

power to look into, again, ready for this? Hillary Clinton's emails.

The last time I checked, Hillary Clinton is not President, nor is she running for President. It is another example of the Republicans in this House who are focused on the past. Democrats are focused on the future. We want to reduce healthcare costs, address the opioid epidemic, invest in infrastructure to increase wages, and get corruption out of government.

Mr. GALLEG0. So what have we learned today?

Unfortunately, we have learned that our Republican colleagues are unwilling or afraid, either-or, to use their power vested in them by the Constitution on behalf of the American people to keep the executive in check.

□ 1245

Mr. TED LIEU of California. It is really simple. At the end of the day, Congress should not be going on recess before we do the important work on behalf of the American people.

Mr. GALLEG0. It is shameful that we are going on recess right now while we know that there are foreign adversaries targeting our elections, targeting our elected officials; we have a President that we cannot get straight answers out of, and this Republican-led Congress refuses to act.

So maybe it is time to turn control of this Chamber over to Members who are willing to hold this administration accountable.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct all remarks to the Chair and to formally yield and reclaim time when under recognition.

#### STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, as the House recesses, I want to call Members' attention to something I hope they will consider over the recess, this year's record attacks in the form of riders or undemocratic additions to the D.C. appropriation and how that makes the best case for statehood for the District of Columbia.

I need to report to the House the remarkable progress we are making on D.C. statehood.

We are closing in on 100 percent of Democratic House Members as cosponsors of the D.C. statehood bill. In the Senate, where the District has no representation, we have more than half of the Democratic Senators. Before this session is over, we are striving for 100 percent, certainly, of Democrats in the House and even in the Senate as we go

over to the Senate to also make the case without having any representation there. That is why I am so grateful to the Senators who have understood the importance of equality for the 700,000—equality of citizenship, I should say—for the 700,000 American citizens who live in the Nation's Capital.

In the face of that good news on statehood, you would think that there would be applause from the Congress, who sits in the home district of the District of Columbia. But recently, there have been a spate of undemocratic riders, that is, attempts to amend the District's appropriation.

What is the District's appropriation doing here?

That is the nub of the problem. It shouldn't be here.

When I first came to Congress, there were actually hearings held on the D.C. appropriation, but I have been able to make sure that that doesn't happen. Indeed, Congress has no interest in the D.C. appropriation because it is a local budget with funds from only local residents. Not a penny of it is raised in this Congress.

To be sure, we are entitled to some funds from the Congress, just like the States. But we are not talking about those funds. We are talking about the local D.C. budget passing through the House and the Senate for no other purpose except to see if somebody in either of those two bodies wants to insert undemocratic amendments, using the DC budget as the vehicle to do it. There are a number of ways to keep that from happening short of statehood, but statehood would be the end of it.

I can't decide anything about New York's budget because it is New York's budget and it doesn't have to come here. In the same way, the local budget for the District of Columbia has no business here.

It must be that Members who attempt these additions to our appropriation don't have enough to show to their own constituents for what they have accomplished during this Congress, so they look around for something to say, "I passed this."

Well, let me be clear. I have been able to keep most of these riders from passing, so I don't know why they keep trying. But as long as they keep trying, they have got someone standing in the doorway of the House to keep these antidemocratic amendments not approved by the residents of the District of Columbia but having everything to do with the District of Columbia from, indeed, passing.

And remember, this Member has a vote in committee, which may be the most important vote any Member can have. That is how I have gotten things accomplished for the District of Columbia. As it turns out, by the time a matter comes to the floor, the deal is done.

But I draw your attention to the fact that I do not have the final vote on the House floor, and yet the D.C. budget is voted on the House floor.

I do not have a vote on the House floor, although the people I represent are number one, per capita, in Federal taxes paid to support the United States of America. If anybody deserves a vote on this House floor, it is the residents of the District of Columbia who deserve that vote.

Here is another reason why the residents of the District of Columbia deserve statehood or, at the very least, a vote in the House of Representatives, the people's House: The budget of the District of Columbia is larger than the budget of 12 States; the District of Columbia has more residents than two States.

Here is the District of Columbia, here is Vermont, and here is Wyoming. Each has two Senators, but not the District of Columbia. Yet the District of Columbia has more residents than Vermont and more residents than Wyoming. You begin to see how the inequality comes up just in population.

The District has a budget surplus. It is almost \$2 billion. That is the envy of most States, that kind of large surplus, because a surplus means that you are not spending all your money. You are putting money aside, which is what, of course, is encouraged for all the States, but very few States have this kind of surplus.

We are not talking about a big poor city. The per capita personal income of the District of Columbia is higher than the per capita income of the residents of any State. Its total personal income is higher than that of seven States. Its per capita personal consumption expenditures are higher than those of any State.

Yet, each year, I have to fight abuses of home rule, as we call it, or self-government for the District of Columbia, using the fact that this budget has to pass through here in order for the District of Columbia to use its own budget.

Members rush to press what we call riders—I have indicated amendments—to our local budget. There have been about four attempts to repeal the Local Budget Autonomy Act. The District passed a Budget Autonomy Act. The House repealed it; the Senate did not.

The only quarrel we have with that is, although we have a Budget Autonomy Act, the House and the Senate continue to appropriate the District's budget after it has already been appropriated by the District of Columbia government. Nothing has ever been so redundant as the congressional appropriation, or shall we call it reappropriation, of the District's local budget.

There is the annual repeal—and I say "annual repeal" because I have been able to keep it from being repealed altogether—of the so-called Death with Dignity Act. This is a controversial piece of legislation, but eight States have this same legislation which allows a doctor to give a pharmaceutical to somebody who asks for it, has 6 months to live and is in great pain.

It is interesting to note that in the District of Columbia and in the States that have the so-called Death with Dignity Act, most people who have this pharmaceutical that allows them to end their own lives do not use it. Obviously, they are only looking for a peaceful way to die, and most of them decide to die without taking their own lives.

If such a law exists in eight States, there is no reason why it shouldn't also exist in the District of Columbia. I have been able to keep that law from being repealed, and I will do it again.

There is a third bill that, again, is annually repealed. It is called the Reproductive Health Nondiscrimination Act.

Why would anybody want to repeal an act that simply says to an employer that you cannot penalize an employee for the form of birth control that an employee uses? In the first place, most employers shouldn't even know that private information.

The District passed such a law, the House repeals it, and I am able to keep it from being repealed in the final bill every single time. But it gives some sense of how Members scramble for bills they don't want in their districts, but since it was passed in mine and since they can abuse their own congressional power, they simply decide to do so.

They have not been able to repeal it, but I believe, if the polls are correct, the Democrats will recapture the House, and then I believe I will be able to dispose of these issues as well. Again, these are controversial, but other States have these same laws.

There is a perennial amendment to keep the District from spending its own local funds on abortions for poor women. Seventeen States do that, no Federal funds. What other States are doing, the District should be able to do for our American citizens.

Another, of course, is recreational marijuana. This is another matter that has been passed by almost 9 States and DC. Essentially, these States legalized small amounts of marijuana. In the District, it is 2 ounces.

□ 1300

The House stumbled to try to repeal the District's marijuana law. It was unsuccessful, so the District still has legal marijuana up to 2 ounces.

However, it can't regulate marijuana, and it can't monetize it. If you go to the States that have legal marijuana, they sell it, they tax it. There is no reason why the District of Columbia shouldn't be able to do the same thing.

This year, there are some additional riders. Representative GARY PALMER, a Republican from Alabama, needs to mind his own business. Instead, he has filed amendments to keep the District from using its local funds to pass something that you would think would not even come to his attention. It is an initiative that would raise the minimum wage so that everybody in the District

of Columbia earns the same minimum wage and so that so-called tipped workers do not live on tips alone but on a basic wage in addition to whatever tips they get.

The industry doesn't like this, but if you are a tipped worker, you may well like it. Actually, it didn't pass overwhelmingly, but it passed in the District. The District Council does have the right to overturn a referendum or an initiative. It may overturn this on its own, but here comes Congress rushing in to overturn the Tip Minimum Wage Act.

I had to chuckle at another amendment that was filed, I think also by Mr. PALMER, who definitely needs more work to do because he keeps meddling in our business. This rider goes after the District's bill that mandates health insurance.

What this is about is Republican Members smarting at the notion that they have not been able to overturn the Affordable Care Act. They have not been able to do that here either. It turns out that the Affordable Care Act is, I believe, the most popular piece of recent legislation on the books today. It has gotten more and more popular the more the House and the Senate have tried to cripple it.

Local jurisdictions have their own version, and the District says, yes, you must have health insurance.

Why do they say people must have health insurance? Why did the Affordable Care Act say that? It is the basic law of insurance. If you spread the risk and spread the cost, then, of course, everybody's insurance costs less. So it is the ABCs of insurance. That is why you have jurisdictions continuing to mandate what the Affordable Care Act did.

It is interesting to note that the Senate is not going home for the August recess, and the reason it is not going home is it is trying to get through a new addition to the Supreme Court.

By the way, that proposed member is Brett Kavanaugh, who happens to sit on the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals. As it turns out, the Democrats in the Senate have one-upped this decision to stay for the August recess because the Democrats are using that time to speak and to press the Affordable Care Act, which is so popular and will help them, I am sure, in the November elections.

Madam Speaker, may I ask what my remaining time is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HANDEL). The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 32 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, it doesn't stop in the House. It goes over to the Senate.

But one of the reasons I have been able to get these antidemocratic riders off is that the Senate has helped me even though the Senate is controlled by Republicans, not Democrats. And the reason I think the Senate has been more open is that, unlike the polarized

House—and, sure, the Senate is polarized as well—the Senate, by its very nature, represents a broader cross-section of the American people and, thus, represent Republicans and Democrats and has to think about how far it wants to go with making itself a target by trying to overturn somebody else's legislation. So we are able to get most of these antidemocratic riders off there.

I note that Senator TED CRUZ also needs to devote more attention to his own constituents from Texas because, in the Senate, he is trying to do what Representative PALMER is doing: to get rid of the District's healthcare mandate.

Again, Senator CRUZ represents a large State. He is not doing his best for them as long as he is meddling in the business of another city, another jurisdiction, the District of Columbia.

It is the height of hypocrisy for Republicans to spend so much time trying to overturn the laws of the District of Columbia because local control is a core belief of Republicans in the House and the Senate. We are going to hold them to that core belief when it comes to matters affecting the District of Columbia.

Meddling in the business of the District of Columbia can and has cost the District of Columbia actual dollars. The District of Columbia just had another bond market report and an upgrade of its rating by one of them to AAA. Yet one of the bond markets, Standard & Poor's, said: "[W]e continue to have concerns about the role of the federal government in future District budgets. We view this as an ongoing . . . factor that has a negative effect on the District's finances and as a slight offset to the District's otherwise very strong management practices . . ."

What S&P is saying is, essentially, there is an unknown here. There is an actor. It is the Congress of the United States meddling in the business of the District of Columbia. So it is hard to judge the District of Columbia as long as somebody can come from left or right field and try to change parts of its business.

Essentially, what you have is S&P and other bond markets calling for Congress to let the District be the District so it can be judged by what the District alone does. Look at what they say when the bond markets look at what the District alone does. Look at what the bond markets say.

Let's look at Moody's, who has just given the District a AAA rating, given its bonds a AAA rating: "The dynamism of the District's economy has led to the largest population in 40 years and strong growth in the tax base. Financial governance is exemplary. Reserves are robust . . ."

I want to ask Members of this body how many of you have had reports like that on your own jurisdiction.

Moody's goes on to say: "The District of Columbia, the nation's capital, is

small but wealthy. Its population would rank 48th among States . . .” That is what you see with this graph. [B]ut its per capita income is higher. I repeat, the District’s “per capita income is higher than all 50 States, and its GDP is greater than 17 States.”

What more do you want from the District of Columbia when you get that kind of objective report on its finances?

The fact is that only eight big cities—the District of Columbia and seven others—have AAA bond ratings. Only 22 of the States have AAA bond ratings.

Again, I repeat, what more do you want from us when we have excelled, outdone the great cities of the United States, outdone most of the States in our fiscal prudence? Such an outsized performance, if anything, should encourage the Congress to, at the very least, recognize the District’s budget autonomy law.

Here I am not talking about statehood. I am talking about the District’s budget, having it stay in the District, go into effect immediately and not come as a pass-through to this body, because, by coming here, it gets harmed. It adds costs to the budget because of the uncertainty of having another actor, the federal government, who could do anything to your local budget.

The bond markets have made the best case for recognizing the District’s budget autonomy law, instead of another passage of the appropriation after the District has already passed it and getting our budget here only to see if Members can attach undemocratic amendments, and get them passed that way.

The fact is, if there were budget autonomy—here, I am not talking about statehood, but only the budget of the District, like the budget of every other city and State—and the budget didn’t come to the Congress—if the District had that, it would lower our taxes even more, and the District would need even less in Federal funds.

I have already gotten the rating agencies to credit a provision I got in the budget keeping the District from being shut down if the Federal Government shuts down. That is what I said: shut down.

The Congress often acts like a child. Sometimes they disagree with the President; sometimes they disagree among themselves; and the whole darn thing just closes down, leaving everybody out there on his own with no budget; and then the House and the Senate go at one another until they finally get something done.

I have annually gotten into the D.C. appropriation a provision exempting the District from the threat of the shutdown.

So here is the irony: If the Federal Government shuts down or if doesn’t pass a budget on time, the District’s budget goes into effect; and it goes into effect at next year’s budget levels,

while with the Federal Government, the most that will happen is that it will stay open on the prior year’s budget.

We are grateful that the bond markets have recognized the District as one of the most fiscally responsible jurisdictions in the United States. We are grateful that they have pointed out who the culprit is if we want to get an even higher rating than we share with seven States who have AAA ratings.

Remember, Madam Speaker, nobody in this body is interested in the D.C. budget. That is how I have been able to make sure that nothing happens on the District budget. And since there is no interest in it, it simply shouldn’t be here.

The District budget is just like a number of other items here from the District that I have been able to keep from being overturned.

□ 1315

An example is the District’s gun laws. It may be the best example. Every year, I keep the Congress from passing bills to overturn the District’s gun laws. They are very extreme. I do it in the House, and I do it in the Senate, even though I am not in the Senate, and there is nobody from the District of Columbia in the Senate.

Senator MARCO RUBIO from the State of Florida has been the chief culprit of late. Members vary as to who tries to wipe out all the District’s gun laws. You would think that Senator MARCO RUBIO would be the last to do that, because Parkland, Florida youngsters have become the leading advocates for gun safety control in the United States and are making some considerable headway.

But, actually, Senator RUBIO started his effort to wipe out the District’s gun laws before the Parkland tragedy. And why did he do it? What does he care about the District? He doesn’t care about the District. He cares about his NRA rating.

Apparently, he had a B-plus NRA rating, National Rifle Association rating. Within minutes of putting in a bill to eliminate all the gun safety laws of the District of Columbia, the NRA raised his rating from a B-plus to an A.

Do you want to know why I am mad? Why I come to this House floor to say get off our backs and treat us like every other jurisdiction? That is a perfect example: using the District of Columbia to get an increased NRA rating.

Over here, it is the Representative from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) who partners with Senator RUBIO. Neither of them has been successful. Why should I have to fight these two Members at all about an entirely local matter?

Mr. Speaker, I have not asked only for statehood. I understand the House and the Senate are essentially incremental bodies. So I have bills that would simply give the District many of the elements of statehood.

An example would be a local prosecutor. What is the United States At-

torney for the District of Columbia doing prosecuting local crimes? That is what he does. In fact, more than 90 percent of the business of this U.S. attorney doesn’t have anything to do with Federal matters.

Again, this is a holdover from before the District had what we call home rule, and it was 45 years ago that the District was given the right to govern itself.

But that, the Congress could give the District, and then the District would choose its own local DA.

There are other examples. the President offers clemency, and that means it never happens for people in prison in the District. That is a State function. The District knows more about its own local residents who are incarcerated than any president. That is the kind of matter that should go to the District of Columbia.

I cite these examples because they are not statehood. They are just ordinary home rule jurisdiction, ordinary democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with the most poignant examples of denial of democracy to District of Columbia’s residents. Mr. Speaker, the most poignant of the reasons residents resent the denial of equal treatment to their own jurisdiction has to do with the sacrifices that District of Columbia residents have made in every war since the creation of the republic.

The District is one of the oldest cities in the United States. It was created by the Founders. District residents fought in the war that created the United States of America. Thus, the city stands as a living contradiction to what the Framers fought for: “No taxation without representation.”

Residents of the District are not only taxed without representation in the House and the Senate, they are taxed at a higher rate than other Americans—they are number one per capita in Federal taxes paid to support the Government of the United States.

When you consider the sacrifices that our residents have made, one would wonder how they could possibly be denied equal treatment in their own country. One way to understand the sacrifices the District has made is to look at those sacrifices in times of war: World War I, more District casualties than three States; World War II, more District casualties than four States—understand that we are talking about a city, and these are more casualties than in the States; Korean war, more casualties than in eight States of the United States—this city, more casualties than in eight States; finally, the very worst of the casualties, the Vietnam war, more casualties than in 10 States.

There is not an American who wouldn’t say that, with those sacrifices and with federal taxes paid at a higher rate than any others are taxed, surely the 700,000 residents who live in our Nation’s Capital have more than paid their dues.

So I have come to make that case. It is not a difficult case to make. At the heart of the case are the sacrifices in lives for their country. Not only did they not have the vote, but, to date, as I speak, those who are serving their country in Afghanistan and around the world are doing so without equality with other Americans, with the votes in the House and the Senate.

If you were to ask the American people, I have no doubt where they would be on the issues I have spoken about this afternoon. The Democrats are doing very well in the House and the Senate. I will ask for a vote for the District in this House, if in fact Democrats take control of the House of Representatives, as it seems they will.

This is a matter that should be bipartisan, but my party does not control the House. There is no chance of getting the kind of equality that our country stands for unless my party gets control of the House. Therefore, I hope all will understand that is why I am working hard to see a change in who controls the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States.

The District residents, those who died, those who live here today, have more than earned their right to be treated as equal American citizens.

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

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF SPECIAL AGENT NOLE EDWARD REMAGEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Special Agent Nole Remagen.

Special Agent Remagen suffered a stroke while supporting the recent Presidential trip to Scotland, and, sadly, passed away a few days later, surrounded by his family.

Special Agent Remagen was a true patriot who dedicated his life to serving his country. He began his service as a member of the United States Marine Corps, where he served honorably for 5 years.

After leaving the Marine Corps, he yet again heeded the call to serve his Nation, joining the Secret Service as an officer in the Uniformed Division.

Special Agent Remagen served in the Uniformed Division for 10 years and rose to the rank of sergeant just like his father, also a retired sergeant in the Secret Service Uniformed Division.

He became a special agent in 2009 and served faithfully many assignments, including the Dignitary Protection Division and the Presidential Protective Division.

Special Agent Remagen represented the best of the United States Secret Service, and his dedication to the agen-

cy's mission is both admirable and inspiring.

Special Agent Remagen is survived by his wife and two young children. I ask that you keep his family in your thoughts and prayers during this difficult time.

#### ADDRESSING ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about a disease that touches nearly every family in our country.

There are more than 5.7 million Americans living with Alzheimer's and more than 16.1 million unpaid caregivers who dedicate much of their lives to caring for their loved ones struggling with this terrible illness.

I became familiar with Alzheimer's long before I came to Congress. You see, my father, Andy Katko, or Pop-Pop, as he became known to us, his 7 children, his 18 grandchildren, and his 6 great-grandchildren, as well as everyone else, began, in 2008, to show signs that his memory was deteriorating. He was eventually diagnosed with dementia that same year.

His condition progressed significantly each and every year after his initial diagnosis, and he was ultimately diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease. My mother, his wife, Mary Lou, took on the challenging role millions of loved ones do and became his primary caretaker.

Mary Lou remained by Andy's side, helping him with everything from cooking, bathing, dressing, and taking his medications, to offering him love and reassurance when he would wake up in the middle of the night confused and sometimes scared of his surroundings.

About 1½ years ago, with Andy's condition progressing dramatically, and my mother, Mary Lou, suffering from her own health issues, our family had to make the terrible decision that many other families have to make and admit my father, Andy, into a nursing home, where he could receive the 24-hour care and attention that he desperately needed.

Although Andy and Mary Lou lived apart since then, their strong bond of love for each other was still evident, perhaps in the hand-holding, perhaps in the kiss on the cheek, or perhaps just giving a reassuring look.

Andy's eyes would light up at any mention of Mary Lou, especially when she came to visit him. In March of this year, when we had to tell him that Mary Lou had died, his beloved wife of 64 years, it barely registered. In fact, we can't tell whether he understands that his wife, the love of his life, is gone.

Today, Andy still resides at our local nursing home. His condition has worsened, and he can no longer recognize his children or grandchildren, nor can he form coherent sentences. It is extremely difficult for our family to see him in this condition, as he is no longer the same talkative, strong-willed father and grandfather he once was.

Although Alzheimer's has diminished my father, Andy's quality of life, the disease has not diminished his spirit. Yes, Andy's sincere appreciation for his family is still evident, and he has maintained his distinct sense of humor and happy-go-lucky disposition, which allows our family some temporary relief and lightness amongst such a heavy situation.

This struggle my father and our entire family is going through is not unique. I have heard nearly identical stories told by countless families throughout my district—really, from throughout this country.

□ 1330

The toll this disease takes on the millions afflicted, the millions of caregivers, and our overall economy cannot be understated.

I am proud of the actions we have taken as a Congress to begin to address this epidemic, including the passage of the 21st Century Cures Act, which will strengthen efforts to find a cure. And the recent passage of the RAISE Family Caregivers Act, which is now one of the first laws to address the needs of our Nation's family caregivers. However, we must do more.

I will continue to support the doctors, the scientists, and the medical professionals, who are on the front lines caring for those suffering from Alzheimer's, working tirelessly day and night to find a cure, looking for promising treatments.

I implore all of my colleagues to join me in supporting funding for research to put an end to this epidemic, honoring the millions of Americans, like my father, who have lost so much of their lives to this disease. This is for you Pop Pop.

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

#### BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor of the House today to talk about an issue that has been in the headlines a lot recently.

Every month, more than 30,000 people come across our border, our southern border, without the benefit of a legal status. Now, there is no doubt that there are more people in those 30,000, but 30,000 are what are identified by our Customs and Border Protection personnel on the border.

Thousands upon thousands of these are unaccompanied children. The end result is many of them reside in shelters and they are cared for by American taxpayer dollars. Some others are less fortunate, and they end up being released into dangerous situations.

I think all Americans can agree that we want our immigration system to work, and maybe we want it to be better. But as we consider this crisis on