As a clinical psychologist, I know that there is no budget cut more shortsighted than one that stands between mental health resources and those who desperately need them. For a student, that access may be the difference between a productive day in class and an act of aggression against themselves or their peers. In the case of Andrew and that student, it made the difference between life and death.

That's why last week I introduced the Partnerships for Achieving Student Success, or PASS, Act. It does more than ever before to help our Nation's neediest schools ensure that our children have access to the appropriate mental health and student service professionals on campus. It creates a Federal grant program to help low-income school districts recruit, employ, and retain school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, and other psychologists qualified to work in K–12 schools.

Galway School District ultimately kept their mental health professionals, but not every school district has the capacity to do so. By expanding the number of school mental health professionals in low-income, high-need schools, we can effect positive change in the lives of students who need it most. That's why the PASS Act already has the support of the American Psychological Association, National Association of School Psychologists, American School Counselor Association, and the School Social Work Association of America.

And it is why I take to the floor today to encourage my colleagues to support this bill and improve the academic and life success for students across this country. Together, we can make sure that the Andrews of this world are there when their students need them.

COMFORT WOMEN

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the systematic and brutal enslavement of women during World War II by the Imperial Government of Japan. What is known today as ''comfort women'' is, in reality, a state-sponsored program of sexual brutality against 200,000 women from Korea, China, Taiwan, and the Philippines.

The fact that women and girls as young as 13 years old would be forced into this kind of misery is appalling. It runs counter to every recognized international norm against human dignity.

Anyone seeking to justify or deny the existence of comfort women is ignoring history. The sheer amount of evidence regarding this terrible time in history is staggering. Not only are there documents chronicling the existence of comfort women camps, but there is also the gut-wrenching testimony of survivors and of eye witnesses.

Countless governments around the world have come to the conclusion that, yes, the Imperial Government of Japan did indeed condone this most reprehensible of actions during World War II, along with such brutal violence as the rape of Nanking.

That is why I rise today to condemn the unfortunate remarks of the mayor of Osaka, Japan, who, as recently as yesterday, denied the existence of comfort women. The mayor not only questioned the existence of comfort women, but he sought to justify the use of a ''comfort woman system'' as a means to boost morale for the military. The mayor's remarks are absolutely outrageous, and it adds insult to injury for survivors and their families.

The rise of ultranationalism in Japan is very worrisome and, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I strongly condemn it.

Mr. Speaker, the House went on record in 2007 to express our outrage regarding the forced enslavement of 200,000 women during World War II. The civilian populations of Korea, China, Taiwan, and the Philippines suffered so much from the imperialism and aggression of the Imperial Government of Japan.

We speak with one voice when we speak against grave violations of human rights. It is in America's interest that we continue to press for justice and to never forget.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time.

In every congressional district, there are seniors, new mothers, young children, low-income families, and young adults just starting out on their own. Do my good Republican friends really want to take away their chance for better health?

I would never do that to my constituents, which is why I'm here today, Mr. Speaker, to say again, I am proud of my vote for the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1030

Recently, I had a chance to spend some time with some Hoosiers across my district, and I heard again and again their worry about rising health care costs and their family's ability to access care. Fortunately, millions of Americans no longer have to worry about accessing care because of the Affordable Care Act. Instead, more than half a million Medicare beneficiaries in Indiana alone received free preventive services in 2012, avoiding more costly illnesses. More than 17 million children with preexisting conditions nationwide are no longer being denied insurance coverage. More than 100 million Americans no longer face lifetime limits on coverage.

Mr. Speaker, over 360,000 small businesses have already used tax credits to help insure 2 million workers. By the end of this year, health exchanges will be set up making it easier for people who don't have insurance to choose the coverage that best suits their needs. Next year, we will happily welcome even more consumer protections. Insurance companies will no longer be able to place lifetime limits on coverage. Discrimination against preexisting conditions will be banned for all Americans.

This means that when a woman notices a lump under her arm, there is no reason for her to wait until she finds a job to schedule an appointment. And she doesn't have to wait to get sicker, costing more of her time off from work and away from her family. Under the Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker, she knows she can obtain potentially lifesaving care right away. The same goes for her spouse, her parents, and her children. Our health care system benefits us by allowing us to make investments in lower-cost treatments and prevention now rather than expensive therapies later.

Of course, I know that times are tough right now and we have to be even more careful about the mandates we put on businesses. But my good Republican colleagues seem to forget that people have to be healthy to contribute to our economic growth. As a Representative of many hardworking families, Mr. Speaker, I have stood here time and time again over the past few years to extend a hand to anyone who wants to work with me and us to provide quality health care for all Americans.

Today, I make that very same offer. I will work gladly with anyone who wants to improve our health care system and ensure that all Americans have access to quality and affordable health care.

I call on my Republican colleagues to work with us to implement the Affordable Care Act and start improving it. It's time we all stand together, Mr. Speaker, and start looking out for the health of this great Nation. Without it, we have nothing.

POLITICAL BIAS AT EPA

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express in the very strongest terms possible my disapproval of a pattern of conduct of the Obama administration that is of great concern to all of us, a pattern of conduct in which this administration rewards its friends and punishes its opponents.

Now, when our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution many years ago, there were some basic principles in that Constitution. One was equal protection under the law, and the other was protection from discriminatory

practices. Well, we all know about the IRS being accused of going after groups that they disapprove of.

Today and late yesterday afternoon, two more incidents arose that show that this administration is about punishing their opponents and taking care of their friends. The first incident revolves around the Environmental Protection Agency. There is a system in the Federal Government called the Freedom of Information Act in which individuals, groups, and other entities can request of the Federal Government to obtain information about regulations, things that the Federal Government is doing; and if the group asks for a waiver of fees to obtain that information, they can obtain the information free.

Well, because of a lawsuit filed by the Competitive Enterprise Institute, we now find out that EPA routinely grants fee waivers to its favored left-wing groups who demand a more intrusive and powerful EPA, but systematically deny waivers for free information from any group that EPA disagrees with. In fact, the headline says that EPA gives information for free to groups it agrees with 92 percent of the time, but it denies fee waivers for groups that it disagrees with 93 percent of the time. We cannot afford a government that systematically goes against groups that it opposes and yet rewards groups that it favors.

I want to give you another example that came about yesterday. More than 573,000 birds are killed by the country's wind farms each year, including 83,000 hunting birds such as hawks, falcons, and eagles. Now, nearly all the birds being killed are protected under the Federal environmental laws which prosecutors have used to generate tens of millions of dollars of fines and settlements from businesses, including oil and gas companies and electricity generators over the past 5 years. As a matter of fact, BP oil company was fined $100 million for killing and harming migratory birds during the 2010 gulf oil spill. And PacifiCorp, which operates coal plants in Wyoming, paid more than $10.5 million in 2009 for electrocuting a number of eagles along power lines in its substations.

Yet this administration has never fined or prosecuted a wind energy company, even those that flout the law repeatedly. Instead, the government is shielding the industry from liability and helping to keep the scope of the deaths secret.

So there is clearly a double standard in this administration. If you kill an eagle and you happen to be a private business or you are a power generator or you're an oil company or a chemical company, you're going to be fined. But if you're a wind energy company, even though the bird you killed may be protected under the Endangered Species Act, you're going to be protected. America will not stand for a government that rewards its friends and punishes its opponents in this discriminatory fashion.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE END OF THE CIVIL WAR IN SRI LANKA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the fourth anniversary of the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka on May 18, 4 years ago. Although the war has ended and all of those who care about the well-being of this country are indeed glad and delighted, there remain high levels of suspicion among many Tamils who still feel that they are being denied equal rights, equal protection under the law, and are being treated as second-class citizens.

A large number of Tamils fled the country, left their homeland, during the war; and many have not returned to their homes. Peace is present, but there still exists many hard feelings. Therefore, I urge that the government and the Tamil community find as many ways as possible to promote peace and live in harmony with equality, equal justice, and equal protection under the law. Mr. Speaker, I wish the country well on its peaceful coexistence.

□ 1040

INTRODUCTION OF PUERTO RICO STATUS RESOLUTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today, joined by a bipartisan group of my colleagues, I am introducing the Puerto Rico Status Resolution Act. This bill is a response to the results of a referendum held in Puerto Rico in November. The first question asked voters if they support Puerto Rico's current territory status, which deprives my constituents of the most fundamental democratic rights. Fifty-four percent said ''no.''

The second question asked voters for their preference among the three alternatives to the current territory status. Of those who chose an option, 61 percent favored statehood. More voters said they want Puerto Rico to become a State than to maintain the current status, which is unprecedented.

The White House has recognized the importance of the results, which is why the President is seeking an appropriation to conduct the first federally authorized vote in Puerto Rico's history, intended to ''resolve'' the territory's future status.

The legislation I am filing today is consistent with the President's budget request and serves as a blueprint for how the vote conducted pursuant to that appropriation could be structured.

After outlining the rights and responsibilities of statehood, the bill authorizes a ratification vote on whether Puerto Rico should be admitted into the Union as a State. If a majority of voters affirm Puerto Rico's desire for statehood, the bill provides for the President to submit legislation to admit Puerto Rico as a State after a reasonable transition period. The bill also expresses Congress's commitment to act on such legislation.

Now, I want to speak directly to the men and women who voted for statehood in November. Our movement has become a predominant force in Puerto Rico. Every day, we grow stronger. Like you, I believe that justice delayed is justice denied. And, like you, I find it difficult to be patient. But we fight with our heads as well as our hearts. Perfecting our Union requires passion, but it also demands perseverance. There are no shortcuts on the path to statehood, and politicians who suggest there are are leading us to a dead end.

The statehood movement is powerful because we are united by a single principle, the principle of equality. The November vote has fortified our spirit and renewed our sense of purpose. We will not shy away from a fight. History teaches that once a people have chosen democracy, self-government and progress, they are unlikely to reverse course. Rest assured, now that the people of Puerto Rico have withdrawn their consent to second-class citizenship, the question is not whether, but when, Puerto Rico will obtain equality through statehood.

To my colleagues who represent States, I know you will respect my constituents for seeking the same rights and responsibilities as your constituents. This respect must take the form of concrete action. The U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico have made their choices heard, and they deserve a meaningful response from their national government.

There is overwhelming evidence that territory status has affected Puerto Rico's political, economic, and social development; and it has become clear that the status quo does not serve the national interest, either. The U.S. succeeds when Puerto Rico succeeds; when the island is strong, stable and secure; and when its residents do not feel obligated to relocate to the States to achieve their dreams. From the U.S. perspective, a robust and resilient State of Puerto Rico would advance the national interest.

The position of every President since Harry Truman has been that their administration would accept whatever status choice is made by a majority of Puerto Rico's voters. The U.S. Government is a champion of democracy and self-determination around the world, and it must adhere to those principles with respect to its own citizens. This is essentially true in light of the service that generations of men and women from Puerto Rico have rendered to this Nation, most notably in the Armed Forces, but in so many other ways as well. In a very real sense, Puerto Rico has earned the right to be equal, and equal we will become.

Puerto Rico has been called the shining star of the Caribbean. The time has