

seminaries (Madrassahs) to receive Commission in Pakistan Army. The previous Director General of ISI (now the head of Pakistan's National Defense University) General Rizwan Akhtar has even proposed to 'incorporate militants belonging to banned extremist religious outfits into paramilitary forces.'

The region is burning due to the highly unprofessional and irresponsible policies and acts of Pakistan's military establishment and ISI. The entire world is suffering. As the British Prime Minister Mrs. Theresa May said following the most recent terrorist attack in London "enough is enough." It is about time for the world to act against this madness and put its foot down.

World Muhajir Congress sincerely request Trump Administration and US Congress to cut off military aid to Pakistan. Pakistan Army and intelligence agency ISI is mainly using this military aid to kill innocent Muhajirs, Baloch and Pashtoons. The double game of Pakistan's security establishment with US administration must come to an end which has put lives of US and NATO soldiers in danger in Afghanistan.

Mr. POE of Texas. So what does all this mean?

I have given 20 or 30 enumerated counts of an indictment against Pakistan, alleging them of supporting terrorism in the world.

What can we do about it?

Pakistan is not an ally of the United States. But the United States, every year, gives millions of dollars to Pakistan. Congress has even brought this up before, has tried to cut some of that money off. It has passed the House, but it has never passed and become law. And we continue to give them money.

The United States does not, and should not, continue to give Pakistan money because the money we give them goes to ISI, and that money goes to support terrorist activity in Afghanistan that kills Americans.

Why are we doing this?

But we continue to do it, for some reason that I think is absurd.

So the first thing we need to do is cut off the aid to Pakistan. We don't need to pay them to kill us; they will support killing Americans on their own. Cut off the aid.

The second thing we do is to label Pakistan a state sponsor of terrorism. That is what they are: a state sponsor of terrorism. Congress needs to label them and make that designation so they suffer the consequences for their terrorist mischief throughout the world.

And the third thing we do is we need to remove and revoke their major non-NATO ally status. That is a fancy word for: because Pakistan is a major non-NATO ally, they get certain benefits, militarily, that other countries don't get.

Revoke that. Quit giving them military aid. Quit giving them money. Designate them as a state sponsor of terrorism, and remove the major non-NATO ally status against Pakistan. There needs to be consequences for this long history, that most Americans are not aware of, where Pakistan says one thing and, like the ambassador said, does something else; and those con-

sequences need to come down to get attention.

The longest war in American history continues today, and it is a war supposedly against terrorism. But Afghanistan still is a hotbed because of what takes place and supported from Pakistan. The Afghan Government knows it, we know it, and the Pakistan Government knows it.

So there must be consequences. I think Pakistan is found guilty of supporting terrorism, and there should be action by the United States immediately to do these three things.

And that is just the way it is.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it is a privilege and it is good for the House and good for America when Judge TED POE is on the floor making a case. He was a great judge, a great prosecutor before that, and we will always need his voice making a case here on the floor, especially the kind of strong case he was just making. And I want to follow up with that.

There was a story yesterday, June 22, by Kristina Wong. It says:

"James Comey may have misled Senators on May 3, when he testified to the Senate Judiciary Committee that he had never been an anonymous source in news reports related to the Russia investigation.

"By that time, he had already leaked several private conversations he had with President Trump to his friend Benjamin Wittes, editor-in-chief of the blog Lawfare and former editorial writer for The Washington Post."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will recall, as we see every day, evidence that The Washington Post does not just despise Donald Trump, they are actually malicious in their reporting. President Trump, as a public figure, would normally have a tough time making a case as a public figure for libel or slander because you have to prove malice. The Washington Post has proved repeatedly they are not interested in fairness or anything resembling balance. They can't stand Donald J. Trump, and they are out to try to get him in a malicious fashion.

So when anybody, especially somebody with the FBI, leaks anything to people that may have it end up in The Washington Post, they, indeed, themselves become part of the malice for our President.

The article says:

"Wittes wrote in a piece on May 18, only 9 days after Comey was fired, that the former FBI Director had shared those conversations 'over the previous few months.' He wrote:

"Comey never told me the details of the dinner meeting; I don't think I

even knew that there had been a meeting over dinner until I learned it from the Times story. But he did tell me in general terms that early on, Trump had 'asked for loyalty' and that Comey had promised him only honesty. He also told me that Trump was perceptibly uncomfortable with this answer."

Now, let me insert here because obviously Mr. Comey does not understand what loyalty means and why a President of the United States would ask for loyalty from the Director of the FBI. But what loyalty means from a Director of the FBI is: Mr. President, I will be loyal to the administration. I will not go out and leak things to the media and I will not go out and stab you in the back every chance I have, even though I have these friends that hate your guts. And I know when I leak things or share things to people that can't stand the President, it is going to hurt him and it is going to be disloyal.

That is what loyalty is. It is outrageous for someone to try to make an obstruction case out of a President asking for loyalty.

Look at what the Obama administration did. They prosecuted more people that they alleged were leakers than all other administrations put together. They were aggressive in prosecuting disloyalty.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, as President of the United States, wasn't threatening to prosecute the way the Obama administration obviously had done. And he didn't try to make an example of everybody by having them prosecuted if they leaked anything. Otherwise, Comey would be standing before a judge answering charges right now; and maybe that should come later.

All he was asking for is: I need you to promise me loyalty.

And the very question of a President just asking for loyalty ended up being a source of evidence that Mueller—not Mueller. That is another case altogether. There is plenty of evidence about him—that Comey is probably the most disloyal FBI Director since J. Edgar Hoover was taping Presidents himself and having them watched and spied on.

So it is amazing, as smart as James Comey is—I have questioned him a number of times, so I know how smart he is. But as smart as he is, he couldn't figure out that loyalty would mean you don't run—try to make your President look bad after a simple meeting where the President just asked: Would you be loyal? I am not asking for the Moon. I am not asking for anything outrageous. I am simply asking: Would you please be loyal?

And even as President Trump was, apparently, asking for loyalty, this disloyal, dishonest Director of the FBI was already turning wheels in his head: How can I hurt this President? I know a reporter that hates Trump, who worked for the Trump-hating Washington Post. Even though he is not there now, he will know how to help me hurt Trump.

I mean, even as the President is asking for loyalty, that is what he is getting in the mind of the FBI Director.

So is it any mystery when we look back at the case history we have talked about here on the floor about how Comey manipulated John Ashcroft into recusing himself so Comey could push his own dear friend and godfather of his child, Patrick Fitzgerald, into being special counsel to go after the Bush administration?

Clearly, Comey and Fitzgerald were hoping to nail Karl Rove's and Dick Cheney's hide to the wall. That is what they were after.

And how do we know?

Because on day one—well, of course, the fact that Comey would push the godfather of his child into that position tells you all you need to know, but there is plenty more.

They both knew that Richard Armitage had leaked Valerie Plame's identity as a CIA agent. And they knew that there was no need for a special counsel or a special investigation. Yet they spent millions of dollars and man-hours trying to get beyond that and find some way to nail somebody they didn't like.

You would call that dishonesty or disloyalty because honesty would have had Comey and his dear friend and godfather of his child immediately going public on day one.

This would be honesty, to go forward and say: We know that the godfather of my child here, Patrick Fitzgerald, was appointed to find out who leaked information about Valerie Plame and her dishonest husband, Joseph Wilson, who lied to the CIA and lied to Congress, but we still need to know.

And guess what. We already know on day one who leaked it. It was Richard Armitage. There is no need to squander taxpayer dollars and there is no need for the government to pay massive amounts of money to Patrick Fitzgerald to do this investigation.

□ 1230

We are honest individuals. We are coming forward, and, yeah, maybe it wasn't all that honest for me to put my dear close friend, Fitzgerald, in this position, but I am going to be honest now. We don't need this investigation.

But that is not what they did. They were disloyal and dishonest to the American people, to the Bush administration, and to justice. They asked for expanded jurisdiction, made it seem like they were on the trail of something big.

No, they weren't on the trail of anything big. They had nothing. They wanted to try to get somebody prosecuted, and that way they could try to justify the massive amount of expenditures for nothing, for no good reason, that they were about to go through.

Eventually, they prosecuted Scooter Libby for allegedly being inconsistent with something he said—same thing they went after Martha Stewart for.

There was no insider trading that Martha Stewart engaged in. And I

know she is not a fan of Republicans—seems like a very nice person when I talked to her—but she was treated grossly unfairly. There was no insider trading. So they keep talking to her until they find they think she said something inconsistent so they could get a conviction, get a scalp under their belt, figuratively speaking, and claim they had done some great good. Comey was underneath, behind the scenes in that as well.

So it is amazing to me how anybody could try to be accusatory of someone, a President that said: Can you please promise me you will be loyal?

He didn't ask for anything illegal, nothing unethical, but apparently—you know, I didn't know Donald Trump. I supported TED CRUZ for over a year for President. But I have come to understand, this man has amazing instincts with people, amazing business acumen, figures out when something makes sense and something doesn't make sense.

One of the other Members of Congress just this morning was saying: You know, I never realized until I had seen the President in person, the man really has a big heart.

Okay. It was kind of surprising to some folks. But you get the inkling of it the more you are around him. And you see the way he treats kids, and we saw the way he treats children. You know, we saw the way he was so good to all kids. It didn't matter—he didn't care if they were Democrats' kids or Republicans' kids.

But I do recall, 8 years ago, one of my friends from Texas had a daughter, had her little book and pen, saw kids lined up getting an autograph from President Obama. So she ran over to get an autograph, and she came back in tears because she said when he got to her, he said, "I am not signing yours," and walked away. Her parents assured her it was nothing personal. He just obviously had some kind of emergency.

But then later on, before the congressional picnic was over, she saw other children lined up getting an autograph. She ran, got to the end of the line, and once again, when President Obama got to her, he said, "I told you, I am not signing yours." It took a long time to get over that.

But a lot of the people that saw the way President Obama treated some kids—not all of them, but some—saw the way President Trump didn't care anything about their background, what party their parents supported. He was just a gracious guy, obviously showed a big heart for kids.

So it would be understandable that somebody in business, doing multi-million-dollar deals, would need to know people were going to be loyal. And I have come to know enough about Donald Trump and his intuition about people he is dealing with, if he asks someone to be loyal and that person hedges their bets, said, well, I will be honest—I haven't asked him, but I am willing to bet when James Comey re-

fused to say he would be loyal but said he would be honest, I would be willing to bet you Donald Trump knew immediately this man is not going to be loyal or honest, and that is exactly what has happened.

James Comey has been both disloyal to his country, to the FBI, and to the President he was serving. He admitted leaking information. And some of us believe that if President Trump had not tweeted out, making reference to potential tapes of their conversations, that the disloyal, dishonest former Director of the FBI would probably not have been as honest as he was about some other things that were said.

But for anyone in the media to make some kind of big deal, potential obstruction of justice charge, just bringing up "I need you to be loyal; tell me you will be loyal" is absolutely outrageous.

I would expect every President, surely, if they were a good President, at one time or another needed to ask for a pledge of loyalty, not that you are going to lie, not that you are going to commit a crime, but you are not going to run out and leak stuff more than once the way James Comey did. You are going to be loyal to me. And if there is a problem, you come to me. You don't go leak it to your leftwing friends.

And also being loyal, I would think, would include that, if you believe there is a need for an independent counsel, a special counsel, and that you are a critical witness, that being loyal and being honest would—and being ethical would require that you not look forward to having one of your best friends in the world, Bob Mueller, being the special counsel.

My friends, my very dear friends, JIM JORDAN, MARK MEADOWS, JODY HICE—I have an article from yesterday. I have been talking about this for a week or so with different people, but we do need an independent counsel. We need a special counsel. And courts have made clear, Congress cannot appoint an independent counsel. It is an executive branch function. It is a violation of the separation of powers.

It has been made very clear: Congress can appropriate for independent counsel, they can make laws that create an office of independent counsel or a special prosecutor, they can do all those things, but they cannot, Congress cannot appoint an independent prosecutor, a special counsel. That is an executive branch function, and everyone in the executive branch derives their power, any that they have, from and through the President of the United States.

We know, there is no question about it, President Barack Hussein Obama regularly and intentionally obstructed justice, but we know that for a President to obstruct justice the way President Obama did was legal. He has the power to legally obstruct justice a number of ways, whether it is at the very end, just an outright pardon, or whether it is a dictation of policies the

way President Obama did: We are not going to go after and prosecute this group of people that have come in and committed crimes from other countries.

Some of us felt like it was terrible judgment, but President Obama had the legal authority to obstruct justice in directing the Justice Department not to pursue and prosecute certain groups of people or even individuals. He could pardon them outright before or after investigation. The President has that power. So does President Trump.

But as my friends point out in this article, Mr. Comey misled the American people in the early weeks of the Trump administration by furthering the perception that President Trump was under investigation when, in fact, he was not. He, again, did this willfully and intentionally, and, I would add, he did it disloyally and dishonestly.

They point out that Comey recently admitted that, after being fired from the FBI, he had a friend leak an internal FBI document to *The New York Times* detailing a conversation Comey had with President Trump. Comey testified under oath that he had ordered the leak to help create public momentum for the appointment of a special counsel, which we now know is Comey's mentor, predecessor, dear friend, Robert Mueller.

Unless anyone be confused—and I have even heard our great Speaker of the House say: Yeah, well, you know, the fact is his credentials are impeccable. We trust him.

Well, anybody who looks into Mueller's situation deeply enough will not say that his credentials are impeccable. He served honorably, heroically in Vietnam, but as FBI Director, he set a policy in place that would run people out of the FBI that had years of service and experience as supervisors. One article pointed out, he had run off thousands and thousands of years of experience.

I would submit it is because his egotistical narcissism would not allow him to have anybody that knew more than he did so they could question or offer suggestions contrary to what Director Mueller wanted. That is why he cost the FBI millions of dollars. And because of his poor leadership, his purging of the FBI training materials so that all these new people, after he ran off the experienced people that knew what radical Islam was—they had been trained to recognize it—ran them off, had younger people in there who were not allowed to learn what radical Islam was, so when the Orlando shooter or Tsarnaev or any of these others that were on the radar were investigated by Mueller's trained FBI, they didn't know what they were looking for. Because of the poor training—it wasn't intentional by Mueller that they would end up costing people their lives, but that is what happened.

An article points out: "On May 7, 2014, the House of Representatives passed a resolution calling for a special

counsel to investigate the IRS targeting of conservatives for their political beliefs. Comey and Attorney General Eric Holder blocked the appointment. This despite the fact that the lead investigator they assigned to the case, Barbara Bosserman, was a max-out contributor to President Obama's reelection campaign.

"This is the type of unequal justice the Americans despise. No special counsel in the IRS targeting investigation. No special counsel for the Clinton email investigation. But if it's about protecting Comey's reputation and hurting President Trump, then of course there has to be a special counsel."

"Throughout 2015 and 2016 there were calls from Congress for a special counsel in the Clinton email scandal."

I mean, for heaven's sakes, when you have someone go out and destroy known evidence that has been subpoenaed with a hammer, now that is illegal obstruction of justice.

But, no, Comey didn't want that investigated. Oh, no, his dear friend Hillary Clinton, the dear couple that was so close to Loretta Lynch that she would order him to misrepresent what the FBI was doing, that she would get on a plane knowing he is the spouse of somebody they are supposed to be looking at prosecuting, that there is plenty of evidence to show she violated the law many times, criminal law many times, oh, no. But this Justice Department refused, even after it was revealed that Attorney General Loretta Lynch met privately with Bill Clinton less than a week before the FBI interviewed Hillary Clinton.

□ 1245

No special counsel was established, even allowed, or even recommended, even after some unusual Justice Department immunity deals, the deals the Justice Department made with Comey there as Director when he, apparently, was a big enough shot he could do his job and Loretta Lynch's; say, I'm not going to let anybody—what he said was no good prosecutor, in essence, would prosecute this case.

That was a lie, but he went before the public to say it to help his friends, the Clintons or, rather, better friends of Loretta Lynch and the President.

Boy, if President Trump had ever gotten the loyalty from James Comey that President Obama got, in numerous cases, undeservedly, people would be recognizing prior criminal activity for what it was and is.

Anyway, in one of the hearings, Mueller was asked about this incredible, horrendous activity of persecuting conservative organizations, refusing to allow them to form because they could go against President Obama in the next election. The Obama administration clearly used the IRS as one of its most effective campaign operative groups, and it worked. They were able, in 2012, to prevent conservative groups from forming and from coming after Presi-

dent Obama for problems he had created.

But with all the national furor over the IRS, Mr. Mueller was supposed to be so fair, so impartial. He is asked: Okay. Well, we're told we don't need a special counsel because you, the FBI, are all over this. You don't need any special prosecutor. You've got this under control. Who is the lead agent?

He couldn't answer the question.

He is asked: Okay. Well, how many agents have been assigned to the case?

Mueller could not answer that question.

He is asked: Have any victims been interviewed?

The answer again was: I don't know.

The reason was Mueller is not objective. He is not fair and balanced. He despises this President, like his and Comey's friends at *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, and elite circles. They have shown they are and have been disloyal to the President. They have been unjust to this President.

And Mueller, I mean, going back to when William Jefferson was being investigated, I haven't seen the articles in many years, but I do recall, because we were paying attention, when Mueller had a congressional office searched without having—there are many times Members of Congress have potentially probable cause they committed a crime, and the way it was always handled, for over 200 years, you go to the Speaker of the House, because things in a Member of Congress' office—like, at that time, nobody should have come into my office, even with a warrant from the FBI, and been able to get material that said what FBI agents were giving me information about the terrible administration in the FBI.

The only way we can have a balance of power and the only way we can have oversight is if the FBI has no right to come in and find out who the whistleblowers are, because they do come after them. We have seen that over and over.

But Mueller was out for blood. They get a search warrant. Forget 200 years of law. We are not going through the Speaker so they can preserve things that are privileged that the FBI shouldn't get. Always in the past—there have been many people prosecuted with things that came from their office, as I understood it.

I was in on one of the meetings between the Attorney General's lawyers, the House lawyers, and the FBI. They said: You know, many times we have given you—when you show us what it is, we make sure what is privileged stays privileged and give you the evidence that lets you prosecute.

But Mueller went straight there, as a smack at Congress: You better not have oversight of me, or I will come after you.

And when he was questioned about this issue that Congress was raising, his response was: Maybe it's time I appointed 400 agents to investigate Congress.

He was threatening Congress.

This is mean-spirited. This is an unfair, unjust man. And there is only one answer because he leaked out, "I am investigating the President for obstruction of justice." Now if the President fires him, oh, it will be another Saturday night massacre.

So the answer is that the President has all the authority to appoint special counsel. He has got to appoint somebody to investigate Mueller, his chummy buddy Comey, their chummy buddy Loretta Lynch, and the Hillary Clinton and Bill Clinton couple so we can finally find out truth, honesty, and loyalty in this country.

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

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write to inform you that I hereby resign from the office of U.S. Representative, effective at 10:00 AM Eastern Time on June 30, 2017. It has been a tremendous honor and privilege to serve the people of Utah as a Member of Congress. I thank you for your leadership as Speaker and look forward to working with you in my capacity as a private citizen to continue to find ways to improve our great Nation.

Sincerely,

JASON E. CHAFFETZ,
U.S. Representative,
Utah Third Congressional District.

MAY 18, 2017.

Hon. GARY R. HERBERT,
Governor, State of Utah,
Salt Lake City, UT.

DEAR GOVERNOR HERBERT: I write to inform you in advance of my intent to resign from the office of U.S. Representative at the close of business on June 30, 2017. It has been a tremendous honor and privilege to serve the people of Utah as a Member of Congress. I look forward to working with you and others as a private citizen to continue to find ways to improve our remarkable State and Nation.

Sincerely,

JASON E CHAFFETZ,
U.S. Representative,
Utah Third Congressional District.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LAMALFA (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a wedding.

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 26, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Greg Gianforte

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1787. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting reports entitled "2017 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 note; Public Law 107-314, 366(a)(5); (116 Stat. 2522); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1788. A letter from the Chairman, Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the 2016 Annual Report of the Appraisal Subcommittee, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3332(a)(5); Public Law 101-73, Sec. 1103 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1473(b)); (124 Stat. 2190); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1789. A letter from the Acting Comptroller of the Currency, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting an annual report to Congress containing a description of actions taken to carry out Sec. 308 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1463 note; Public Law 101-73, Sec. 308(c) (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 367(4)(B)); (124 Stat. 1556); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1790. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received June 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1791. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, 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.

1792. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting the 2016 Management Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines including financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1793. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Agency Response for the period of October 1, 2016, to March 31,

2017, in accordance with Sec. 5 of Public Law 94-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1794. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress on the Medicare and Medicaid Integrity Programs for FY 2015, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ddd(i)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1893 (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 6402(j)(1)(B)); (124 Stat. 762) and 42 U.S.C. 1396u-6(e)(5); Public Law 109-171, Sec. 6034(a)(2); (120 Stat. 76); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1795. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018"; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2258. A bill to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves; with an amendment (Rept. 115-189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2547. A bill to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2548. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; with an amendment (Rept. 115-191, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1492. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice (Rept. 115-192, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1492 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Natural Resources and Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2548 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.