

been a breakthrough on solar cells, an additional 25.7 percent efficiency, except the problem is it was developed in China.

The very people who preach at us to subsidize all this stuff, but let's subsidize less generations or maybe even the generation before that's technology.

You want me to put solar panels on my house, you want us to drive electric cars, make it so economically sensible and make it so economically affordable that it is the disruption.

Why did you stop going to Blockbuster Video? Because you had this button you could hit at home and stream videos right to your home. Was that subsidized by the government?

□ 1845

The fact of the matter is that there are technology disruptions. Why didn't we fixate on that? Well, it turns out that maybe the disruptions don't write checks to your campaign.

The Democrats' planned economy, the control of the marketplace, the arrogance that somehow they think they know what the future looks like instead of building a tax system or regulatory system that is competitive, that is disruptive. Some are winning; some are losing. That is the way the American economy is supposed to work.

In many ways, we have now built a society of oligopolies, thanks to Dodd-Frank and Democratic policies. They have made the big bigger, the big really powerful, and the really big and powerful now your constituency.

It turns out now that if you look at who votes for Republicans, it is entrepreneurs, working people, and those who are being crushed by those they have to compete with who now get subsidies from their political allies.

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

REQUIRE VOTERS TO PROVE CITIZENSHIP

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for his willingness to come to the floor and talk about these important issues that, frankly, all of us should be talking about. He does so with regularity, and it is important.

The average American is hurting because they watch the price of goods going up and all the things that are happening as a direct consequence of what we are doing and not doing here—as the gentleman points out, our inability and lack of willingness or fortitude to focus on the issues that matter.

Right now, I think something the American people need to understand, as we head into the fall season, is that we are heading into the time of elections.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle come down to give a whole lot of rhetoric about the lack of agenda or lack of things that we are doing. We have legislation on the floor of the House this week to ensure that only citizens vote, something we call the SAVE Act. That legislation is necessary because anybody with eyes knows that we are getting overrun by open borders that are endangering the American people. We have millions of people flooding into the country and have thousands and thousands of people who are on the voter rolls who are not supposed to be. Those are facts. It is true.

We know States that are starting to cleanse their voter rolls are finding people who are noncitizens and are registered to vote. We saw it in Virginia. We have seen it in North Carolina. We have seen it in Texas. We have seen it across the country. The truth is, it goes far deeper than that.

The question that we have to ask ourselves is: What does it mean to be an American? What does citizenship even mean anymore?

We have an administration—Joe Biden, the people who work for him, and our Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle—that is at war with the whole idea of American exceptionalism and what it means to be an American. They are at war with the whole idea of what it means to be an American citizen. They are undermining the whole purpose, the whole intent, behind citizenship. Citizenship is supposed to matter.

This week, we are going to be voting on the floor on a bill to require a simple thing: that we know that only American citizens are voting in our American elections. That is what we are voting on this week, tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that some number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be willing to work with us on such legislation. They bemoan that they are not getting an amendment offered. Let's be very clear: They offered one amendment—one—in the committee of jurisdiction, the House Administration Committee. Do you know how many Democrats were present? One, the ranking member. The ranking member offered the amendment. It went down 6-1. There was no real debate from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle because the only purpose of the amendment was to gut the bill. That was the only purpose.

Then, I heard bemoaning from our Democratic colleagues and the ranking member of the Rules Committee when we were up in the Rules Committee, and he said they should be able to offer this amendment. Why? His Democratic colleagues didn't even show up to the debate in the committee, and the whole purpose of the amendment was to gut the bill.

The bill has been strongly supported by the Speaker on down, strongly supported by his staff, strongly supported

by the people who have worked on it hard, but none of that matters to the American people. The only thing that matters to the American people is that it is legislation that would protect their constitutional right as a citizen to be the one who has a say in his or her government.

What is happening right now is we are undermining the integrity of our elections and undermining our very Republic by allowing noncitizens to vote. Indeed, some jurisdictions—Oakland, San Francisco, New York, and, indeed, our Nation's Capital—are purposely registering noncitizens to vote.

They say, wink, wink, nod, nod, don't worry about it. We are only going to do that in State and local elections. We will not, of course, put them over in Federal elections because that is against the law. My Democratic colleagues want to say we don't need this bill because it is already against the law for a noncitizen to vote in Federal elections. True.

However, number one, then what are you worried about? Why are you concerned? What is so problematic that you think it is bad that we try to put procedures in place to carry out the law you say is already in place?

The truth is you don't like that that law is in place. That is the truth about our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We know this because Democratic jurisdictions across the country, as I said a minute ago, are registering noncitizens to vote in State and local elections.

They want them to vote in Federal elections. The problem is, they have this pesky little issue with the American people, 81 to 87 percent of whom believe that only citizens should vote in American elections.

We have a bill before us on the floor of the House tomorrow that I believe is going to be opposed by virtually all or all of our Democratic colleagues. We will see. I kind of dare them to vote "no" on a bill supported by 81 to 87 percent of the American people. I dare them to vote "no" against a bill that says that only American citizens should vote in American elections. I am going to dare them to go ahead and follow a President who has put out a policy against a bill, the purpose of which is to guarantee citizens are the ones who get to vote in American elections.

We will see if our Democratic colleagues want to go to the polls in November having rejected what clearly the vast majority of their constituents, even in the most liberal jurisdictions in the country, believe is right. That is what is likely to occur tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, if you believe the news, believe the accounts, look at what the President has done, and look at the posturing of the House Democratic leadership, they are on the precipice of staking out a position of belief that noncitizens should be able to vote in our elections.

That, of course, is not too surprising, given the extent to which a number of

our Democratic colleagues have repeatedly talked about how it is beneficial for them to have noncitizens—indeed, sometimes illegal aliens—voting in elections.

The fact of the matter is, we know what has happened in the Biden administration as the American people have been endangered, as Americans have died, as Laken Riley has died, and as numerous individuals have been killed, raped, murdered, and assaulted across this country by people who have been let into this country illegally.

We know that some 8 million illegal aliens have crossed the border under Biden's tenure. We know that some 5.3 million illegal aliens have been released by Joe Biden. We know that we have had massive numbers of criminal gang members, massive numbers of people affiliated with terrorist organizations, and thousands of numbers of Chinese nationals who have come into our country.

We know that our domestic crime is increasing. We know that we are being endangered. We know that people are being released. We know that we have criminals coming to our country, yet we want to do one simple thing. We have been fighting them, trying to stop what they are doing by releasing people into the country. We passed H.R. 2. Democrats refused to do anything about it. They refused to move it. CHUCK SCHUMER refuses to do it. Joe Biden doesn't even know what we are talking about.

Here, our Democratic colleagues are poised to reject a bill to protect our elections, to ensure that only Americans vote in our elections. That should give everybody in this country pause and give them a glimpse into the soul of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and what they think about citizenship. They don't respect citizenship.

Our Democratic colleagues don't believe that citizenship matters. They don't believe that sovereignty matters because if they did, they wouldn't do this. If our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, our Democratic colleagues, had some small fix or even significant fix to believe that we could make our system better, we would be all ears.

If it was a legitimate exercise to say, yes, of course, we want to not only have it against the law for noncitizens to vote in our elections, as is currently the case, but we also want to make sure that we remove all Federal barriers and, indeed, improve the situation and have requirements in place to guarantee that we can check, know, and ensure that only citizens vote. That is not what they are doing.

The legislation that we put forward is pretty simple, the SAVE Act. It will allow you to come forward, prospectively. If you are going to vote this fall, you can go vote. You are in the system. If you move, your address changes, you get married, if something changes at some point over the next few years, we require States to clean their voter rolls.

If you want to register to vote, take a passport, take a military ID, take a Real ID, all of which demonstrate your citizenship. If you don't have one of those, take your regular driver's license, get a copy of your birth certificate, get a copy of an adoption certificate or naturalization papers and go down to say that you can register and are a citizen.

There are 400,000 tombstones on the other side of the Potomac River. They either gave the last full measure of devotion or risked the last full measure of devotion. I think you can take a few seconds to make sure that you demonstrate your citizenship to vote.

More than that, we put in massive safeguards. We give flexibility to States. We say that if they want to come up with a better way to do it, they can balance and check the Federal systems. They can sign an affidavit as a government official saying that they believe this is a citizen. They checked, and this is a citizen. They provided all the information necessary. Great.

There are no barriers, no undue burdens, no restrictions on the ability of an American citizen to vote under our plan. What it will do is give not just increased confidence but a return of belief in our system, a belief that they can actually trust elections, a belief that it is, in fact, their country.

Shouldn't we want this to be our country? Shouldn't we want to be proud and say this is our country, these are our rules, and that anyone is welcome to come here under the terms of our invitation only and will follow the rules. Criminals are not going to be allowed here, and they are not going to be allowed to carry out criminal activities. They are not going to be allowed to murder, rape, maim, or steal. However, if someone is coming here and is hardworking and follows our rules, God bless them, come on in, but they are going to vote only if they are a citizen.

The fact that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to guarantee that tells us everything we need to know. It gives up the whole game. It gives up the fact that our colleagues don't want sovereignty and security, and that is the truth.

There is a reason our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to continue to throw money at international organizations, want to send an endless supply of funds and blank checks to the United Nations, the World Health Organization, and all the NGOs that are funneling people into our country, endangering our own citizens, and putting children into the sex trafficking trade.

All of that is being done on purpose. All of that is being done because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want it all to occur. There is no other explanation for it.

I am tired. I have been sitting here watching for my entire time in Congress, watching this President—to the extent he even knows where the hell he is—destroy this country and endanger

the people who I represent, destroy and endanger Texans. That is what has happened, nothing less.

The President of the United States and the people who work for him have endangered our country. The Secretary of Homeland Secretary has endangered our country.

□ 1900

Ask the now probably thousands, certainly hundreds of parents who are sitting there having lost loved ones, killed, raped, or maimed, the tens of thousands of parents who have lost their kids to fentanyl poisoning, ask any of them. Ask the cops. Ask the Border Patrol who want to do their job but are being told they can't and being accused of whipping Haitian migrants. That is what is happening. Here we are again.

We are not even talking about securing the border in this bill. We are not talking about doing the things we should be doing as a sovereign Nation. We are talking about doing the simplest thing if you are a sovereign Nation, and that is ensure the integrity of your elections and that only citizens can vote.

I am proud of the job the Republican Party has done and my Republican colleagues have done, and the Speaker of the House has done in putting forward legislation that will solve the problem, that follows the law, defers where appropriate to States, sets a Federal standard where it is appropriate with respect to Federal elections only, follows the constitutional parameters, and lays it all out in a way to protect our elections.

This is what we are supposed to do. We are supposed to protect our country. We are, in fact, the guardians of our country. When we sit in this hallowed Chamber, what on Earth are we supposed to do but do the work of protecting the country, which leads me to another point.

Our country is in danger right now because the President of the United States no longer has the mental capacity to carry out the powers and the duties of the office. I get no great joy in saying that. It is true.

It is appalling to watch the news media and my Democrat colleagues in this Chamber, in the Senate, and in the administration ignore the reality of the state of the President's mental acuity, endangering the American people, and now suddenly wake up because there is an election in a few months and suddenly go, oh, we need to do something about this. Why? Because there is an election in a few months.

Even at that, they are unwilling to call the question. I would posit that they are unwilling to call the question because the Democrats in the White House, indeed, the First Lady and the Vice President of the United States, are all complicit in covering up the lack of mental ability of the President, covering up the health, the mental health, the physical health of the

President. By doing this, they are endangering the American people. Indeed, they are unconstitutionally calling for President by committee.

I heard the former Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson; I have heard numerous current administration staffers; I have heard numerous Democrat colleagues in the House and the Senate talk about: Don't worry. The President has some good people around him. Don't worry. There are a lot of really good people that are advising him. There are committees of people.

First of all, I am not blown away by the quality of the people surrounding the President. Second of all, that is not how it works.

The Founders firmly rejected, from memory, I think it is Alexander Hamilton in Federalist 70, the notion of President by committee, that it would endanger us, that you needed an executive, you needed a Commander in Chief to make the decisions.

A brief note to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who are saying CHIP, shhhh. Don't say anything. Don't bring it up. We are in election season. They are falling on their own sword. They are blowing up. Let them blow up.

What I am concerned about blowing up is our country if we are attacked and we have a President in the White House who can't respond. That job is not just from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. This matters. It matters that the President of the United States is, at best, questionable to make decisions when it matters.

It is why the 25th Amendment exists, which, of course, requires the Vice President to take action, which I do not believe the Vice President will do because the Vice President knows she is complicit in having hid from the American people the mental state of the President of the United States for years.

This is not a political statement. As I have just noted, some people on my side of the aisle would rather I not say it. Shhhh. Let's just get to November. I just want our country to get to November. I want our country to get to December. I want our country to get to the next century.

When the President of the United States can't carry out the powers and the duties of the office without a committee of staff around him, when the press secretary at the White House today literally answered the question when asked by a reporter what would happen at 11 p.m. if nuclear weapons were fired at the United States, and her answer was: Well, there are some really good people around him that would come and talk to him. That gives me a lot of pause.

All of us who are in elected office have advisers, people we trust, seek their advice, seek their counsel, but I can promise you, when you know what hits the fan, if I have to come down here and make a decision, I walk down here and make a decision because that

is what we are hired to do. When you have to have a vote, you have to vote. When you have to come down and take action, you have to take action. The President of the United States is uniquely in that position.

The fact of the matter is this administration has been propped up, effectively, a Manchurian candidate, being propped up with committees of people around the President, hiding and obfuscating the truth, making decisions. That, frankly, should give all of us pause.

It is no wonder that the country is in such bad shape at the moment. Our country is being impoverished by the day. The Bureau of Labor Statistics found over the last year almost a million native-born Americans lost jobs on net.

Americans are spending over \$12,800 more annually to buy the basics because of the inflation under this administration. Mortgage rates are up to 7 percent. Housing affordability has plummeted to record lows. Gasoline is up 55 percent, eggs up 40 percent, flour up 35 percent, electricity up 29 percent, baby food up 29 percent, breakfast cereal up 25 percent, bread up 25 percent, chicken and poultry up 25 percent, lunch meat up 24 percent, eating out up 23 percent, rent up 21 percent, used cars up 20 percent. Americans have lost over \$4,400 paying higher energy costs under the President.

The Biden administration announced they paused all non-FTA exports for liquefied natural gas. What do you think that does? It doesn't help us. We are involved in endless conflicts, funding them. Nobody in this Chamber wants Ukraine to lose to Russia, but nobody in this Chamber wants to continue to fund a perpetual war by an administration that is out of touch while the American people are suffering. Biden has sold off more than 40 percent of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and in 2023, the SPR stockpile plunged to 40-year lows.

The fact of the matter is this administration is failing the American people. Republicans have for the last 18 months in this Congress for sure, if not the duration of the Biden administration, but certainly the last 18 months been putting forward responsible, strong policies that the President of the United States and my Democrat colleagues are rejecting.

We have worked hard to put forward Limit, Save, Grow, which would dramatically turn around the economic situation, dramatically reduce spending, dramatically reduce the size of the bureaucracy, dramatically improve our energy prices and competition around the globe, which, by the way, which would have had an impact in Ukraine, which would have helped us push back on Russia.

We passed responsible appropriations bills. We got caps enacted and put in place. The defense bill is funded. The increase in defense spending is funded out of taking cuts to the IRS expansion

the Democrats wanted to foist on hard-working Americans and we took money out of remaining COVID funds. Non-defense was then held flat.

We passed H.R. 2, a responsible border security bill, which would have ended the release of people into the United States. It would have tightened down on parole and asylum. It would have ended the release of unaccompanied children. It would have treated them responsibly. It would have reduced the power of cartels. It would have reduced sex trafficking, and it would have kept people like Laken Riley alive. We did that. We passed H.R. 2. Our Democrat colleagues opposed it. They opposed it in the Senate, and they opposed it here.

This Republican Conference has passed appropriation bill after appropriation bill to be rejected by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We have passed thousands of amendments. We passed seven appropriations bills last year. We passed a number of appropriations bills this year, and we are continuing to pass them.

We are doing the work the American people sent us here to do with zero help from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and, frankly, I am proud of the work that we have been putting forward that has been rejected by our Democrat colleagues.

I haven't always agreed. I have been very clear on this floor. You have to deliver results. You have to get some things across the finish line. You have to be willing to hold the line and fight and use the power of the purse. There is more that we can do but make no mistake about it. We have been putting forward good bills to make our economy stronger.

If our legislation had been adopted by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the President, inflation would be down. The border would be secure. People would be enjoying much more affordable energy. Job creation would be up. People's lives and quality of life would be better. More Americans would be secure on the streets.

This week, we have on the floor a bill that would protect voting and ensure that only citizens vote. Again, if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would work with us, we could do that. We could restore belief in our system. These are all the things that we have been working on, working to try to do.

Right now, our Democrat colleagues are wrapped around the axle trying to figure out what to do about their President because with all due respect, they are not putting America first. The President of the United States right now is not putting America first. The Vice President of the United States is not putting America first. The Cabinet is not putting America first.

If you were going to put America first, if you were going to put Americans first, then you would call it like you see it. You would act. You would lead. You would do what everyone in America knows needs to be done.

Everyone with eyes who has been watching the President—and again, I take no joy in saying it. He is our President. I disagree with him a lot, but he is our President, and the President of the United States needs to be strong and coherent and capable and able to lead in an increasingly dangerous world.

Notwithstanding the horrible policies that have been promoted and pushed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, can we not just agree that the President of the United States should be mentally aware and competent to carry out the powers and duties of the office?

Will our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and in the administration not look at this the way every American is seeing this right now?

Even the most politically biased people in the media and around the country are looking at this and throwing their hands up and saying what is going on?

Admittedly, it is because they are panicking about the election in November when what it should be is that they are panicked about the state of our country and whether or not we can be safe and secure.

In the Book of Acts, it is noted that Paul was a Roman citizen. The Roman authorities put him in chains and were about to flog him without a trial, but when he said that he was born a citizen, they let him go even though he was spreading the message of hate and distrust of a religious minority, but citizenship meant a great deal.

One of the things that eventually led to the downfall of the Roman Empire was the fact that over the next few centuries after that, citizenship meant less and less and less until it meant almost nothing. Its people no longer knew how to preserve the civilization their ancestors had built. We cannot let the same thing happen here.

□ 1915

Citizenship matters. Being a citizen of this country matters. It matters in observing the White House. It matters in citizens voting in elections. It matters in the policies we put forward to put the American people first. Citizenship has to matter again.

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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for July 8 and July 9 on account of a funeral in the district.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 10, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-4739. A letter from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Information Security Controls: Cybersecurity Items [Docket No.: 220520-0118] (RIN: 0694-AH56) received May 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4740. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation/RMA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expanding Options for Specialty and Organic Growers (EOSOG) [Docket ID: FCIC-24-0003] (RIN: 0563-AC85) received June 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4741. A letter from the Program Analyst, Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S. Grade Standards for Pecans in the Shell and Shelled Pecans [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-21-0039] received June 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4742. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Colonel Robert J. Schreiner, United States Space Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4743. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Colonels Terri J. Erisman and Steven M. Ranieri, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4744. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing 31 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general or major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4745. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing seven officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4746. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing eight officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to

10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4747. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Limitation on the Acquisition of Certain Goods Other Than United States Goods (DFARS Case 2021-D022) [Docket: DARS-2023-0042] (RIN: 0750-AL40) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4748. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Restriction on Certain Metal Products (DFARS Case 2021-D015) [Docket: DARS-2023-0018] (RIN: 0750-AL33) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4749. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Architect and Engineering Service Fees (DFARS Case 2024-D019) [Docket: DARS-2024-0019] (RIN: 0750-AM16) received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4750. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [Docket ID: DoD-2024-OS-0047] (RIN: 0790-AL77) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4751. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — TRICARE; Removal of Certain Temporary Regulation Changes Made in Response to COVID-19 [Docket ID: DOD-2023-HA-0049] (RIN: 0720-AB89) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4752. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Data Requirements for Commercial Products for Major Weapon Systems (DFARS Case 2023-D010) [Docket: DARS-2023-0047] (RIN: 0750-AL83) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4753. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Revision of Limitations on Subcontracting [FAC 2021-07; FAR Case 2016-011; Item II; Docket No.: 2016-0011; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN35) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4754. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's 2023 Fair Lending Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5493(c)(2)(D); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1013(c)(2)(D); (124 Stat. 1970); to the Committee on Financial Services.