

This resolution tracks the history of persons having the opportunity to first embrace themselves with the protestations that started and to move on to the point where now persons can actually embrace marriage and live with the person and love with the person that they choose.

As an ally of this community, I find none of this offensive. I find all of this to be natural for human beings who want to just simply be themselves.

I am also honored to say that in Houston, Texas, not only will this resolution be celebrated but also there is a Pride parade that would rival any parade in this country. People show up in the thousands, the tens of thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands. They line the streets, and they celebrate. To a certain extent, some commemorate lives who have been lost simply because they are a part of this community.

This is something that I would hope we could see around the country to a greater extent than we see it. Houston, Texas, has embraced it. Many other places have.

Until it is embraced in the small towns, in the boroughs, in places where people are now at some point in some places afraid to announce who they are, until this attitude of pride is embraced by the workplace—workplaces where people cannot indicate who they are because if they do, they are likely to lose their jobs—until that same level of pride, that same spirit of embracing people for who they are, judging them by the content of their character, not what they believe them to be within, I think we ought to believe people when they tell us who they are.

Today, my prayer is that this LGBTQIA+ Pride Month resolution will inspire people to do more than simply say hello, but they will become an ally. I am recruiting. The Pride community needs allies.

It needs people who are willing to stand up publicly and say: I am an ally of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I assure my colleagues that when we do this, we are doing what is expected of people of good will who want to see people simply live their lives, enjoy who they are, and just simply be themselves, we will promote and will help to cause a good many people that we may never meet and greet to benefit from another person becoming an ally of the LGBTQIA+ community.

□ 1120

Mr. Speaker, I close with this: The LGBTQIA+ community does not exist in a vacuum. It exists in a country that prides itself in pledging liberty and justice for all. This is an opportunity for every person who has never had the opportunity to talk to a person from this community to just do so.

I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, if you do so, you will leave with a different attitude. I absolutely believe this. I also say to you, Mr. Speaker, don't

worry about the pride community trying to impose anything on you. If you don't know a person from the community, you are not likely to be invited to a wedding, so you don't have to worry about some imposition. Just worry about making America all that it claims it is.

I plan to do it, and I invite others to do so, as well.

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

TAX CUTS AND SPENDING

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. ROY of Texas was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Texas, and I wish him safe travels back home to our great State.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to let people know this not just for the Honorable CHIP ROY, but I have relationships with people across all lines in this Congress. When he comes to the floor and says that he wishes me safe travels, I want to let people know that I will extend that to him, but also that notwithstanding what others may think, I have great respect for the gentleman. I don't have to agree with him to have great respect for him, and the gentleman doesn't have to agree with me, but at some point, we have to do what we are doing now and let people know that we have respect for each other notwithstanding these differences.

I really appreciate the way the gentleman has called for regular order. That means something to me. So while I have not been on the floor with the gentleman when he has done it, I want him to know that I have noticed that he has done it. I appreciate the gentleman, and I consider him a friend.

Mr. ROY. I appreciate those kind remarks from the gentleman. I consider the gentleman from Texas a friend, and I am sincere in wishing him safe travels and well wishes heading back home. We throw a lot of barbs around this Chamber, for good reason, we are here. Everybody always says how crazy it is and how divided we are, and I always remind people that when was the last time you had a Secretary of the Treasury and Vice President dueling in the street?

That has happened in our past, not now, that was 200-and-change years ago. We have differences of opinion, and that is the reason this body exists. We represent our constituents, and we are supposed to express on their behalf our views consistent with the Constitution in our republican form of government.

I am here today to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about what has been known now as the One

Big Beautiful Bill Act which is, in simple speak, a reconciliation package which is supposed to be designed to reconcile current policies, tax and spending, to achieve a reduction in deficits, or make sure that we are not adding to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, here we are.

The House of Representatives worked together and passed a bill. We passed a budget, we then passed a new budget, and then we passed a bill. We sent it to the Senate.

The House bill was not perfect by any stretch of the imagination from my perspective. The House bill didn't do enough on many things that I think are important. However, the House bill had core components of tax-cut extensions for hardworking Americans. The House bill had core components to give resources to the President, the administration, Tom Homan, Stephen Miller, and Secretary Noem to secure the border, and, importantly, to remove people through ICE and enforcement.

The House bill had core components to make sure our defense can modernize. The House bill had core components—and this is where it gets important—to terminate the green new scam subsidies, but not all of them. That is why I said the bill wasn't perfect.

I think we should repeal them all and save over \$1 trillion. We should stop subsidizing China. We should stop subsidizing big corporations. We should stop subsidizing unreliable energy, and stop interfering with the market. We only terminated about 60 percent of the green new scam. I think we should have done better.

The House had core components in it to reform Medicaid. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle were saying we are going to be taking Medicaid away from people. Medicaid goes up between 20 and 30 percent under our budget over the next 10 years.

Medicaid under our bill would be focused primarily on the vulnerable population more than the able-bodied. I think the bill should have gone farther. I think we should reform more of the money laundering scam that the FMAP seven times multiple giving more money to the able-bodied than the vulnerable. I think we should stop the scam of blue States taking more money from red States and nonexpansion States and giving it to hospitals and insurance companies. I think we should have ended that and done more.

We took a giant step forward to have work requirements to ensure that Medicaid could actually be solvent. It has gone up another \$1 trillion just under the Biden administration in terms of overall baseline costs.

That is all in the weeds. People watching this at home don't know what is going on. They are going about their lives. All they know is that there is a big bill, there is some tax stuff in it, there is some spending stuff in it, and there is some border stuff in it. That is about all they know.

Mr. Speaker, so why am I here?

It is because the House passed that bill—imperfect but I will call it passable by definition. We sent it to the Senate. The Senate is making the bill worse as we speak. The Senate is making decisions, both policy decisions and what is called going through a process over there to see if it is language that is supposed to be in a budget-related reconciliation package. We call it the Byrd process. They are pulling pieces out of it. The bill is getting worse.

Let me see if I can put it in basic terms.

This chart is not going to mean much to most people back home. Mr. Speaker, you don't even need to look at all the bars. It gets kind of complex. I just want to be real simple. This orange line on this chart—people in the gallery can't see it, but imagine an orange line on an X-Y graph.

That orange line says that under the House bill on a dynamic basis—what does that mean?

It means, that accounting for economic growth, accounting for the tax policies, and accounting for what we believe will happen, we would have about an additional \$72 billion of deficit spending over 10 years. Sadly, \$72 billion is kind of a rounding error when we are talking about 10 years.

In other words, it is close to breakeven. We would cut taxes, we would reduce spending, and we would get economic growth. We believe we would add nothing more to the deficit.

Here is the problem. Adding nothing more to the deficit means we still have deficits. We still have \$1.8 trillion to \$2 trillion a year in deficits.

I voted for a bill that will perpetuate \$1.8 trillion deficits, and I hated doing it. I did it because in this process, in this political environment, to get the reforms that we were getting to Medicaid, to get the reforms that we were getting to terminate 60 percent of the green new scam subsidies undermining our grid, and to get the tax cut extensions for hardworking Americans, to me it was worth doing that when I thought credibly and believably we would not be adding to the deficit and get those important reforms.

Here we are. The Senate, in its infinite wisdom over in the house of lords, they are embarking on focusing on what we would have anticipated they would focus on, which is just the tax-cut side, for the most part. They are backing away from the spending cuts, the spending restraints. They are backing away from the reforms that we think makes the math work, and there-in lies the problem.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to know why we are \$37 trillion in debt as a nation?

It is because too often my Republican colleagues have never met a tax cut they didn't want to advance while then campaigning on balancing the budget and cutting spending that they never want to vote for.

We can't do that.

□ 1130

We have to actually lead. In a Republican form of government there are 435 of us representing 300 and, what, 30-something million Americans. I represent about three-quarters of a million people. In a Republican form of government I am supposed to take the hard votes. I am supposed to go back to my constituents and say: Well, we are doing this and this and this. We think it is good. I know you wanted this, but we can't have that because we are \$37 trillion in debt.

I go back to this chart. There is a big yellow bar over here with flames on top. It shows almost a trillion dollars of additional deficit that the Senate bill would add if the policies they are currently debating in the Senate are adhered to. That means they got rid of a lot of our savings, and they made certain tax cuts more permanent. They extended them. I support making those tax cuts permanent and extending them but not without the spending reductions necessary to get us back to deficit neutrality or deficit savings.

Why does this matter? It matters because Republicans will go around all the time and say: Don't worry. All tax cuts pay for themselves.

Let me be very clear. Not all tax cuts pay for themselves. They just don't.

I grew up a child of the eighties. I grew up on studying supply-side economics. I believe in leaving money in the hands of the American people to produce wealth. I believe that does create more revenue the Treasury can bring in with lower rates on a bigger pie. I think that is important.

You still have to do basic math. If you reduce the rate, which I want to do to be perfectly clear, for the worker, for the family, for the business, you are going to get a revenue reduction to the Treasury. Your hope is the economic growth will offset part of that.

When we do the math and we talk to every outside group and we listen to the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office gets a lot wrong—but every outside group who looks at this tells us that our assumptions that we baked in of \$2.5 trillion of economic growth is a kind of reasonable sweet spot, meaning we are assuming the growth. We are already baking in that you are going to get more revenue, but when you keep extending these tax cuts and you don't do enough spending cuts and you weaken the spending cuts that we put in place, you end up with this chart. You end up with a trillion dollars of additional deficit on top of the roughly \$18 trillion we are not even touching.

My question for my colleagues is: Was even the House bill good enough? Not really; it really wasn't. I held my nose and voted for it. I want to help the President. I want to move the agenda forward. I want tax cuts. I want the green new scam subsidies terminated. I want Medicaid reform. However, we were leaving in place adding another \$18 trillion to \$20 trillion of deficit spending, if we are lucky for it to be that low, over the next 10 years.

If the Senate is going to send the bill back to us that is going to add a trillion dollars more and not reform Medicaid properly and not terminate the green new scam that the President campaigned on terminating, then there is no way I can vote for that bill when it comes back. That needs to be said, and it needs to be clear.

The fact of the matter is our country is hanging on by a very thin fiscal thread. The bond markets are recognizing this. There was a headline in the Financial Times today that foreign markets are starting to pull out of Federal treasuries. Interest rates are doing what they are doing. You can change the Fed chairman all you want, but if you don't fix the fiscal mess we are in, the outer part of that curve, which is what sets our mortgage rates, our long-term borrowing rates, that is still going to be a mess, and the American people aren't going to be able to afford homes.

The average age of the American homeowner today is as high as it has ever been. It is up about 10 years. Now you are in your upper thirties before you are buying a home instead of your upper twenties, which it was not long ago.

We are ripping the American Dream out of the hands of our kids and grandkids because of people in this Chamber and people in the other Chamber who refuse to do the hard work of governing responsibly. I should say representing; we don't govern, but do our job.

I am blessed to be alive. I am a cancer survivor. I have talked about that before. I was blessed to have treatment at MD Anderson, and that was 14 years ago. I think it was 14 years ago this next month.

Why do I bring that up? I bring that up because I get cancer groups that come into my office all the time. Mr. Speaker, you get cancer groups, you get ALS groups, you get people who have a heart to solve a problem, and they want money. They want funding. I have to say no. If they don't come in and say: Well, we know that we are \$37 trillion in debt, so we are proposing this plan, and we are proposing cuts over here in order to achieve what we want, which is \$100 million for some research—they usually don't do that. They just come in and say: We need \$100 million for research or \$500 million for research or \$1 billion for some program, and I have to say no. I always say no.

I tell my farmers who come in and are just dying for relief because we have messed up their livelihoods so much, Congress has, with a failed system. Crop insurance is important. All the things we do are important, but we include a bloated food stamp program, which is exploding off the charts in the farm bill every 5 years, and they expect me to vote to continue a food stamp program, which is often going to the able-bodied, often corrupted, often feeding our children and people in this

country sugary, terrible foods that are making our healthcare system more expensive, and they want me to keep paying for that. I have to tell my farmers: Sorry, guys, I am not voting for the farm bill.

I have got to say there are only a handful of us in this Chamber who are willing to say no. "No" is the most powerful and important word in the English language when it is used the right way, which I would say in this body should be used most of the time.

Ronald Reagan famously said, I think it was on Johnny Carson's "The Tonight Show" interview, and they were talking and Reagan said—and Reagan hated taxes—Reagan said: That every new program that a Member of Congress brings to the floor should have a tax increase attached to it. He is correct. He was correct.

Why? He was correct because if you bring a billion-dollar program to the floor, we vote for it because the headline will say: CHIP ROY opposes puppies or CHIP ROY opposes cancer research or CHIP ROY opposes something for veterans or for the elderly. Who can vote against that?

If the bill was billion-dollar program and needed a tax increase on every American to pay for it, well, now that vote is a little different. We don't do that. We never do that.

Now what is going to happen? Well, there is going to be a lot of posturing over the next week.

Here is something that everybody should get a bit of a chuckle out of. We had to pass the budget right before Easter. We had to pass the bill right before Memorial Day. Now, we are supposed to pass the final bill, get it through the Senate by July 4.

□ 1140

We had to pass the government funding bill right before Christmas. The speaker knows. Mr. Speaker, why do you think that is? Do you think that is just because everybody says, well, wouldn't it be nice to do that right at those great holidays? No. It is something called jet fumes.

Every Member of Congress has a trip, personal, business, government, whatever. They all are going to take a trip, so they always want to have these bills right before that so that everybody comes in and says: "Yes, I will vote for it. Let's get out of here." Boom, they get out of town.

Mr. Speaker, here we are. Over the next week, there is going to be an enormous amount of pressure brought to bear from the White House and our leadership on both sides to get in line and say: "We have to pass it. If we don't pass it, the taxes are going to go up. If we don't pass it, we are not going to get the border funding. If we don't pass it, we won't have a debt ceiling increase, and the bond markets are going to freak out."

We are not going to default on our debt.

We are not going to let taxes go up in the end before this year is over. They

don't go up until December. We are going to do what we need to do on the border.

I would like to do it in this bill, but I am not going to do it in this bill if this bill is adding to the debt, not doing what it needs to do on the green new scam, not doing what it needs to do on Medicaid, and not doing what it needs to do on countless other issues.

I am not going to do it if it is going to be a big giveaway to blue State tax jurisdictions in State and local taxes. My friends in this Conference who represent big tax States like New York and California want a bigger deduction for their State taxes. Why the hell should I subsidize their stupid decisions in their States for their expensive taxes? Why should my constituents have to do that?

Why should we continue to allow food stamps to go to the able-bodied? Why should we continue to have Medicaid go to the able-bodied and not have work requirements or not deal with the money laundering scam?

Why shouldn't we, by the way, have health savings accounts? The Senate bill took our health savings accounts out of the House bill.

Why should we continue to have taxpayer-funded sex-change operations? The Senate bill puts that back in.

Why should we not tax these big university endowments and these universities that are engaging in political activism and taking massive Federal money and Federal student loan support? Why shouldn't we tax them on it? The Senate reduces our tax on university endowments to raise revenue by 20 percent.

Why shouldn't we stop China from getting taxpayer dollars through the green new scam subsidies? Our bill prevented China from getting rich off of our tax dollars. The Senate bill takes it out. Why?

Why shouldn't we tax the remittances of illegal aliens who are sending money back to their home countries? Our bill did that. The Senate bill takes it out.

We are at a critical juncture in our history as a country, and the question here is: Will Republicans step up and put forward transformational reforms when we have the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate, and the White House?

Will we deliver on the President's agenda responsibly? Will we actually take this moment to change the trajectory of debt that is killing our country for our kids and grandkids, or will we continue the same game of tax cuts for everyone but spending and more spending for everyone?

We can't keep doing the same thing. We can't.

I know the American people are frustrated. I know they expect us to deliver, and we must deliver. Failure is not an option, but we shouldn't deliver for the sake of it. We shouldn't pass a bill just to check a box.

We shouldn't pass a bill that increases the deficit; doesn't terminate

the green new scam; doesn't reform Medicaid; doesn't prevent tax subsidies for high State tax jurisdictions; doesn't prevent China from continuing to get subsidies for solar panels with taxpayer dollars; doesn't curb the waste, fraud, and abuse in food stamps; doesn't tax remittances for illegals who are sending money back home; doesn't include health savings account expansions for the American people; and, frankly, even in the House bill, doesn't do enough to reduce deficits.

The Senate bill was supposed to make the bill better, not worse. I voted for the House bill to move it along in the process for incremental gains and expected the Senate to step up to the plate. Right now, they are striking out.

If the Senate sends a bill over that makes this bill worse, adds to the deficit, and adds all the things I just talked about, I will vote "no."

No, Mr. President, it is not grandstanding. It is not grandstanding to say that I think we ought to be fiscally responsible. It is not grandstanding to say that we should honor the campaign commitment to terminate the green new scam in full. It is not grandstanding to say that we should reform Medicaid so that the able-bodied are not being subsidized by the vulnerable. It is not grandstanding. It is not grandstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make one final comment, and then I will save everybody from listening to my destroyed voice.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, Rhonda Massie, wife of my colleague and good friend THOMAS MASSIE, passed away suddenly.

THOMAS is a dear friend. THOMAS happens to be taking some heat politically because THOMAS believes, as I do, that we are not doing enough on spending and on the legislation we are talking about, but that is politics. THOMAS is thick-skinned. He will take the arrows. He will keep representing his constituents.

I believe he will get reelected, and I will support him in that endeavor because he is a good man and a good friend.

I just want everyone to know that my friend is hurting today because he lost his wife 1 year ago suddenly. My prayers are with THOMAS. My prayers are with his family. I know Rhonda is in Heaven looking down on THOMAS, probably laughing at him a little.

I know my colleagues all wish THOMAS well. He is a dear friend, and we will be thinking and praying about him today even as we go about doing our jobs.

I am proud to call THOMAS a friend. I am proud to stand alongside THOMAS, and I will stand alongside THOMAS as a man of principle who is trying to do the right thing. I don't always agree, but I agree most of the time.

God bless him, and God bless the memory of Rhonda and THOMAS' entire family.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 42. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to exclude certain payments to aged, blind, or disabled Alaska Natives or descendants of Alaska Natives from being used to determine eligibility for certain programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 43. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide that Village Corporations shall not be required to convey land in trust to the State of Alaska for the establishment of Municipal Corporations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 618. An act to amend the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989 to include the City of North Las Vegas and the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2215. An act to redesignate the Salem Maritime National Historic Site as the "Salem Maritime National Historical Park", and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina). Pursuant to clause 13 of rule I, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 30, 2025.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 30, 2025, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

EC-1277. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's interim final rule—Business Combinations Under the Bank Merger Act; Rescission [Docket ID: OCC-2025-0001] (RIN: 1557-AF29) received June 26, 2025, 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.

EC-1278. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's extension of commission statement—Regulation SBSR (Reporting and Dissemination of Security-Based Swap Data Repository Rules; Extension [Release No.: 34-102886; File Nos.: S7-34-10; S7-35-10] (RIN: 3235-AK79; 3235-AK80) received June 26, 2025, 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.

EC-1279. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Air Plan Approval; ID; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R10-OAR-2025-0009; FRL-12550-01-R10] received June 26, 2025, 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.

EC-1280. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Depart-

ment of Transportation, transmitting a notification of designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1281. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1282. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Method of Correcting Errors Involving Retired Lifecycle Funds received June 25, 2025, 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 Government Reform.

EC-1283. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts for 2025 [Docket No.: FR-6513-F-01] received June 25, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1284. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK), transmitting the Grant and Legislative Request for FY 2026, and other materials, pursuant to Section 24315(a)(2) of Title 49 U.S.C.; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1285. A letter from the Section Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Associate Chief Counsel, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule—Extension and Modification of Transitional Relief Under Sections 3403, 3406, 6721, 6722, 6651, and 6656 with Respect to the Reporting of Information and Backup Withholding on Digital Assets by Brokers under Section 6045 (Notice 2025-33) received June 25, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-1286. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report titled, "Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used by Dual-Eligible Enrollees: 2025 (OEI-05-25-00120)", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 note; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 3313(a)(2); (124 Stat. 477); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 4214. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish, concurrently with any final rule establishing or revising a national ambient air quality standard, regulations and guidance for implementing the standard, including information relating to submission and consideration of a preconstruction permit application under the new or revised standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAUMGARTNER (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. MOYLAN, and Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina):

H.R. 4215. A bill to require the Secretary of State to promulgate expedited and fixed timelines for the decision-making process to license the export of certain defense articles and defense services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina (for herself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. BAUMGARTNER, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 4216. A bill to direct the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to carry out a review of the list of defense articles and services required to be transferred under the foreign military sales program as opposed to direct commercial sale (FMS-Only List); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 4217. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use on-site regulated medical waste treatment systems at certain Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 4218. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to facilitate State implementation of national ambient air quality standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 4219. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish the National Wildlife Refuge System Invasive Species Strike Team Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4220. A bill to require the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to issue an advisory about how homegrown violent extremists and other perpetrators of domestic terrorism procure firearms and firearm accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4221. A bill to modernize the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4222. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to restrict the ability to transfer business inventory firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4223. A bill to repeal certain impediments to the administration of the firearms laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4224. A bill to establish a grant program through the Department of Justice to incentivize States to establish point-of-contact systems for firearm sales subject to a background check, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4225. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require adequate supervision before a juvenile can possess a firearm, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINE (for himself and Mr. GILL of Texas):