

and scout. You name it, he has done it. His impact on the game and on Kansas City is simply unmatched.

He was there for some of the most defining moments in Royals history, including the club's first World Series in 1985. Long after his playing days, he continued to shape generations of players and strengthen the organization he proudly called home.

They called him The Duke, but what truly set John Wathan apart was not just his talent. It was his loyalty, his love, and his humility. The city of Kansas City is 100 percent behind him.

This honor is more than overdue. It is a testament to a lifelong commitment to the game, to the city, and to our community.

Mr. Speaker, legends aren't just defined by what they achieve but how they are serving others. John Wathan's legacy will continue to inspire for generations to come.

We are so proud to congratulate The Duke and his family on this incredible honor.

CONGRATULATING BEVERLY WHARTON, VIRGINIA'S SEVENTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENT OF THE WEEK

(Mr. VINDMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Ms. Beverly Wharton, my Constituent of the Week, for her more than 43 years of service as a registered nurse at the UVA Health Culpeper Medical Center.

Beverly Wharton is a critical care nurse, and she has been doing that job since 1992. She has served on the front lines caring for patients and families during their most vulnerable moments. During the COVID-19 pandemic, she demonstrated extraordinary courage and compassion and helped save countless lives.

Her commitment to excellence, her steady leadership, and her compassion for others have made a lasting impact on her colleagues, patients, and the entire Culpeper community.

Beverly embodies the very best of the nursing profession. I thank her for her remarkable service and congratulate her on this milestone.

FIGHT AGAINST ASSAULT ON PUBLIC LANDS

(Ms. STANSBURY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, this week the administration has continued its assault on our public and sacred lands, repealing critical protections for Chaco Canyon and Bears Ears, two of our most sacred cultural landscapes.

For New Mexico's Tribes and pueblos, these are not relics of the past. They are living, sacred places where history,

culture, religion, and identity endure. They hold thousands of ancestral sites that are central to ceremonies, traditions, the stories, and the people who have cared for these lands since time immemorial.

These repeals disregard years of Tribal consultation and open the door to oil, gas, and mining, threatening sacred sites that are irreplaceable.

Let me be clear, though. This fight is not over. We will stand with our Tribal Nations, our communities, and everyone fighting on the front lines. We will fight back in the courts, in Congress, and alongside our Tribal Nations and the American people because our sacred sites are not for sale.

□ 1140

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JULY 16, 2026, TO SATURDAY, JULY 18, 2026, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM SATURDAY, JULY 18, 2026, TO MONDAY, JULY 20, 2026

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Saturday, July 18, 2026, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 20, 2026, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JUSTICE FOR NORTHWEST OHIO RATEPAYERS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, justice delayed is justice denied. That couldn't be more true for the thousands of honest, hardworking people and businesses I represent in northwestern Ohio.

They were wronged for decades by the largest nuclear power corruption scandal in both American and Ohio history. First Energy took the public's money to buy influence and bail out failing nuclear plants, costing the public over \$1 billion and counting, at a minimum. That is money stripped from families and our local economy.

Just weeks ago, First Energy visited the Public Utility Commission of Ohio seeking to raise electricity bills again—this time for 3 more years. This follows a mistrial declared in the spring in the State in its ongoing corruption case and Federal litigation that is ongoing for conspiracy, wire fraud, and bribery.

It is over time to recover the money taken and return it to the ratepayers. Nuclear power executives must be held accountable. The Ratepayer Justice Act I just introduced yesterday would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Energy and Commerce Committee to act with dispatch to schedule a hearing on this important bill. Mr. Speaker, let's get to the bottom of this once and for all and return the public's money.

STILL I RISE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, and today, in the name of we the people. I rise censored, Mr. Speaker, but not silenced. I rise as a unbought, unbossed, liberated Democrat—some would also add unelected liberated Democrat. My friends over on the racist radio say that proudly, and they have a lot of alacrity when they say it. They seem to say it because they seem to think that somehow they played a role in it happening. Well, be that as it may, I still rise in the name of we the people.

I rise in the name of we the people today, Mr. Speaker, because of concern that I have with the killing that took place in Houston, Texas. As a result of some other things that happened, there was a killing in Maine. I sent out a tweet, as it were. I am not sure that they are called tweets anymore, but a message by way of the electronic social media. I would like to read this message because it is the essence of my message today.

It reads: @realDonaldTrump—I am told that by saying “@realDonaldTrump” in this message, the President should have an opportunity to hear about it and possibly read it himself. “@realDonaldTrump, your ICE force has killed a person in Maine. After the killings of Good, Pretti, and Araujo, without accountability, we cannot trust your Homeland Security or Justice Department to investigate ICE. ‘We the people’ demand accountability and congressional oversight.”

I rise in the name of we the people to demand accountability and oversight. I do so because, quite frankly, I am concerned about the possibility of a cover-up, and I am also concerned about the possibility of a clean-up. Let's start with the clean-up, and then I will move into the cover-up.

The clean-up. You might recall, friends, that there was an assault on the citadel of democracy, this Capitol. You might recall, also, that there were persons who engaged in this dastardly act of cowardice. They were here to prevent the peaceful transfer of power at the insistence of the President, it seems. He delivered incited commentary that caused much of what happened that day to take place.

They were here and did some things that were unlawful. They were unlawful, and we know they were unlawful because they were prosecuted, many of them—not just 5 or 10, not just 20 or 30, not just 100 or 200. Hundreds of them

were prosecuted—after they were prosecuted, convicted and sentenced.

We also know that the President, upon being reelected—upon being reelected, one of his first acts as a new President for a new term of office—this was not his first term, his second term—his first act was to pardon the people who assaulted the citadel of democracy at a time when there was an attempt to engage in a peaceful transfer of power, something that our country is known for far and wide. We are known for the peaceful transfer of power.

After he pardoned them, they were able to walk freely. They were pardoned.

Now, let's bring that forward. Given what has happened to the persons who were here to prevent the peaceful transfer of power, who were convicted and who were pardoned by the President. The people who are a part of the ICE force are very much aware of what happened, and they know that the President—who gave a pardon to those persons who assaulted the Citadel of Democracy—they know that this President can provide them a pardon if they are charged with a Federal offense.

Because they know, it is my belief that this somehow has caused some of them to believe that they have a license to exceed what the law allows—some of them, not all. This is not a condemnation of everybody. This is about the people who have done things that are unlawful, in my opinion. They know this. As a result of knowing it, I think they take liberties that they should not because they know that the President—to borrow a term that we use in my hood—will have their backs. They know.

Let's now examine a rationale for my being concerned about the possibility of a cover-up. That was the clean-up, by the way. The clean-up occurred when the President had those persons released—after he pardoned them, of course—who had been found guilty. They were released. They are walking freely.

By the way, that was lawful. The President has every right to pardon people, and he doesn't really have to give a rationale for it. That was a clean-up of what he started when he engaged in this movement to prevent the peaceful transfer of power.

Unfortunately for him, and fortunately for the country, it did not succeed. So now, back to where I was.

□ 1150

After the cleanup having occurred and these officers now understanding that the President has this authority, then we have to examine what happened next with Ms. Good.

Let's talk about Ms. Good first.

We, with our very own eyes, saw most of what happened with Ms. Good, and we can say, because of what we saw if we want to believe our eyes, that Ms. Good was not there to harm anyone. She was unarmed. She was an Amer-

ican citizen. She was engaging in a peaceful protest—unarmed American citizen, and engaging in peaceful protest—when confronted by officers who were making demands. If you saw what happened, you know that it ended with her losing her life.

She said kind things, by the way, to the officers, kind things, but she lost her life. We saw this with our own eyes. We saw it.

Let's move over to Mr. Pretti.

We saw Mr. Pretti as he was prostrate. He was sprawled on the ground and an officer removed a weapon that he had, but it was after the removal of the weapon that he was shot. He lost his life. He was an American citizen, not armed at the time his life was taken. He was an American citizen engaging in peaceful protests.

These two cases are worthy of following because to this day, we don't have credible information about what has happened. We don't really know when or if there will be charges that will be brought before a court of law such that there would be a trial.

These cases are evidence of the fact that at least these investigators are taking an unusual amount of time to bring these cases to the attention of the public in a fashion such that the public will understand that there will or will not be prosecution.

I happen to think there should be prosecution, but if there is not going to be prosecution, if they found some evidence beyond what we have been able to see and hear, then I think they should bring this evidence forward and let us have an opportunity to review it so that we can, again, have the transparency necessary for the public to have the knowledge that it is entitled to when an American citizen has been killed at the hands of the constabulary.

We should know. We should have the opportunity to be told by credible sources what the final decision is, whether we are moving forward with trials. With this happening the way it is happening and given that we were able to see in these two cases most of what happened—didn't see all of it, but most of what happened—in fact, I would say we saw the relevant portions, but there may be something else that is there that we need to see, but we saw relevant portions.

Having to see that and not seeing any action taken after all of these months have passed that causes me the consternation and concern that I placed in my message to the masses today indicating that I am concerned about and would be addressing a possible cover-up.

We live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right, they must also look right. It doesn't look right for these two cases to be pending. We have two additional cases now, and we also have very little evidence of what actually occurred in one of these cases, and that would be the case with Mr. Araujo.

We don't have all of the evidence of what occurred. We saw enough to get

some sense of what is likely to have happened, but because we don't have enough evidence—we are told that there were no body cameras. There were no vehicle cameras. We don't have any evidence from the side that should produce evidence because they should have had their body cameras on. There was \$20 million accorded to them for body cameras. They should have had vehicle cameras. There should have been cameras, but they don't have the cameras. They don't have the cameras.

Now, why would I believe, as in the case with Mr. Araujo, why would I believe the story that the person who is deceased, Mr. Araujo, tried to assault officers with a vehicle? Why would I believe that given that we have seen stories manifest themselves about the cases that we actually saw wherein the original stories told were not in conformity with what our eyes allowed us to see.

Immediately after the shooting of Pretti, immediately after the shooting of Good, there was a story put forth that was not in conformity with what we saw.

If we know that you will send us a message, a false message, about things that we saw, you send a false message about things that we saw, a prevarication about things that we saw, why should I believe that you are going to do anything less in a case where we didn't see everything?

I am concerned about a cover-up. I am concerned about a cover-up because, as I have explained, these officers are aware that there will be a cleanup. If the President is true to his words and he honors what he says he will do, he has given hints to officers in his prior administration about how they should conduct themselves when arresting people. He told their officers, you don't have to be nice, words from the President of the United States of America about making an arrest. You don't have to be nice, implying that he had their back.

He was implying that we are not as much concerned about law and order as we are about order and law. Law and order means you are going to follow the law to bring about the order necessary. Order and law means you restore order and I will provide the law—this is the President, not AL GREEN—I will provide the law necessary to protect you.

Why should I believe the stories that are being told when we don't see evidence of the cars having collided? Why should I believe when the officers who were engaged in this circumstance that cost the life of a human being in Houston, Texas—they have been secreted away, why should I believe when you have shut out the engagement of other members of the constabulary, of the Houston Police Department?

You have said, apparently based upon what I have been told and heard, that the Houston Police Department should not attempt to engage because you are going to take care of this yourselves.

The Houston Police Department investigates. It doesn't prosecute, but it has one of the finest homicide departments in the country. It investigates homicides. The Houston Police Department has investigated police shootings in the past.

The Houston Police Department has investigated circumstances where officers who were not in the Houston Police Department, but officers of the law, have been investigated.

The Houston Police Department is capable, competent, and qualified to have this investigation, but you are shutting out the Houston Police Department wherein we could get some scintilla of transparency by virtue of having another authority engaged in the process of investigation. You shut them out. You have gone so far as to shut out the district attorney in Harris County.

They can't get the information that you have such that they can give an analysis. They haven't talked to the officers who were engaged in the shooting. They haven't been able to assess the value that you place on what you now are saying appears to be some sort of drugs that were in the vehicle, the vehicle that Mr. Araujo was driving.

Yes, for those who do not know, the allegation is being made now that there may have been drugs in the vehicle. They saw this substance in there and they are contending that it might be some form of illegal drugs.

□ 1200

Why do we believe all of these things when we were told not to believe our eyes in the case of Pretti and Good? Why would we not have some degree of suspicion? Why would we not think that you are, Mr. President, in charge of this ICE force? You, Mr. President, after the person who is now heading Homeland Security, Mr. Mullin, why would you countermand what he has done?

Mr. Mullin, as I understand it by way of news reports, was going to put a pause on stopping cars. Mr. Mullin was going to give a moment of opportunity to take a look at circumstances and see if there is a better way to do what you are doing, but you, Mr. President, yourself, countermanded what came from your Department of Homeland Security. You did it knowing that he had done this because of the way your language was couched as you presented your command that the officers go back to stopping cars. You made that very clear, that they should do that, that this was something that they should continue to do.

You use the term "weak," don't want them to look weak, Mr. President. We have to ask why would we the people believe that there will be justice served given that we know that you tend to want to decide without having the opportunity to see what actually occurred? You tend to want to decide before seeing and making your decisions about what the officers have done, and

then moving from there, it seems, by and through your agents in the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice, by and through what they say.

They are at your command. We should make no mistake about it. You are in control. The Supreme Court has given you the green light. You have taken advantage of it. That is why you sent out your message by way of your Truth Social, indicating that you were countermanding the order from the person that you just installed as your person who is in charge of Homeland Security.

Why would we believe? Why should we believe that you are going to do all that you can to ensure transparency?

To the contrary, it would not be unreasonable for a person to believe that there may be a coverup, and if not a coverup, if there is a conviction, that there would be a cleanup.

You will try first to do all that you can to exonerate the officers, make sure that the investigation centers around whether the person who is deceased, the victim, was trying to harm the officers. That is what has been said: make sure the investigation is on whether the victim was trying to harm the officers.

I have not heard to date—and I know that initially it was not said—that there would be an investigation as to whether the civil rights of the victim had been violated, no investigation about the civil rights of the victim being violated, but whether the victim was making an effort to assault the officers.

The visceral reaction is let's protect the officers, not let's have a free, open, fair investigation. When I say "free," free for other persons to see and to be a part of. Have a parallel investigation with the Houston Police Department. There was none of that, none of that, just immediately decide that you are going to investigate the person who has lost his life without some indication that there would be an investigation as to whether or not the person who lost his life had his civil rights violated, the right to life, whether that has been taken away from him unlawfully.

So, here we are now. We have Mr. Araujo in Houston. We have two other persons in Minnesota. We have a person in Maine. We have a President who has taken control himself, has hands-on experience with what is happening in these Departments.

Nobody can deny that he is without knowledge of what is going on. His latest messages are indicative of his level of engagement and of the knowledge that he has as it relates to these circumstances. He is in charge. This is his Department of Justice. It is his Office of Homeland Security, and these people do believe that they work for him.

What makes you say this, that they believe they work for him? Well, just yesterday, Mr. Vought, who is with the CFPB, indicated at a hearing that he

works for the President. Just as recently as yesterday or the day before—I believe it was yesterday—we had the person who is auditioning before the Senate for a position with the Department of Justice. This person made it very clear that he works for the President, or at least he did. He said he was the President's lawyer. Maybe it was a Freudian slip, but he said he was the President's lawyer.

So you have people who tend to do whatever you say. When your Cabinet meets, there is an effort to see who can give you the most praise. You have them all under your thumb. They are all under your control. They all bend a knee to you. They all kiss the ring. They are your people who serve you, not the country.

The country is not primary. It may be secondary. It may be tertiary. It could even be quaternary, but it is not primary. They believe in you and report to you.

Given these circumstances, why should we believe that you are going to cause the right thing to be done?

Mr. President, others have said, and I have said—and I say it now—the blood of the people who I have called to your attention today, the blood of these persons is on your hands. It is. Other people are saying it. Other people are linking you directly to what has happened. I think they should, given that we know that you are in control, in command, in authority, and that you have knowledge.

You are not like a typical President who leaves things to others to do and decisions to be made. When there is a crucial decision to make, you make it, as evidenced by what you have done with your Truth Social and the case of the gentleman who was killed in Maine. You made the crucial decision as to how the officers will behave when they encounter the opportunity to observe, make an arrest at a later time, as opposed to rush in with guns blazing. You have made the decision that they can continue to do what they have been doing, but you do try to cover yourself by using the term "judiciously," that they should behave judiciously. That is only to cover. We understand what is going on, Mr. President.

It seems to me that it would not be unreasonable for a reasonable and prudent person to conclude that there may be a coverup in this case, and if there is a conviction in the Federal court, there will be a cleanup—may be a coverup and will be a cleanup if you find—if the courts find, I should say—I shouldn't say "you." You haven't taken complete control of the courts. You do have an outsized amount of influence, it seems.

If the courts find that there is a Federal crime, I am saying here and now, without question, reservation, or hesitation, I believe that you, Mr. President, will pardon the persons who have taken these lives.

I believe that you want to send a message to others, as you did on your

first day in office when you pardoned the persons for what happened here at the citadel of democracy when there was a peaceful transfer of power taking place. You want to send a message and let officers know that you have their backs.

□ 1210

You do this because you want to complete your mission of removing persons from this country, many of whom are not the worst of the worst. You want to send a message that you are going to remove and people should be intimidated, they should be terrorized, and they should leave the country of their own volition before you have the opportunity to send your agents out—your ICE agents—with masks, with no body cameras, and with, sometimes, malice aforethought, in my opinion. Not all the time, but sometimes.

Mr. President, we, the people, are not going to allow you to continue with this kind of behavior. We, the people, are not going to allow you to continue to do this. While you are President of the United States and the Supreme Court has given you a certain amount of immunity, allow me to place another poster before you.

Mr. President, this is real. This is real, Mr. President. There is a countdown to impeachment. I have been very patient in waiting. I thought others might want to do what has to be done, and I say it has to be done. People can differ with me. I say it has to be done. It is the only tool that we have to bring you under control, to let the world know that we are opposed to what you are doing, and we are willing to take action against you.

This is it, this one word: Impeachment.

Mr. President, I assure you that Articles of Impeachment are going to be filed, and they are going to be filed in the very near future because we cannot allow the world to believe that the Congress of the United States of America will do nothing when people are being killed in the streets under circumstances that are clearly questionable and clearly unlawful in the minds of many people. I am one of them. Under these circumstances, we have to take action, and the only action is impeachment.

We in Congress can talk about a lot of things that we will do next year. By the way, I marvel at people who will run for office on what they are going to do, and then when they get here, they talk about what they will do next year. They give people the impression that they are going to come here and change things, that they know things that other people don't know about the process, that they have something called a strategic approach, and this strategic approach—they never say what it is going to be, but this strategic approach is supposed to make a difference, that people who have been here for years and years and studied

these things can have it made. And then when you get here, you talk about next year, we are going to be really tough. We are going to be really tough when we take back the House next year.

Some of us don't buy into waiting until next year. Some of us believe that the time is always right to do what is right, and it is right to bring impeachment against this President of the United States of America. We don't have to wait until next year.

Do what you want next year when you have the power to investigate, when you have subpoena power, but most of the public wants to know what you are going to do right now.

Here is what will happen right now, and it is going to happen very soon. How soon? Within weeks. Within weeks, it is going to happen. There will be Articles of Impeachment, and they will be brought to a vote, not just filed. We are going to vote.

This is a question of conscience. I want to live with myself. I want to be able to say to myself, to me, that, on my watch, I did all that I could to stop a reckless, ruthless, lawless President from taking the lives of the American people.

I am AL GREEN, a liberated Democrat, unbought, unbossed, unafraid, and unelected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Saturday, July 18, 2026, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-4094. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31669; Amdt. No.: 592] received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4095. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31667; Amdt. No.: 4221] received June 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4096. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department

of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31668; Amdt. No.: 4222] received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4097. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Jet Routes J-70 and J-94 and Amendment of Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range Federal Airways V-30, V-55, V-84, V-170, and V-274 and Revocation of Jet Routes J-547 and J-548 in the Vicinity of Pullman, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2025-5244; Airspace Docket No.: 25-AGL-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4098. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31670; Amdt. No.: 4223] received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4099. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Rosenberg, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2026-4093; Airspace Docket No.: 26-ASW-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4100. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Barksdale, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2026-4171; Airspace Docket No.: 26-ASW-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4101. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Glen Rose, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2026-4167; Airspace Docket No.: 26-ASW-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4102. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Ralph Wien Memorial Airport, Kotzebue, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2025-2423; Airspace Docket No.: 23-AAL-10] received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4103. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Canton, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2026-3763; Airspace Docket No.: 26-AGL-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 10, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4104. A letter from the Manager, Legal Legislation and Support, FAA, Department