United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2014 No. 139

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, November 17, 2014, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2014

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 14, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We come to the end of a week during which some Members of this people's House have come to finish their service in the Congress and others have come to prepare for their opportunity to serve this great Nation. It is a time of tremendous transition, a time fraught with trepidation and some uncertainty.

Send Your spirit of peace and calm that all might have confidence in Your faithfulness to us and that no matter what lies ahead Your grace is abundantly available.

Bless the Members of this assembly and us all that we would be worthy of the call we have been given as Americans. Help us all to be truly thankful and appropriately generous in our response.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IRAN NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, as we approach the November 24 Iran nuclear deadline, we should all be reminded that Iran is a U.S.-designated state sponsor of terrorism. Iran continues to violate multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions, and the regime continues to advance its ballistic missile program, a program that has only one purpose: to launch a nuclear weapon. Iran is one of the world's worst human rights violators and under the so-called moderate Rouhani has been executing people in record numbers.

Yet we recently found out that President Obama sent a secret letter to Iran's Supreme Leader last month. The Supreme Leader responded by releasing a plan to destroy our closest friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

The Iranian regime cannot be trusted. Yet this administration continues to push for a nuclear deal that threatens our U.S. national security interests.

Madam Speaker, we must not allow any deal to be finalized that we view is not in the interests of the United States of America.

STOP DELAYING AMERICA'S MAIL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to stand with the American Postal Workers in Buffalo, New York, and across the country who today rally to send a message: Stop delaying America's mail.

Since 2012, 141 mail processing plants have closed. Eighty-two more across 37

Printed on recycled paper.

States are scheduled to either close or be consolidated beginning in January.

The erosion of service standards is not only bad for customers, U.S. businesses, and hardworking postal workers, but it represents a huge step backward in an increasingly competitive delivery industry.

Today the Postal Service Board of Governors holds their last public meeting of 2014. I urge them to reverse course and maintain service standards that uphold the trademark reputation of the United States Postal Service.

I also urge the House to bring H.R. 630, the Postal Service Protection Act, to the floor for a vote. This legislation removes the pension pre-fund obligation, provides for the expansion of shipping operations and the lease of surplus facility space while maintaining Saturday delivery.

WE NEED TO CHANGE THE WAY WE DO POLITICS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, money and negative advertising in the last election cycle has clearly established the need for us to change the way we do politics here in America.

Putting an end to negative advertising is so essential. It is not only polluting the airwaves on TV, but it is denigrating the candidates, it is corrupting the public policy process, and it is dangerously diminishing people's confidence in our system.

I was greatly heartened 2 years ago to see the spirit of bipartisanship that came with all the new Members of the Congress. I am seeing it again. But until we change the way we do our politics, it is not going to be realized.

We need to do this by putting an end to all this money by outside special interests and their negative advertising and complement that with a change in the way we do business with open rules, where every idea gets a chance to be heard and voted on.

That is how bipartisanship works. That is how things get done. That is essential for compromise, and that is where we need to go to restore people's confidence in our system here in America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9:00 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1213

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5682) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Thursday, November 13, 2014, all time for debate on the motion to recommit had expired, and the previous question had been ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the passage of the measure.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 224, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

YEAS—192

Adams
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—224

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Barletta
Barton
Bass
Blumenauer
Campbell
Coble
Costa
Duckworth
Enyart
Gerlach
Hall
Jones

McGovern
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Payne
Perlmutter
Smith (WA)

□ 1242

Messrs. STUTZMAN, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, GARDNER, ROSS of Florida, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, HUDSON, PERRY, YOUNG of Alaska, LAMALFA, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. ROSKAM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. ADAMS, Ms. HAHN, Messrs. HOLT, CÁRDENAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. BRALEY of Iowa and SCHIFF changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 161, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

AYES—252

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—161

Adams
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT—1''

Amash

NOT VOTING—20

Barletta
Barton
Blumenauer
Bustos
Campbell
Coble
Costa
Duckworth
Enyart
Gerlach
Hall
Jones
McGovern
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Payne
Perlmutter
Ros-Lehtinen
Smith (WA)
Stockman

□ 1252

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of November 14, 2014, a series of votes was held. I intended to cast the following vote: rollcall 519—I vote "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

I want to, first, congratulate the majority leader on his reelection. I want to congratulate him on the expansion of his majority—not something that I was seeking, but it is the reality. I know that all of us look forward to moving forward and to, hopefully, having a degree of cooperation that will respond to what, clearly, the American people want, and that is the two sides to be working together to make their country better and more successful.

And so I want to congratulate the majority leader, and at this point in time I will yield to the gentleman for the purpose of telling us what the schedule is for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate your comments.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week. A complete list will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider three bills aimed at alleviating burdens imposed on small businesses by EPA practices. The first, H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, sponsored by Representative CHRIS STEWART, would establish board member qualifications. The second, H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act, sponsored by Representative DAVID SCHWEIKERT, would prohibit EPA from finalizing a regulation unless the data is made public. The third, H.R. 4795, the Promoting New Manufacturing Act, sponsored by our majority whip, STEVE SCALISE, will bring much-needed

transparency to the EPA permitting process.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for that information, and we will expect to be considering those pieces of legislation.

The majority leader has not mentioned, of course, four bills that I know the majority leader is focused on and are very important.

□ 1300

Are we still, Mr. Majority Leader, expecting to end this session of the Congress on the 11th of December?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Yes, it is our intention. I do understand that government is only funded until the 11th, and it is our intention to continue to work with you and all Members and have that finished by December 11 and be out.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Let me say, Mr. Majority Leader, I know there has been discussion on your side and my side of the aisle. I know Mrs. LOWEY is working with Mr. ROGERS to effect an omnibus appropriations bill.

As we all know, not a single appropriations bill has been adopted. We are operating under a continuing resolution. That is not giving the stability that we need to give to the agencies to know what resources they have to accomplish the objectives we expect.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not his expectation is we will proceed with an omnibus out of the Appropriations Committee before December 11?

It is not on the schedule for next week. My presumption it would be, therefore, hopefully on the schedule for the first week in December when we get back so that we can send it to the Senate to be adopted.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman is right. We did pass seven of the 12 and 11 of the 12 out of committee. Unfortunately, the Senate had passed none.

The best way for this House and this country to work is through regular order, and we hope to be able to get that back with the new Senate.

The gentleman is right. It is not scheduled for next week. No decisions are made, but there is a possibility that we could end on an omnibus in December.

Mr. HOYER. Is it the expectation of the Majority Leader that we would be considering an omnibus so that we would do the 12 appropriations bills in a single bill?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. No decisions are made on the direction that we will go. The gentleman knows that we were down at the White House just last week meeting with the President. I do believe the best way forward is that we would all work together and move this country in the right direction. So no decisions are made on the direction that we go.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I would say, on our side, we agree with Mr. ROGERS and Senator MCCONNELL, who did indicate early on that an omnibus would be the preferable alternative.

The problem, as the gentleman well knows, with the CR, it gives a very limited ability of agencies, particularly the Department of Defense, at a critical time, to plan as they would like. General Dempsey and General Odierno and others have mentioned that, so I am hopeful that we will be able to work together to accomplish that objective.

There are three others. There is no mention of a tax extenders bill. As the gentleman knows, the Senate is addressing that.

Does the gentleman have any idea, again, given the fact that we have essentially 3 weeks left to go and a few days, and cooperation is going to be essential if we get our work done, where we are going on tax extenders?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I had just met with our chairman of Ways and Means and he has been working in the other House with the chair on the Senate, and nothing has been finalized yet.

As you know, we had passed many of those bills permanently out of this House. Negotiations are still going on with the Senate, but it is our intention to have that done before the end of the year as well.

Mr. HOYER. Given that intention, can the Majority Leader tell us whether or not there is an inclination—the Senate, as you know, had a different approach. They did a limited extension, not permanent extensions, and they dealt with all of the extenders, and they had a 2-year extension, as you know.

Whether or not we are looking at doing something temporarily while we prepare for what I think both sides think are necessary, and that is a major tax reform bill at some point in time in the spring or the summer, can the gentleman tell me whether there is that component of the consideration of the tax extenders legislation?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman again. As the gentleman stated, yes, coming out of the House we made it permanent because that gives much greater stability to the country, and that is still part of the negotiation.

The Senate has a different idea than inside the House. None of that has been finalized yet. When the negotiation gets finalized, that will give us the answer.

Mr. HOYER. I would thank the gentleman and urge him that we get to agreement pretty soon because if we are going to give some certainty to the business community, as well as individuals, we need to act on that, and we have some approximately maybe 10 days, if we count 3 days for each one of the weeks that is remaining, 10 days in order to accomplish that through the House and the Senate. So it is necessary, I suggest respectfully to the Majority Leader, that we come to agreement on that fairly soon if we are going to have the ability to pass and send to the President that legislation.

Thirdly, the third of the items, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, which Mr. HENSARLING just wrote an op-ed about. I know that the committee has acted or is contemplating action on that.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not TRIA—and I know there has been some discussion about including it in the omnibus. I don't know whether that is rumor or fact that it is being considered. But can the gentleman tell me where we are on the Terrorism Risk Insurance?

As the gentleman knows, it passed 93–4 in the United States Senate, so it was not a partisan bill in the Senate, overwhelming support for it, and I would hope that we could move it through the House in a similar bipartisan, overwhelming fashion.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have just met with our chairman and he is scheduled to meet with the Senate on the other side of the aisle early next week.

The Speaker and I have both put a statement out that we know the timeline of this. If they can't come to agreement, we are open to doing a 1-year extension, making sure that it doesn't have any problems. But we would like to see a resolution of this with a negotiation between both sides.

Mr. HOYER. The Senate bill, of course, is 7 years, as the gentleman knows, and that gives a certain degree of certainty to the lenders and borrowers and those who do business with both lenders and borrowers and in the construction industry.

I am hopeful that we could come to an agreement that is longer term so we could give more confidence. I think that would be in the best interest and, very frankly, I think would enjoy bipartisan significant support in this House, Mr. Majority Leader.

Lastly, the National Defense Act, authorization bill, which has passed this House, as you know, is pending in the Senate. Does the gentleman have any knowledge as to where that stands now and what possibilities there are to assure its adoption prior to the 11th of December?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman is correct. We have passed it in the House and we have been working with the Senate. I think it is very

strong that we will get this done before December 11. I don't have a set date, but I believe that this is a top priority, not just on this side, but on your side of the aisle as well. We just need a little movement on the Senate and we will be done with it.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Given that expectation of moving on it, does the gentleman expect or know whether or not we will deal with the ''train and equip'' authorization within the framework of the National Defense Authorization Act, or perhaps the omnibus or some other piece of legislation?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You were with us at the White House when the President laid out the supplemental. The Appropriations Committee is going through all the funding there. No decisions have been made yet where that would move forward, but it is our intention to be able to have that question answered but be able to have the resources needed to do the job.

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

APPOINTING THE DAY FOR THE CONVENING OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 129) appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 129

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first regular session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 6, 2015.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 753) providing for the printing of a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 753

Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress be printed as a House document, and that three thousand additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which nine hundred sixty copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2014

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, November 17, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF EAGLE SCOUT JAMES WHITE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Eagle Scout award, the highest honor in the Boy Scouts of America, is widely recognized as a great accomplishment in the life of a young man. Only a small percentage, about 2 or 3 percent, of all the young men who join and participate in the programs of the Boy Scouts are able to achieve it.

This weekend, in my district, James White will become our Nation's newest Eagle, and he is the third son of Dave and Ann White of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, to have been awarded scouting's highest honor.

As an Eagle, James has lived up to the principles of the Scout Oath and Law and has demonstrated the type of citizenship and leadership that I believe is so vital to the future of our Nation.

When he becomes an Eagle Scout, James will be standing with World War II combat veteran George Gieda, who James accompanied on an Honor Flight of veterans here to the Capitol 2 years ago. They became friends; they have stayed in touch; they have provided inspiration to each other.

Because I can't be with the White family this weekend, I wanted the RECORD to reflect my congratulations, my hope that James' future will be filled with many more significant and meaningful achievements, and my belief and reflection that we need more young men like Eagle Scout James White.

RULE FOR THE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the closing of the comment period on the rule for the Waters of the United States under the Clean Water Act that has been proposed by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Since the comment period opened, which was April 24 of this year, landowners, States, counties, and groups representing a diverse range of both economic and environmental stakeholders from across the country have filed more than a quarter million comments on a rule that threatens both our economy and the ability of States to effectively manage water quality.

Through a strong State-Federal regulatory partnership that provides adequate flexibility to address water quality while accounting for local and regional variations and conditions, Pennsylvania has demonstrated a successful track record of improving and protecting the ecological health of its waters. Unfortunately, this new Federal policy poses a direct threat to the longstanding federalist approach empowered within the Clean Water Act.

Today, Members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation will join the thousands of other concerned citizens in opposing this flawed policy.

FEDERAL FOOD POLICE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal food police now control what American children are permitted to eat in public schools. The First Lady has said, ''We just can't leave it up to the parents.''

Several things are wrong about this totalitarian control of children. Kids say the portions are so small or the food is so disliked they must smuggle food from home or just go hungry. This leads to the Federal Government food being wasted and thrown away at the end of the day.

What is next?

Are the Federal food bureaucrats going to force-feed schoolchildren with government food?

It should not be the role of Washington and the Federal Government to control what children eat. That is the responsibility of parents.

Americans are not stupid and cannot leave it up to the almighty Feds to determine what is best for our kids. The Federal Government should not raise our children because the Federal Government is not the parent of my kids or my grandkids, whether Washington likes it or not.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1315

THE NEW OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is an important day for a number of reasons.

It is an important day in that we passed the Cassidy bill here in the House that will open the door to the Keystone XL pipeline being built. Since this administration has dallied so, the Chinese have entered the picture and are desirous of having a pipeline going to the west coast of Canada so that, apparently, when this administration does, finally, get around to deciding what is best for Americans instead of what is best for his political situation, then we will have to compete with the Chinese, who will be seeking the oil to go in their pipeline as opposed to the United States' getting it to come through our pipeline.

We understand that our friend Ms. LANDRIEU, Senator LANDRIEU, will have a bill in her name come to the Senate floor for a vote. I am really proud BILL CASSIDY is a friend. I am proud that we had a chance to vote on the Bill Cassidy bill, and I am proud that it passed. I think it is such a shame that MARY LANDRIEU will not be able to likely get her colleagues to vote for the Keystone pipeline and pass it as BILL CASSIDY has been able to do here in the House.

Make no mistake. Since I live in east Texas and the pipeline will come through part of my district and come across private land, nobody who has private land wants a pipeline coming across their land. Anybody who has ever had one knows it is no fun. You don't like having an easement across for a pipeline like that. So it will require great diligence to make sure that it is properly maintained and that damage is avoided, and if damage occurs, then I will certainly want to fight for our landowners to make sure they are properly addressed and taken care of and compensated.

That is one thing today, but it really pales in comparison, Mr. Speaker, to what happened 100 years ago today.

THE NEW OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Mr. GOHMERT. In recent years, after this administration blindly supported what it called—and others in North Africa and the Middle East called—an Arab Spring, we have come to find out what many of us suspected even at the time and said was likely to be even more of a devastating winter than an Arab Spring. It has seen the fall of the government in Libya. It has seen the chaos arise in many parts of Libya. It has seen terrorists take control of parts of Libya. It has seen the fall of the governments in Algeria, Tunisia, and the takeover of radical Islam.

I was amazed at the ignorance of many in the mainstream media when I said back at the time that what radical Islamists—what the Muslim Brotherhood—were seeking to re-create was the beginning of the Ottoman Empire and that, in its ignorance, our executive branch—this administration here in the U.S.—actually helped jump-start what the Muslim Brothers are hoping will be the new Ottoman Empire. I was surprised how many reporters asked what did I mean by ''Ottoman Empire.'' They had not had the kind of education that I was fortunate to have had in public schools in east Texas and in public school by way of Texas A&M University and then law school at Baylor. So they didn't know what the Ottoman Empire was. Hopefully, they did some research.

Many of us did not realize that the date 9/11—when the worst attack on America occurred—also marked the anniversary of the worst defeat that the Islamic caliphate ever suffered in history. That was the devastating defeat to the caliphate. The radical Islamist caliphate had made it all the way to Vienna. It laid siege upon Vienna, and on 9/11 of 1683, the radical Islamic caliphate suffered its worst defeat in history. Amazingly, that was the date that Osama bin Laden and the mastermind, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed—currently in Guantanamo, who hopefully will stay there until his death—chose to inflict the worst attack in American history.

To many people, dates mean things. My anniversary means a lot. I have never forgotten one. Our birthdays mean a lot to most Westerners. Some of us begin to try to forget them, but major dates in caliphate history mean a great deal to radical Islamists.

There was an article today written by Dr. Sebastian Gorka, and I would like to read this in for the RECORD. He does a good job of incapsulating this issue today.

Dr. Gorka says:

> One hundred years ago today, the last caliph, or emperor of Islam, declared the last jihad against the infidel, and today is the first time ever that the National Cathedral in the Nation's Capital will host Muslim prayers.
>
> Most Americans will have no idea that, as part of World War I, the then-caliph of the Ottoman Empire declared a holy war against infidels as was his right within shari'a law and Islamic theology. You can read the full fatwa.

In that fatwa, there actually was a typo in the original. It was provided on this day in 1914, but they had a typo saying it was 1915.

The article says:

> That statement by the last sitting head of what was the theocratic empire of Islam was the catalyst which led to the religiously fueled genocide against Christian Armenians and Assyrians.

That is what is pictured. It actually represents a photograph that was taken of young Armenian Christian girls who were kidnapped, stripped naked, raped, and then crucified on crosses as far as the eye could see.

This article points out:

> The Episcopal church leaders who agreed to host Muslim prayers inside the Washington cathedral probably have no idea what happened a century ago in Asia Minor or that there even was a caliph in office at the beginning of the 20th century.
>
> However, we can rest assured that the co-organizers do, for they include the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), The Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), the Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC), and the All Dulles Area Muslims Society (ADAMS) Center.
>
> Both CAIR and ISNA will be fully aware of the significance of November 14th, seeing as both organizations were declared by a Federal court to be unindicted coconspirators of Hamas, the Muslim Brotherhood terror group, in the largest terrorist financing trial in U.S. history.
>
> Those Muslims who have a supremacist understanding of their religion, such as members of al Qaeda and the Muslim Brotherhood, which was recently declared an illegal terrorist organization in the country of its founding, Egypt, have a special regard for historic dates and anniversaries.
>
> It is, of course, no accident that the 9/11 attacks—the worst terror attacks in world history—occurred exactly to the day in 1683 when the Islamic Ottoman forces were defeated outside the city walls of Vienna, the deepest the Islamic caliphate's forces made it into the heart of the Christian West.
>
> There is nothing inherently wrong about interfaith initiatives as long as they start from the same place: a mutual respect for the belief system of the other and their inherent dignity as humans created by God. When one party acts in bad faith based upon its ideological commitment to see other faiths destroyed or subjected, then the event runs the risk of becoming a propaganda coup for the extremists and their followers.
>
> The fact that this event is occurring just as ancient Christian communities are being destroyed in the Middle East and ''non-believers'' are being actually crucified by ISIS jihadists makes it all the more egregious.
>
> We know that the Episcopal church is in trouble with more conservative believers leaving in great numbers and the remaining adherents not exactly outdoing their Catholic cousins in terms of reproducing the next generation of believers.

The author goes on to say:

> But I doubt they also understand the finer points of jihadist doctrine, one of which is that if a place of worship is used by Muslims for their prayers that territory subsequently becomes part of Dar al Islam, sacred Muslim land, forever.

That author was Sebastian Gorka, Ph.D., and he is the Major General Matthew C. Horner Distinguished Chair of Military Theory at the Marine Corps University and is the national security and foreign affairs editor at Breitbart.com.

Mr. Speaker, it is an important day. The prosecution referred to in this article was actually the Holy Land Foundation criminal trial in the United

States Federal District Court in Dallas, Texas. I have done a great deal of reading and looking into the issues involved in that case, and am aware of the massive number of counts of conviction, and also have read some of the pleadings in this case in which the Islamic Society of North America and the Council on American-Islamic Relations—CAIR and ISNA—were named as coconspirators in that prosecution, in which they were contributors and part of funding terrorism.

□ 1330

They were not named as indicted coconspirators, but they were named as coconspirators. And CAIR and ISNA were among parties that filed pleadings in Federal District Court, demanding that their names be eliminated from the pleadings.

Yet after the Federal judge in Dallas reviewed all of the information, the evidence before him, he declared that actually there was plenty of evidence to support the fact that CAIR and ISNA—which have such cozy relations with this administration now—that there is plenty of evidence to support that those two entities are coconspirators in supplying and financing terrorism.

Well, those convictions occurred in late 2008. And from some who have been involved in that effort, their understanding was that if the Bush administration Justice Department, after years of investigation and effort of prosecution, if they got convictions, then the intention was to come back—and especially since the courts had said that there is plenty of evidence to support that these named coconspirators were coconspirators, then they would come back and actually indict them, prosecute them. And those parties were not satisfied, though, with the judgment of the Dallas Federal court.

So they appealed the ruling that there was plenty of evidence to support CAIR and ISNA being coconspirators, and Imam Majid, who is their part of the prayer effort at National Cathedral today—they wanted their names eliminated. The Federal judge in Dallas would not do that. So they appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

And after the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reviewed the record, all the information, then they stated even more plainly and more directly than the Federal District Court did that, yes, there really was plenty of evidence to support that they were coconspirators and that the names should not be struck. They should not be kept private.

And the thinking was that, you know, gee, any administration, of course, will understand that once a Federal District Court and a Court of Appeals find there is plenty of evidence to support that CAIR and ISNA are coconspirators in helping terrorism around the world that surely they would not end up being cozy with any American administration. That would be the common sense, you would think.

There is plenty of common sense back where I come from. But you get to Washington, and it is not common sense. It is just sense.

And it is rather a shame that organizations who were said by a Federal court system to have plenty of evidence to show that they are coconspirators and had radical Islamic efforts at terrorism, that they would have such an open ear at the White House.

In recent years, there was a 2-day seminar that was going to take place out at Langley. And I know one of the instructors very well. He has made a career out of studying radical Islam. He used to provide briefings, do research, provide advice to the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our military about radical Islam. Well, he was one of them. Well, that rather upset what the Federal courts have said the evidence indicates were front groups for the Muslim Brotherhood, were suppliers, helpers in terrorism. They got upset that he was going to be out there and be a part of the teaching of the seminar. So they burned up the phone line to the White House. The White House canceled the seminar.

And it was CAIR that had an ongoing partnership that they developed with the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation. And I was surprised that it took so long after the FBI had spent a couple of decades investigating what, ultimately, we understood was the Muslim Brotherhood. It was surprising, with Federal courts saying that there is plenty of evidence to show that they are complicit in supplying terrorism funding, helping with terrorism. I was surprised that the FBI decided, with all that evidence they furnished the prosecutors, that they ended up turning around and making CAIR their partner.

So I was surprised that the letter took so long from the FBI eventually to the leaders of CAIR, saying that, in view of evidence in essence there in the Holy Land Foundation trial, we need to suspend our partnership in the outreach program that the FBI had to them.

When I was questioning the immediate previous director of the FBI, Director Mueller, about the Tsarnaevs and the lack of investigation into their backgrounds, even after the Russians warned this administration twice—after the first time, apparently the Russians were surprised that we didn't do anything with the knowledge they had provided, that Tsarnaev had been radicalized and would likely kill people here. They warned a second time and had to be totally shocked—and, to the best I understand, basically the investigation included talking to Tsarnaev, himself, and to his mom. There may have been some other peripheral things.

But as I questioned the director of the FBI, saying, you guys didn't even go out to their mosque to ask questions to help you determine whether Tsarnaev had been radicalized. And, in essence, he ended up saying, we did go to the mosque. When he gave the answer, I didn't hear the little add-on he gave until my staff replayed it with the little add-on he gave after: We did go out to those mosques, but he added, ''in our outreach program.''

So just as I suspected, the FBI didn't go out and investigate. MICHELE BACHMANN, LYNN WESTMORELAND reviewed some materials. TRENT FRANKS looked at some of the materials. But we were concerned because CAIR, this named coconspirator in supplying and helping terrorism, as a front group for the Muslim Brotherhood, we were surprised that CAIR had such powerful inroads into the FBI, enough to the point that they could demand to have the training materials for the FBI reviewed and had them purged of things that they, as apparently a front group for the Muslim Brotherhood, found offensive. As named coconspirators in funding terrorism, they were offended.

So a massive number of pages that radical Islamists might find offensive, that people who wanted to kill Americans might be offended by, were purged from our training materials. The State Department apparently purged materials. The intelligence community purged materials. And, as one intelligence officer told me, we have blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemy.

So, Mr. Speaker, it breaks my heart, grieves me deeply when innocent Muslims are maltreated, killed, tortured. It is a grievous violation of human rights. But in the same way, the things that have been done and are growing and spreading in numbers never before seen in human history, of Christians being persecuted around the world, as America basically remains silent.

But today, being the 100th anniversary of the caliph's public fatwa, demanding the murder, killing of Christians in 1914 by the last Islamic caliph, also is the first day in our history when the National Cathedral, run by the Presbyterian church, conceded to the named coconspirators in funding terrorism, their demands to have prayers today on this 100th anniversary of the fatwa that caused the deaths of countless Christians, especially Armenian Christians, as depicted in this blown-up photograph from the newspaper, as depicted in this drawing that we have blurred, depicting what was actually seen along the road as massive numbers of young Christian girls were raped and crucified.

We don't want a holy war. No Christian should ever go to some kind of holy war. But for heaven's sake, when there is an international group about which moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East have said to me: The Muslim Brotherhood is your enemy; they have been behind every attack that has occurred onto America and Americans; they have been behind the killing of Americans all over the Middle East and the world—why do you keep helping the Muslim Brotherhood?

When the largest uprising in the history of the world occurred over a year ago in Egypt, when moderate Muslims, Christians, even the Coptic Christian Pope, secularists, over 30 million came to the streets of Egypt and said, we don't want radical Islam controlling our country, it was a day of historic proportions. Never before had there been a crowd of that size gathered. Even when 20 million came out or when the estimated 33 million came out, they demanded the same thing. It was not a military coup, as CNN and this administration tried to paint. It was the largest uprising in the history of the world, in Egypt.

And the Egyptians, instead of being called stupid, foolish by this administration and some media, they should have been congratulated. We should have rushed to their assistance. And, instead, this administration said, Unless you put Muslim Brother Morsi back in power, then we are not going to help you. The Apache helicopters that were coming, that you use to keep the Suez Canal open, that you use to fight terrorism in the Sinai, that help Israel, we are not going to send them. You are not going to be able to keep the Suez Canal and the Sinai terrorism down until you put the Muslim Brothers back in charge.

Many in the media made a big deal about the Christian churches being burned and about Jews and Christians being persecuted, tortured, and killed, and, for some unbelievable reason, tried to blame it on those who ousted the Muslim Brothers. And anybody that will do any modicum of research in Egypt will understand, it was the Muslim Brothers that burned the churches, that killed Christians and Jews there. It was not the government. It was not the military. The military, under General el-Sisi, was doing everything it could to stop it.

I talked to a former CIA operative in the Middle East last year who said that he had talked to a guy who said, Morsi, President Morsi, had tried to contract through him to have General el-Sisi murdered.

□ 1345

I asked our Embassy personnel if they had heard of anything like that. They said they had not.

In our meeting with General el-Sisi, I asked him directly, ''Did you have evidence when you arrested President Morsi that he was trying to hire someone to kill you?'' He beat around the bush twice and ultimately answered, ''Yes, we did.''

Yet we even had even Republicans go to Cairo and say, ''Put back the Muslim Brothers.'' And I met the brilliant gentleman—Muslim, seemed to be a very fine man—that was put in charge of the committee to draft a new constitution because the constitution the United States helped and this administration helped Egypt to get that led to the Muslim Brotherhood control of the country had no provision for impeachment.

So as Muslim Brother President Morsi began to usurp power, kind of in the same vein, and Noriega and other dictators who get elected and then start grabbing power, he was doing it in Egypt. There was no provision for impeachment.

There was nothing they could do except what they did, go to the street in the tens of millions, demand his removal and, in the largest uprising, cause the removal of an unconstitutionally acting President, and he was removed, thank goodness.

I was thrilled earlier this year when I think it was over 90 percent of the Egyptian voters voted to ratify the new constitution for Egypt. I really wished that all of the American media could have grasped the significance of what happened.

That constitution actually included provisions that required the Egyptian Government under the constitution to rebuild and replace the churches or synagogues that had been damaged or destroyed by the Muslim Brotherhood. They felt so badly for what the Muslim Brotherhood had done to the Christians and Jews that they put it in their constitution that they had to be repaired and replaced. That should have been a big day for freedom, and most of the American media missed it entirely.

Well, they are also missing today. As the left often wants to do—maybe they want to vilify me. You can try to rewrite history, but you can't change what has happened in the past, and what happened 100 years ago today, the first day, November 14, that the National Cathedral, run by the Presbyterian Church, has allowed Muslim prayers by named coconspirators in the terrorist funding trial to come lead prayers in this Christian cathedral.

I thank God that the massive majority of Muslims, including some of my Muslim friends in the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan, they don't want radical Islamists controlling anything. They don't want to be at war with Americans. They don't want to kill Americans. Thank God for that.

But it is sheer lunacy not to recognize how important anniversaries are to radical Islamists, to the Muslim Brotherhood, to those who would kill and persecute and wipe out Jews and, as they say, wipe the Great Satan America off the map and the Little Satan Israel off the map. It is lunacy not to recognize the way these radical Islamists feel. We can live at peace with moderate Muslims.

When I visited Nigeria not long ago to mourn with the Africans—23 mothers who had had their daughters kidnapped, brutalized every day still in Boko Haram, radical Islamist controlled, it was a beautiful thing. Nigeria, until the radicals got involved, had Muslims and Christians living peacefully together.

Meeting a government official, a devout Christian, who had in his wedding party one of his best friends in the world who was a Muslim, it is a thing of beauty to see people with different backgrounds and beliefs living at peace together.

But until the American media, until a majority of Americans realize there really are radical Islamists that think that the fatwa that was declared by the last Islamic caliph of the Ottoman Empire 100 years ago today was a great thing, then this country remains at great risk.

It is bad enough that we have enemies publicly saying they want to wipe us off the map, destroy our freedom of worship, free speech, the freedoms we hold dear and love, but to be blind that they want to destroy us is negligence, reckless indifference that can cost a country's freedom.

Mr. Speaker, today is a big day. I hope Americans will wake up and understand the Muslim Brotherhood is not our friend. They want us all to be living, if we live at all, as Muslims or to pay the fine that acknowledges that we are subjugating ourselves to radical Islam. People have got to wake up. This country is at risk.

Mr. Speaker, with prayerful regard to the masses of young Christians who were kidnapped, raped, crucified as a result of that fatwa issued 100 years ago today, I hope that we will not be so blind that we could allow this movement to continue to grow as it has grown and grown.

Some say a good way to avoid destructive forces overtaking civilized society is to watch Israel—that Israel could be looked at as the world's miner's canary, as miners used to take canaries into mine shafts. They knew canaries were more sensitive to poison gas, so if they saw a canary getting in trouble, falling, then they knew they better get out of the mine because it was very, very dangerous.

When we see Israel being attacked, our best friend in the Middle East being attacked, when we see anti-Semitism, hatred for Jews, hatred for Israelis growing in Europe, of all places—I never thought that would happen again after Hitler—but it is growing again around Europe. It is growing on American campuses.

These young, wonderful, brilliant students who have been miseducated to think that they need to get involved in anti-Semitism on their campuses in America will hopefully wake up and realize they have been played by people that are not about freedom.

It is time for America to wake up. Because today, as an anniversary of what happened 100 years ago, is a really big deal for those who want to destroy our way of life and our lives if we are Christians.

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

LOCAL CONTROL FOR LOCAL LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is

recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon because of a threat, a rare threat, because this seldom happens in the House anymore, but a threat from at least one Member of this House to try to nullify a local initiative approved by the voters of the District of Columbia.

But when it comes to the lawful initiative for District of Columbia citizens, that is a threat to democracy that means that anyone who represents this city, has to come to the floor and to indicate to Members how important it is to hold fast to your own principles.

Wherever you stand on the District of Columbia or any of the underlying issues, this is the local jurisdiction of 650,000 people who pay taxes without full representation in this House.

So I am asking Members of the House not to take advantage of an anachronism in the law which does allow Members of the House to step forward, if they are so inclined, to try to get others to join them in nullifying the local laws of a local jurisdiction. If one reads the history of our country, it is hard to find anything more un-American.

That is why, particularly, I have to thank the bipartisan group of Members who stood with me yesterday, three Members of this House—two Democrats and a Republican—who themselves come from States that have taken action on the underlying issue, one that is rapidly developing in our country where the States differ among themselves. But since each State is, as a local or State matter, a government unto itself, those matters don't come before this House.

The Members who stood with me yesterday were Representative EARL BLUMENAUER of Oregon, which has approved a ballot initiative just this past election day, that legalized small amounts of marijuana; Representative JARED POLIS of Colorado, his was the first State to legalize small amounts of marijuana; and DANA ROHRABACHER of California, who is perhaps the recognized leader in the House of Representatives and in the country for reform of marijuana laws.

□ 1400

Alaska and Oregon joined two other States, Washington and Colorado, and yes, a third, the District of Columbia, approved the legalization of marijuana in small amounts. I am going to indicate to the House how that came about because it didn't come about in the usual way. There were pressing concerns that led the District to move to decriminalize and then legalize small amounts of marijuana.

In fact, the D.C. Council, upon hearing concerns about disparities in arrests and convictions based on race, had moved to decriminalize marijuana with a small fine; whereas, before, there was a penalty of up to 6 months in jail and up to a $1,000 fine. After the council passed that decriminalization law—and 18 States have decriminalized—then some residents put legalization on the November ballot.

Now the people have spoken. Two-thirds of the residents of the District of Columbia say that the council did not go far enough, and they have, I think, among them a number of reasons that I will try to indicate on the floor this afternoon why they thought they had to go further.

I indicated that there are and already were States that had legalized marijuana, and the Justice Department has taken the position and took it again at a hearing on the D.C. decriminalization law that the District will be treated like the States that have relaxed their marijuana laws—in our case, 2 ounces of marijuana for personal use.

And the position of the Justice Department—and I will indicate later why the Justice Department has taken that position—has been that, as a matter of prosecutorial priority, the Justice Department, the U.S. attorneys of the United States are not in the business of prosecuting people who smoke small amounts of marijuana.

So the District is to be treated in the same way as the States who have either decriminalized or legalized marijuana. The Justice Department is on record in a hearing saying that—and we appreciate that the District is not to be treated differently when it comes to Federal enforcement, any differently than, for example, Oregon, Colorado, and Alaska, and you don't see the Justice Department rushing forward to prosecute what will almost always be young people for possessing small amounts of marijuana.

Particularly for new Members, I want to make clear that there is an anomaly here, an anachronism, because the House does still have the authority to step forward and nullify the local laws of the District of Columbia. That goes back hundreds of years, and the fact that anybody would attempt to use that authority today flies in the face of 200 years of history and democratization in our country.

It is interesting to know that the Member who has stepped forward to stop D.C. thus far is a sophomore. I want to thank Members of Congress who recognize that they have the authority and who may disagree with the District but have not in fact moved to nullify local law. This really isn't where you stand on the law. It is whether you believe local jurisdictions should have what the Framers believed all should have throughout the United States, and that is the right to pass local laws without interference by the Federal Government.

That is the principle at stake here. That is why we rarely have Members step forward to try to nullify a law of the District of Columbia, and I am very grateful that principle for most Members is almost always observed.

Now, I want to make something very clear: I am not here this afternoon to make a case for the use of marijuana; I am here to make a case only for local control of local law.

If you were to ask my preference, and obviously, I am obligated to support the laws of my local jurisdiction here, but if you were to ask my preference, I would say to you, in all candor, that I don't believe Americans should smoke anything.

We know that millions of lives were lost needlessly because people didn't know about the deadly effects—I think I do not speak inaccurately when I say the ''deadly effects''—of cigarette smoking. Cigarette manufacturers are still paying the price with millions of dollars—billions of dollars that they have had to pay States in order to make up for essentially hiding information on the effects of cigarette smoking.

Frankly, there is much investigation still to be done about cannabis. We certainly can't say it is good for your health, except for medical marijuana.

Representative ROHRABACHER yesterday spoke of a constituent whose son had come back from Iraq and had seizures and other problems emanating from his service, and no amount of medicine had done him any good. He was able to get a prescription for medical marijuana, and it controlled the problem.

Yet, by the way, although there have been bills introduced, the VA could not have prescribed medical marijuana to that veteran.

So I can't make the case for the underlying issue. In fact, there is evidence of harm to the brains of children. The bills that have passed the States are for adults only, people over 21. I am not even making the case for them. We need to know a lot more about marijuana, a substance that is breathed in deeply.

However, I tell you this much: I cannot make a case at all for a drug conviction for smoking marijuana in small amounts. That is where it seems to me that there is increasing agreement by the American people.

Just look at the latest polls. 54 percent approve legalization. I don't think they approve of legalization because they smoke cannabis; I think they approve of legalization because they don't believe people ought to be convicted of a drug offense for possessing small amounts of marijuana.

There is very good news. The reason we always speak of marijuana and young people is because, apparently, people tend to outgrow the use of marijuana. As young adults leave college and become more mature, they tend to smoke very little of anything today and no longer marijuana. You don't see lots of middle-aged people talking about marijuana either.

I wish I could say that their parents had outgrown alcohol, that people could outgrow alcohol, which is a legal substance that destroys lives, the lives of individuals, lives of entire families. Some become addicted to the substance, but if all you do is use it and

get drunk and don't hurt anybody, then of course you are not convicted of a crime.

A Member of this House, Representative ANDY HARRIS, makes the case for nullification of the D.C. law based on harm to young people; except, of course, the law doesn't allow young people to smoke, and it is interesting to know that Representative POLIS said, because it is legal in Colorado, that smoking among juveniles in Colorado has gone down. I asked why.

He said it is because Colorado is wiping out the illegal market and kids have to go to that illegal market to get marijuana—and to a very illegal market to get it because some are under 21, so young people are smoking less and less in Colorado.

I don't think you can make the case against freedom and liberty based on children here, where we are talking about a substance for adults, and not when the District of Columbia already has introduced a bill called the Marijuana Use Public Information Campaign, which Council Member Tommy Wells has put on a fast track for passage. I like the bill that Council Member Wells is taking through the council. It would include education forums for each ward of the city. There are eight wards.

It is trying to get to people where they live, educating the public on what we do know of the impact of marijuana use and abuse. The bill requires that the Mayor report to the council on the type and the frequency and the provider and school age level of public school health education programs related to substance abuse, including marijuana use, and of course alcohol and tobacco.

Again, not making the case that I cannot in honesty make, I do want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that marijuana is still classified under Schedule I, and that is the schedule for the most dangerous drugs.

Marijuana is scheduled in the same category as heroin and LSD and ecstasy, even though the science we know today tells us that the addictive qualities of cannibis are nowhere near the same; worse, marijuana is scheduled above cocaine.

Now, if you want to know a drug that has torn big cities and suburbs alike apart, it would be cocaine. So cannibis is more dangerous, according to the scheduling of drugs, than cocaine and methadon and OxyContin.

Well, young people know that is not the case. The young people who smoke and then outgrow marijuana know that is not the case, so they don't pay any attention to the law.

And as I shall indicate, the laws don't pay much attention to them because most of them do not face the possibility of conviction. They don't face conviction, and I want to emphasize this because, when you consider law enforcement, it is impossible not to recognize that State and local law enforcement officials and Federal law enforcement officials, have virtually ceased to enforce the laws that make marijuana a Schedule I drug offense—but some people do get arrested.

I have already indicated that the Justice Department has said that it will not prosecute people for possession of small amounts. U.S. attorneys in Democratic and Republican administrations for years now—there are many who have never prosecuted anyone for small amounts of marijuana.

In effect, that means that marijuana is so widely used, has caused so little in the way of known harmful effects, that it is, today, de facto legal. That is why young people take the risk.

□ 1415

If that is the case, if convictions rarely occur, let's look at what happens when arrests and convictions do occur.

What led the District of Columbia to pass its law, its first law, the decriminalization law, were two studies done by outside organizations, two reputable organizations: the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and the American Civil Liberties Union. They found that while Whites and Blacks use marijuana at the same rate, 9 out of 10 arrests are of African Americans. This city is half White and half Black.

The people of the District of Columbia have decided that decriminalization alone would not undo this outrageous disparity. A conviction on your record for marijuana is a conviction for a schedule 1 drug offense. And it doesn't matter; the word ''drug'' is what matters. That record can sentence, for example, a young Black man or woman or young Hispanics to a lifetime of underemployment or unemployment. Indeed, if there is enough underemployment and unemployment, a drug conviction for a small amount of marijuana can lead some further to a life where drugs become, in their view, the only way to make a living at all. So for them it can be a gateway drug precisely because the marijuana arrest or conviction has simply stopped their lives.

So when the council understood that 9 out of 10 arrests were of African Americans, it could not justify keeping that law on the books. And I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have now had, for 10 years, a Commission on Black Men and Boys and am cochair of a Congressional Caucus on Black Men and Boys because of issues like this that affect young men of color. Such a conviction can ruin a young man's life for work. If it makes work impossible or work possible only in the underground or the illegal economy, then it ruins his life for marriage and for children and for stability in the community.

The D.C. Commission on Black Men and Boys and the Congressional Caucus on Black Men and Boys, of course, look at issues across the board, but there are serious concerns about disparities of this kind that affect men and essentially take them out of the African American community, out of the Hispanic community, and make them men apart. Marijuana use is simply one example.

And again I point out, it is not that people of color use marijuana at a greater rate than their counterparts of the same age who are White. It is who gets arrested. Whether that is in the ordinary course of law enforcement, intentional or not, those are the facts.

The interesting thing about the investigations by the independent organizations in the District, is that they find that these statistics showing hugely disparate treatment of people of color from other Americans on marijuana convictions and arrest are by no means confined to the District of Columbia. It is a nationwide phenomenon. If only a tiny minority are arrested and they turn out to be people of color, you have a classic case of racial discrimination.

I note that I have been joined on the floor by a very good friend from Nevada (Ms. TITUS). I am pleased to yield to her.

Ms. TITUS. Well, thank you very much.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman NORTON, for arranging this important discussion about an issue that is moving quickly in State capitals across the country, here in Washington, D.C., but in Congress maybe not so much.

I would like to speak about the legal regulated use of marijuana for medical and commercial sale because this is an important issue that has garnered attention nationwide as States and communities continue to enact laws to allow for legal and carefully regulated and taxed sale and use. We see this in all parts of the country, in all types of communities, and we see it not just passed by State legislatures, but mandated through public referenda.

I represent the heart of the Las Vegas Valley in the State of Nevada where, for nearly 14 years, we had a voter-approved mandate allowing for medical marijuana. Then just last year, the State legislature put forth a legal framework for medical marijuana businesses to be permitted, regulated, and to go into operation around the State.

This has led to enormous interest from investors and entrepreneurs, researchers, and, most importantly, patients who now can benefit, through the assistance of their physicians, from medical marijuana for the treatment for all kinds of things, a variety of things: epileptic seizures in children, PTSD treatment, pain relief from cancer, appetite enhancers for people undergoing chemotherapy, and HIV/AIDS.

Nevada is now one of 23 States with legal marijuana for medical or commercial sale, and those numbers continue to grow after poll after poll shows increasing support for legalization and regulation. We saw two States just in the election last week where marijuana was approved.

Now, that brings us to what is happening here in Congress. Over the course of the last 113th congressional session, we have seen considerable advancements that had not been the case up until now. A few years ago, just a short time ago, only a small group of Members of Congress would be willing to speak out about medical marijuana, much less support any kind of legislation that would update our Nation's antiquated drug laws. But today, Democrats and some Republicans have come together to advocate for this industry and work to update the Nation's laws to catch up to what is happening in the States and to reflect the realities of what is going on in Nevada, in Washington, D.C., and in places around the country.

For the first time, with the help of leaders like Congressman BLUMENAUER, Congressman ROHRABACHER, and others, the House of Representatives passed not one, but two significant amendments to protect the rights of States when it comes to legal marijuana sales and use.

As more States and communities move forward with ballot initiatives like the one that passed here in D.C., 2–1, or with regulatory laws like those that were just enacted in Nevada, it is important that we, as elected representatives of our communities, become educated and advocate for the community's best interests.

Because of the important potential role that medical marijuana will play in Nevada's economic future and because this conversation is so quickly becoming a national issue, I have tried to educate myself and have been traveling the country visiting dispensaries, growers, and experts in the industry to learn about the fiscal and scientific potential, as well as the obstacles that are faced by these businesses.

I traveled to the Berkeley Patients Group, The Apothecarium, and Blum dispensary in the San Francisco Bay area to learn more about how the industry has evolved from leaders like Sean Loose, Ryan Hudson, and Salwa Ibrahim, all of whom are recognized experts and innovators in the field of medical marijuana.

I went to Arizona to visit with Beth Stavola and Dr. Sue Sisley and discussed the advantages of medical marijuana in treating veterans with PTSD and for helping seniors. I also met with folks at Monarch Wellness Center to hear how an entrepreneur's personal history with his mother's medical condition inspired him to open Scottsdale's first medical marijuana dispensary. And I recently traveled to Colorado, where I was very impressed by CannLabs' facility that is bringing the highest standards of quality and safety to the medical cannabis industry.

I would encourage my colleagues here in Congress to visit these businesses, talk to their employees, and see firsthand that today's industry is not just some little head shop on the corner with a picture of Che Guevara. It is a very professional, very scientific, very regulated industry. It is a modern, professional office with skilled and educated personnel.

So we have more work to do. It has begun, but we have a lot to do as we start the 114th Congress. We should concentrate on issues that are having a significant impact and bringing uncertainty to an industry that is booming and needs certain protections. We also need to regulate it to protect children, for example, and also hold it accountable so it can make a financial contribution by being a legal, regulated operator that pays taxes.

Congress should also allow medical personnel at our veterans hospitals to recommend the best available care for our Nation's veterans, and that may include medical marijuana. This could help with the effects of PTSD that are far too common in our Iraq and Afghanistan veterans.

We must also ensure that products are available for vital research into the medical benefits of marijuana. So far the research has mostly been on the negative side. What are the possible positive contributions that can come from studying the benefits so we can advance the science and move us beyond that notion of ''Reefer Madness''?

And as you have been hearing from my colleague, it is important that, in considering all of this, Congress respect home rule and the will of the people. That is certainly true in the District of Columbia. Their laws need to be respected because they have been enacted in the best interests of that own community. Just as State laws are, we need to respect those states' rights.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on this important issue and to protect the rights and interests of those communities like Washington and States like Nevada where the people have decided that this is the way of the future.

I thank you for letting me join you today, and I look forward to working with you on this issue.

Ms. NORTON. Well, Ms. TITUS, I must say I thank you for coming to the floor, but I particularly thank you and congratulate you for the extensive homework you have done educating yourself before you took a position on this issue. It is something to be emulated.

I do want to say, when you spoke of the need for further investigation, and particularly when you considered how many veterans with PTSD and other ailments may benefit from medical marijuana, it is worth noting that marijuana is so sharply regulated and restricted that we have not even been able to do the studies necessary to find out what is wrong with it or what is right with it. For example, medical marijuana cries out for studies. If, in fact, the anecdotal evidence is to be believed, that in itself should lead to Federal studies by the NIH and federally funded studies.

What are we afraid of? We need to know more about this substance. And on the negative side, we know that it has some harmful effects on the brain for children. We need to know more about it for adults. Why would the Federal Government not be out front, considering how widely used this substance is?

If the government had done the kind of homework you had, Ms. TITUS, I think we would be much further ahead. Thank you very much for coming to the floor with all of that useful information from your own study.

□ 1430

I particularly appreciate your supporting the District's home rule and the right to pass its own local laws without Federal interference. I thought that was what both Democrats and Republicans believed. I thought that was the contention of Republicans that want to get the Federal Government even out of Federal matters. I thought they would be my natural allies to say, ''Big foot Federal Government, don't mess with any local jurisdiction.'' Yes, even here in the District of Columbia.

In July, the District's marijuana decriminalization bill took effect. I should note that the District passed medical marijuana earlier with one of the strictest sets of regulations in the United States. Our council has shown it knows how to handle these issues.

The threat that has been made is to use our local budget. Now, if you want to know insult on top of injury, you ask what is our local budget doing here? We are talking about $6 billion raised in the District of Columbia locally from businesses and residents. It comes here, again, because of an anomaly.

Although the District got home rule 40 years ago, there was still the obligation to bring its balanced budget here, where there is no balanced budget. Well, it has resulted in shutdowns of the District of Columbia more than once. It has been responsible for the fact that the District pays a premium on Wall Street because our budget has to be passed by another body that knows nothing about our budget. And to its credit, the Appropriations Committee doesn't even have hearings on our budget because it doesn't intend to overturn our budget. But it does allow people to come forward and use the budget as a vehicle for attachments to try to nullify our local laws. It is rarely done—and I appreciate that—because Members, in their own forbearance, have tended not to do that. But we do have a threat on this bill.

Now, the House did pass an amendment to block D.C.'s decriminalization bill. Representative HARRIS offered it in committee. And this amendment was not included, I am pleased to say, in the fiscal year 2015 short-term resolution or in the Senate's fiscal year 2015 D.C. appropriation bill. You see, there is a real difference here, and I hope that the House, in contempla-

tion, will understand it also should go with liberty and freedom for the local jurisdiction.

The administration has issued a statement of policy that it strongly opposes the amendment that passed the House. And it did so. And here I am quoting its words:

Because it violates principles of states' rights and of District home rule.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the District is not even a pioneer when it comes to marijuana decriminalization or legalization. Yet it is the District that is singled out. There has been no Federal interference. No one has come to this floor who may disagree with the notion of legalization to call down the States that have legalized or decriminalized. And I think the reason is because there is simply no principled way for Members who 100 percent believe in local control to call out the States that may have taken their own route different from the other States and the District.

There is just no principled way to do anything with respect to what those States have done because those are local matters or State matters. Therefore, for the District, it is particularly painful not to be respected because the District has no vote on this floor.

When the bill containing the Andy Harris amendment was passed, everybody in the House could vote on it except the Member who represents the District of Columbia, because I have no vote even on matters affecting the District of Columbia. When the Democrats controlled the House, I would have had a vote on amendments to appropriations bills because they occur in the committee of the whole, but even that was taken away. So every Member got to vote on a matter affecting only my district except the one Member that the District sends to the Congress, and that is why I come to the floor.

We pay $12,000 per capita in Federal taxes. Keep that figure in mind because that is the highest per capita figure in Federal taxes paid by any jurisdiction. The lowest in Federal taxes happens to be Mississippi. I point out the difference because I think Mississippi pays about $4,000 per capita. The District pays $12,000 per capita.

So you can imagine if you support the Federal Government at this rate and you have no vote on the House floor and others have a vote that could take away your laws, you perhaps have every reason to be concerned.

May I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 18 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When I say that there is no principled position except the American position that local jurisdictions must have complete autonomy to deal with local matters, I can offer at least one very prominent example.

Senator RAND PAUL was asked what he thought about the District's marijuana legalization initiative. And I want to quote him. Senator PAUL said:

I'm not for having the Federal Government get involved. I really haven't taken a stand on the actual legalization, but I'm against the Federal Government telling them they can't.

This is a classic principled position because Senator PAUL hasn't taken a position on the underlying issue. He has only taken a position consistent with his views, and what I thought were the views of my Republican and Democratic colleagues alike, that the Federal Government shouldn't tell a local jurisdiction that it can't do what is, in this case, de facto legal, because the Federal Government does not prosecute. All I am asking Members to do is to take the same principled position that Senator PAUL has taken.

Notwithstanding Senator PAUL's position, Representative HARRIS has said that he will try to insert language into the omnibus bill to block legalization in D.C. Well, I am going to try to keep him from doing that. But isn't it interesting to note that Representative HARRIS couldn't keep his own State, Maryland, from decriminalizing marijuana, and so he hops over into my jurisdiction to do what he couldn't do in the State where he has authority. Well, we are not going to have it.

Representative ROHRABACHER and I disagree on any number of things. That is why I was pleased to have him stand with me. But what he said is interesting because he has the longest history of fighting for marijuana reform. I want to quote him. He called on Members of his own party to ''wake up and see where the American people are.''

Representative ROHRABACHER is from conservative Orange County. He says he believes that his position on marijuana reform may have helped him to gain 5 points in the last election. He says that he thinks that GOP principles about individual liberty and limited Federal Government are completely consistent with his own views on marijuana, and certainly consistent with his own philosophy. I cite Representative ROHRABACHER and Senator RAND PAUL because they have taken positions that I do not believe are inconsonant with the positions of their party.

People are fond of saying that this is not a partisan issue. Well, I guess it is because the parties have not come together on it. What is not a partisan issue, however, is local control of local laws.

I want to note what my good friend from Nevada referred to. Representative ROHRABACHER and a Democrat, SAM FARR, succeeded in passing an amendment in this House, this very Congress, that would keep the Justice Department from intervening in States that have legalized medical marijuana. This matter passed in a Republican House.

The fact is that the Justice Department has indicated that it will not intervene—and it has not intervened—when it comes to medical marijuana or recreational use of medical marijuana when we are talking about small amounts. And yet the House came forward and indicated where it stands, and that is where I think the country is going and where the House is going.

But there is an important issue still pending—one that this House has passed and I urge the Senate to pass, along with the Rohrabacher-Farr bill—and that is a bill that is sponsored by Representative BLUMENAUER and Representative ROHRABACHER, who were joined at a press conference by Grover Norquist, who, of course, is the antitax advocate. Their bill passed this House. It would change Federal tax law so that State-sanctioned providers can claim deductions and credits as other businesses do.

I am sorry I said that passed. This did not pass. This is pending. What did pass is an amendment that would no longer penalize financial institutions because they provide financial services to State-sanctioned marijuana operations. Now, you can imagine those operations now must deal in cash because the banks and the financial institutions are afraid to deal with them.

This amendment, which is perhaps the most urgent of the reforms, did pass the House, and I think it, again, shows growing recognition of where the country is and where the House should be headed.

It is worth noting that just hearing the names of the States that have decriminalized marijuana, I think, makes the case for where the country is headed. This is decriminalization alone. States that have done so, in alphabetical order, have red and blue running right through the list. I am talking decriminalizing marijuana for small amounts.

They are Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington. They have nothing in common except they don't convict people for possessing small amounts of marijuana.

□ 1445

The Congress, 40 years ago, passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act. That act says that matters of local law are for the District alone. It was a landmark law. We intend to have it respected.

There were some exceptions. They were very small, and I can guarantee you that there were no exceptions of the kind that I have spoken about today.

Legalization in the District of Columbia comes from the direct votes of two-thirds of the people in my district; therefore, it comes with a very special mandate. It comes with a mandate of freedom and liberty, and it comes with a very special mandate that the country will probably increasingly note, and that special mandate is the disparity in arrests based on race, where 9 out of 10 of the arrests are of blacks in, by the way, a progressive city.

It is very hard to justify such a law remaining on the books. That is why I think the people went all the way to legalization.

So what I am asking this afternoon is for House Members to remember your own States and the States of your colleagues that have taken action in one form or another to relax marijuana laws, and I am asking for all of the residents of the District of Columbia simply the same ordinary privilege.

I particularly ask, not only our own Members, but Members who I think would particularly want to take note in the other body because in that body are found the Senators who represent the 23 States that have passed medical marijuana laws, the 18 States that have passed marijuana decriminalization laws, and the four States that have legalized marijuana.

It is difficult for me to see how the other body, which has States which have relaxed marijuana in this way, could possibly vote not to give equal treatment to the residents of the District of Columbia.

So, Mr. Speaker, at bottom, I am asking only for equality of treatment for the residents of the District of Columbia. I come in that spirit only. I don't ask for your support for the underlying matter.

I ask for your support on the one issue in which I believe I can say Members in this body, to the last Member, are in agreement, and that is, since the very founding of our country, the principle that holds us together is federalism, that what happens in a State may not be what we would desire or do in our own, but if it is a local matter and if it is legal and constitutional, then it is for the people of that State.

Mr. Speaker, that is the essence of freedom and democracy. I ask in that spirit for the same respect for the people of the District of Columbia that I would give to the people of every State of the Union.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY of California) for today on account of official business in his district.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, November 14, 2014.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Committee Allocations, Aggregates, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2015 published in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2014, pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, Public Law 113–67. These revisions are provided for bills, joint resolutions, and amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, considered by the House subsequent to this filing, as applicable.

The revisions made by this communication are pursuant to the authority granted in section 115(e) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. For fiscal years 2015 and 2015–2024, aggregate levels of budget authority, outlays, revenues, and the allocation to the Committee on Ways and Means included in the levels of the budget resolution found in the statement published in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2014, are revised. Associated tables are attached. The revisions are necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of deficit reduction resulting from enactment of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

The provisions of H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress), as deemed in force by section 113 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, Public Law 113–67, remain in force to the extent its budgetary levels are not superseded by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 or subsequent action of the House of Representatives. This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. For the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act, these revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the statement published in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2014, as adjusted.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. RYAN OF WISCONSIN,
Chairman.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year	
	2015	2015–2024
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,031,744	(1)
Outlays	3,026,384	(1)
Revenues	2,533,388	31,202,135
Adjustment for the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014:		
Budget Authority	0	(1)
Outlays	−15	(1)
Revenues	2,590	4,264
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,031,744	(1)
Outlays	3,026,369	(1)
Revenues	2,535,978	31,206,399

(1) Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2016–2024 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

House Committee on Ways and Means	2015		2015–2024 Total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	987,320	985,919	15,009,326	15,007,958
Adjustment for the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014	0	−15	−3,542	−4,777
Revised Allocation	987,320	985,904	15,005,784	15,003,181

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1233. An act to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4194. An act to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 898. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Albuquerque, New Mexico, to the Amy Biehl High School Foundation.

S. 1934. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey the Clifford P. Hansen Federal Courthouse to Teton County, Wyoming.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 17, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Rodney Alexander*, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews*, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Ron Barber, Lou Barletta, Garland ''Andy'' Barr, John Barrow, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Kerry L. Bentivolio, Ami Bera, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Jo Bonner*, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G.K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor*, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cárdenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Tom Cotton, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Steve Daines, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson*, Eliot L. Engel, William L. Enyart, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Pete P. Gallego, John Garamendi, Joe Garcia, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Rush Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steven A. Horsford, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Daniel B. Maffei, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey*, Thomas Massie, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Vance M. McAllister, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Gloria Negrete McLeod, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald W. Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Gary C. Peters, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Trey Radel*, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, Jon Runyan, C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Bradley S. Schneider, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason T. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland II, Jackie Speier, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Steve Stockman, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takano, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Jackie Walorski, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt*, Henry A. Waxman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, C.W. Bill Young*, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7699. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Contracting Programs for Minority-Owned and Other Small Businesses [FAC 2005-77; FAR Case 2009-016; Item I; Docket No.: 2011-0090, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM05) received October 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7700. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Irrevocable Letters of Credit [FAC 2005-77; FAR Case 2011-023; Item II; Docket No.: 2011-0023, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM53) received October 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7701. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Uniform Procurement Identification [FAC 2005-77; FAR Case 2012-023; Item III; Docket No.: 2012-0023, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM60) received October 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7702. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Standard Format and Content for a Specific License Application for an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation or a Monitored Retrievable Storage Facility, Regulatory Guide 3.50, Revision 2 received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7703. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Medical Assessment of Licensed Operators or Applicants for Operator Licenses at Nuclear Power Plants, Regulatory Guide 1.134, Revision 4 received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7704. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-116, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7705. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-090, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7706. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-101, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7707. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-100, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-062, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7709. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-082, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7710. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-092, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7711. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-023, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7712. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-115, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7713. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-081, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7714. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Independent Expenditures and Electioneering Communications by Corporations and Labor Organizations [Notice 2014-10] received October 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

7715. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the semiannual report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; (H. Doc. No. 113-174); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

7716. A letter from the FHWA Regulations Officer, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Environmental Impact and Related Procedures—Programmatic Agreements and Additional Categorical Exclusions [Docket No.: FHWA-2013-0049] (FHWA RIN: 2125-AF59) (FTA RIN: 2132-AB14) received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7717. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Environmental Impact and Related Procedures—Programmatic Agreements and Additional Categorical Exclusions [Docket No.: FHWA-2013-0049] (FHWA RIN: 2125-AF59) (FTA RIN: 2132-AB14) received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7718. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Part B Monthly Actuarial Rates, Premium Rate, and Annual Deductible Beginning January 1, 2015 [CMS-8058-N] (RIN: 0938-AS34) received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 5708. A bill to protect individuals who are eligible for increased pension under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the basis of need of regular aid and attendance from dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 5709. A bill to terminate the authority to waive certain provisions of law requiring the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran, to codify certain sanctions imposed by executive order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. BASS, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 5710. A bill to authorize the provision of assistance on an emergency basis for countries affected by or at risk of being affected by the outbreak of the Ebola virus disease to effectively address such outbreak at its source, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 5711. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the coverage of the Federal prohibition against hate crimes in order to provide greater protections to persons who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 5712. A bill to authorize the Private Sector Office of the Department of Homeland Security to improve private sector engagement in protecting the homeland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 5713. A bill to require the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere to conduct an assessment of cultural and historic resources in the waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5714. A bill to permit commercial applicators of pesticides to create, retain, submit, and convey pesticide application-related records, reports, data, and other information in electronic form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5715. A bill to adjust the age limitations under the Social Security program for payment of child's insurance benefits to certain disabled individuals and for calculation of recent work for determining eligibility for Social Security disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. RUNYAN):

H.R. 5716. A bill to extend the replacement period for nonrecognition of gain for property involuntarily converted in the Hurricane Sandy disaster area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5717. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require annual reports from agencies detailing the cost of multilingual services, to end speculation about the cost of multilingual services provided by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5718. A bill to study the effect of the Earth's magnetic field on the weather; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 5719. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of non-violent persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 5720. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.J. Res. 129. A joint resolution appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; considered and passed.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that health workers deserve our profound gratitude and respect for their commitments and sacrifices in addressing the Ebola epidemic in West Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H. Res. 753. A resolution providing for the printing of a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 754. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its gross human rights violations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOYCE (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 755. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Education Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

319. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 22, requesting the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years. Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 5709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 (regulation of commerce with foreign nations)

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Clause 8, Section 18.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 5712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution enumerates to Congress the power to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.'' This legislation defines the way that the Department of Homeland Security engages with the private sector to address homeland security challenges.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 5713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 5714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 5715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

''The Congress shall have Power . . . To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts.''

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 5719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 4 Clause 1 of United States Constitution

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 5720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 provides Congress with the authority to spend revenue on the general welfare.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 278: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 519: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 532: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 628: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 809: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1563: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1732: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1764: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1795: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1801: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1852: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1857: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1878: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2077: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2288: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2329: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 2788: Mr. RUIZ and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2831: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2851: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2856: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2994: Mr. ROKITA, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 3121: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3297: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3398: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 3426: Mr. KIND and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 3489: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 3513: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3543: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3717: Mr. REED.
H.R. 3991: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 4122: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4148: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4188: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4214: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4395: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4494: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4515: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4525: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4647: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 4703: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 4706: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 4717: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4740: Mr. WELCH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 4793: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4807: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4837: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4920: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 4930: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4946: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4960: Mr. BYRNE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. MENG, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PERRY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4969: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 5059: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 5199: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 5213: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 5226: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5227: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 5231: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 5239: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5294: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 5320: Mr. BARR and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 5381: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5382: Mr. HURT.
H.R. 5403: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 5417: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 5439: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 5441: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5445: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 5481: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 5484: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5508: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5539: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 5544: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 5559: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5609: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 5644: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5646: Mr. KILMER and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5648: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5655: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 5685: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 5686: Mr. OLSON and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 5688: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 5700: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Res. 208: Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 456: Mrs. NOEM.

H. Res. 596: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 658: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 701: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 711: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 728: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. GOSAR.

H. Res. 735: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. GARRETT.