

Today at least 300,000 people in North America suffer from dystonia, a neurological movement disorder that causes muscles to contract and spasm involuntarily. Joel and Harriett's daughter Shari—Beth's sister—had dystonia. The Farber family not only advocated for her, they determined that they would advocate on behalf of the entire dystonia community. They reached out to me and so many others to explain what is known about the disease, its impacts, and the need for expanded medical research and support networks. Over the years, they have continued to come to my office and have travelled the country to push for action.

Dystonia affects men, women and children. For most people with dystonia, the cause remains unknown and there is currently no cure. Dystonia is not usually fatal, but it is a chronic disorder producing symptoms that vary in degrees of frequency, intensity, disability, and pain depending on the type of dystonia. The inability to predict or control the movements of the legs, arms, hands, neck, shoulders, face, eyelids, jaw, tongue, or vocal cords has a profound impact on an individual's life.

Dystonia may be inherited or caused by specific factors such as certain medications or traumatic injury, particularly traumatic head/brain injuries. Our men and women in uniform face a disproportionate risk of developing dystonia as a result of injuries sustained during their military service.

The Dystonia Medical Research Foundation, which works to raise awareness of dystonia, is a nationwide organization that has served the community for more than 40 years. The Dystonia Medical Research Foundation provides the dystonia community with support, education, advocacy, and the promotion of research into the causes of and care of dystonia.

I call on my colleagues to recognize the goals and ideals Dystonia Awareness Month by supporting federal activities that improve lives of patients impacted by dystonia including research programs at the National Institutes of Health. We need to improve medical research and we need to make sure that those living with dystonia receive the quality health and caregiving services they deserve.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION AND ECONOMIC AND ENERGY CONVERSION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Nuclear Weapons Abolition and Economic and Energy Conversion Act, a version of which I have introduced since 1994, after working with the District of Columbia residents who were responsible for the Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion ballot initiative passed by D.C. voters in 1993. This version of the bill now requires the United States to immediately begin negotiating an international agreement to disable and dismantle its nuclear weapons, to provide for strict control of fissile material and radioactive waste and to use nuclear-free energy.

The bill continues to provide that the funds used for nuclear weapons programs be redi-

rected to human and infrastructure needs, such as housing, health care, Social Security, restoring the environment and creating carbon-free, nuclear-free energy. This conversion to a peace economy would occur when the President certifies to Congress that all countries possessing nuclear weapons have begun elimination under an international treaty or other legal agreement.

The bill is particularly timely with the ongoing nuclear threat from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Our country still has a long list of urgent domestic needs that have been put on the back-burner. As the only nation that has used nuclear weapons in war, and that still possesses the largest nuclear weapons arsenal, I urge support for my bill to help the United States reestablish our moral leadership in the world by redirecting funds that would otherwise go to nuclear weapons to urgent domestic needs.

HONOR THE LIFE OF LESTER MANDELL

HON. STEPHANIE N. MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Lester Mandell, who transformed countless communities in central Florida through his work as a builder and transformed countless lives through his generosity as a philanthropist. Lester passed away recently at the age of 96, leaving behind a large and loving family, but his legacy will live on.

Born in a hardscrabble Brooklyn neighborhood, and a veteran of World War II, Lester did not graduate from college. However, neither his lack of formal education nor the anti-Semitism he frequently faced could stop Lester from achieving his professional goals, because they were no match for his talent, tenacity and toughness. Lester's life was a quintessentially American story of success earned through hard, disciplined, joyful work.

As one of Lester's grandsons said about his grandfather. "He believed that, if you did things the right way, you would get the right result." This is the essence of character.

Lester was a master builder, in both the literal and figurative sense. The homes, neighborhoods, and public parks he developed throughout central Florida over the course of many decades are his most visible legacy.

Lester also built bonds of a more intangible nature. He donated generously to many causes he cared about, from scholarships for inner-city children to support for the Jewish community he loved so much. Lester often donated anonymously and rarely spoke about his donations, even to his own family.

As his grandson recounts, Lester was a serious man who did serious work, but he did not take himself too seriously. He had a sense of humor and light-heartedness that disarmed friend and stranger alike.

Lester's greatest legacy, of course, is his family. He leaves behind his wife and partner for life, Sonia. They were married for 70 years. Sonia and Lester had four children, eight grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren.

I know they miss Lester. But I hope their loss is eased by the knowledge that Lester was a great man and, even more importantly, a good man.

HONORING FREDERICK LOCKEHART MAYS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to recognize Mr. Frederick Lockhart (Locke) Mays, a dedicated family man and distinguished member of the community. Locke was born in Columbia, South Carolina, on September 20, 1927 to Elizabeth and Fred Mays. He joined the Marine Corps in 1945, following graduation from Dreher High School. He served 18 months, then joined the reserves as a Sergeant. He was called back up during the Korean Conflict, training at Quantico and in Puerto Rico, although not being sent to Korea. Except for a brief stint in banking, Locke worked in the trucking industry, retiring after selling G&P Trucking Company to Southeastern Freight Lines in the mid-1980s. He now enjoys restoring old Fords to mint condition; with his favorite being a 1935 Phaeton. He has been active in First Presbyterian Church of Columbia for over fifty years, where he serves as an Elder Emeritus. A devoted husband, father, father-in-law and grandfather, Locke celebrated his 90th birthday last Wednesday, September 20th in Columbia, South Carolina, surrounded by his family.

IN RECOGNITION OF STEVE NORTON AND HIS SERVICE AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY STUDIES

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Steve Norton as he leaves the New Hampshire Center for Public Policy Studies after 12 years of remarkable service to begin a new chapter in his life.

As Executive Director of the Center, Steve helped raise new ideas and improve policy debates through quality information and analysis on issues that are shaping New Hampshire's future. In his previous role as director of Medicaid Services for the N.H. Department of Health and Human Services, Steve worked to ensure vulnerable Granite Staters had access to quality, affordable health coverage.

Through his commitment to public service, Steve has helped improve the lives of countless families and communities in need, and his vision has aided in creating a better future for the Granite State and its residents.

On behalf of New Hampshire's Second Congressional District and all those who have benefitted from Steve's work, I thank him for all he has done for our state. I look forward to our continued work together to make New Hampshire be an even better place to live, work, and raise a family.

THE OVERCRIMINALIZATION OF IMPEACHMENT

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following CATO article for the RECORD:

[From CATO.org, Aug. 7, 2017]

(By Gene Healy)

Trying to tamp down impeachment talk earlier this year, House minority leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) insisted that President Donald Trump's erratic behavior didn't justify that remedy: "When and if he breaks the law, that is when something like that would come up."

Normally, there isn't much that Pelosi and Tea Party populist Rep. Dave Brat (R-VA) agree on, but they're on the same page here. In a recent appearance on Trump's favorite morning show, "Fox & Friends," Brat hammered Democrats calling for the president's impeachment: "there's no statute that's been violated," Brat kept insisting: They cannot name the statute!"

Actually, they did: it's "Obstruction of Justice, as defined in 18 U.S.C. §1512(b)(3)," according to Rep. Brad Sherman (D-CA) who introduced an article of impeachment against Trump on July 12. Did Trump break that law when he fired FBI director James Comey over "this Russia thing"? Maybe; maybe not. But even if "no reasonable prosecutor" would bring a charge of obstruction on the available evidence, that wouldn't mean impeachment is off-limits. Impeachable offenses aren't limited to crimes.

That's a settled point among constitutional scholars: even those, like Cass Sunstein, who take a restrictive view of the scope of "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" recognize that "an impeachable offense, to qualify as such, need not be a crime." University of North Carolina law professor Michael Gerhardt sums up the academic consensus: "The major disagreement is not over whether impeachable offenses should be strictly limited to indictable crimes, but rather over the range of nonindictable offenses on which an impeachment may be based."

In some ways, popular confusion on this point is understandable. Impeachment's structure echoes criminal procedure: "indictment" in the House, trial in the Senate—and the constitutional text, to modern ears, sounds something like "grave felonies, and maybe lesser criminal offenses too."

But "high crimes and misdemeanors," a term of art in British impeachment proceedings for four centuries before the Framers adopted it, was understood to reach a wide range of offenses that, whether or not criminal in nature, indicated behavior incompatible with the nature of the office. For James Madison, impeachment was the "indispensable" remedy for "Incapacity, negligence, or perfidy" on the part of the president—categories of conduct dangerous to the republic, only some of which will also constitute crimes.

The criminal law is designed to punish and deter, but those goals are secondary to impeachment, which aims at removing federal officers unfit for continued service. And where the criminal law deprives the convicted party of liberty, the constitutional penalties for impeachable offenses "shall not extend further than to removal from Office," and possible disqualification from future officeholding. As Justice Joseph Story explained, the remedy "is not so much designed to punish an offender, as to secure the state against gross official misdemeanors. It touches neither his person, nor his property;

but simply divests him of his political capacity."

No doubt being ejected from a position of power on the grounds that you're no longer worthy of the public's trust can feel like a punishment. But the mere fact that removal is stigmatizing doesn't suggest that criminal law standards apply. Raoul Berger once illustrated that point with an analogy Donald Trump would probably find insulting: "to the extent that impeachment retains a residual punitive aura, it may be compared to deportation, which is attended by very painful consequences, but which, the Supreme Court held, 'is not a punishment for a crime.'"

Had the Framers restricted impeachment to statutory offenses, they'd have rendered the power a "nullity" from the start. In the early Republic, there were very few federal crimes and certainly not enough to cover the range of misdeeds that would rightly disqualify public officials from continued service.

Criminality wasn't an issue in the first impeachment to result in the removal of a federal officer: the 1804 case of district court judge John Pickering. Pickering's offense was showing up to work drunk and ranting like a maniac in court. He'd committed no crime; instead, he'd revealed himself to be a man "of loose morals and intemperate habits," guilty of "high misdemeanors, disgraceful to his own character as a judge."

As Justice Story noted in 1833, in the impeachment cases since ratification, "no one of the charges has rested upon any statutory misdemeanours." In fact, over our entire constitutional history, fewer than a third of the impeachments approved by the House "have specifically invoked a criminal statute." What's been far more common, according to a comprehensive report by the Nixon-era House Judiciary Committee, are "allegations that the officer has violated his duties or his oath or seriously undermined public confidence in his ability to perform his official functions."

The president's violation of a particular criminal statute can serve as evidence of unfitness, but not all such violations do. That's obvious when one considers the enormous growth of the federal criminal code in recent decades. Overcriminalization may have reached the point where Donald Trump, like everyone else, is potentially guilty of "Three Felonies a Day," but even in Lawrence Tribe's wildest imaginings, that wouldn't translate to three impeachable offenses daily. If Trump were to import crocodile feet in opaque containers, fill an (expansively defined) wetland on one of his golf courses, or misappropriate the likeness of "Smokey Bear" he'd have broken the law, but would not have committed an impeachable offense.

It's also easy enough to imagine a president behaving in a fashion that violates no law, but nonetheless justifies his removal. To borrow an example from the legal scholar Charles Black, if the president proposed to do his job remotely so he could "move to Saudi Arabia [and] have four wives" (as well as his very own glowing orb), he couldn't be prosecuted for it. Still, Black asks: "is it possible that such gross and wanton neglect of duty could not be grounds for impeachment?"

A more plausible impeachment scenario presented itself recently, with reports that President Trump had "asked his advisers about his power to pardon aides, family members and even himself" in connection with the special counsel's Russia investigation. The president's power to self-pardon is an open question, but his power to pardon others has few limits. There's little doubt Trump could issue broad prospective pardons for Don Jr., Jared Kushner, Paul Manafort, Mike Flynn, and anyone else who might end up in the Mueller's crosshairs—and it would

be perfectly legal. It would also be impeachable, as James Madison suggested at the Virginia Ratifying Convention: "if the President be connected, in any suspicious manner, with any person, and there be grounds to believe he will shelter him, the House of Representatives can impeach him; [and he can be removed] if found guilty."

Some years ago, I put together a collection of essays on the expansion of the criminal sanction into areas of American life where it doesn't belong—published under the title, *Go Directly to Jail: The Criminalization of Almost Everything*. The idea that criminal law concepts had infected and weakened the constitutional remedy of impeachment wasn't quite what I had in mind with that subtitle, but it seems to fit.

Congress has made the problem worse by outsourcing its investigative responsibilities to the executive branch. As Princeton's Keith Whittington observes in a recent essay for the Niskanen Center "relying so heavily on prosecutors to develop the underlying charges supporting impeachment has come at a high cost . . . it has created the widespread impression that the impeachment power can only appropriately be used when criminal offenses have been proven."

It's important to get this straight, because confusing impeachment with a criminal process can be harmful to our political health. It may lead us to stretch the criminal law to "get" the president or his associates, warping its future application to ordinary citizens. And it can leave the country saddled with a dangerously unfit president whose contempt for the rule of law is apparent, even if he hasn't yet committed a crime.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI MARINE LANCE CORPORAL (LCPL) JOSHUA SCOTT OSE

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen Mississippi Marine Lance Corporal (LCpl) Joshua Scott Ose who gave his life while in service to our nation on September 20, 2010, during Operation Enduring Freedom. LCpl Ose was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 8th Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force.

LCpl Ose was killed by enemy gunfire while conducting combat operations in Musa Qala, Helmand Province, Afghanistan. The day after LCpl Ose's death was announced, a United States flag was flown over the U.S. Capitol in his honor. That same day, flags were flown at half-staff in his hometown of Hernando, Mississippi.

LCpl Ose enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps during his senior year at Hernando High School. He graduated in 2009. Sissy Fernandez Ose, LCpl Ose's mother, said her son began talking about serving in the military when he was in the sixth grade. "That was all he wanted to do," Mrs. Ose said. "It was his choice. He was very proud."

Reverend Robert A. Hatcher, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Hernando, delivered the eulogy at the funeral which was held at the Trinity Baptist Church in Southaven. According to the Associated Press, Rev. Hatcher