could adjust the pumping to protect the species and to take advantage of the high flows that occur during the normal winters and also this year, even though it is well below normal.

I have confidence. I have confidence in the wisdom of the Californians who decided that they would pass a water bond to put in place long-range solutions for California—recycling, conservation, storage systems, underground aquifers—and to develop safe drinking water. I have confidence in the wisdom of California because they voted by over 60 percent for this project.

I have confidence in the Congress. I have confidence in the Senate. Senator FEINSTEIN has come up with a good bill. I had the honor to work with her on that bill, and I will soon introduce that bill here in the House.

I have confidence that we have the wisdom and we have the understanding of the systems of California water to maximize over time the water potential of California. And in the near term, in the near term when California, this great State that we would like to see as green, when California is faced with this, I have got confidence that we are wise enough and we are smart enough politically to maneuver ourselves into a situation where we can address the current drought to the maximum extent possible, delivering water to the San Joaquin Valley and on into southern California without harming the fish, without destroying the salmon of California and the fishing, the multibillion-dollar fishing industry that goes with it, and without jeopardizing the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

That is our challenge. This is what we are going to try to accomplish. Senator FEINSTEIN's bill has been introduced. That version will be introduced over here in the next several days as we develop a better understanding among my colleagues of what we are trying to accomplish here.

□ 2045

I have confidence that the representatives of the southern California area will see the wisdom of putting aside

what Mark Twain said we always do in California: Fighting over water and getting about drinking more whiskey. Probably a pretty good idea.

I think we are going to get southern California support for this. I think the San Joaquin Valley folks will look at this and say: Well, we can continue fighting as we have for the last 5 years with no progress, none, nada, zero.

Let's see if we can figure out how to do this in a way that protects the species, the salmon, the other fish, that protects the largest estuary on the west coast of the western hemisphere, and that provides the maximum amount of water that is available to California, which, by the way, has an economy that is ranked seventh in the world. So water is really important.

I know we can do better. I know that this Nation doesn't have to have this kind of water in Flint, Michigan. I know that this Nation doesn't have to have children in the Central Valley of California getting their water out of a cattle water trough.

I know that this Nation doesn't have to destroy the largest estuary and all of the fish, all of the salmon, and all of the industry that goes with that in its quest for water and that what little is available can be shared and maximized.

That is what we are going to try to do with the Feinstein-Garamendi legislation. I know we can do it. I know we have to do it. I know, at the end of the day, we are not going to destroy. We are going to build, we are going to create, and we are going to solve the problem.

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

IN TRIBUTE TO UNITED STATES  
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE  
ANTONIN SCALIA, A PRE-  
EMINENT MIND

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, I rise tonight in tribute to one of the greatest jurists in this Nation's history. Justice Antonin Scalia had a preeminent mind following an excellent education. He has a beautiful family and has already been very sorely missed.

I thought it might be helpful, Mr. Speaker, to get a sense of the man and how profoundly concerned he was with the place in which this country finds itself after world wars, after depressions, after all kinds of threats: a massive civil war in the 1860s, all kinds of things that have threatened this Nation, even the War of 1812 during which this Capitol was set on fire.

There were all of these threats; yet, at this time in which we live, he could see and he tried to sound the warning alarms for what the majority of the Supreme Court was doing to this country.

It seemed to be encapsulated rather well back in the June 12, 2008, decision

in the case of *Boumediene vs. George W. Bush*, President of the United States, combined with another case.

The decision of the majority of the Court, as Justice Scalia pointed out, was so totally inconsistent with the majority's own majority opinion in a prior case regarding people who were captured on the battlefield and who were clearly at war with the United States.

Throughout the history of warfare at least among civilized nations during the period of warfare, the civilized thing to do was to hold those who were at war with you until such time as the groups they represent, they come from, declare they are no longer at war with you.

Then they can be released unless they have committed some heinous crime for which they should account beyond that of being part of the war against the Nation.

The Supreme Court majority had previously said basically that, of course, the Constitution gives the Congress the power to create tribunals, to create courts.

As my former constitutional law professor said, there is only one Court in the whole country's Federal system that owes its creation to the U.S. Constitution, and that is the U.S. Supreme Court. All other Federal courts, tribunals, owe their existences and their jurisdictions to the United States Congress.

So the majority Court had previously said, in effect, that Congress could, in cases where enemy combatants are seized on the battlefield, hold them without right of writ of habeas corpus, because that has basically been the history of civilized warfare.

Obviously, in uncivilized warfare, people were taken, abused, tortured, made slaves. That has happened throughout the history of mankind. But for nations that were civilized, you simply held them, hopefully, in humanitarian conditions.

In the *Boumediene* case, Justice Scalia starts his dissent by writing:

"I shall devote most of what will be a lengthy opinion to the legal errors contained in the opinion of the Court. Contrary to my usual practice, however, I think it appropriate to begin with a description of the disastrous consequences of what the Court has done today."

Justice Scalia goes on:

"America is at war with radical Islamists. The enemy began by killing Americans and American allies abroad: 241 at the Marine barracks in Lebanon, 19 at the Khobar Towers in Dhahran, 224 at our embassies in Dar es Salaam and Nairobi, and 17 on the USS *Cole* in Yemen.

"On September 11, 2001, the enemy brought the battle to American soil, killing 2,749 at the Twin Towers in New York City, 184 at the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., and 40 in Pennsylvania.

"It has threatened further attacks against our homeland; one need only

walk about buttressed and barricaded Washington or board a plane anywhere in the country to know that the threat is a serious one. Our Armed Forces are now in the field against the enemy, in Afghanistan and Iraq. Last week, 13 of our countrymen in arms were killed.

“The game of bait-and-switch that today’s opinion plays upon the Nation’s Commander in Chief will make the war harder on us.”

What comes next is, perhaps, one of the most profound statements that any Justice on the Supreme Court ever put in writing, but he was right. And being right in his discernment of the Supreme Court’s decision, he knew he needed to put this next sentence in print.

So, in talking about the majority opinion, Justice Scalia wrote this:

“It will almost certainly cause more Americans to be killed.”

He wrote:

“That consequence would be tolerable if necessary to preserve a time-honored legal principle vital to our constitutional Republic. But it is this Court’s blatant abandonment of such a principle that produces the decision today. The President relied on our settled precedent in *Johnson vs. Eisentrager*—this was back in 1950—“when he established the prison at Guantanamo Bay for enemy aliens. Citing that case, the President’s Office of Legal Counsel advised him ‘that the great weight of legal authority indicates that a federal district court could not properly exercise habeas jurisdiction over an alien detained at Guantanamo Bay.’”

Further down, the Justice writes:

“In the short term, however, the decision is devastating. At least 30 of those prisoners hitherto released from Guantanamo Bay have returned to the battlefield.

“But others have succeeded in carrying on their atrocities against innocent civilians. In one case, a detainee released from Guantanamo Bay masterminded the kidnapping of two Chinese dam workers, one of whom was later shot to death when used as a human shield against Pakistani commandos.

“Another former detainee promptly resumed his post as a senior Taliban commander and murdered a United Nations engineer and three Afghan soldiers. Still another murdered an Afghan judge. It was reported only last month that a released detainee carried out a suicide bombing against Iraqi soldiers in Mosul, Iraq.

“Their return to the kill illustrates the incredible difficulty of assessing who is and who is not an enemy combatant in a foreign theater of operations where the environment does not lend itself to rigorous evidence collection.”

Justice Scalia goes on:

“During the 1995 prosecution of Omar Abdel Rahman, federal prosecutors gave the names of 200 unindicted co-conspirators to the ‘Blind Sheikh’s’ de-

fense lawyers; that information was in the hands of Osama Bin Laden within two weeks.”

Justice Scalia went on to write page after page, explaining the perils that the overzealous and underthinking majority of the Court had imposed on the United States, on our military.

Justice Scalia made clear, when it comes to war, the decision that the majority made was to basically tell our military: Instead of protecting yourselves and protecting your brothers and sisters in arms, we are going to require you to go out there, gather up DNA evidence, get blood evidence, maybe just drive a forensic wagon out there onto the field of battle. Start gathering evidence because some moronic person in a palace in Washington—“palace” being what some of the Justices who first went through the new Supreme Court building said about it back in 1935, that palace in which they reside—has said that, in a time of war, we have lost our mind in America, and we are going to now start putting our military at risk of their very lives so they can go gather up evidence to satisfy some bloated judge in a palace in Washington.

That is why he made the profound statement that he did in this dissent.

□ 2100

His words will almost certainly cause more Americans to be killed. That is extraordinary.

Dear Justice Scalia finished the dissenting opinion by saying: “Today the Court warps our Constitution in a way that goes beyond the narrow issue of the reach of the Suspension Clause, invoking judicially brainstormed separation-of-powers principles to establish a manipulable ‘functional’ test for the extra territorial reach of habeas corpus (and, no doubt, for the extraterritorial reach of other constitutional protections as well). It blatantly misdescribes important precedents, most conspicuously Justice Jackson’s opinion for the Court in *Johnson v. Eisentrager*. It breaks a chain of precedent as old as the common law that prohibits judicial inquiry into the detention of aliens abroad absent statutory authorization. And, most tragically, it sets our military commanders the impossible task of proving to a civilian court, under whatever standards this Court devises in the future, that evidence supports the confinement of each and every enemy prisoner.

“The Nation will live to regret what the Court has done today. I dissent.”

What a magnificent man. What a brilliant man with extraordinary common sense.

So, Mr. Speaker, my staff helped me. We have all been picking out favorite quotes that Justice Scalia has provided, both in written opinion and in speeches.

One of Justice Scalia’s statements was: “Never compromise your principles, unless, of course, your principles are Adolph Hitler’s, in which

case you would be well-advised to compromise them as much as you can.”

Another statement by Justice Scalia was: “More important than your obligation to follow your conscience, or at least prior to it, is your obligation to form your conscience correctly.”

Justice Scalia said: “You think there ought to be a right to abortion? No problem. The Constitution says nothing about it. Create it the way most rights are created in a democratic society. Pass a law. And that law, unlike a constitutional right to abortion created by a court can compromise.”

Justice Scalia said: “A Constitution is not meant to facilitate change. It is meant to impede change, to make it difficult to change.”

Brilliant statement.

Some think the Constitution is a living, breathing document. I have discussed this over at the Supreme Court palace with him, and I have discussed it with him at lunches, breakfasts.

There are a handful of special privileges that I count myself blessed to have been able to enjoy, and one of those handful has been time spent with Justice Scalia. He had an incredible sense of humor. He could crack me up. Most of the time, he meant to. Sometimes his sarcasm was just too humorous not to laugh. And he attacked himself with self-effacing humor.

He said this: “I attack ideas. I don’t attack people. And some very good people have some very bad ideas. And if you can’t separate the two, you’ve gotta get another day job.”

He was a funny man, but a brilliant man. God blessed that man with wisdom.

Justice Scalia said: “I love to argue. I’ve always loved to argue. And I love to point out the weaknesses of the opposing arguments. It may well be that I’m something of a shin kicker. It may well be that I’m something of a contrarian.”

He said: “Well, we didn’t set out to have nine children”—talking about his beautiful family. He said: “We’re just old-fashioned Catholics, you know.”

Justice Scalia said: “I think Thomas Jefferson would have said the more speech, the better. That’s what the First Amendment is all about.”

Today I see around our college campuses conservatives like me are often shunned. I am grateful to have been invited to speak at Oxford in England and at Cambridge. But it is amazing that places like my conservative Texas A&M, there are students there—much fewer there, but all over the country at what are supposed to be enlightened universities—that don’t want to hear any view different from themselves.

When I was at A&M, I mean, I helped host Ralph Nader. I didn’t agree with him on much, but I loved the exchange with him, the thoughts that went back and forth. He was a very intriguing man. We weren’t afraid of discussions with liberals.

It is one of the things I loved about Justice Scalia. He was so brilliant, so

grounded. His faith was so strongly standing on God's Word, the Bible. He knew who he was. He knew whose he was, and he knew whose was his, and he loved his family dearly.

Justice Scalia said: "Undoubtedly, some think that the Second Amendment is outmoded in a society where our standing army is the pride of our Nation, where well-trained police forces provide personal security, and where gun violence is a serious problem. That is perhaps debatable, but what is not debatable is that it is not the role of this Court to pronounce the Second Amendment extinct."

It was absolutely a great dissent. Pointing out the hypocrisy, the flawed thinking, the incredible poor quality of the writing in the majority opinion in the ObamaCare decision, Justice Scalia said: "This Court, however, concludes that this limitation would prevent the rest of the act from working as well as hoped. So it rewrites the law to make tax credits available everywhere. We should start calling this law SCOTUSCare instead of ObamaCare."

The Supreme Court of the U.S. care, how about that?

He went on to say: "Under all the usual rules of interpretation, in short, the government should lose this case. But normal rules of interpretation seem always to yield to the overriding principle of this Court: The Affordable Care Act must be saved."

He goes on. It says: "If a bill is about to pass that really comes down hard on some minority and they think it's terribly unfair, it doesn't take much to throw a monkey wrench into this complex system. Americans should appreciate that; they should learn to love the gridlock. It's there so the legislation that does get out is good legislation."

Mr. Speaker, it brings to mind a discussion I heard him have with some people from my district, some senior citizens that were coming to Washington, 50 or 60. They had asked me: They say you are friends with Justice Scalia. Do you think we could meet him?

I felt comfortable enough to call him. He said: Sure. Bring them.

So we worked it out, brought them through the side entrance, came into a meeting room. They were all seated there when Justice Scalia came walking in. He leans up against the table in front of them, and they were kind of in awe because they knew how brilliant Justice Scalia was.

He said: Well, you wanted to meet me. Here I am. What questions have you got?

It kind of took the group aback, so people were struggling to try to come up with a question. Finally, one of them said: Well, Justice Scalia, wouldn't you say that we are the freest Nation in the history of the world because we have the best Bill of Rights?

In typical Scalia style, he said: Oh, gosh, no. The Soviet Union had a much better bill of rights than we have got.

It guaranteed a lot more freedoms than we have.

And I've forgotten, but in college I made an A on a paper that discussed the Soviet constitution and the bill of rights. He was right. That old Soviet bill of rights guaranteed all kinds of rights, but it didn't protect them.

He went on to say—and I am not quoting exactly—but the gist of what he had to say is, now, the reason America is the most free Nation in the history of the world is because the Founders didn't trust the government, so they made it as difficult as they could to pass a law. It wasn't enough to have one House; they wanted two Houses, and not like England where one of them doesn't have all that much authority. They wanted two Houses where either one of them could stop a law from being passed. So even if one House were successful in finally getting a majority of people to agree on a law, then the other House would have to agree, and they could stop it completely in its tracks.

That wasn't good enough. They wanted another check and balance, another way to stop law. They wanted to create gridlock. So they said: You know what? We don't want a parliamentary system where the legislators elect a prime minister. No. We want an executive elected totally different from the legislature. So we will have him elected in a whole different way, and then he can stop any law they may try to pass. And that is not good enough. Let's create another branch, the judiciary branch, and then they can nix anything that is passed.

No, we are the most free Nation in history because the Founders didn't trust government and they made it as hard as possible to pass laws.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Justice Scalia says in one of his dissents: "I have exceeded the speed limit on occasion."

He said: "A man who has no enemies is probably not a very good man."

He said: "If you read the rest of the section, you would say, to find a way to find a meaning that the language will bear that will uphold the constitutionality. You don't interpret a penalty to be a pig. It can't be a pig."

He did know how to bring things back to tangible terms.

He said: "If you're going to be a good and faithful judge, you have to resign yourself to the fact that you're not always going to like the conclusions you reach. If you like them all the time, you're probably doing something wrong."

I've experienced that myself. There were times I disagreed with the law, but it was constitutionally made and passed, and I followed the law as a judge and chief justice. That is exactly what he did.

In a dissent in 1996, Justice Scalia said: "The Court must be living in an

another world. Day by day, case by case, it is busy designing a Constitution for a country I do not recognize."

Ten years later, in 2006, he says: "So the question comes up, is there a constitutional right to have homosexual conduct? Not a hard question for me. It's absolutely clear that nobody ever thought when the Bill of Rights was adopted that it gave a right to homosexual conduct. Homosexual conduct was criminal for 200 years in every State. Easy question."

He made those statements in remarks at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, back in 2006.

In 2009, he said: "The Court today continues its quixotic quest to right all wrongs and repair all imperfections through the Constitution. Alas, the quest cannot succeed."

He also said: "This case, involving legal requirements of the content and labeling of meat products such as frankfurters affords a rare opportunity to explore simultaneously both parts of Bismarck's aphorism that 'no man should see how laws or sausages are made.'"

He said: "God has been very good to us. One of the reasons God has been good to us is that we have done him honor."

Certainly, Justice Scalia did God honor.

A lot of people don't realize what a tenderhearted man he was as well. After the horrendous murder of Justice Michael Luttig's father and the assault and attempted murder of his mother in their own garage, two streets over from my house, the family did not want to call Michael and describe the horrors that had been inflicted on his father and mother.

□ 2115

Middle of the night, Justice Scalia is in bed. Justice Scalia gets called, would he go out to Michael Luttig, Judge Luttig's house, and let him know in the wee hours of the morning that his father had been killed. Justice Scalia, for whom Judge Luttig had clerked, he knew Michael Luttig loved him. He put on his warmup suit and went out in the middle of the night many miles away because he cared.

As I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I thought about the words of John Quincy Adams in the Amistad case. He didn't think he had won the case. He was finishing. He was afraid he had not done an adequate job defending these Africans who should be free and should be free to go where they wanted without chains, without bondage.

So he finished his argument by saying, and this is John Quincy Adams, 1841, in the Supreme Court:

"As I cast my eyes along those seats of honor and 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 the 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, I humbly hope, and fondly trust, that they have gone to receive the rewards of blessedness on high."

In taking, then, his final leave of the bar there at the Supreme Court, John Quincy Adams said he hoped that every member of the Supreme Court may go to his final account with as little of earthly frailty to answer for as those illustrious dead.

And he said: "That you may, every one, 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.'"

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt whatsoever that Justice Antonin Scalia, my friend, our friend, the luminary of the Supreme Court, heard those words days ago: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through February 26.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

#### SENATE BILL 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. 2451. An act to designate the area between the intersections of International Drive, Northwest and Van Ness Street, Northwest and International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Liu Xiaobo Plaza", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill

of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 644. An act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 620, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 24, 2016, at 10 a.m., for morning-hour debate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Antonin Scalia, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

#### RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

[Omitted from the RECORD of February 8, 2016]

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of July 21, 2015, through January 4, 2016, shall be treated as though received on February 8, 2016. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4351. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Conditions for Payment of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Indemnity Claims [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0061] (RIN: 0579-AE14) received February 10, 2016, 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 Agriculture.

4352. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Phalaenopsis Spp. Plants for Planting in Approved Growing Media From China to the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0106] (RIN: 0579-AE10) received February 16, 2016, 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 Agriculture.

4353. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Farm Ownership Microloan (RIN: 0560-AI33) received February 12, 2016, 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 Agriculture.

4354. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency,

Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Farm Ownership Microloan (RIN: 0560-AI33) received February 12, 2016, 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 Agriculture.

4355. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 904(c)(2); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 254 (as amended by Public Law 112-25, Sec. 103(1)); (125 Stat. 246); to the Committee on Appropriations.

4356. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 901a(9); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 251A (as added Public Law 112-25, Sec. 302(a)); (125 Stat. 256); to the Committee on Appropriations.

4357. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Logistics and Materiel Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled "Strategic and Critical Materials Operations Report To Congress: Operations under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during Fiscal Year 2015", pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b); June 7, 1939, ch. 190, Sec. 11 (as amended by Public Law 103-35, Sec. 204(d)); (107 Stat. 103); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4358. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on assistance provided by the Department of Defense for certain sporting events, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2564(e); Public Law 104-201, Sec. 367(a); (110 Stat. 2496); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Navy's annual report to Congress on Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7310(c); Public Law 110-417, Sec. 1012(c); (122 Stat. 4584); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4360. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting draft of proposed legislation entitled the "Military Justice Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4361. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Logistics and Materiel Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Defense Stockpile (NDS) Annual Materials Plan (AMP) for Fiscal Year 2017 and for the succeeding four years, FY 2018-2021, pursuant to Sec. 11(b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4362. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, pursuant to Public Law 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4363. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's annual integrated Strategic Plan, Budget, and Performance Plan and Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4364. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Security-Based Swap Transactions Connected with a Non-U.S. Person's Dealing Activity That Are Arranged, Negotiated, or Executed By Personnel Located in a U.S. Branch or Office or in a U.S. Branch or Office of an Agent; Security-Based Swap Dealer De Minimis Exception [Release No.: 34-77104; File