

10 days later, if you don't sign it, it becomes law. Ten days later, it becomes law, not counting Saturdays and Sundays. Ten days later, it becomes law. Then when it becomes law, Mr. President, you didn't sign it so that gives you a way out.

You didn't sign it. It became law, and you can go out and tell people how you were opposed to the many things that I mentioned. How you were opposed to helping people who are renters acquire a place to call home. How you were opposed to helping the builders construct more homes so that people can have a place to call home.

You can go out and talk about that in your very own way. So you don't have to sign it, but it does have to arrive in your space. You have to receive it, and it has to be sent to you. If it is sent to you, then the 10 days will start from the day that it is forwarded to you.

My hope is that it would be done if it hasn't been done and that the 10 days would run. I know, Mr. President, that you enjoy having other people take responsibility for your inactions and your actions.

Since you enjoy it very much, my fear is that you will encourage that it not be sent to you. You will push back on it being sent to you so that later on, you will be able to say: Oh, I never got it, so I couldn't sign it. That would give you your way out. You would push back.

Well, I would hope that that pushback won't be sufficient. I would hope that you would receive it so that either you will sign it and move on, or it is not signed and it passes, or you can veto it.

If you veto it, I believe that with the number of votes that I have called to your attention for passage in the House and Senate, that veto can be overridden. Again, you are off the hook. You are off the hook, but my fear is that knowing you, you are going to do everything that you can to avoid having that get to your desk so that you can then blame someone else for your inaction, which really would be your actions because you would have rejected having it being sent to you in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I close with this. I am proud to have been a person to vote for this piece of legislation. It is landmark. It is going to make a difference in the lives of people once it becomes law. My hope is that it will become law expeditiously because there are many aspects of it that will have to be activated, and it will take time for these things to be properly activated so that they become meaningful and can function.

□ 1420

I am hoping that you will sign it, but, Mr. President, if you don't sign it, here is what you are doing. You are providing another piece of ammunition for the countdown to impeachment.

Now, why would I say this? Because, Mr. President, you have angered a good

many Senators. A good many of them who might have considered other things will give some consideration to this word: impeachment.

Impeachment starts in the House. It is the Senate that will vote to determine whether you are a person who should be actually convicted of the charge. The House acts as sort of a grand jury—not the same, but similar to. You have caused a lot of people in the House, Mr. President, who are going to give consideration to this word.

Now, you may not be impeached for this bill, but you are giving people reasons to consider your impeachment for legitimate reasons that already exist, by the way. For legitimate reasons, you should be impeached already, but you haven't been.

The countdown is still on. What you are doing is adding fuel to the fire of impeachment that may, at some point, become more than you can manage.

I really do believe, Mr. President, that this act can help you by signing it, this bill. It is going to hurt you immensely if you don't sign it, not physically. I don't want your FBI concluding that somehow I would cause you any harm. I would never want to see you harmed, and anybody that would want to see you harmed, I am absolutely opposed to whatever they might do. You deserve life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I can tell you this: You also deserve impeachment.

The countdown will continue. I trust that you will stall it and do something to benefit yourself by simply signing a piece of legislation that the American people want. The American people want it to the extent that the builders, Mr. President, are going to contact you, or some aspect of your administration, about it.

You are going to have citizens calling your office at the White House. You are going to have people writing you letters. You are going to have plenty of communication to contend with because this piece of legislation is pervasive. It is huge. You are going to have people who have a vested interest in this legislation contacting somebody to let you know that you should sign this legislation.

And still I rise, an unbought, unbossed, unelected, liberated Democrat.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARIDOPOLOS). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

PRESENTING THE MATH

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this is sort of our weekly attempt to see if

we can use math to annoy people, so let's actually have some fun here. I am going to try three different things in this presentation.

One, we are going to actually talk about the real driver of interest rates, housing affordability.

The second thing we are going to actually talk about is sort of the cycle of fraud in so many of these government programs. Yesterday, in my Joint Economic Committee, we did a high-level fraud in government-sponsored healthcare, Medicaid, and other programs—some wonderful data.

Then, the third thing, we are going to step on one of the third rails of politics, and we are going to tell the truth about demographics and the financing of Medicare and some of the things we are going to have to do to actually keep it stable.

Let's actually start to tell the truth. How many of you have seen this chart? It has been one of my opening charts for year after year after year, trying to help everyone—staff, Members of Congress, anyone who is crazy enough to watch this—with the reality.

You see the blue area here? That is functionally the only thing a Member of Congress gets to vote on. You get to vote on defense and nondefense discretionary. Everything else is substantially on formula.

Why this is so important is that I keep trying to explain to people to understand that Social Security is the number one spend. It is going to come in about \$1.65 trillion. Interest is the second biggest spend in our government at \$1.2 trillion. Medicare is \$1.1 trillion. Medicaid and ObamaCare, ACA subsidies, are about a trillion. Defense is actually number 5.

The thing that is in the Constitution is number 5 in our spending stack, and we have a problem. If anyone was paying attention in the math there, if we are going to take in \$5, \$5.5, \$5.25 trillion in tax receipts, did you notice that by the time I got to the Medicaid ACA subsidies, we were out of money?

That means this year, my math is we are going to borrow about \$2 to \$2.3 trillion. Once again—think about this, Mr. Speaker—last year, for every dollar we took in in tax receipts, we spent \$1.43.

Remember, Congress just passed the housing bill. I voted no on it because there are a number of things in there—being a guy who actually has a background and actually even a degree in finance and housing, I don't believe it built another house. It created some programs, expanded this and that, but it didn't produce another house. It didn't do the things necessary.

One of the hardest parts is having an honest conversation around here—I am going to show you. We have actually done some academic literature. Your 30-year mortgage today is going to be at 6.5 percent. Mr. Speaker, how would you like to be 5.5 percent? Do you know why it is a full point higher? U.S. government borrowing. When almost

every single day we are borrowing about \$7 billion, about \$98,000 a second, you are competing with your own government.

Here, we put together a couple of helpful charts. Housing affordability sensitivity to interest rates—think about this. If we were at 5.5 percent—and this is sort of using what would be a mean mortgage size in my community, Tempe, Scottsdale, your house payment would be \$2,828. Add in that extra 1 percent of higher interest rates because we borrowed so damn much money, it is not \$2,800. It is \$3,100 a month. That premium that you are paying is an object of our borrowing.

Did you hear a single discussion around this place saying, hey, we are going to talk about housing affordability, maybe we could actually convince the debt markets we are going to stabilize our borrowing.

Instead, every data point we have, it gets dramatically worse over the next 10 years, and it is the thing we are not allowed to tell the truth about, Mr. Speaker.

We have a problem. Some of the math says, next year, we will have fewer under 18 than we had 20 years ago, but we will have double the number of 65 and up. I will be one of them. If you look around somewhere here, I think my 4-year-old is running around—yes, my little boy turns 4 today. I am 64 years old, and I have a 4-year-old and a 10-year-old and a wife my age because we are really optimistic about the future, or we did really bad retirement planning.

Look, this is just math. I have tried presenting this, and Members of Congress get mad at me because the hallways here are full of people showing up at our offices right now demanding more money.

□ 1430

So let's actually have a little fun here. "Household Cost Impact of Legislative Fiscal Policy. Cumulative Legislative Contribution Since 2015"—what the hell does that mean? It basically is saying if you and I go back to 2015 and had 30-year mortgages, just the amount of borrowing the Federal Government does has made that 30-year mortgage \$76,000 more over that 30-year time. That is what a single point of interest on an average loan is in my part of the country.

What is the likelihood that we are going to convince our brothers and sisters here that we are going to borrow less money?

The frustrating thing is you and I will go home, and we will have a town-hall or meetings, and this and that, and the public will turn to us and say: It is all waste and fraud.

I am going to show you the slides. Waste and fraud are a big deal, but it is a sliver. Our problem is our government functionally is an insurance company with an army, and we are terrified to tell the truth about it.

So let's actually have some fun here. Let's actually try to understand where

the real mismanagement of spending is.

We have more spending and leakage. What is leakage? I would argue leakage is what we in the Joint Economic Committee have identified over and over when we have written a piece of legislation poorly or the lawyers, or CMS, or the Treasury have actually designed it, where the smart lawyers out there find ways to exploit it.

We have done entire presentations here on something called Medicare part C, Medicare Advantage. Mr. Speaker, 55 percent of our brothers and sisters on Medicare use this managed care model. There is something in there called risk scoring. There's something called a MedPAC report. It is about that thick. We write it. We get it every year. No one bothers to read it.

It basically says: Hey, Member of Congress, there is \$100 billion, \$150 billion a year in what we would define as leakage, where these insurance companies are able to come in and score grandma as being sicker and, therefore, they get risk scoring, additional cash.

Well, that extra spending means we have to raise our borrowing. Do you understand the problem? I just showed you our borrowing is raising your interest rates.

We get over here, and higher interest rates cause us a real problem because we make everything less affordable, and now interest is the second biggest expense in our government. Some of the models actually say that in a decade, interest will be our number one expenditure.

Look, when you have an almost \$40 trillion debt, CBO's own report said in 9 budget years—and this is without the recent higher interest rates, without some of the additional supplementals and other borrowing and spending we are about to do—in 9 years, the deficit is going to be \$3.1 trillion, and \$2.1 trillion of that was just interest. \$1 trillion was actually the structural deficit. Hey, we are spending too much money. Over here was \$2.1 trillion that was just interest, and there becomes the fragility.

I love that fancy word. Fragility means small movements of interest going up, and it is a technical economic term, Mr. Speaker. It means we are screwed.

The reality of it is, there is this whole concept—I have done presentation after presentation after presentation about it—that is called interest rate fragility. The bond market is about to run this country. We aren't. What are we going to do to convince that bond market—because, remember, we borrow money. The entire industrialized world is borrowing money. China is borrowing money. Japan is borrowing money. Now Germany is borrowing money. We are competing with everyone for what is left in the world's savings.

What happens in the industrialized world when people are getting older, and they are moving into their retire-

ment years, and they are not saving in the same numbers? You start to have this stress. Ray Dalio talks about this all the time, and that is the world's savings compared to the borrowing appetite. We have got a mismatch, and that means interest rates go up.

Let's actually start to dig through some of the perversities we identified in our Joint Economic Committee hearing yesterday, when we were talking about where some of the leakage is in programs we have designed. This isn't a—well, some of it is. This isn't something where foreign nationals sneak into the country and set up a scam. Some of this is we wrote a law, and we just did a really crappy job writing it.

So High New York Caregiver Pay—Medicare actually has a program where States can set up a program where it is visiting. So you can have your child, your cousin, your sister visit you on your Medicaid. We actually have States like New York where the caregivers' salaries, just these people who are coming and visiting you, are 50 grand.

Well, what happens if I come to you and say, over the last 5 years, this program in New York City was the number one job creator? You start to actually look at what is happening by categories, so Federal outlays by major categories. We are going to bounce back and forth to try to make the point that it is how we have designed the policy.

In 2011, you actually start to see where the leakage was. Here we are in 2026, and we are spending \$7.449 billion. Do you understand the problem? Our tax receipts are only going to be about 5½ if we are lucky. The rest of this ends up being borrowed.

So let's actually do the board that actually annoys most people here when we get behind these microphones and say: It is waste and fraud. We can balance the budget if we just got rid of that.

We can make a difference, but our best estimate is government fraud is almost 7 percent of the spending. Think of that. We calculated it at 6.9 percent of our spending.

Did I mention a little while ago that last year, for every dollar we took in, we spent \$1.43? This is a hell of a lot of money, but it is 7 percent. Are you going to help me find the other almost 35 percent we need? That is actually structural. That is how we have designed programs. We have created incentives to basically exploit the system, not help people get healthier, not do the most efficient things, but the most profitable things. Then armies of lobbyists are all up and down these hallways to stop us from fixing this.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, our best estimates, fraud in the Federal Government, if you do everything, is under 7 percent.

Here are some of the numbers that get really uncomfortable: a large share of Medicare spending on age 65. So this

is the distribution, just so you understand. We calculate that over the next 6 years, Medicare spending will double. We will basically go from \$1 trillion last year to \$2 trillion per year. It is not a conspiracy. It is not Republican. It is not Democrat. It is just we got older, and baby boomers are moving into the higher utilization year of their healthcare benefits.

I have had this question over and over, but what about all the people that aren't 65? Well, look, you have some of this population over here, renal failure, other certain categories, where you are able to enroll in Medicare, but it is still a very small population. The majority, 82 percent of the population, on Medicare is 65 and up. It is an earned benefit.

□ 1440

Here is one of the punch lines.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who is willing to listen—and this is just math. It is not personal; it is just math—what do you think we spend as a Federal Government?

Remember, the Medicare trust fund only takes care of a portion of Medicare spending. The majority of Medicare spending actually comes out of the general fund and your copays.

So let's take a look here. Here we are in 2026. Your Federal Government spends about \$20,000 per enrollee in Medicare. In 9 budget years, it is \$34,000 a year.

Now, what, there are 67 million baby boomers. Does anyone start to see a math problem?

Medicare spending on people 65 and up will accelerate—and this acceleration is just demographics. As the baby boomer population gets older, they are moving into higher utilization years.

Okay. So we can actually take a look at this. Think of this. In 2035, \$2.13 trillion. So in 9 budget years, over \$2 trillion will just be the Medicare budget. Now you start to see what I mean when I talk about that the debt is substantially demographics.

Let's see how many more of these we want to torture you with.

Medicare spending will continue to expand. Look, this year, it is a little over 4 percent of GDP. In 9 budget years, it is over 5.6 percent of GDP. Do you remember how we in the House, the Budget Committee, the Treasury, we all talked about how we want to get down to 3 percent of borrowing—3 percent of the entire economy. Okay. That is great.

If you add up everything, including the borrowing from the trust funds, this year, we are right now getting close to 7 percent of the entire economy is being borrowed.

Does anyone see the irony? In a few years, just Medicare is taking 5.6 percent of the entire economy, just for that one program.

All right. Let's see what else we can do here that actually drives people a little bit insane.

This is how bad we have been in our projections and not understanding.

Now, understand, since 2011, think of the things that have happened. We had the financing of the mortgage bubble from 2008. We had COVID. We have actually had these things hit. But debt held by the public per capita—and remember when we were in 2011, we were basically \$33,000 per capita. Today, we are over \$92,000, and that is a 176 percent increase since 2011.

This breaks my heart. When I got elected, I was part of the Tea Party wave. We basically were pledging fiscal sanity and fidelity to the U.S. Constitution. I am not sure we are doing either of those these days.

So when I am showing you those charts, I am using the CBO projections. Remember, they were saying this year we were going to borrow about \$1.7 trillion. My math is saying we are up to \$2.3 trillion. Maybe I am a bit pessimistic, but CBO's own calculation is, in 2035, we are over \$2.5 trillion in borrowing. If you actually look at their February numbers, they had \$3.1 trillion.

Okay. Let's see if we can make some of this make sense.

This is always difficult to talk about, and what I am arguing for is we, as policymakers—what can we adopt? What can we do? I have done entire presentations here week after week after week of here are ways we can get rid of duplicative MRIs, X-rays, ultrasounds, CT scans, and put those scans on your device so that when you go to your next doctor, it is there and we get rid of the duplicates. We think that could be as much as \$35 billion in 1 year, \$350 billion over 10 years. The lobbyists hate that idea because of the excess spending.

My reason for my rambling is there are solutions. You are not magically tomorrow going to say that 40 years of falling fertility rates, 65 years of knowing we had baby boomers—the demographics aren't magically going to change.

What are we about to do to grow productivity so fast that we can make up for a country that is now at zero population growth and that Census had a prediction that sometime in the next 5 years, we will actually have 1 or 2 years with negative population growth.

You are not used to hearing that about America, but take a look at this. Seniors per 100 working age adults, and I go back to 2011. I had 21 seniors for every 100.

In 2025, the last year where we had the data, it went from 21.9 to 32.2. Just trying to make the argument, Medicare, Social Security, today's worker pays for today's retiree. The total FICA tax and the total payroll tax don't cover the benefits going out the door.

That is why they have to reach in and cash in their special T bills, their special Treasury bills. That trust fund in the Social Security actuary report that came out a week ago basically says that in a little over 6 years, it is gone. The trust fund is gone.

Now, we can geek out for a while and explain that we already started borrowing that money internally because Treasury has already spent it, but Social Security holds those T bills so they cash them in. Treasury has to go out and borrow the money to send them the money so they can send their checks out.

But under current law, when that trust fund is gone in 6 years, 3 months, everyone over 65 getting a Social Security check under current law gets a 22 to 24 percent cut. We will double the poverty of seniors at that time.

The U.S. population age 65 and up in 2011, 41 million; 2026, so the year we are in right now, 63 million.

It is just math. What drives me insane around here, just makes me angry, it is math. Didn't we sort of know how old we were getting? Didn't we know about baby boomers?

Heaven, in the early 1980s, I remember sitting in a statistics class and the professor at that time was talking about this, and that is 40 years ago.

Here is one of the toughest things: The population of young people is in decline as the population of 65 increases.

For those of you who are uncomfortable with the discussions I have had on this floor of legalizing technology that could disrupt the price of healthcare, of moving to a talent-based immigration system instead of the migration of large populations of poverty into the country, of designing systems, of cures—see if I can make this make sense.

So much of our spending around here is to maintain misery. I would argue that the most moral thing we can do, particularly in healthcare, is the elimination of a disease, moving toward a cure. I will give you the classic example of 15 years ago, Hepatitis C, we had hospitals all around the country getting ready to put up liver transplant centers.

And then a drug comes along—it was expensive—what is it—Sovaldi, and then a competitor right after that crashed the price. Now those liver transplant centers are not needed.

Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, we had lobbyists here trying to slow down access to the drug so those folks who had built the liver transplant centers could actually amortize their costs?

If this is our demographics, are we going to design policies where we can actually disrupt the cost of delivering healthcare?

□ 1450

Yet, every time I talk about this, I realize we are not only talking about disrupting bureaucracies; we are talking about disrupting business models, particularly in healthcare. Cures are moral, and they are really amazing economics.

A while back, I did a series of presentations on something we are not supposed to talk about but we really should: that 47 percent of U.S.

healthcare was somehow related to obesity.

Think about what I just said: 47 percent of U.S. healthcare was related to obesity. Maybe it would be moral and really good economics and just compassionate saying: What are we doing in nutrition support? What are we doing in gamification of helping people eat healthier, deal with multichronic conditions? What are we doing in access to new drug categories and other things that could help our brothers and sisters get healthier and the economic value of that?

It turns out being the single biggest thing you could do is to reduce U.S. borrowing. It turns out, Mr. Speaker, those folks who talk about MAHA and these things, they are actually partially exactly correct.

Health. If the biggest growth of our spending is within those healthcare categories, what can we do to lower the price of healthcare? Is it rationing or working for it using technology and other things to help our brothers and sisters get healthier?

All right. I am going to see if I have one last board here.

All right. Apparently, we didn't print it.

Mr. Speaker, we basically just ran through sort of three categories.

U.S. debt is raising the cost for all of you. You are paying higher interest rates on your credit card, your mortgage, and your car loan because of the insatiable appetite of the Federal Government. And, let's be honest, the insatiable appetite of borrowing from the Federal Government is because our public actually demands it. They want things. They don't want to be told no.

Number two, we talked about waste and fraud and how real it is, but it is structural in so many of our programs. It is a profit model for many of those who use these programs, but even then it is still under 7 percent.

The third thing is the reality of what we are as a country. It is demographics. We have a lack of young people. We are getting older. We have a whole bunch of benefits that we are obligated to because we made promises. We made a societal contract.

I can give you a path that we keep our promises, Mr. Speaker, but every day we refuse to deal with the reality of the math it makes it that much harder to protect the future.

The little boy that is sitting behind me, he turned 4 years old today. The math says if you use the 6 percent generational discount rate, which is reasonable in today's world, we need 104 percent of his lifetime earnings just to pay the pensions of the Federal Government. Is this really what we decided we are going to do to our kids and our grandkids? It is what we have done.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 29, 2026, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-3925. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's advisory opinion — Equal Credit Opportunity (Regulation B); Special Purpose Credit Programs; Rescission received June 17, 2026, 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-3926. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyridiflufenoxifen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2025-0183; FRL-13308-01-OCSP] received June 11, 2026, 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-3927. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium Nitrate in Pesticide Formulations; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0296; FRL-13292-01-OCSP] received June 11, 2026, 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-3928. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure To Attain the 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} Standards; California; San Joaquin Valley; Error Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2026-1257; FRL-13247-02-R9] received June 11, 2026, 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-3929. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; Ozone Ambient Air Quality Standard and Adhesive and Sealants Regulation Revisions [EPA-R01-OAR-2025-1311; FRL-13029-02-R1] received June 11, 2026, 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-3930. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; New York; New York Metropolitan Area Second Ten-Year Limited Maintenance Plan for the 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} Standard [EPA-R02-OAR-2025-0256; FRL-12788-02-R2] received June 11, 2026, 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-3931. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Withdrawals of Findings of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plan (SIP) Revisions to Amend Provisions Applying to Excess Emissions During Periods of Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2021-

0863; EPA-R03-OAR-2023-0179; FRL-12161-04-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AW38) received June 11, 2026, 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-3932. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Technical Amendments to the EPCRA Hazardous Chemical Inventory Reporting Requirements to Conform to the 2024 OSHA Hazard Communication Standard [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2025-0299; FRL-12698-06-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AH40) received June 17, 2026, 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-3933. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; OR: Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R10-OAR-2026-1222; FRL-13248-01-R10] received June 17, 2026, 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-3934. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Resin acids, Esters with Glycerol in Pesticide Formulations; Exemption from the Requirement for a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2024-0354; FRL-13403-01-OCSP] received June 17, 2026, 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-3935. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 26-020, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3936. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 26-023, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3937. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 26-026, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3938. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 26-030, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3939. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 26-045, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3940. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 26-042, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3941. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 26-034, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.