

safe; keeping people safe at concerts, like in Las Vegas; keeping people safe in church, like in South Carolina; keeping people safe in their public schools, like in Parkland, Florida; keeping college students safe, like at Virginia Tech. That is what we are talking about doing.

Now, we don't know why Congress won't act. Some people are starting to hypothesize that America has become a failed state, that we can't respond to an almost unanimous demand by our own people to legislate in the interests of public safety, which is the most elementary requirement of a civilized society under a social contract.

Some people say we have become a failed state, like failed states we see around the world. You know that authoritarianism is on the march all over the world, whether it is in Putin's Russia or Duterte's Philippines or Orban's Hungary or Erdogan's Turkey, where it is all about enriching the people in power—ignoring the needs of the people, ignoring the rights of the people, but instead, using government as a money-making operation for a tiny group of people.

Have we become a failed state? Is that what we are? I don't think we are a failed state.

We have had other periods in American history where Congress has refused to deal with pressing public policy problems. One of the most famous ones, beginning in the 1830s, was when a proslavery faction within Congress said it would refuse to have any hearings at all and would refuse to entertain any petitions against slavery from anywhere in the country. It was a direct assault on the right to petition Congress for redress of grievances, it was a direct assault on the freedom of speech, but they imposed this stranglehold on Congress so there could be no debate on the most pressing issue of the day.

Now, I am not likening slavery to gun violence. Okay? I want to be clear about that. But I am saying that there are other times in American history where Congress has acted as a chokehold against the ventilation of serious public concerns and grievances. There have been times when Congress has refused to engage in debate, discussion, and analysis of the most pressing problems of the day, and that is where we are right now on gun violence.

All we are saying, Mr. Speaker, to the majority in Congress, is let's have some hearings on this, let's have some hearings on a universal criminal and mental background check being demanded by nearly every American right now. Let's start with that. Is that one thing we can all agree on, that there should be a background check before people go out and obtain weapons of war that they then carry into the hallways and the schoolrooms of our country? Can we have a hearing on that?

If you don't want to vote for it, you can stand up with the 1 or 2 percent of

the people who are against it, but allow those of us who want to represent the 97 or 98 percent of the people who are for it to have a vote, because we don't think that terrorists and criminals should be able to go to a gun show and purchase firearms, including AR-15s, without a criminal background check. We don't think that.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have got a consensus in America on this. Let's not stifle the consensus. Let's not choke off the ability of the American people and their representatives to govern. That is why we were sent here, to legislate.

The essence of legislation is hearings. We have to hear the American people, we have to hear the experts, we have to collect the evidence. We have got to overturn the ban on the collection of statistics about gun violence that was imposed a few decades ago on the CDC. We have got to collect the information, and we have to act.

The time for just prayers and meditation about the problem is long gone, as the young people from Parkland, Florida, have told us.

They were told in the wake of the massacre: It is too early to start debating gun policy.

They turned around, and they said: No. It is too late to be debating gun policy. This should have been done after Las Vegas. It should have been done after San Bernardino County. It should have been done after the Sandy Hook massacre. It should have been done after Virginia Tech.

How many more massacres do we have to await before this Congress decides something really must be done? How many more massacres? That is what America is asking us, Mr. Speaker.

Please, let's do our job. We have sworn an oath to the American people. Let's go and represent the public will, let's make it consistent with the Second Amendment, because it is very easy to do so. We proved it in the State of Maryland, and the Supreme Court has told us we can pass reasonable commonsense gun safety measures without violating anyone's rights.

We have got a consensus in America. In Congress, we have got to do our job and let that consensus become the law.

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

WE MUST PROTECT THE SOVEREIGNTY OF OUR NATION

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address the House and people across the country.

I am joined today by two of my friends, JARED HUFFMAN, Congressman from northern California; and DAN KILDEE, Congressman from Flint, Michigan.

We are here on another very important topic. We just heard our friend, JAMIE RASKIN from Maryland, talking about gun violence and the need to try to limit that and bring it under control, but today we have another very important topic, a very troubling topic, and it has to do with the sovereignty of our Nation.

□ 1730

It has to do with our freedom, and it is really as pretty simple as that.

This country separated from England so that we could be a sovereign nation, so that we could rule ourselves, and right now that is a real big question as to whether or not that is happening, because it is clear that the Russians interfered with our elections last year.

The investigation into that interference now has resulted in at least 13 indictments of Russians, coupled with indictments of 5 or 6 people, 5 of whom have pled guilty to some crime or another based upon the investigation conducted by Robert Mueller. There seems to be something going on between the Trump administration and Russia, and we want to know what it is. The investigation is directed at that.

Mr. Speaker, it starts with something that we asked for last year. We asked to see the President's tax returns. We asked for it on a number of occasions. But unlike anybody else who has run for President or who has been President, our President has refused to turn over his tax returns.

So the question we ask is: Why? What is in there that would stop him from producing his tax returns? Is it a relationship that shows some kind of financial connection to Russia or the like? What is in there? Is he hiding something? What is it?

As time has gone on, starting with that question, we have some more questions. There has been this effort, beginning last summer, to question the integrity of the FBI and to question Mr. Mueller and this investigation to the point there was word that Mr. Mueller was going to be fired from his job last summer, and that question seems to percolate to the surface every so often.

And the question is: Why? What are they afraid of that he might find? What connections are they worried about that Mr. Mueller may uncover that really are hurting our Nation? So what is it that they are hiding? What are they afraid of?

These are very simple questions that need to be answered. This is important because this goes back to the heart of why our Nation was founded and the heart of all of us as Americans. It is our sovereignty, and it is our freedom. And if, in fact, we are being directed, our government is being directed by a foreign entity, by Vladimir Putin or Russia, generally, then this country has been undermined to a degree none of us could have ever seen coming.

Now, hopefully, that is not the case, but let's get this investigation going.

Let's keep it going. Let's not impugn the integrity of our detectives, the FBI, or the prosecutors who are trying to just find out what the truth is. And any kinds of actions to really undermine that, whether it is from here in the Congress or from the executive branch, it is like: What are you afraid of? What are you hiding?

So just to kind of connect a couple more dots, something that I am concerned about, and I know my friends are, too, is you go back to our sovereignty, our freedom—and this Congress, Mr. Speaker—particularly concerned about the interference by the Russians in our elections. There is not any question that there has been some interference.

We know that the Russians are flexing their muscle around the world. In fact, Putin, the other day, said: I have got nuclear weapons you can't detect.

So they are flexing their muscles.

We as a Congress—419-3 in this House, and 98-2 in the Senate, virtually unanimously—said: We want you to be imposing sanctions against this Russian interference, against some things that they have been doing around the world.

Not one sanction has been added by the Trump administration. Why not?

Even more perplexing, the State Department has been appropriated, Mr. Speaker, \$120 million to prevent further espionage and interference by the Russians in our elections. Do you know how much money has been spent by them, by the State Department under this White House, to stop this interference, to stop this espionage? Not one dollar.

These departments generally say we need more money to do X, Y, or Z. Here, something so important as to the integrity of our elections, not \$1 spent by the State Department, despite the fact that this Congress appropriated \$120 million. Why not?

So a lot of questions are out there. I think it is time, and I think my friends will make some comments and statements similar to mine: What are you afraid of? What are you hiding? Let the detectives in the FBI, let the prosecutors do their job.

Why aren't sanctions being imposed? And why aren't we using the money we have appropriated to spend against this espionage and interference? Why aren't you spending it?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) to see if he has any answers or if he only has questions about what is going on.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado because I have all of the same questions and all of the same concerns, and so it is very appropriate that we are coming together to ask what are they afraid of, what are they hiding, because there are a lot of red flags.

Last night, Mr. PERLMUTTER, I was at the Washington Press Club event, which is a fun event to celebrate the

free press. The best joke of the night—and there is a lot of humorous material. The best joke of the night was when someone said, for a guy that claims he doesn't drink, President Trump sure loves a lot of White Russians. That brought the house down.

Unfortunately, though, it is not really funny because, when you have got a President who won't impose the sanctions that we authorize him to impose, who won't direct his State Department to spend the funds to protect our election system that we authorize and appropriate, when you have all of these other problems, it is not clear that he is able to do his job without fear or favor, and that is a big problem for our democracy and for the interests of our country.

If Congress were doing its job right now, we would be asking the hard questions to bring forward the transparency that the people need, to give this country the assurance that their government officials, including their President, can perform their job without fear or favor. But, unfortunately, this body is not doing a very good job of asking those hard questions, so that is, in part, why we are here trying to raise some of these issues.

One of the very important questions that I think we have to ask involves the ties between the NRA, yes, the National Rifle Association, and this Trump Russia scandal. Specifically, we need to know whether Russia worked through the NRA to illegally move funds in support of the Trump campaign.

Here is what we do know. We know that McClatchy and others have reported that the FBI is actually investigating whether Aleksandr Torshin, deputy governor of Russia's central bank and NRA's main liaison in Russia, used the NRA to funnel millions of dollars to support Donald Trump's candidacy in 2016.

We know that in 2016 Donald Trump, Jr., had dinner with Torshin, who is a close ally of Vladimir Putin—also someone accused of money laundering—and they had that dinner at the NRA convention.

We know that the NRA spent tens of millions of dollars on the 2016 elections, including \$30 million to support Donald Trump. That is three times what the NRA spent to support Mitt Romney when he was the Republican nominee just 4 years prior.

So we need to think about and ask this question: Where did all that money come from? We have asked the NRA. The NRA won't tell us.

Now, we know that in testimony to the House Intelligence Committee, there are indications that Russians made a very concerted effort to work through the NRA, and that is why Senator RON WYDEN has asked the Treasury Department—again, because the NRA won't answer these questions, but he has asked the Treasury Department for more information about suspicious Russian funding of the NRA.

So just to recap a few of these things that we need to be asking about: We know how close President Trump is to the NRA. We know how close the Russian banker Alex Torshin is to the NRA. We know how close the NRA is becoming, closer and closer, to Russia.

In fact, I have a piece here that explains how, in 2015, a series of top NRA officials—including one of their top donors, past presidents, a delegation that included Donald Trump's high-profile surrogate, Sheriff David Clarke—all went on a so-called fact-finding mission involving gun rights in Russia.

Now, there aren't a lot of gun rights in Russia. Russia has very restrictive gun laws, and there is no serious effort in the country of Russia to change that. But, nevertheless, apparently this group felt they needed to go to Russia for this fact-finding trip to cozy up with some of these same folks that we are talking about. So that is one of the things we know and we need to ask questions about.

We know that the NRA spent this huge cache of money on the 2016 campaign to support Donald Trump, and we know that we have more questions that need to be answered. So we need to follow this money, and we need to find out, again, as you have asked here on the floor: What are they hiding? What are they afraid of?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and he will make some comments about how he perceives all of this, and then I am going to open it up to a little conversation among the three of us.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, like my friend Mr. PERLMUTTER and my friend Mr. HUFFMAN and others, we didn't come to the Congress with the idea that we were going to spend our time talking about Russian collusion with a campaign to try to undermine our electoral system. We came here to solve problems that Americans want us to take on, to deal with the big problems that we face, whether it is infrastructure or education or the environment or all the things that people actually worry about, financial security for families.

But we do have an obligation to uphold the oath that we took. We swore an oath to the Constitution of the United States. So while it is not my preference, and I know from my friends it is not our preference to have to deal with this question, we can't avoid it. We can't just look the other way, particularly when it is very clear that not just this President, but, sadly, some around him; and I think we have to acknowledge some of our Republican colleagues seem willing to try to interfere with or obfuscate what is a really important investigation.

Let's remind ourselves, Mr. Mueller, who is leading this investigation, the special counsel, was appointed by the Republican Attorney General, appointed by the President of the United States, both Republicans. Bob Mueller

was appointed head of the FBI by a Republican President.

This is not a partisan question, certainly not a partisan witch hunt. This is a question as to whether or not we are going to let this investigation go to completion.

The President keeps saying no collusion. The truth of the matter is, so far, there has been no conclusion. There is no conclusion to be drawn yet from this investigation, other than 17 individuals have been indicted. Several have pled guilty to very serious crimes, some people who have been very close to the President of the United States, the closest you can be, literally engaged in his campaign, side by side with him every day.

So it begs the question and, really, the most important question: What are they afraid of? What do they have to worry about?

If there is nothing to find, if there is no collusion, then let's let the process complete itself. Let's let the process come to conclusion and accept the result.

So this is really a fundamental question to our democracy: Are we going to adhere to the rule of law, or are we going to allow a President to rule by fiat and, essentially, dismiss or diminish or discredit anyone who raises any question about his conduct coming into or performing his duties?

□ 1745

That is not the America that we know, and that is not a standard that we ought to allow: 17 people indicted, people at the top of his campaign, including a whole group of Russians who clearly were engaged in trying to affect our election.

You know, don't you remember the good ol' days? I think about some of our friends on the other side, when the biggest scandal that they could come up with was that the President of the United States wore a tan suit. The outrage. Where is the outrage now when a special counsel has been appointed and, at every moment, there is an attempt to try to discredit the work that this individual is doing?

So I ask my Republican colleagues to stand up, adhere to the oath that they swore, support this process, allow for your own good and the good of the country, allow the investigation to be completed without interference. Push back when the President tries to discredit this process. There is just too much at stake. What are they afraid of? What are they worried about?

This guy is a professional. When he was appointed, remember the chorus of praise left, right, and center for Bob Mueller and the integrity with which he has conducted himself in public life. He didn't change. He is still doing that. Let's let him do his work.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan for his comments. And he was talking about the 17 indictments. We have a poster here. Starting over on the far side of

this poster to my right is Paul Manafort, the campaign chairman. Then we have 13 Russians who have been indicted, plus three Russian companies that interfered with our elections, and we will see how these indictments and the cases unfold, but Bob Mueller and the team have said those people should be indicted.

This side, we have guilty pleas by Michael Flynn, National Security Advisor; Rick Gates, assistant campaign manager; George Papadopoulos, campaign adviser; Richard Pinedo, apparently he did some kind of—stole identity from somebody; and a lawyer, Alex van der Zwaan, from—he is a foreign lawyer who worked for a firm here in the United States. We have five guilty pleas. We have 14, 15, 16 indictments. There is a lot of smoke. Where there is smoke, there is fire.

Mr. KILDEE talked about sort of the bread-and-butter issues: Do I have a good job? Am I ready as the economy changes and innovation kicks in; am I going to be ready for the next job? You know, do we have the proper infrastructure for this country so that for the next 50 years we can compete with anybody at any time?

I mean, those are the conversations we really want to have. But when you get down to it, at the very heart of why we are America, why we are the United States of America, it is about our freedom. It is about the sovereignty of this Nation to conduct its own affairs without interference by another entity: Russia, England, Japan, North Korea, it doesn't matter. We want to take care of ourselves and not be told what to do by others.

That interference from outside of this country, despite these big questions we have as to our infrastructure, our future of our workplace, our education, when it comes to freedom, you don't step away. You don't ignore attacks on our freedom.

And we are not going to let that happen. I am just very pleased that these two men joining me today, and Democrats, really, throughout this Chamber, and I know some Republicans, are very concerned about what is unfolding. And all of us are asking: What is the problem here? What are you hiding? What are you afraid of? Why won't you let the detectives do their work?

Sam Nunberg, he was going to—last night, he was on all the TV stations: I am not going to honor that subpoena. What is he afraid of?

We have been joined by our friend JAMIE RASKIN, but, first, let me give him a second to catch his breath.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from northern California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for a comment or two, and then I will yield to Mr. RASKIN.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman PERLMUTTER is asking all the right questions, and it seems to me, in the short time we have been on the floor here, in some ways, we are asking harder questions than what we are seeing from the committees that should

be conducting oversight and investigations if Congress were functioning and taking this issue as seriously as it should.

Those questions would include very disturbing reporting, just in the last few days in *The New Yorker*, that suggests that the Steele dossier may just be the tip of the iceberg; that, in fact, you have senior Russian officials who claim that they had something of a veto power over our choice for Secretary of State.

We should be looking into that right now in a very intense way, and the American people should know that we take those matters very seriously. But so much of this simply flies by these days with the constantly moving media cycle, and I think more and more people are beginning to wonder if Congress is interested in even asking hard questions or if we just have to sit back and either wait for Special Counsel Mueller to catch these folks in crimes or wait for the media. Thank God for the free press, but the media is unearthing far more information than the oversight actions of this Congress, and that is disappointing.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, you know, we have got to say to the Speaker and to the other Republicans in this Chamber, you know, they need to do their job on this thing. This isn't just something that is peanuts. This goes to the heart of what America is all about: our freedom and our sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PERLMUTTER very much for yielding for just a moment. I was very moved by his comments. We know that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and I want to salute him for his vigilance and his zealotry in defending American freedom and our democratic process against foreign and potentially domestic enemies, those who would subvert and undermine our political processes.

It seems to me that, in Congress, we have two jobs that we need to do now. One is to defend the Mueller investigation and the Department of Justice against unfair attacks and attempts to subvert and undermine investigation; and two, and perhaps more importantly now, is we have got to work to fortify our election systems against a repeat in 2018.

The U.S. intelligence agencies, they told us, in January of 2017, that there had been a campaign of cyber espionage and cyber sabotage and cyber propaganda against the American elections. They have told us that the Russians are very likely to be doing the same thing with respect to the 2018 election. And, by the way, it is not just the Russians now. They may have just set the template for other bad actors who want to stick their nose into American elections, too.

You know, James Q. Wilson wrote this book called, "Broken Windows,"

where he said if somebody throws a rock into a window and you have got a broken window and nobody does anything about it, it is an invitation for more people to come along and break some more windows. Well, right now, the U.S. Government has done nothing.

As you have said, we have not spent the money in the State Department to try to defend ourselves against the foreign subversion of our elections and cyber espionage and sabotage. And when we had the Attorney General come to the Judiciary Committee, we asked him what had he engaged in to try to defend our elections across the country against another attack, and he said basically nothing. And followup efforts by members of the committee to get the Attorney General to meet with us have resulted in nothing.

So, this week, we have asked for \$14 million from the appropriators to go to the Election Assistance Commission, which is the only Federal body we have got that is charged with trying to help State election administrators defend themselves against cyber attack. That \$14 million is urgent and necessary, and it is obviously a very small sum of money, given the amount of money we spend on defense in America, but this is defense of our elections.

We are also asking for \$400 million to help update outmoded and weak election technology in the States today. That is another badly needed infusion of cash to the States so we can fortify our elections. We know that at least 22 States suffered attempted electronic probes by foreign actors in 2016, and they are coming back in 2018, and everybody wants to know what are we doing about it, and we have no coordinated plan. At the very least, we should get this money to the Election Assistance Commission so we can help the States harden themselves.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for participating with us. We are going to be doing this because we want people asking this question all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my friend from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to let him close us out.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PERLMUTTER for yielding, and I want to just underscore a point he made in his opening remarks.

This is fundamentally about a principle that we hold pretty dear in this country, and, that is, our freedom. Our freedom is rooted in the assumption that our democratic systems actually work, that the process of democracy has integrity, and that the choices that people make are not the subject of interference by some foreign power.

We know that Russia interfered in our elections. There are only two people I can think of who have denied that repeatedly. One of them is President Trump; the other one is Vladimir Putin. Everyone else, including our Republican colleagues and our intelligence community, acknowledges that

the Russians interfered with our elections.

Five people have acknowledged that they committed crimes as a result of the investigations taking place; 12 other—15 others indicted. Why on Earth would we not allow the investigation that is taking place right now to determine the extent of that interference in order to prevent it from ever happening again? Why would we not insist that we protect that principle of democracy and that foundational principle of freedom by letting this process complete? What are they afraid of? That is the question: What are they afraid of?

That is why I am glad Mr. PERLMUTTER initiated this effort, and I will continue to stand with him as he does it.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, I thank Mr. HUFFMAN, and I thank Mr. RASKIN for their comments.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 35. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources; in addition, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs 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.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 6, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3656. To amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a consistent eligibility date for provision of Department of Veterans Affairs memorial headstones and markers for eligible spouses and dependent children of veterans whose remains are unavailable.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4183. A letter from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), Office of the

Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Annual Stress Test — Technical and Conforming Changes [Docket ID: OCC-2017-0021] (RIN: 1557-AE28) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4184. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination and certification that the top five exporting and importing countries of ephedrine and pseudoephedrine have cooperated fully with the United States or have taken adequate steps on their own to achieve full compliance with the goals established by the 1988 United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2291j(b)(1)(A); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 490(b)(1)(A) (as added by Public Law 102-583, Sec. 5(a)); (106 Stat. 4924); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4185. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5190. A bill to provide a temporary safe harbor for the publishers of online content to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which their content may be distributed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 5191. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish Alzheimer's Disease research, education, and clinical centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 5192. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Social Security to provide confirmation of fraud protection data to certain permitted entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 5193. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. WALBERG (for himself, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. STEFANK, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 5194. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 5195. A bill to improve diversity and inclusion in the workforce of national security agencies, and for other purposes; to the