

investigator and you show that everything that concluded from that investigation was 100 percent consistent with the bias and hatred, you don't have to have the witness agree: You are right; you caught me. All my bias affected the outcome of my investigation.

Just like a prosecutor who puts on evidence that a guy gets in a car, drives to a bank, pulls out a gun, holds it to the head of the teller, makes the teller give him money, and leaves in that car, you have to prove intent, that he intended to rob the bank, but you don't have to have evidence that the bank robber said, "Hey, I intend to rob this bank." No.

When the results—and there are a lot of results—all of them are consistent with the bias and the hatred, the disdain, the animus, then you have got at least a de facto case, certainly one that can get past a motion for summary judgment and get to the jury and put in the hands of the fact finder.

Again, when you have somebody who is as good at lying to folks over and over and over again with a straight face, gets a lot of practice, and he comes before Congress—the guy is good. He is really good.

As I told him—I think, obviously, he and his lawyer had a different opinion, but it seemed to me it would have been more credible to come in and do what Inspector General Horowitz did, and say: Yeah, there is a lot of bias here, no question, but I don't think it affected the outcome.

Of course, he wasn't 100 percent sure, it didn't sound like, that it didn't affect when Strzok decided to end the Hillary Clinton investigation and when he immediately decided to pick up the investigation against Trump.

As I heard my friend say over and over about how Comey, of course, just really harmed the Clinton campaign, they are ignoring something that appeared pretty clear, even without resorting to people who have provided information about what went on.

□ 1830

We know Hillary Clinton's emails that she claimed were missing were found on Anthony Weiner's laptop. Maybe it was Huma Abedin, Anthony Weiner, one of their laptops. They found those emails there.

Of course, Peter Strzok, helping the woman whom he thought ought to win 100 million to 0 for President, wow, that was not good news for people like him who wanted to help Hillary.

They couldn't help the fact that FBI agents, when investigating something else, find all these missing 30,000 or so emails on this laptop. And they have got the information at least for some weeks, maybe 2, maybe 3, maybe 4. We are not sure, but they had found this information.

So Comey was in a difficult situation. He wanted Hillary to win, no question. He did not want Donald Trump to win. He never did like

Trump, never has, apparently, things he has said and done.

So what could he do that would cause the least amount of problems for Hillary Clinton?

There was a threat, apparently, that FBI agents were going to go public that they had found these missing emails and that Comey was blocking reopening the investigation now that we have all these emails. And if FBI agents, who are righteous, unlike Peter Strzok, really righteous people—and I know a lot of them around the country. They are good, decent, upstanding, honorable, give-their-life-for-their-country kind of people, not give their affair for themselves but give their lives for their country. Those people have gotten a big blemish on them because of Peter Strzok and others at the top of the Department of Justice in the last administration, as they held over. They would never do what Peter Strzok did. They would never do that.

So it gets a little like they erect a straw dog: You are condemning the thousands of great FBI agents around the country.

No, I am blaming you. We know they are good, but you are not.

And that is where we have been here. This country is in a lot of trouble. But it was very clear: Peter Strzok, intentionally and knowingly, with demonstrated prejudice, refused to pursue the disclosed fact to him, in his presence, that a foreign entity not Russia was getting every email that Hillary Clinton sent and received. There was classified material in there, and there was higher than just plain classified. There was extremely sensitive information in there.

What else did we know? Actually, if you dig what has been uncovered during the last 2 years, Hillary Clinton had the President's Daily Briefing going to her home. And there are times that the young man—I believe his name was Oscar Flores—who worked there, they may have tried to get him a clearance at one time, but, apparently, from what I could read, he didn't have any kind of clearance, yet he would print stuff off.

The President's Daily Briefing is some of the most sensitive information in the entire United States Government, extreme sensitivity, and she violated the law by making it accessible to people without the proper clearance and, certainly, her young man, or man, who was working there for her.

She violated the law. It wasn't necessary that she have intent; it was just necessary that she broke the law in that case.

I really would like to have intent be an element of most every crime that is in the Federal law. I think it would be a good idea. But right now it is not part of the laws she broke.

Yet people like Peter Strzok covered for her. They refused to pursue the things that would have made her guilty. They went after things to try to hurt Donald Trump.

When you look at that October press conference that Comey had, you realize, gee, what if he had not called that press conference and you had one or more FBI agents come out and say: "Hey, we found these emails on Anthony Weiner's laptop weeks ago, and Comey refused to reopen the investigation"; that would have doomed her election far worse than what happened.

So what, under the circumstances, was the best thing that Comey could do for his friend Hillary Clinton? It was to get out ahead of anybody disclosing that they had been sitting on the thought-to-be-lost emails and say: We have got them.

Then, as I had said back at the time, well, we will find out how serious Comey is. If he comes back within 2 or 3 days and says they have examined all 30,000 or so, whatever, of the emails, then we will know that this was just a charade to cover for Hillary Clinton, because they are not going to be able to adequately research all of those emails in just a matter of 2 or 3 days.

He came back very quickly, so that it would not affect the election coming up, and announced: No. Clean bill of health. We looked at all the new evidence. Nothing was there.

Except they still didn't bother to use the information provided by the intelligence community that was available. They didn't pick it up, didn't do anything with what was disclosed.

I am telling you, I am very grateful we have people working in this government who want to protect the United States and want to protect the United States' people. They don't get a lot of credit, usually don't get any credit, but they do a good job for this country; and my head and my heart and my salute go out to them as we deal with the mess that has been created by those with far more selfish motives.

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

CLOUD OF COLLUSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PASCARELL. Madam Speaker, in light of the upcoming one-on-one meeting between President Trump and Vladimir Putin, I rise today to remind the American people about the cloud of collusion hanging over their heads.

As the American people continue to learn details of this unfolding scandal, the implausible idea of Russia compromising the President of the United States becomes more fact than fiction. The President, his family members, his campaign staff, and his close associates have repeatedly lied about their multiple contacts with Russian officials and close associates of Putin. They have had no consistent explanation for these meetings. It has happened over and over.

Furthermore, the President continues to parrot Putin's version of

world events over those of his own American career civil servants, intelligence operatives, military officials, and allies. This betrayal has become like clockwork, an inexplicable routine we cannot simply shrug off.

While it is possible the current list of known campaign contacts, positive policy positions, and fawning statements have an innocuous explanation, there is a simpler reason the House should be investigating: Has President Donald Trump been covertly influenced or personally compromised by Russia, a hostile foreign power?

Russian intelligence is known for using blackmail that exploits greed, stupidity, and ego—and other weaknesses—to leverage over people. He has employed Mr. Michael Cohen, Mr. Felix Sater—the record is very clear on this—both of whom have links to the Russian mafia. He has continued the secrecy about his business finances by not releasing his tax returns.

The ethics commissioner told the President of the United States to divest. He did not, and he defied that person most responsible for draining the swamp, the ethics commissioner.

From operating his business at or beyond the edge of ethical boundaries, Trump's penchant for compromising behavior, his willingness to work closely with criminals and expressed desire to protect his privacy makes him the ideal target.

With close business ties, Russia has enjoyed financial leverage over President Trump for 15 years. This is a fact that his family has admitted to multiple times. The story is well known.

After a series of brazen abuses of bankruptcy laws, President Trump, who was not President at the time, Mr. Trump, found it impossible to borrow from American banks, so he turned to unconventional sources of capital, including Russian cash.

From 2003 to 2017, people from the former Soviet Union made 86 all-cash purchases that we know of, a known red flag of potential money laundering of Trump properties, totaling \$109 million.

"Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets." Those are the words of Donald Junior in 2008.

In 2010, the private wealth division of Deutsche Bank also loaned President Trump hundreds of millions of dollars during the same period it was laundering billions in Russian money.

"We don't rely on American banks. We have all the funding we need out of Russia." Those are the boasts of Eric Trump from 2014.

Shady business transactions offer the perfect cover for covert payments, and President Trump's adamant refusal to release his tax returns publicly only raises the level of suspicion.

The idea that Russia has been cultivating, supporting, and assisting Donald Trump to undermine Western alliances should come as no surprise to anyone paying attention. Before and

during his campaign for President—Mr. Trump—there were several odd connections between the two men, which they lied about to the public.

As President, Mr. Trump called Putin "fine people." He ignored the fact that Putin invaded Crimea; intervened in eastern Ukraine; poisoned people in the United Kingdom; has commissioned the murder of dissidents, journalists, and spies; shot down a commercial airliner in Europe; propped up the most ruthless dictator of our time in Syria; and violated our sovereignty in the 2016 Presidential election, by every—every—intelligence organization that says "USA."

To ensure the American people and future Congresses know how we got here today, today I will read parts of the Trump-Russia dossier into the RECORD, also known as the Christopher Steele dossier, and include a link to its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Partisans on the other side of the aisle may dismiss the document as bogus, even fake news, but they know that several allegations in this document have already been verified. While the dossier represents raw intelligence or, effectively, a first draft, not a single thing of substance has been disproven—not one. And Christopher Steele has reliably provided intelligence to the U.K. and U.S. intelligence agencies for decades.

While history will be the final judge on these matters, these are some of the allegations which we know have been verified.

Madam Speaker, this is serious business. When I read from the dossier, I am reading from my prime source. What I read tonight has all been verified and certified, that which I am reading.

□ 1845

While history will be a final judge on these matters, here are some of the allegations. Page 1 of the dossier, the claim: "Russian regime has been cultivating, supporting, and assisting Trump for at least 5 years. Aim, endorsed by Putin, has been to encourage splits and divisions in the Western alliance"—in the Western alliance.

"So far," the dossier reads, I will continue, "Trump has declined various sweetener real estate business deals offered him in Russia in order to further the Kremlin's cultivation of him. However, he and his inner circle have accepted a regular flow of intelligence from the Kremlin, including on his Democratic and other political rivals."

Now, here is the truth: On January 6, 2017, an intelligence community assessment released by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence stated that Russian leadership favored Trump's candidacy over Clinton's and that Putin personally ordered an influence campaign to harm Clinton's electoral chances and "undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process," as well as ordering cyber attacks on "both major U.S. political parties."

Page 7 and 8, I don't have time to read the whole thing tonight, obviously. Dossier claim on page 7 and 8: "The Russian regime had been behind the recent leak of embarrassing email messages, emanating from the Democratic National Committee to the WikiLeaks platform. The reason for using WikiLeaks was 'plausible deniability,' and the operation had been conducted with the full knowledge and support of Trump and senior members of his campaign team. In return, the Trump team had agreed to sideline Russian intervention in Ukraine as a campaign issue and to raise U.S./NATO defense commitments in the Baltics and Eastern Europe to deflect attention away from Ukraine, a priority for Putin, who needed to cauterize the subject."

This is what he wrote. That is on page 7 and 8, what the dossier claims.

Now here is the truth: In July 2016, the Republican National Convention made changes to the Republican Party's platform on Ukraine. Initially, the GOP platform proposed providing "lethal weapons" to Ukraine. That is what it originally stated, that platform. But the line was watered down to promise "appropriate assistance."

NPR reported that Diana Denman, a Republican delegate who supported arming U.S. allies in Ukraine, has told people that Trump aide J.D. Gordon said at the Republican Convention in 2016 that Trump directed him to support weakening that position in the official platform.

J.D. Gordon, who was one of Trump's national security advisers during the campaign, said he had advocated for changing language because that reflected what Trump had said. The Trump campaign did not appear to have intervened in any other platform deliberations, only the language on Ukraine.

Here is the truth: As the President and throughout the campaign, Donald Trump has called NATO "obsolete"—although he changed his mind today, a little bit—championed the disintegration of the European Union, and said that he is open to lifting sanctions on Russia or has declined to enforce them.

Trump has repeatedly questioned whether our allies are paying enough into NATO, ultimately raising questions as to whether he is deliberately facilitating Putin's long-term objective of undermining the Western liberal order.

Dossier page 30: "Speaking to a trusted compatriot in mid-October 2015, a close associate of Rosneft president and Putin ally Igor Sechin"—his name appears all over the place in the dossier—"elaborated on the reported secret meeting between" Mr. Sechin and Carter Page, of United States Republican Presidential candidate's foreign policy team, in Moscow in July 2016.

The secret meeting "had been confirmed to him/her by a senior member of the staff, in addition to by the

Rosneft president himself. It took place on either 7 or 8 July, the same day or the one after Carter Page made a public speech to the Higher Economic School in Moscow.

"In terms of the substance of the discussion, Sechin's associate said that the Rosneft president was so keen to lift personal and corporate Western sanctions imposed on the company that he offered Page," and Mr. Trump's associates as well, "the brokerage of up to a 19 percent privatized stake in Rosneft in return. Page had expressed interest and confirmed that were Trump elected U.S. President," sanctions on Russia would be lifted.

The truth: On December 29, 2016, during the transition period between the election and the inauguration, National Security Advisor-designate Mike Flynn spoke to Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak, urging him not to retaliate for newly imposed sanctions. Ultimately, the Russians did not retaliate.

Days after the inauguration, the Trump administration ordered State Department staffers to develop proposals for immediately revoking the economic and other sanctions imposed against Russia. Thankfully, these staffers alerted Congress, who took steps to codify the sanctions in a law passed in August 2017. The attempt to overturn the sanctions was abandoned after Mr. Flynn's conversation was revealed and Mr. Flynn resigned.

Carter Page has confirmed this meeting with top Moscow and Rosneft officials, that company or corporation, in the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence testimony. It is all laid out.

When Page was asked if a Rosneft executive had offered him a potential sale of a significant percentage of Rosneft, Page said, "He may have briefly mentioned it."

Dossier claim on page 23: "Finally, speaking separately to the same compatriot, a senior Russian," Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "MFA official reported that, as a prophylactic measure, a leading Russian diplomat, Mikhail Kalugin, had been withdrawn from Washington at short notice because Moscow feared his heavy involvement in the U.S. Presidential election operation, including the so-called veterans' pensions ruse," which we reported previously in the dossier, "would be exposed in the media there. His replacement, Andrei Bondarev, however, was clean in this regard."

The truth: Mikhail Kalugin was the head of the economics section at the Russian Embassy. He returned to Russia in August 2016. The BBC would go on to report that United States officials in 2016 had identified Kalugin as a spy, that he was under surveillance, thus verifying this key claim in the dossier. Further reporting by McClatchy has claimed that the FBI was investigating whether Kalugin played a role in the election interference.

Mr. Speaker, these are facts. They just scratch the surface of what we are dealing with. This is what we know. Despite some opponents and opportunists and attempts, these facts are indisputable.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the link to the entire Trump/Russia dossier produced by Christopher Steele, so future generations will know the truth of how we got here today. The link is: <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/3259984-Trump-Intelligence-Allegations.html>.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). The gentleman from New Jersey has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a little bit more of the dossier, and I am going to stay away from the scurrilous things that have been reported in the newspaper, because they, to me, are just distractions from what we should be looking at.

This is from the dossier: The "mechanism for transmitting this intelligence involves 'pension' disbursements to Russian emigres living" in the United States as cover, using consular offices in New York, Miami, and D.C.

"Suggestion from source close to Trump and Manafort that Republican campaign team happy to have Russia as media bogeyman to mask more extensive corrupt business ties to China and other emerging countries.

"Speaking in confidence to a compatriot in late July 2016, Source E, an ethnic Russian close associate of Republican U.S. Presidential candidate Donald Trump, admitted that there was a well-developed conspiracy of cooperation between them and the Russian leadership. This was managed on the Trump side by the Republican candidate's campaign manager, Paul Manafort, who was using foreign policy adviser Carter Page and others as intermediaries. The two sides had a mutual interest in defeating Democratic Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, whom President Putin apparently hated and feared.

"Inter alia, Source E acknowledged that the Russian regime had been behind the recent leak of embarrassing email messages emanating from the Democratic National Committee" to that WikiLeaks platform.

Attention, attention: "Source E said he understood that the Republican candidate and his team were relatively relaxed about this because it deflected media and the Democrats' attention away from Trump's business dealings in China and other emerging markets."

For the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I will enter that in the RECORD at the proper time, not this evening. We have a whole dossier, again, having nothing to do with this, of every deal that we know of that the President and his team made in 52 foreign countries. That will be entered into the RECORD.

"Finally, regarding Trump's claimed minimal investment profile in Russia,

a separate source with direct knowledge said this had not been for want of trying. Trump's previous efforts had included exploring the real estate sector in St. Petersburg as well as Moscow, but, in the end, Trump had had to settle for the use of extensive sexual services there from local prostitutes rather than business success."

That is what the dossier says.

"Trump adviser Carter Page holds secret meetings in Moscow with Sechin and senior Kremlin Internal Affairs official, Divyekin. Sechin raises issues of future bilateral U.S.-Russian energy cooperation and associated lifting of Western sanctions against Russia over Ukraine. Page noncommittal in response. Divyekin discusses release of Russian dossier of 'kompromat' on Trump's opponent, Hillary Clinton, but also hints at Kremlin possession of such material on Trump."

"Kremlin concerned that political fallout from DNC email hacking operation is spiraling out of control. Extreme nervousness among Trump's associates as result of negative media attention/accusations.

"Russians meanwhile keen to cool situation and maintain 'plausible deniability' of existing/ongoing pro-Trump and anti-Clinton operations; therefore, unlikely to be any ratcheting up offensive plays in the immediate future.

"Source close to Trump campaign, however, confirms regular exchange with Kremlin has existed for at least 8 years"—I said 5 years before; 8 years—"including intelligence fed back to Russia on oligarchs' activities in U.S."

□ 1900

"Within this context, Putin's priority requirement had been for intelligence on the activities, business and otherwise, in the U.S. of leading Russian oligarchs and their families." And his associates duly had obtained and supplied that information.

"Speaking in early August 2016, two well-placed and established Kremlin sources outlined the divisions and backlash in Moscow arising from the leaking of Democratic National Committee emails and the wider pro-Trump operation being conducted in the U.S. Head of Presidential Administration, Sergei Ivanov, was angry at the recent turn of events. He believed the Kremlin 'team' involved, led by presidential spokesman Dmitriy Peskov, had gone too far in interfering in foreign affairs with their 'elephant in a china shop black PR'. Ivanov claimed always to have opposed the handling and exploitation of intelligence by this PR 'team'. Following the backlash against such foreign interference in U.S. politics, Ivanov was advocating that the only sensible course of action now for the Russian leadership was to 'sit tight and deny everything'."

And they did.

"Continuing on this theme, the source close to Ivanov reported that Peskov now was 'scared'"—I will not

use the derogatory term—"that he would be scapegoated by Putin and the Kremlin and held responsible for the backlash. . . ."

Page after page, Mr. Ivanov appears. He is at the center of this. And if we know this, then Mr. Mueller knows this. And if we know this, Mr. Mueller knows more.

So this is the dossier, which has been public now since early last year. And I wanted to bring this to the floor last year, but we chose to do it another way, if you remember, in trying to get the President's taxes made public.

So I will conclude with this, Mr. Speaker—you have been patient. This is, to me, a big deal: 83 percent of this dossier has been proven correct. I did not use anything that was dubious of the 17 percent.

So I say to you, the Congress has a right, as an equal branch of government, to review what has happened so that our President, as Mr. Shaub, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, said to President Trump: What you need to do is cut yourself off from your assets. That is what you need to do. That is what you must do.

And, obviously, he did not do it.

So there is a lot of material out there. Going at this a year and a half is not a long time. You know how long Watergate took. But I would think that this is going to take longer than Watergate—that is my opinion—on some of these things which will have to be traced. Some people have been indicted. Some people are going to prison already. But I am telling you, the bulk of information is going to be laid out when Mr. Mueller is ready, not when I am ready or anybody in the Chamber is ready.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. PASCRELL. That is unacceptable. I did not engage in any personalities. I read from the record. I didn't call anybody a name. If I read it, it was somebody else that was writing it, not me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Remarks in debate in the House may not engage in personalities toward the President, whether originating as the Member's own words or being reiterated from another source.

Mr. PASCRELL. The President is not above the law, sir. I am not above the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have a motion?

Mr. PASCRELL. No, I don't have a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Do you want me to make a motion to extend? Is that what you are asking me to do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would entertain a motion to adjourn at this time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Fine. You have it your way. I will be back.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 13, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5537. A letter from the Acting PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Simplified Cost Accounting and Other Actions To Reduce Paperwork in the Summer Food Service Program [FNS-2013-0026] (RIN: 0584-AD84) received June 11, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5538. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility, Mason County, Illinois, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2018-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8531] received June 11, 2018, 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.

5539. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Securities Transaction Settlement Cycle (RIN: 3064-AE64) received June 11, 2018, 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.

5540. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Investment Company Liquidity Disclosure (RIN: 3235-AM30) received July 2, 2018, 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.

5541. A letter from the Director, Division of Coal Mine Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Black Lung Benefits Act: Medical Benefit Payments (RIN: 1240-AA11) received June 15, 2018, 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.

5542. A letter from the Acting Chief of Staff, Office of the Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conservation Program Recipient Reporting (RIN: 0578-AA64) received May 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5543. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — The Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and the Connect USVI Fund [WC Docket No.: 18-143]; Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications [WC Docket No.: 14-58] received June 11, 2018, 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.

5544. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG Revision — Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Exempt Distribution Licenses [NUREG-1556] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5545. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief — CCR, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 11 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Emergency Alert System [PS Docket No.: 15-94] received June 11, 2018, 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.

5546. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Legal and Policy, Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WT Docket No.: 10-90]; Universal Service Reform — Mobility Fund [WT Docket No.: 10-208] received May 17, 2018, 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.

5547. A letter from the Supervisory Regulations Specialist, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska — Applicability and Scope; Tongass National Forest Submerged Lands [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2015-0159; FXFR13350700640-167-FF07J00000; FBMS#4500096963] (RIN: 1018-BB22) received June 11, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5548. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassifying Tobusch Fishhook Cactus From Endangered to Threatened and Adopting a New Scientific Name [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0130; FXES11130900000-178-FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB90) received June 11, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5549. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassifying Echinocereus fendleri var. kuenzleri from Endangered to Threatened [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0137; FXES11130900000 189 FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB89) received June 11, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5550. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Lesser Long-Nosed Bat From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0138; FXES11130900000 178 FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB91) received June 11, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5551. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department