

relegated security concerns to just 10 percent of a weighted formula, but in contrast courtrooms and chambers account for 50 percent.

In reality, the courts' projections have been shown to be wrong. As a result, the taxpayer pays for space that sits vacant.

The CASE Act directs GSA, which builds and owns Federal courthouses, to only design and build courthouses that strictly comply with courtroom sharing requirements.

The committee has reported out similar language in the past and a hearing before the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management earlier this year on courthouses reinforced the need for this legislation.

H.R. 3426, as amended, also incorporates reasonable revisions recommended by the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SHREVE) for his leadership on this legislation and the gentleman from D.C. (Ms. NORTON) for working on this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FIGURES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3426, the Courthouse Affordability and Space Efficiency Act of 2025, or CASE Act.

I thank my colleague from, I almost want to say Louisiana because of his familial ties to the naming of Shreveport, but my across-the-hall neighbor in the Cannon Building, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SHREVE), I thank him for his leadership and support on this issue.

This bill develops space-sharing guidelines to prevent overbuilding of new Federal courthouses. As a former Department of Justice staffer and a former Federal law clerk myself, I have had the privilege to see many beautiful courthouses and courtrooms across this country, and so I have seen how empty and underutilized many of those spaces are.

By implementing these standards into the design guide for Federal courthouses, the GSA will be able to reduce construction costs and ensure that existing spaces in courthouse complexes are being fully utilized.

Over the last 45 years, the GAO has compiled a large body of work on Federal courthouse construction, much of it at the request of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

GAO has found that the judiciary has requested and received courthouses that are larger than the size authorized by Congress, more expensive to build, and more expensive to operate than Congress was aware of.

The judiciary has tried, however, to meet the concerns of Congress over the last several years. Recently, the judicial conference revised its courtroom allocation planning assumptions. New courtroom construction projects are to

be designed to facilitate courtroom sharing for senior district judges, magistrate judges, and bankruptcy judges.

□ 1540

There is still some cause for concern. This legislation, by establishing sharing guidelines for active district court judges, will certainly help.

I support this legislation because this is about making the American taxpayer dollar go further and making more sensible investments. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SHREVE).

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, it sounds like my case in salesmanship is going to be modest with the support that this act enjoys from colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I am someone who has built a business from the ground up, including several million square feet of space. It is a reality that to construct space is one thing; the carry cost of maintaining it is quite another.

There is general recognition increasingly within this Congress that we have more space than our Federal Government needs. That is certainly the case at the courthouse level in our Federal courthouses and the supporting office space.

My legislation, the CASE Act, directs the GSA to construct the courthouse space that is necessary and no more. I worked with the U.S. courts on this bill. The resulting legislation is straightforward. It is clearly bipartisan, and it is commonsensical.

The CASE Act codifies the court's sharing policies for our magistrates, seniors, and bankruptcy judges. For the larger courthouses, it limits the number of courtrooms to two for every three judges.

The bill codifies this administration's approach to rightsizing our Federal Government. That is something that we share in common, both sides of the aisle, toward being good stewards of our taxpayer dollars.

The GSA, as was noted, is still forced to build to standards that account for potential judges, despite Congress not having authorized any additional judgeships over the past 30 years. This act is a move toward making taxpayer dollars go further.

I thank my colleague, Ms. NORTON, for joining me on this legislation and for her good work on this issue. I urge passage.

Mr. FIGURES. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3426, the CASE Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, H.R. 3426 as amended, will rightsize Federal courthouses, reducing unneeded space and potentially saving the taxpayer billions of dollars.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure passed reforms to begin the process of rightsizing the Federal Government's real estate portfolio last Congress. This legislation continues that work of ensuring a more efficient use of taxpayer resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 3426, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3426, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROTECTING VETERAN ACCESS TO TELEMEDICINE SERVICES ACT OF 2025

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1107) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize certain health care professionals employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs to deliver, distribute, or dispense to veterans certain controlled medications via telemedicine under certain conditions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1107

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Veteran Access to Telemedicine Services Act of 2025".

#### SEC. 2. DELIVERY, DISTRIBUTION, AND DISPENSATION OF CONTROLLED MEDICATIONS BY COVERED DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS VIA TELEMEDICINE.

Subchapter III of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section (and conforming the table of sections at the beginning of such chapter accordingly):

#### “§ 1730D. Delivery, distribution, and dispensation of controlled medications via telemedicine

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 1730C of this title and subject to the requirements of title II of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), a covered health care professional may use telemedicine to deliver, distribute, or dispense to a patient eligible to receive medical treatment under this chapter a controlled substance that is a prescription drug as determined under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) regardless of whether such covered health care professional has conducted an in-person medical examination of such patient if—

“(1) such covered health care professional is—

“(A) authorized to prescribe the basic class of such controlled substance under an active, current, full, and unrestricted State license, registration, or certification; and

“(B) acting in the usual course of professional practice; and

“(2) such substance is delivered, distributed, or dispensed for a legitimate medical purpose.

“(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish in regulations guidelines and a process for the delivery, distribution, and dispensation of a controlled substance pursuant to subsection (a).

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to remove, limit, or otherwise affect any obligation of a covered health care professional under the Controlled Substances Act.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.— In this section:

“(1) The terms ‘controlled substance’, ‘deliver’, ‘dispense’, and ‘distribute’ have the meanings given such terms in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, respectively.

“(2) The term ‘covered health care professional’ means—

“(A) a health care professional who—

“(i) is an employee of the Department appointed under section 7306, 7401, 7405, 7406, or 7408 of this title or under title 5;

“(ii) is not a contractor of the Department;

“(iii) is authorized by the Secretary to provide health care under this chapter;

“(iv) is required to adhere to all standards for quality relating to the provision of health care in accordance with applicable policies of the Department;

“(v) has an active, current, full, and unrestricted license, registration, or certification or meet qualification standards set forth by the Secretary within a specified time frame; and

“(vi) with respect to a health care profession listed under section 7402(b) of this title, has the qualifications for such profession as set forth by the Secretary; and

“(B) a health professions trainee who—

“(i) is appointed under section 7405 of this title; and

“(ii) is under the clinical supervision of a health care professional described in subparagraph (A).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1107, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1107 offered by Representative WOMACK.

This bill would allow telemedicine prescriptions for controlled substances at VA even before an in-person medical exam.

During the COVID pandemic, VA waived requirements for an in-person appointment. As a result, providers could prescribe controlled substances by telemedicine. This waiver was helpful for continuity of care during the pandemic.

We also realized that many veterans received more access than before due

to this waiver. I cannot tell you how many times veterans in rural areas have told me stories about hours they have to drive to receive care or a prescription from the VA.

Representative WOMACK’s bill would close the loop and modernize the delivery of prescriptions by making the current waiver permanent.

While telemedicine will never totally replace in-person care, the VA must be granted the tools to deliver 21st century healthcare. This bill would remove burdens on veterans who need VA care so they can get it sooner by telemedicine.

I will continue to do whatever I can to ease access to care and critical treatment for veterans living in rural areas of this country. This bill would give VA power to meet the moment and the use of the latest medicine and technology for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1107, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we are considering H.R. 1107, the Protecting Veteran Access to Telemedicine Services Act of 2025, as amended. It will enable VA providers to prescribe substances to veterans through telemedicine without first conducting an in-person exam. This bill will make permanent a flexibility that has been extended to VA and non-VA prescribers alike since the COVID-19 pandemic.

The current waiver, which has been extended by the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services, is set to expire in December of 2025. This legislation will make permanent VA prescribers’ authority to prescribe controlled substances via telehealth, if and when DEA and HHS end the temporary authority.

Telemedicine has helped VA to greatly increase veterans’ access to a variety of types of care, providing a critical lifeline for veterans, especially those who may have difficulty leaving the house or who live in extremely rural areas.

We can clearly recognize that after the pandemic, we must be open to changing the way we provide care to everyone, especially veterans, to reflect technological advancements, individual preferences, and the necessity of expanding access to care. In fact, telehealth is the industry standard for many providers and categories of care, including many in the VA’s community care network. Veterans should expect nothing less when they receive care from the VA.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1107, which is the Protecting Veteran Access to Telemedicine Services Act of 2025, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK),

the sponsor of this legislation and my good friend.

□ 1550

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 1107, the Protecting Veteran Access to Telemedicine Services Act of 2025.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is pretty simple. I argue that it is a very commonsense bill. Most importantly, it is vital. It ensures that our veterans, whether they live in the heart of our largest cities or in the most rural, remote communities, have uninterrupted access to the healthcare that they have earned.

I thank my good friend Chairman BOST and Ranking Member TAKANO for their support in advancing this bill as one part of the effort to support our veterans.

I also thank my friend Mark Berry, a former adjutant general for the great State of Arkansas and a former State representative, for his advocacy on behalf of our veterans on this issue. Mark brought this to my attention, and I wouldn’t be standing here today without his encouragement.

In 2008, Congress passed the Ryan Haight Online Pharmacy Consumer Protection Act to address the rise of rogue online pill mills and the potential for abuse in prescribing controlled substances. At the time, it was the right step to safeguard public health. Yet, the world of 2008 is not the world of today, and the law has not kept pace with the realities of modern medicine or the unique needs of our veterans.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the in-person requirement for prescribing controlled substances under the Ryan Haight Online Pharmacy Consumer Protection Act was temporarily waived. This flexibility allowed VA doctors and specialists to reach veterans where they are through secure, effective telemedicine. The Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services have continued to extend this waiver. Yet, without further action, it will expire at the end of this year.

My bill would permanently extend the exemption for VA healthcare professionals with the appropriate safeguards so that they can continue to prescribe medically necessary treatments to veterans via telemedicine.

For veterans in our urban communities, letting this waiver expire means longer wait times, fewer appointment slots, and even more strain on an already overburdened VA system.

For veterans in rural America, the consequences are even more serious. Many of these men and women live hours away from the nearest VA provider. For them, the exemption has meant timely care without the cost and hardship of traveling hundreds of miles for a single appointment.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just a matter of convenience. It is a matter of necessity. It is about ensuring that every

veteran, regardless of where they live, has equal access to the care that they have earned through their service and sacrifice to this Nation. Our veterans have given this Nation their best. It is our duty to give them our best in return.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation and to act swiftly to make sure that our veterans never see their care delayed, denied, or diminished because of outdated laws.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1107, Protecting Veteran Access to Telemedicine Services Act of 2025, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1107, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize certain health care professionals employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs to deliver, distribute, or dispense to veterans certain controlled medications via telemedicine under certain conditions, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SERVICEMEMBER RESIDENCE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2334) to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to preempt any squatter's rights established by State law regarding real property owned by a member of the uniformed services, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2334

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Servicemember Residence Protection Act".

#### SEC. 2. SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT: TOLLING OF PERIOD OF ADVERSE POSSESSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 206 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3936) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) TOLLING OF PERIOD OF ADVERSE POSSESSION.—The period of a servicemember's military service may not be included in computing a period of adverse possession of such servicemember's real property."

(b) WEBSITE.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the

Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall consult with the Attorney General and update the website of the Department of Veterans Affairs and other relevant websites to include information and resources regarding—

(1) how a member of the uniformed services may secure real property while absent for a period of military service;

(2) leasing real property;

(3) landlord-tenant rights and obligations; and

(4) any other relevant information determined necessary by the Secretary and the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2334, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2334, as amended, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), my friend and colleague.

This bill would protect servicemembers' homes from squatters while they are away on Active Duty. Under current law, servicemembers are not clearly protected under various State adverse possession laws. Due to this lack of protection, a squatter might be able to move in and make a claim to that servicemember's home when that servicemember is deployed.

This is outrageous. We must ensure that servicemembers can return to their homes following a deployment without the worry that someone might be occupying their home and that they will be forced to get into a costly legal battle to get their home back.

Mr. Speaker, it should go without saying that this should not be happening, and I will do what I can to protect our servicemembers.

This important bill would also require the VA and Department of Justice to work together to provide updated information to servicemembers about their rights.

I thank Chairman MAST for bringing this issue to the committee's attention and championing this legislation. We must ensure that servicemembers' homes are not occupied by squatters while a servicemember is away serving our great country.

I look forward to continuing to work with the ranking member this fall on a bipartisan piece of legislation like this one that puts veterans' and servicemembers' needs first.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2334, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 2334, the Servicemember Residence Protection Act, as amended. However, I still have many concerns that the bill, while well-intentioned, does not live up to the promises made by some supporters.

I appreciate the work of the majority to improve this bill during our markup. All of us want to ensure that servicemembers do not return home from serving their country to find trespassers or squatters living in their homes. We also want to ensure that servicemembers who are confronted with this situation have the tools and resources to seek legal relief.

However, I want to be clear that neither the original bill nor the amended text that we are considering today will eliminate the possibility that a servicemember will need to seek judicial or other legal relief to evict a trespasser.

The ability of Congress to legislate a solution to that particular issue is legally difficult. The text of H.R. 2334, based on my amendment in committee, was drafted so as to avoid creating confusion where courts have already ruled in Servicemembers Civil Relief Act cases involving adverse possession by codifying existing legal interpretations of SCRA tolling provisions.

What that means is that many State courts across the country have already found that the SCRA applied to adverse possession and that the period of time while the servicemember was away from their property did not count toward adverse possession. The amended bill simply makes this existing legal interpretation law.

Since acquiring title to property through adverse possession is a long and involved process, in practice, this legislation would likely apply to servicemembers in rare circumstances, such as when an adverse possessor was able to satisfy all the elements of adverse possession, including possession for the lengthy statutory period, which is likely longer than the time that most servicemembers are stationed away from home.

Mr. Speaker, the other type of trespassing case that a servicemember may encounter is a holdover tenant, such as may happen if a servicemember rents out their property while they are away from home.

□ 1600

Now, many of the stories presented to the committee to support this bill were of that type of trespass. A servicemember invited someone to stay at their property while they were gone and then the tenant did not want to leave.

It is important to follow good practices when becoming a landlord, such as using a written legal lease agreement, and this legislation does provide instruction for the Department of Veterans Affairs to work with the Department of Justice to provide resources on