

repair. Eleven percent of our bridges are obsolete or functionally deficient. Ongoing operations, to say nothing of strategic new investments, are increasingly difficult.

This is sad because the Federal Government used to play an essential role for infrastructure throughout our history, from Benjamin Franklin's postal roads to Abraham Lincoln's transcontinental railroad to Dwight Eisenhower's interstate highway system. The ability to even imagine such accomplishments is increasingly a thing of the past. This means we are losing our competitive edge to be able to move goods efficiently. Our families are losing mobility.

Our low level of investment is being dwarfed by competitors overseas: Europe, India, Japan, and especially China.

Shanghai has 14 subway lines, a high-speed Maglev railway, two massive modern airports, 20 expressways, and a high-speed train leaving Shanghai every 3 minutes. China has spent 8½ percent of its gross domestic product for 20 years, while American investment has shrunk to 1.7 percent recently for a system that is variously rated 12th or 27th, depending on what you are looking at.

Is it any wonder that China's economy has expanded 700 percent in 20 years while America struggles to grow at 2 percent a year?

With such an overwhelming, well-established need, it is criminal that Congress is in the process of making a decision that will probably delay any meaningful opportunity to correct this situation in transportation funding for 3 years or longer.

Yes, it is essential that a financial transfer take place to the highway trust fund to stop the summer slowdown and give Congress a chance to work, but hopefully, only with enough money to work through this year. The Senate may well appropriate enough money, as the House did a couple of weeks ago, to slide into the next Congress with new committees, new leadership, perhaps, in the Senate. The situation will get no easier, no less complex, and no less expensive if this Congress abandons its responsibility.

This is a continuation of an unfortunate pattern since 2003, where a series of ever-shorter solutions and 21 temporary extensions have created near permanent uncertainty for communities who rely on the Federal partnership for the big picture, major repair, and new construction of roads, transit, and bridges.

The people who build, maintain, and depend on our transportation infrastructure are in the dark where they stand now, where they will be in 6 months, where they will be 2 years from now. It is absolutely unacceptable.

I will fight for this Congress to get on with its job now. If it means we have to work in October instead of campaigning, so be it. If it means we

have to come back after the election and work into the holidays, we should do so. Congress should not recess for vacation, for campaigning, or adjourn for the year unless it has met its responsibilities for a long overdue, 6-year, robust transportation bill provided with enough sustainable, dedicated funding to stop this chronic uncertainty.

The Senate will be debating limiting funding for this year or sliding into next. They will even debate Senator LEE's proposal to slash the Federal partnership and turn it back to the States as an unfunded mandate, eliminating the gas tax and, with it, any thoughtful, overall Federal transportation system.

These are the choices that really need to be drug out into the light. They need to be talked about in the open to find out what the public thinks, and then we make a decision, let them know, and move on. America deserves no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from trafficking the well while another Member is under recognition.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision in *Halbig v. Burwell* held that ObamaCare "makes tax credits available . . . to individuals who purchase health insurance through . . . exchanges . . . established by the State."

Supporters of the law predictably decried judicial partisanship. They claimed the reasoning of the Court was spurious because it led to an absurd result which was not in line with the intended policy of the law.

Also recently, video surfaced of MIT health economist Jonathan Gruber, a prominent architect of and supporter of ObamaCare, clearly stating that States have an incentive to set up exchanges so that their citizens will have access to Federal subsidies. So much for the charge that the Court's reasoning led to an absurd result.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that someone at some point in the legislative drafting of ObamaCare thought using Federal subsidies as an incentive to get States to set up insurance exchanges was a good idea, and that was the view that was codified as law. But at a fundamental level, the issue here isn't the way the statute was written; it is the way the statute was passed. The extremely partisan nature of ObamaCare's passage has made the administration unwilling or unable to seek fixes via the normal legislative process because doing so would necessitate working across the aisle and compromising.

We all remember that ObamaCare was hastily passed after an election which cost the Democrats their supermajority in the Senate. They couldn't edit this law because the people of Massachusetts denied them that privilege. But that didn't stop Democrats from ramming this poorly drafted law through using some very questionable legislative tactics. Now they are asking the courts to let them make edits to the plain language of law without consulting Congress.

As this case moves forward on appeal, judges should ask themselves this question: Is it my role to shield the Democratic Party from the consequences of a republic form of government? I don't recall ever reading that particular clause in my copy of the Constitution.

THE LEGISLATURE'S JOB IS TO PASS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the House uses what little legislative time is left in the year to sue the President, I am reminded of what Benjamin Disraeli once said: "How much easier it is to be critical than to be correct." That is the reason why the American public thinks that the lawsuit against the President of the United States is a political stunt, because it is a political stunt.

The majority argues that the President's executive actions give them no choice but to sue the President; that it is the legislative branch's job to defend against the executive branch's supposed overreaches.

But I will tell you what the job of the legislature is. The job of the legislature is to pass legislation.

For 112 Congresses before this one, the fight over the separation of powers has endured, with each Congress before us using the powers allocated to it in our Constitution to pass legislation to counter the actions of the President.

□ 1015

It is not a unique idea: You don't like the job the President is doing? Well, then let's do our job. You don't like the President's policy? Well, then let's enact some policies of our own. Rather than litigating, we should be legislating.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been so busy trying to prevent the President from doing his job, they have forgotten to do their own. For years, their number one legislative priority was making President Obama a one-term President, to discredit him, to delegitimize him. Time and time again, with every issue, from extending unemployment insurance to comprehensive immigration reform to climate change, to name a few, this Congress has punted the ball. Instead of finding the courage to tackle the tough issues the American people are

begging us to take on, we have retreated.

For many issues, we even refuse to allow a simple up-or-down vote on the floor. We are afraid that if we actually allowed a vote, we might actually pass something.

This Congress makes Truman's "do-nothing Congress" seem downright busy. No wonder why our approval numbers are so low. It is ironic that a Congress that refuses to get anything done has the audacity to accuse the President of getting too much done.

The President isn't taking our power away from us. We have abdicated it to him.

Since George Washington, our Presidents have used executive actions to get things done, yet the majority argues that this President is the exception to the rule. President Obama may be the exception, but not in the way that they think. Out of the last 10 Presidents, President Obama has signed the least number of executive orders, on average, per year. So far, the President has even signed half as many as President Reagan did.

Yet despite this, let's remember what the President has been able to accomplish over the last 6 years. President Obama brought our economy back from the brink of depression, lowering unemployment from 10 percent in 2009 to 6.1 percent today. We have had 52 straight months of private sector job growth, with the last month being the fifth month in a row of adding 200,000 jobs or more to the economy.

The President passed health care reform, achieving what every President since Teddy Roosevelt has tried and failed to do. Now millions of Americans who were previously barred from health insurance coverage because of preexisting conditions or because they simply could not afford it can access the care they desperately need.

And the President has taken unprecedented action to protect our environment. He has proposed the toughest fuel economy standards for passenger vehicles in U.S. history, put a plan in place to cut carbon pollution from new and existing power plants, and significantly increased production of renewable energy.

In 6 years, President Obama has accomplished more than many who have come before him, despite a do-nothing Congress whose stated mission has been obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, Malcolm X used to say that if you have no critics, you likely have no successes.

The intent of the majority's lawsuit may be to spotlight the President's critics, but I am confident that what it will actually do is prove his successes.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act reforms our broken and harmful mental health system. Here are some reasons why we need it.

For some who are experiencing the most serious mental illnesses, like bipolar disorder or schizophrenia, they don't think their hallucinations are real; they know they are real. Their illness affects their brains in such a way that they are certain, beyond all doubt, their delusions are real. It is not an attitude or denial. It is a very real brain condition.

With that understanding, we are left with a series of questions: Do these individuals have a right to be sick, or do they have a right to treatment? Do they have a right to live as victims on the streets, or do they have a right to get better? Do they have a right to be disabled and unemployed, or do they have a right to recover and get back to work? I believe these individuals and their families have the right to heal and lead healthy lives.

But they are sometimes blinded by a symptom called anosognosia, a neurological condition of the frontal lobe which renders the individual incapable of understanding that they are ill.

Every single day, millions of families struggle to help a loved one with serious mental illness who won't seek treatment. Many knew that Aaron Alexis, James Holmes, Jared Loughner, Adam Lanza, and Elliot Rodgers needed help.

Their families tried, but the individual's illness caused them to believe nothing was wrong, and they fought against the help. These families watch their brother, their son, or their parent spiral downward in a system that, by design, only responds after crisis, not before or during. The loved one is more likely to end up in prison or living on the streets, where they suffer violence and victimization, or cycle in and out of the emergency room or commit suicide.

In a recent New York Times article about Rikers Island prison, they report that over an 11-month period last year, 129 inmates suffered injuries so serious that doctors at the jail's clinics were unable to treat them; 77 percent of those inmates had been previously diagnosed with mental illness.

Rikers now has as many people with mental illness as all 24 psychiatric hospitals in New York State combined, and they make up nearly 40 percent of the jail population, up from about 20 percent 8 years ago.

Inmates with mental illnesses commit two-thirds of the infractions in the jail, and they commit an overwhelming majority of assaults on jail staff members. Yet, by law, they cannot be medicated involuntarily at the jail, and hospitals often refuse to accept them unless they harm themselves or others.

Is that humane? Shouldn't we have acted before they committed a crime to compel them to get help?

According to the article, correctional facilities now hold 95 percent of all in-

stitutionalized people with mental illness. That is wrong. Yet with all we know about mental illness and the treatments to help those experiencing it, there are still organizations, federally funded with taxpayer dollars, that believe individuals who are too sick to seek treatment will be better off left alone than in inpatient or outpatient treatment. It is insensitive. It is callous. It is misguided. It is unethical. It is immoral. And Congress should not stand by as these organizations continue their abusive malpractice against the mentally ill.

The misguided ones are more comfortable allowing the mentally ill to live under bridges or behind dumpsters than getting the emergency help that they need in a psychiatric hospital or an outpatient clinic because they cling to their fears of the old asylums, as if medical science and the understanding of the brain has not advanced over the last 60 years.

We would never deny treatment to a stroke victim or a senior with Alzheimer's disease simply because he or she is unable to ask for care. Yet, in cases of serious brain disorders, like schizophrenia, this cruel conundrum prevents us from acting even when we know we must because the laws say we can't. We must change those misguided and harmful laws.

The system is the most difficult for those who have the greatest difficulty. Why are some more comfortable with prison or homelessness or unemployment, poverty, and a 25-year shorter life span?

I tell my colleagues: Do not turn a blind eye to those that need our help. The mentally ill can and will get better if Congress takes the right action.

Tomorrow, Representative EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and I will hold a briefing at 3 p.m. on the rights of the seriously mentally ill to get treatment. I hope my colleagues will attend and understand that we have to take mental illness out of the shadows by passing the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 3717, because where there is no help, there is no hope.

HONORING TED RUBIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to honor the military service and the life of Tibor—known to us as Ted—Rubin, a Korean war veteran, a Holocaust survivor, and a prisoner of war survivor.

Mr. Rubin received the Congressional Medal of Honor in 2005, and he will be the guest of honor at a ceremony in the city of Garden Grove at their post office in Orange County, California, on August 8, 2014.

Ted was born on June 18, 1929, in Hungary. He spent 14 months in a concentration camp in Austria, which was