

LET'S STOP PLAYING POLITICS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over the August work recess, I met with many constituents, but I also met with my regional Zika task force that included health professionals from the public and private sector who recognize the devastation of the Zika virus.

In the continental United States, there are over 2,000 cases. Over 600 pregnant mothers have been impacted by the Zika virus with yet unborn children, and then there are about 30-plus cases of transmission right here in the United States. And yet tonight the other body failed to pass the Zika funding. Now is the time.

My committee was very constructive. Dr. Persse from the city of Houston talked about surveillance of those coming into their clinics to determine whether they have been impacted by fever and a rash. We have talked about the vaccine and also a Zika act to be able to give information to those who are in need of knowing how to prevent it.

Yet the funding is not here. Why? Because we cannot pass a clean Zika funding, emergency funding, without riders.

Let's stop playing politics. Pass the Zika funding. The health professionals insist on it. People are dying.

REMOVING REDUNDANT RED TAPE

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of Americans across our country who are frustrated that Republicans and Democrats are not working together to get things done. Well, I can tell you that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, in the great State of Maine.

During the past 6 months, I have worked very hard with Congresswoman CHELLIE PINGREE, a Democrat, who represents our First District in Maine. I am a Republican representing our Second District. Together we have ushered through a very important bill, Mr. Speaker, that removes redundant and harmful red tape from being imposed upon 650 hardworking Mainers who harvest and process sea urchins and cucumbers from the ocean floor.

Now, unlike lobsters, Mr. Speaker, that are caught in traps up in Maine, sea urchins and cucumbers are collected on the bottom of the sea floor by those who dive in the cold, dark waters. It is a very dangerous job, and the product is a delicacy in the Far East, but it is very perishable.

Now already, Mr. Speaker, Maine officials inspect sea cucumbers and urchins before they leave the State, but the last couple years, U.S. Fish and Wildlife folks down in New York are imposing additional red tape before they can get on cargo planes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am proud of the Maine commonsense, bipartisan bill that removes this redundant red tape from 650 people who work as hard as anyone you can find.

JUDGE POE IS CONFIDENT HE
WILL BEAT CANCER

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, while most of us have been working around in our districts trying to assist others in their lives, one of our number, who is one of the most dedicated public servants in the world, has been fighting leukemia. That is our friend Judge TED POE. He sends this message:

"This summer, while Congress has been out of session, I have undergone treatment here in Houston for leukemia. Fortunately, just 8 weeks into treatment, I am feeling like myself again and am confident I will beat cancer. Incredible progress has been made so far thanks to the good Lord and the world-class team physicians at MD Anderson.

"Tomorrow I will return to Washington for votes and then be present for as much of the fall session as my treatment schedule will allow. The support I have received during this difficult time has been overwhelming."

He goes on to say: "Thank you for your continued thoughts and prayers. This September, during Leukemia Awareness Month, I intend to keep fighting the disease with all that I have while fighting for Texans in the House of Representatives just as I always have.

"And that is just the way it is."

□ 1930

STOP THE SLAUGHTER OF
CHRISTIANS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, as we stand here today, let us remember that the slaughter of Christians in the Middle East continues. The slaughter by radical Islamic terrorists continues as we do our business as usual. We have a President who is even unable to use the words "radical Islamic terrorists," which could have something to do with the fact that we have had policies that have failed to stop this historic slaughter of Christians in the Middle East.

This group has declared jihad on the West and has begun their gruesome bloodletting by targeting Christians in the Middle East for genocide. Again, this administration has failed to do anything to stop the slaughter. Those people who have been permitted into our country from that part of the world, overwhelmingly, have been Muslims and not Christians.

It is time for Congress to act. We have not done our job. We have failed

as well. We need to pass legislation. I have submitted such legislation that says that, from now on, in that part of the world where Christians have been targeted for genocide, they will be given preference for any refugee status or immigration status into the United States. At the very least, we can do this to stop this slaughter of Christians in the Middle East.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, as I was flying to Washington from California today, I recalled conversations I had over the weekend with a group of students who are headed back to school at the universities in California and other parts of the Nation.

To an individual, I asked them: "How are you financing it? What are you going to do? Are your parents taking care of you; your grandparents?"

In some cases, they said: "Well, they are helping a little bit, but I am going to do this with a student loan."

All across this Nation, young men and women and maybe some that are not so young are going back to school to continue their education, to begin it, and, in some cases, learn new skills, and they are taking out student loans. This is an incredible, incredible way in which we have now begun the financing of our higher education system.

What does it amount to?

Well, let me show you what it amounts to. It amounts to a whopping amount of debt. Among Americans, no other loan program exceeds the amount of student debt, except for home mortgages. It is well over a trillion dollars in 2014, and probably approaching a trillion and a quarter dollars.

It is a burden on not just current students, but students from yesterday and from the decades before, still carrying that burden of debt, unable to begin what used to be the normal process of a family, a car, a house, participating in the economic activities of America. But, rather, they are burdened by an extraordinary debt. And here we are in Congress, really not even paying attention to this fundamental American issue. It is an economic issue for the large economy. It is macroeconomic. It is also very, very much a personal issue.

Is there one of you out there in America that doesn't have a son, a daughter, or maybe even yourself that is burdened by this student debt?

You are paying interest rates that are 5, 6, 7, 8 percent and you are wondering why, if you are able to refinance your home, why you are not able to refinance your student debt.

That is a reasonable question and one that I asked my staff and others: Why

can't we refinance this student debt? After all, the Federal Government is able to borrow money for 10 years at less than 2 percent. Why don't we refinance those loans—that trillion dollars—and bring it down from 5, 6, 7, 8 percent, down to, let's say, 2 percent, plus 1 percent for the processing costs?

We could do it. It is feasible. It is possible. Oh, but it is going to cost the government. Well, yes. Right now, the government is earning a profit on the backs of those students. Over \$200 billion of profit will flow into the Federal Government because we, the American public, through the inaction of Congress, are burdening the students of America today and in the past with this incredible amount of debt. So let's refinance it.

Here are some astonishing facts that you may not know. It is \$1.2 trillion—actually, more—second only to the mortgage debt. The number of borrowers on the average balance increased by 70 percent between 2004 and 2012. In other words, mostly every student is taking out loans. The average student loan debt for graduates of 2015 is \$35,051, a burden that they will carry for many, many years.

There are solutions, one of which several of us in Congress and the Senate have proposed, somewhat different versions, but they all amount to refinancing your student debt on current students who are borrowing as well as those in the past that have taken out loans. We can refinance it.

Take a look here. My particular legislation would set all student loan interest rates at 3.23 percent. Actually, that was based on the 10-year cost of a Federal bond about a year ago. So it is a little less today. Save low-income borrowers thousands by delaying the interest while they are actually in school. Right now, that interest rate will continue to accrue.

I was talking to a person on the airplane today. They said: "Well, I am going to go back to school, but I can't continue to pay off my loan just because I get a hiatus."

I said: "Whoa, whoa. Yes, while you are in school, you don't have to pay, but that interest clock continues to tick along the way."

So this legislation would say that if you are continuing your education, the interest clock stops. Also, we want to make sure that the average student can save a lot of money. It amounts to over \$2,000 through the life of the loan.

By the way, why does the Federal Government currently cause a cost here called the origination fee? I know if you go borrow money or refinance your mortgage, there is a fee. But why would the Federal Government charge a fee for the origination of a loan?

Students go down to the student loan office at the university and they take out the loan. The cost to the Federal Government is part of that over \$200 billion profit that the Federal Government has.

Anyway, we have an opportunity here to address this issue. Now that ev-

erybody is focused on this, let's see what we can do.

Changes to the student loan interest rates, we talked about this. If you are a graduate student, it is over 6 percent and so forth. We can bring it down to less than 3 percent based upon today's rates.

There are other people that are involved in this effort to try to deal with the cost of education here in the United States. I want to introduce to you a friend of mine who is often on the floor as we do our East-West show, PAUL TONKO from the State of New York. I know that he is faced with this issue in his district, as I am in mine. I represent the University of California, Davis and four different community college campuses, all of which have this problem. If he would share with us his situation in New York and what he faces in his district.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for leading us in this Special Order to focus on what is a very strong concern that some in the House have for the costs of higher education.

We have prided ourselves as a society on our intellect and our intellectual capacity. That has driven all sorts of entrepreneurship. It has driven new product lines, prototypes that are developed. It really provides for a comeback as an economy, based on the intellect that we can drive into the equation for us as an American society.

So it is very important to be able to make certain that whatever those skills, those talents, those abilities, those likes, those passions are of students out there, that they pursue their intellectual development in a way that is not stifled or diminished by the cost of student loans.

As you heard from Representative GARAMENDI, that loan activity—student loan debt—rivals that of automobile loans and house loans. Something of the caliber of \$1.2 trillion in debt for student loans is not a driving factor that will build our economy. It is one that will have people paying for years and decades for the experience of a higher education.

People are adjusting their dreams, they are adjusting their goals, simply by looking at what debt they can assume or what the salary structure may be. That is telling us we are not fitting our skill set or our intellectual ability to the most appropriate journey that we can travel as students because of the debt situation.

Now, there are many things that we can do. And that was outlined. Representative GARAMENDI, I look at the student population in New York. I look at the wonderful institutions we have: higher ed institutions, public and private sector, a community college environment that is tremendously strong. Many will suggest that is the campus of choice these days, for economic reasons and for very practical reasons.

So we shouldn't limit that choice because we are not open to change in this

arena. We have got to side, I believe, with consumers out there—that being students and their families—making certain that items like loan forgiveness, revisiting our loans and refinancing those loans so they are more affordable and forgiveness that comes for those that may start a business or a social enterprise and assistance that might be given them.

I know Secretary Clinton has made mention of that in her campaign for President, making certain that in distressed communities there would be loan forgiveness, I believe, by as much as \$17,500, and making certain that we are utilizing the strength of our intellectual capacity, driven by desires of students out there that can then champion the cause of the growth of our economy. But we have to be mindful of the debt with which they are saddled, that we may diminish those dreams, we may suffocate those dreams, simply by the lack of affordability of investing in one's future.

So I stand with our colleagues in the House. I stand with Representative GARAMENDI on the issue of refinancing college loans, making certain that, if you can revisit the situation for your mortgage, why not be able to go forward and revisit that student loan debt that you assume?

Again, in Secretary Clinton's package, she speaks of the opportunity for, I believe, some 25 million borrowers in this country to be able to save upward of \$2,000 on their college loan simply by refinancing at today's rates.

□ 1945

So there is an opportunity for us to be constructive and creative in responding to the needs of our students. We have got to do that. That has to be of utmost priority in this House and in this Congress so that we can go forward and alleviate, however possible, the burden of that student loan debt. No society can continue to function adequately and effectively without addressing the cost of that higher education.

These are tools, the higher education opportunities are the tools in the kit that enable people to truly aspire to their dreams, to their goals, and to be able to utilize fully their given abilities that have been fostered and nurtured and brought to the forefront. That discovery is made through K-12, and it is denying that self-discovery of what your strengths are, simply by the cost of a college loan, that is diminishing that opportunity.

So let's go forward. We know what to champion here in terms of forgiveness of repayment of direction that can be fostered by the Department of Education, where there can be, again, a revisiting of loans, refinancing those loans in a powerful way that enables us, again, to do the economically strong thing for this Nation and for individual students and their families.

You know, as was made mention by the gentleman from California, these

are loans that are visited not only years, but decades into the post-higher ed experience, where people are then hampered when it comes to other choices of growing a family, having a family, raising that family, maintaining a household.

These are situations that we need to address so that the freedom of choice to these individual students is fully freedom, fully allowed to be addressed by them, as individuals who want to make choices for their future.

Again, thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for leading us in this Special Order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from New York with whom we have often on the floor talked about many, many issues, including making it in America and building a strong economy here. But a strong economy really depends upon the individuals that work in that economy, and if they are saddled with student debt, they are not able to really explore and really carry out all of their potential. So what we want to do is to address this issue.

You mentioned the Presidential campaigns, and Secretary Clinton, she actually has a very strong and robust and fulsome program dealing with the cost of education. She does have an additional item beyond the debt issues, which you very well explained that she wants to pursue. She also has a program in place where all families who earn initially less than \$85,000 a year would be able to go to a State university, public university in their State, at no cost, and that would then grow to \$125,000 in the next 4 years. That is really extraordinary.

That is pretty much like it was when I went to school a few decades ago and the University of California was literally free. We had a couple of—I don't know—\$125 for the Student Union and some athletic programs, but it was tuition-free. Those are bygone days.

But Secretary Clinton believes—and I think she is correct—that it is possible for the Federal Government to institute programs that would make higher education free for those families that earn initially less than \$85,000, and then growing to less than \$125,000. What an enormous boom that would be to the economy.

So I am excited. I am excited about the potential here in the House of Representatives. PETER WELCH, our colleague from Vermont, has introduced a bill that is identical to Senator WARREN's over in the Senate, and they have a refinancing bill, similar to my bill. My bill goes a little bit further because we not only lower the cost of current students' loans, but we go to those loans that are on the books. So we can deal with this. We have the ability and the economic strength in this Nation to deal with it.

I know you may have some additional comments on that, but my mind, as we were talking here and I was thinking about this Special Order hour,

went to the young and the not-so-young that have student loans, but also to those that are now in their more senior years and the issues that they face in their senior years. So perhaps we can shift to that, unless you have some additional things on student loans.

Mr. TONKO. Well, let me just make mention that—associating my comments with those that you just made about the opportunities for working families to have that tuition issue addressed, I believe that would cover some 80 percent of American families, which, to me, is a tremendously strong number universe.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Wow. 80 percent of American families would be able to send their kids to school without tuition costs.

Mr. TONKO. Would be able to participate in that program. I think that when we start to address those numbers, you can imagine the impact that that would have on revitalizing our economy, producing the talent that we need.

You know, I am impressed with the startup businesses that students at various campuses that I represent are being offered, these wonderful startup opportunities that are tremendously creative and innovative, and that was all triggered by—the inspiration came through work in the classroom and in labs that they may have in pursuing their degree.

This is the sort of climate that you want to grow, not shrink; and that is why these opportunities for these many, many families in this Nation—to have that benefit, that is how we prosper.

Also, when we talk about Secretary Clinton's plan, I believe it is that there is the proposal to make certain that community colleges be free for all families, for all working families, making certain that we are in compliance with what the President has suggested many times over during his administration, the sought-for degree, that working knowledge of an associate's degree, where there is oftentimes hands-on experience through that matriculation.

It is so important for us to recognize that community colleges oftentimes speak to the needs in an atypical fashion, where there may be individuals working and going to school, raising a family, going to school, keeping it close to home, so that there is affordability in that regard; and making certain that, again, we have that need for the business community, for the commerce community, to be met so that this hands-on training, educating, matriculating is made possible through the community college which oftentimes is the campus of choice.

So I think it is putting all the dynamics of what is changing in our society into a working order. And I have to compliment Secretary Clinton for having that commitment, making that commitment to students, their families, our Nation, our economic resur-

gence, our recovery, and, certainly, to the innovation economy that finds us working within an international marketplace, where we can't afford to go backward or stand still. We need to go forward, and a plan like this will enable us to empower the engine of higher education that then takes us to new levels.

We have talked about this many times over. There is a pioneer spirit in this Nation. I am a host community to the original pioneer spirit, I believe, in terms of an Erie Canal movement that sparked a westward movement and an industrial revolution. You see it with all sorts of tech valleys that have driven the economy.

These are the dynamics of which we speak so often on this floor, that need to be heeded, need to be made priority in our agenda of getting work done so that this Nation can again stretch its opportunities to all the folks that we can so that we will then provide those opportunities which create that intellectual capacity.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am so pleased that you brought up this issue of entrepreneurs. I know you often talk about this as something that is very important to you personally and the work that you have done before you came to Congress in New York State with the entrepreneurial activities of that State.

But I also note that Secretary Clinton, who was a Senator from New York, perhaps had listened to you during those years, and is carrying in her proposal a very special program for entrepreneurs.

I am thinking about a group that I met with in Davis, California, this last year, a group that actually nourishes students that are wanting to start a business. And as you said, coming out of the science or out of the technology or other areas, they come upon an idea where they want to grow a business.

Well, Secretary Clinton has loan forgiveness as part of her education package that would forgive \$17,500 of their student loans when they begin that business. When they become entrepreneurs and it begins to operate, there is this loan forgiveness. So suddenly they go into a program where they are \$17,500 less debt on their balance sheet. An enormous act, an enormous piece of advantage.

I am also thinking about—this is not directly to the entrepreneurs, but to home buyers. That student loan prevents people from buying a home because it shows up on their balance sheet and they are not able to get on with it.

I really like what Secretary Clinton is proposing here because it goes along with what you and I and many of our colleagues see as an impediment to economic growth and individual growth in our Nation.

Mr. TONKO. I think that, certainly, there is no denying that the training of the workforce of the future requires all sorts of insertion of technology, hands-

on, cutting edge, perhaps ahead-of-the-curve sort of mentality applied in the classroom, and that can happen when we invest and invest appropriately.

You talk about the Secretary's plan—Secretary Clinton's plan. I believe she extends that beyond business. It can be social enterprise also, so you can help distressed communities with these startups and everybody wins. It's an across-the-board win situation. And, you know, it is the kind of focus we need for that front end of life, for that early-in-professional-development stages of our economy on the age spectrum scale.

To your point, there also needs to be compassion expressed and concern expressed for the opposite end, for the more senior in our society. And you and I have seen what investments are required there, including those for caregivers who provide respite for what is a growing phenomenon there with Alzheimer's in the senior elements of our society.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly. We have been talking about students, some of whom are young, some not so young, and others who are carrying those student loans. But if you begin to look at the totality of society, and if we care about each other and about what is happening in our communities, we come to the more senior years, and immediately we find that seniors are faced with a host of issues. One of the issues—and I am glad you brought this up—is Alzheimer's and dementia.

Let me show you something that we developed here. This is a graph of the cost of Alzheimer's in our society. It is growing very, very rapidly. You can see right now we are spending somewhere around \$236 billion a year on it. And as the population ages, which is part of the baby boom, and the fact that we are all going to get older, we figure by 2050 that we will be spending \$1.3 trillion a year to deal with Alzheimer's. It is an extraordinary burden and it is probably one that will bust the bank, the Medicare bank, and the Medicaid bank.

We know that these costs are shared largely by the Federal Government and by individuals and families. In my own family, my mother-in-law was a victim of Alzheimer's, and she spent her last 3 years of her life in our home and we were able to care for her, but that is unusual.

For most families, it is a burden that cannot be afforded, so that cost then comes to the Medicare and the Medicaid program. In fact, the single biggest expense in Medicaid is dementia and Alzheimer's. This is one where we are faced with an enormous challenge, but it is a challenge that actually may have a solution.

Let me put up another chart here before we get to that issue of how to deal with this. This is one that deals with—the cost of caring for seniors with Alzheimer's will increase nearly fivefold by 2050, and here we have broken down the cost, Medicare and Medicaid, \$1.1

trillion in 2050 and the extraordinary rise. But the burden for the Federal Government becomes awesome and, frankly, probably unaffordable.

Can we do something about it?

I think so. And this takes us back to what we were talking about earlier, about the universities and about research.

Let me just put this up very quickly.

What happens when we invest in research?

Well, let's take a look at what we do invest in research. We know, for example, that for cancer we are investing about—Federal government dollars now—\$5.5 billion a year for cancer research. This is through the National Institute of Health.

For HIV/AIDS, somewhere near almost \$3 billion a year. For cardiovascular problems, a little over \$2 billion a year.

For Alzheimer's, it is now about \$900 million a year. So we were able this last year—in 2015–16 budget year, we were able to increase from \$560 million to just under \$1 billion. So we have ramped up.

We thank President Obama for putting that in his budget, and for all of our colleagues, Democrat and Republican, for approving that additional funding for research.

□ 2000

But what does research mean? What does it mean when we actually research these illnesses? It is incredible. One very quick chart here will show you what happens when we invest in research.

I know, Mr. TONKO, this is a big issue in your district. It is a big issue—not just the illness, but the research, because New York is one of the great research centers.

Deaths from major diseases, 2000 to 2013. So what has happened with breast cancer? We have seen a small decline in breast cancer deaths. Prostate cancer, we have seen an 11 percent decline in prostate cancer deaths; heart disease, 14 percent decline; for strokes, 23 percent decline; for HIV/AIDS, a 52 percent decline. What is that decline a result of? Obviously, better medical care, but also research.

So what has happened with Alzheimer's? Remember that we were investing basically at one-tenth of what we invest in cancer and one-fourth of what we invest in heart disease. For Alzheimer's disease, we have seen a 71 percent increase—not a decrease in the number of deaths but, rather, an increase in the number of deaths. So as we ramp up the research, will we be able to see this kind of reduction in deaths? Well, we would hope so. But what we do know is that if we are able to delay the onset of this terrible illness, quality of life will be better, and the cost to the public and to families will decline.

I know, Mr. TONKO, that in your area, while your family may not have been directly affected by Alzheimer's, I

know that you are seriously interested in it because you see it in your community as I do in mine.

Mr. TONKO. Right. Absolutely. I see it. It is the walk taken by many, many families that I represent. I have to share with you that it has touched my family also. So it behooves all of us to be there in this universal format to speak to what is a growing, growing problem.

I was struck by the dollar figures you shared and the bankrupting of our situation with Alzheimer's and student loans. We are driving—we are driving such heavy burdens on to all of us as a society that it challenges us to come forward with some order of prevention and some order of hope that will be driven into the efforts that we currently share to speak more wisely and speak more compassionately to these situations.

I am reminded that the brain is the least researched organ of the body. Now, that alone should speak to us forcefully. Think of not only Alzheimer's but the many neurologically based situations that affect numbers of people out there from the very young to the more senior, the most senior. The brain, as an organ, needs to be researched, and so we need to make certain that we share that message here in the halls of government. Let's bring the hope to the doorstep of individuals who are rendered hopeless at times, who see their loved ones crumble and become someone different. We know that we can invest in that research and that we do have the minds that can lead us in those research attempts and efforts.

When we look at the budget for Alzheimer's, less than one cent of every dollar invested in speaking to and treating Alzheimer's disease is spent on research. We had put together legislation a couple of sessions ago now that require that we have these Alzheimer's townhalls and put together a plan as a nation to speak to conquering the effects of Alzheimer's. It meant that we have to have certain orders of budgeting done to speak to Alzheimer's.

Then we further improved upon that with legislation that said that this budget is not going to be put together with its guidelines in an ordinary process. It was going to bring in the clinicians and the professionals who speak to the Alzheimer's issues as a disease, and they will put together this professional budgeting that will tell us from now to 2025 what that budget will be, what the demands on the system should be.

So that, again, renders a budget that is speaking to the soundness of numbers for the investment made to conquer Alzheimer's. I think that is the professional approach to be taken. It is the compassionate approach to be taken.

Now we are working on issues, on legislation, that will allow for coverage, Medicare coverage, for planning

when you, as an individual, and better said, as a family, are impacted by Alzheimer's, let's do the planning. What should we expect? How do we walk through this with the greatest amount of dignity and effectiveness? That planning will be covered if this legislation were to be approved.

So there are things we can do here. It really is a challenge, I believe, in these times to make certain that research dollars are available that will, again, study the organ in the body that is least researched. Representative GARAMENDI. I know that, by pushing our colleagues who share our beliefs on this issue, we can get it done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very much for bringing up the Alzheimer's Accountability Act. The new money that goes into it, this additional 300-plus million dollars bringing it up to some \$900 million a year is accountable. There are specific plans that are needed; there is a mechanism to prioritize the expenditures—all of those things. So it is not just money that is going to be thrown out there.

I am also reminded that this issue is one that is a brain issue, obviously, but that is an issue that affects our soldiers who have got PTSD, traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress syndrome, all of those things for our veterans who have come back, which, again, is an issue of the brain. If we are studying Alzheimer's, we will also be studying those issues.

About 3 years ago now, in the National Defense Authorization Act, we enacted a provision that required the Department of Defense, as it goes about dealing with these terrible problems that the veterans have with post-traumatic stress or the other brain injuries, coordinate their work with other brain researchers. So we really need to understand that we have one mind, one human brain, and the research will go at it from different symptoms and different diseases, but it is still dealing with the brain. So the sharing of knowledge is a part of what this accountability act will bring forward to us.

We have challenges. We have many, many challenges, and this issue of Alzheimer's that was in the omnibus bill last year and our Republican colleagues, our Democratic colleagues, all alike faced with this issue in their families and their communities, voted in support of this legislation. So this is not a partisan issue. This is a human issue and an American issue. It is one that we can deal with, and we really do have the money to do it.

Mr. TONKO. I think, too, it speaks to the priorities, again, that we need to carve into the budget work that we do. We make a statement with the budget. We identify with the great public, the great many of us, as to what we believe are those champion issues and what we need to take into concern first and foremost. While we may have cast this into opposite ends of the age spectrum, what really strikes me is, when the

Alzheimer's advocacy community comes to Washington on their given fly-in day, every year you hear of numbers going lower and lower in the population, so that you begin to wonder: Is this genetics, is it geriatrics, or is it environmental? What is driving it? But lower and lower creeps the age.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The early onset.

Mr. TONKO. When some of the early onset occurs.

So, again, it affects all of us in a way that, while you may research Alzheimer's or dementia in a broader sense, it unlocks the door to untold possibilities of discovery, genetic discovery, whatever it might be, gene therapy, gene awareness that might come about that speaks to a plethora of issues that affect the brain.

So many, many are graced with the opportunities of research. We as a nation can partner—the private sector, academia—with the public, with the government. It is the message that I hear as a contrast, government isn't an enemy force. Our domestic investment has shrunk in many ways. We need to ramp up the opportunities for hope, for discovery, for intellectual capacity, and for achieving our dreams. We can do that by this concerted effort to do it with our eyes wide open and with a sense of morality driven by the heart-filled and soulful attempts to really adjust our framework to go to those issues that require the partnership of our government.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As you talk about partnerships, I'm thinking about many of the partnerships that do exist already and those that could exist. This brain research, Alzheimer's, and other brain issues are researched around the world. There is an organization that I am familiar with in California that one of our friends from the Napa Valley started, a program called the One Mind Institute. Our former colleague, Mr. KENNEDY, is part of that organization. We have one human brain, and if we could pull together the research from all around the United States and all around the world so that there is a sharing of information, perhaps we will get to some knowledge much, much faster.

So I am really heartened by the effort that the Congress has made thus far to almost double the research for Alzheimer's. I look forward in this month of September as we put together our appropriations, which hopefully we will, or even a continuing resolution, that we would keep in mind that this is an area where money could be well spent.

We make choices here in Congress, and I just want to lay out, as I prepare to close, and then if you would also, Mr. TONKO, among the choices we make is one that I deal with on my committee assignments. I am on the House Armed Services Committee, and I am on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. Strategic arms mean nuclear weapons. I just am troubled—deeply, deeply troubled—by what we are in the proc-

ess of doing here in the United States as well as Russia, China, and perhaps other places around the world in rebuilding our entire nuclear arsenal.

If you take all of the various things that are involved in that nuclear arsenal—the rockets, the bombs, the submarines, the airplanes, and all the command and control systems—in the next 20 years, 25 years, we will spend \$1 trillion—\$1 trillion—on that whole system. I just often think what if we were to spend just a small portion of that, maybe \$1 billion a year or \$2 billion a year of the \$1 trillion on brain research, what would it mean to American families? What would it mean to families around the world? There is not going to be a family in this world that doesn't suffer from this Alzheimer's thing if they live long enough.

So we make choices here, and I wrestle with those choices. But in this particular case, the choice is clear. I prefer to spend some portion of that money on this Alzheimer's issue and on the students and, therefore, on the very important future of this Nation. That would be my choice, and hopefully our colleagues and the American public would see the wisdom of that.

Mr. TONKO, would you like to close?

Mr. TONKO. Yes. I again thank the gentleman from California for bringing us together this evening for discussion on what I believe are very high-priority items that face us in this Congress. I think it is important for us to speak with that anecdotal evidence and to put a human face on all of these discussions. We talk about illnesses like Alzheimer's, dementia, and neurologically based issues. There is also an issue of the illness of addiction that can be benefited; it can be responded to by research.

So my pledge always to my district and, similarly, their request of me is to provide for that human empathy, provide for those stories, the countless stories of individuals who walk the journey that is so very difficult and how they could be assisted simply by the burning sense of hope that we can address, that we can bring to their lives, this focus and this commodity of hope that provides them the extra energy and the ability to walk their journey, walk straight through the bit of difficulty that faces them.

□ 2015

We are a great Nation. We can be made even greater by our intellect investing in research, investing in student loan reform, and investing in Alzheimer's, a disease that can bankrupt the system. These are wise choices driven by human compassion and responded to, I hope, with a passion that you hear from the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), and that all of us need to embrace as we walk this journey together and make certain our government is an effective government responding wholeheartedly to a given cause.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York

(Mr. TONKO), my friend and colleague, for the passion and commitment he has to his people and to the American people and beyond.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DESJARLAIS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of doctor ordered travel limitations for arthroscopic surgery.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ROSS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of health related.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 841, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 7, 2016, at 10 a.m., for morning-hour debate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Mark Takai.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6340. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; California [Docket No.: APHIS-2016-0052] received August 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6341. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of Namibia To Export Meat Products to the United States [Docket No.: FSIS-2012-0028] (RIN: 0583-AD51) received July 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6342. A letter from the Regulatory Review Group, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Environmental Policies and Procedures; Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Related Authorities (RIN: 0560-AH02) received August 4, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6343. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final

rule — National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0101] (RIN: 0579-AE16) received August 15, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6344. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, National Organic Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program (NOP); Sunset 2016 Amendments to the National List [Document Number: AMS-NOP-15-0052; NOP-15-12] (RIN: 0581-AD43) received August 16, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6345. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees (RIN: 0572-AC06) received August 16, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6346. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization and Functions; Releasing Information; Privacy Act Regulations; Enforcement of Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs or Activities Conducted by the Farm Credit Administration (RIN: 3052-AD17) received July 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6347. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities (RIN: 3052-AC69) received July 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6348. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Governance; Standards of Conduct; Risk Management; and Disclosure and Reporting (RIN: 3052-AC89) received July 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6349. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for the Disposition of Non-Ambulatory Disabled Veal Calves [Docket No.: FSIS-2014-0020] (RIN: 0583-AD54) received August 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6350. A letter from the Management Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reauthorization of the United States Grain Standards Act (RIN: 0580-AB24) received August 4, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6351. A letter from the Associate Director for Operations, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Office of Grants and Financial Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Agriculture and Food Research Initiative Competitive Federal Grants Program — General Administration Provisions (RIN: 0524-AA67) received August 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6352. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts, including Coast Guard personnel accounts, from any discretionary cap sequestration in FY 2017, if a sequestration is necessary, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 905(f); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 255(f) (as amended by Public Law 105-33, Sec. 10207(b)); (111 Stat. 704); to the Committee on Appropriations.

6353. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Joint Department of Defense — VA Medical Facility Demonstration Fund account, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); Public Law 110-161, Sec. 1517(b); (121 Stat. 2285); to the Committee on Appropriations.

6354. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing twelve officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6355. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2016 Operational Energy Budget Certification Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2926(c)(4); Public Law 113-291, div. A, title IX, Sec. 901(g)(1); (128 Stat. 3465); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6356. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Perry L. Wiggins, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6357. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John F. Mulholland, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6358. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Sean A. Pybus, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6359. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts—Further Implementation (DFARS Case 2014-D005) [Docket No.: DARS-2015-0038] (RIN: 0750-AI58) received July 25, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6360. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: New Qualifying Countries—Japan and Slovenia (DFARS Case 2016-D023) [Docket No.: DARS-2016-0021] (RIN: 0750-AI97) received July 25,