

last number of months, and I know he is very knowledgeable about this issue and sensitive to this issue, and I would hope that we could work together to see whether or not we could put a bipartisan bill on the floor sooner, rather than later.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman's bringing up the crisis at the border.

Many of the Members in this House, on both sides, have been down to the border personally to see the crisis, and I think that is very important for all elected officials to go see.

We have a task force working on this right now. I know the President has put forth a supplemental—and the Appropriations Committee is currently reviewing the President's request for a supplemental, but I do not anticipate that coming up next week. As we look toward the remainder of July, we will keep you posted—and others—and I look forward to working with the gentleman further on other issues.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that response, and I would hope that the supplemental—because it deals with a humanitarian crisis—would not be a partisan issue. We obviously need to deal with the immediate problem.

I was talking, of course, about the longer-term problem, but I appreciate the gentleman's observation with reference to the supplemental. I am a supporter of that supplemental.

Obviously, the Appropriations Committee needs to review it with respect to the proper levels of funding, but there is no doubt that we, right now, have inadequate resources to deal with the humanitarian crisis that confronts us immediately, and those funds are necessary.

I am pleased that the gentleman brought it up, and I look forward to working with him on it.

Unless the gentleman wants to make further comment, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 14, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 14, 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.

STEPHEN, KATIE, CASSIDY, BRYAN, EMILY, REBECCA, AND ZACH STAY

(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, a family in Spring, Texas, has been executed.

The evil killer, disguised as a FedEx driver, forced his way into the home of the Stay family on Wednesday. He tied up one child, Cassidy, and waited and waited until all five children and their parents—Katie and Stephen—came home. Then he shot them one by one, killing six, and leaving Cassidy for dead. He fled the scene with more malice in his heartless soul, headed to kill the grandparents of the children.

Cassidy called 911 to alert the law, and quickly, the murderer was caught before he could kill again.

Murdered were Stephen, aged 39; Katie, aged 34; Bryan, aged 13; Emily, aged 9; Rebecca, aged 7; Zach, aged 4—and wounded was Cassidy, aged 15.

The killer had come from Utah to Texas to seek revenge against the Stay family. He targeted the Stays because his ex-wife was a family relative.

People in the quiet area of Spring, Texas, and Houston are saddened and shocked and are in mourning for their neighbors who had life viciously and violently stolen from them.

The killer is charged with capital murder in Texas, and if found guilty, hopefully, a Texas jury will help him meet his Maker very soon.

And that's just the way it is.

ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, this House passed legislation introduced by me and the gentleman from Oklahoma, TOM COLE—the Israel-Cole resolution—supporting Israel's right to defend itself, condemning Hamas for sending rockets over the border, supporting the Iron Dome program, and reminding the American people of the role that Iran has in supplying these terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I am a big believer in what would we do when crisis occurs? What would we do if we had terrorists on our border, sending rockets into our communities?

If the Gaza Strip were in Dover, Delaware, this Capitol, where I am speaking, would be hit by rockets. Baltimore would be hit by rockets. Philadelphia, where tourists gathered during July Fourth to celebrate our independence, would be hit by rockets. New York would be hit by rockets. Long Island would be hit by rockets.

What would we do? Exactly what Israel is doing—we would protect our citizens. We would seek to spare civilian casualties. We would try and negotiate as best we could a peace, but do it through strength. Every nation in the world has the right and the obligation to protect its citizens; so does Israel.

AMERICA'S SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about America's southern border and of the infiltration happening by foreign noncitizens into our country.

It is clear to most Americans that the massive influx of new illegal immigrants is due to the proposed Senate amnesty bill and the President's unilateral decree that U.S. Customs will not deport these minors who cross illegally into America.

Today's immigration problems lay at the feet of the President's and the Senate's, who proposed yet another round of amnesty in America in response to continued illegal border crossings.

Honestly, what does this administration think will happen when it offers another 12 million illegal immigrants amnesty and does nothing to secure the border? Does it think there will not be more to come?

Mr. Speaker, what the American people want to see is a strong fence and a truly secure border, where we as Americans determine who is let into this country. This is not rocket science.

The American people want a government that works—one that builds the border fence, one with a gate that we control.

THE GIRLS OF CHIBOK

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was 3 months ago that the terrorist group Boko Haram attacked and kidnapped 276 female students. They were children, some 12 and 13 years old. Since then, more have been kidnapped, and some have escaped.

This Congress has a positive role to play by supporting U.S. and U.N. efforts to bring these girls home and to bring peace to Nigeria and Africa by supporting investments, by bringing development to Africa, and by encouraging all involved to do all they can to bring these frightened children home.

The African leaders have a role to play. They should be leading this effort in helping to rescue these children.

I will never forget how the world came together for one brief moment in the wake of 9/11 to support America.

"We are all Americans," the world said as one. I would wish now that the world would say that, until we bring these young girls home, we are all African.

AUTONOMY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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, we are approaching the end of the session, and I know Republicans—my good colleagues on the other side—recognize that they are on track to beat last year's session, where we had the distinction of being the Congress with the lowest productivity in recorded United States history.

There seems to be some Members who are looking around to make up for lost time as to what to do. There is always the District of Columbia.

If you want to fatten your agenda, why not introduce a bill having to do with the District of Columbia? That ought to be a free enough ride. After all, the District of Columbia has a Member of Congress who can't even vote against your bill; so why not try that?

I find, as I look at the record of Members who do that, that there is a pattern there. These are often Members who have introduced very few bills that would benefit their own districts.

□ 1130

Next week, the financial services appropriation bill will be on the floor. It happens to contain the District of Columbia appropriation.

Now, of course, unless you are familiar with this bizarre situation, you will wonder, what in the world is the District of Columbia appropriation doing here in the first place? Well, it shouldn't be here because it doesn't have a dime of Federal money in it. It is an undemocratic anachronism that requires this House to somehow approve the District of Columbia, budget although not a Member of this House except me is accountable to the voters of the District of Columbia.

How is that for democracy? Yet, nevertheless, it will be before this House. And until we get the same budget autonomy that every Member's district enjoys for its own local money, we will find that your time is encumbered by a District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The real difference between the District of Columbia, of course, and the other appropriations bills that you will have before you is that our budget is balanced. We have a surplus. The Federal budget is unbalanced and has a deficit.

There are a number of amendments. We had driven these amendments down to just one, what I will call the annual abortion amendment. It has become a kind of annual ritual.

Of course, there is lots of hypocrisy in the House, but it really shows up on the annual abortion bill. Seventeen States with Members who sit right in this body allow their own localities to spend their own local money on abortions for low-income women, recognizing that the Congress does not allow Federal money to be spent for abortions—that is even when a woman will be in distress. If she is low-income, she is out of luck unless the local jurisdic-

tion, of course, allows for such funds to be spent. And, of course, that is regularly done, except for the District of Columbia where, again, unaccountable Members have stepped in to keep the District of Columbia from doing what 17 other States already do.

When the Democrats were in charge of this House, I was able to get all of the so-called attachments to the District appropriation eliminated even the abortion attachment. It has been the only one to return.

I want to thank the House that one of these attachments has not returned; that, of course, was the needle exchange attachment that had deadly effects. And I choose my words appropriately, because that rider, which was attached to the D.C. appropriation for 10 years, literally spread the HIV virus throughout the District of Columbia and is singly responsible for the fact that the District of Columbia has the highest HIV/AIDS rate in the country.

Once I was able to get that attachment removed, we have seen injection needle-related HIV drop precipitously. That will give the House some sense of the great damage that was done by that attachment, and I am grateful—and I will say to this House how grateful I am—that that rider has not returned. I believe that one of the reasons it has not returned is that at least some Members are aware of its effects, and those effects have acted as something of a deterrent to adding that rider again.

This year, here comes the marijuana decriminalization rider. The District of Columbia was pretty late in looking at marijuana decriminalization, and I will get to the reason it looked at decriminalization in a moment. But there are 18 States that have gotten there long before D.C., the first in 1975.

I knew that there was going to be a problem because Rep. JOHN MICA, in his subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, actually had a hearing on this matter. Now, he hasn't called a hearing on Colorado, for example, which has legalized marijuana, although he has looked at Colorado. He could have simply looked at the District of Columbia. He had a whole hearing on the District of Columbia. That is what the District of Columbia has to abide in this House.

Of course, I should not be surprised, and I was not, that there came a Member who decided that he would try to keep the District of Columbia from doing what 18 States have already done before it and block our marijuana decriminalization law.

I had hoped we were in good company because of a very recent vote on this floor. A healthy 49 Republican Members voted with many Democrats to block the government from prosecuting users and sellers of medical marijuana in States that permit its use. That happened within the last month or so. And I said, oh, my goodness, we are in increasingly good company. Republicans and Democrats alike

see that, without condoning any form of marijuana, the tide has changed certainly on medical marijuana.

Well, I do not have any illusion that, because the House comes together even to consensus on any matter, that that means that it will apply that consensus to the District of Columbia.

I must say that it took me more than a decade to get another rider, a rider that blocked the District from implementing its medical marijuana law. Well, that law has now been implemented, and so now we have Members looking at D.C.'s marijuana decriminalization law.

At this point, 23 States have legalized medical marijuana. We are getting close to half the States.

As I indicated, 18 States have decriminalized marijuana. Now, that just means you are not going to give someone a record for smoking weed. It doesn't mean you think it is a good thing to do, but it does mean it is not worth a jail record. Not so much jail, because people don't usually go to jail; they just get a record that keeps them from getting a job.

Two States have legalized marijuana, and the House should take note of this fact: A 2014 Pew Research Center poll has now found that 54 percent of Americans support marijuana legalization. The District hasn't legalized, most States haven't legalized. The American people are ahead of where we are.

But the same double standard that I encountered on medical marijuana I am seeing on marijuana decriminalization.

By the way, marijuana decriminalization isn't new. The first was in 1975, and that State was Alaska. If you look at the map of States that have decriminalized in one form or fashion, you will not see any difference between so-called red and blue States. From California and New York to Mississippi and Nebraska—and of course the two States that have legalized marijuana, Colorado and Washington—we see that this approach to marijuana is spreading.

I think most young people don't see enough of a difference between marijuana and a substance that has done far greater harm, alcohol, to understand why there should be criminal penalties associated with marijuana, even if, like me, you don't think that it is a good thing to go around smoking anything, cigarettes, pot, you name it.

Now, nothing distinguishes the District's democratically enacted local laws, including this law, from the laws of those 18 States. We are all American citizens. But you will occasionally hear Members say something that only a tyrant would say. The Member will allude to the fact that the District of Columbia, before it had home rule, was subject in every respect to the Congress of the United States. In fact, all the laws were passed, essentially, by the Congress. What those Members will not tell you is that Congress repudiated that power 40 years ago when it

gave the District of Columbia what we call home rule, self-government.

Essentially, the Home Rule Act says the Congress of the United States will no longer either pass or interfere with the local laws of the District of Columbia. We leave that to D.C. The Congress did indicate there were a few exceptions. The Height Act, which proscribes how high buildings can go in the Nation's Capitol, is an example. Another example is that the District can't pass a commuter tax, even though many other jurisdictions have commuter taxes.

Except for such examples, which are very few, there is no brand of local law that the Home Rule Act does not cover. So you can cite the Constitution all you want to, but you must also cite the Home Rule Act of 1973, which, in fact, repudiated the power of the Congress to interfere with the local laws of the District of Columbia or with the District of Columbia itself.

And why wouldn't it? Who are the unaccountable Members, Democratic or Republican, of the House or Senate to have anything to say about either money they didn't raise or laws that respecting only with local concerns?

Among those you would expect to be most familiar with the Home Rule Act would be our neighbors, those who live in Maryland and Virginia. And if I may say so, we have Republican Members, Democratic Members in both those States, and, for the most part, they have respected the integrity of the District of Columbia through its own local laws.

But Representative ANDY HARRIS, I believe he is a second-term, has not yet read the Home Rule Act; and though he lives in the region, he has not reacted as a neighbor.

□ 1145

ANDY HARRIS is from the State of Maryland. The State of Maryland is one of those jurisdictions that has decriminalized marijuana. Now, Representative ANDY HARRIS was unable to convince his own State not to decriminalize marijuana, so he steps across the border into the District of Columbia to try to tell us what to do.

He happens to be from the Eastern Shore of Maryland. District of Columbia residents are so enraged that the major D.C. rights organization, DC Vote, has called for a boycott of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. You know what? The Eastern Shore of Maryland is, in a sense, a vacation spot. It depends on people from the region—the District, Maryland, and Virginia—to visit there, especially during this season. And the District of Columbia has many allies in this region who agree with us that the Congress shouldn't be in our business.

I don't know why Representative HARRIS would want to stick his nose into the business of the residents of the District of Columbia. I can't understand why he thought that would benefit the economy of the Eastern Shore

of Maryland. He is from Ocean City. They live off of the rest of this region, including the District of Columbia.

I looked at his productivity here to see, is he busy? Is he not busy enough? He has introduced only 10 bills. I have introduced 63. I am trying to take care of my residents. The 10 bills he has introduced is very low productivity. I have cosponsored three times as many bills as he has cosponsored because I try to attend to the business of my own district.

I don't know if Representative ANDY HARRIS was fishing around for something to do, but he ought to fish at the Eastern Shore, and he ought to find something to do for his own residents because all he has done now is to outrage the people of the District of Columbia. And he has done worse. He has patronized us. He is saying, you know, I am a doctor. Well, you know, I am a lawyer. So what does that mean? Does that enable you to come into my district and doctor my people? "I don't think marijuana is good for young people." Well, I don't either. I also don't think that young people ought to get a record for having used marijuana.

I don't know what motivated the 17, 18 States that have legalized marijuana. But let me tell why you the council of the District of Columbia decriminalized marijuana. Two studies were done. Each showed that in the progressive District of Columbia, where half the population is black and half is white and/or Hispanic, that blacks were arrested at a rate of eight to nine times that of whites for marijuana possession.

Do you know what that means for young blacks—particularly a young black man or boy in this country today? It ruins their lives.

They often live across the Anacostia, which is a low-income part of the District of Columbia. Black men in our country—regardless of income or education—are surrounded by stereotypes. Let one walk in with a "drug possession" stereotype on his record, and I will tell you, you are looking at a black man who, if he starts out in life that way, will have his life ruined because he has a "drug conviction."

I don't know why they decriminalized in Alaska or Mississippi. But I know why they did it in the District of Columbia, although it is none of the business of this House. They did it for racial justice reasons, and we are not going to have it undone by somebody who has no sense of my district.

An arrest or a conviction of any kind for a "drug possession"—and that is what marijuana is—can lead a young man, particularly from poor neighborhoods in the District of Columbia, into the underground economy, even to selling drugs, where he was only possessing them before, because he can't find a job because he has got a "record." So the District passed a marijuana decriminalization law.

I must say that this city is well aware of the effects of drugs. This is a

big city. It has had its time with drugs, just like every other big city in the United States. Nobody in this city fools around with the notion of drugs. Drugs have promoted violence in our city. They have ruined lives in our city. It is the last place in America that would encourage drugs of any kind.

Also, we don't know what the effects of marijuana smoking may be. That is yet to be determined. I know this: millions of Americans are in their graves because we didn't know the effects of cigarette smoking. So the last thing I, or anyone in the District of Columbia is going to say is, go out and be free; smoke as much marijuana as you can find.

Marijuana smoking could prove to be as bad or worse than cigarette smoking. I only wish that we had known for the 100 years or so when people were ruining their lives smoking cigarettes. And the District of Columbia appears to have recognized that.

The bill requires the revenue collected from civil violations—that is, a civil violation of a fine—to be placed in a substance abuse prevention and treatment fund that is administered by the D.C. Department of Behavioral Health for substance abuse treatment and preventative programs. There are four D.C. prevention centers. They are funded by the Department of Behavioral Health. That serves all eight wards of the city.

This is what the city has already done, even though—it is interesting to note—all the polls show that penalties for marijuana use are not key to determining whether teenagers decide to use marijuana or not.

Nobody knows how to steer people away from marijuana. What they do know is that a record for having possessed marijuana can ruin your life. And if you are a person of color, it has an even greater effect.

It is important to note that all of the polls in the District of Columbia and in the country show that blacks and whites in the District of Columbia and in the United States of America use marijuana at the same rate. So why are blacks not only here but across the country given a record more often?

I would note also—and commend Councilmember Tommy Wells, who has introduced yet another bill called the Marijuana Use Public Information Campaign Act of 2014. That bill, which was recently introduced, would establish a public information campaign to educate the public on the impacts of marijuana use.

I bet most of the 18 other States haven't gone to this extent in order to deter people from using marijuana at the same time that they have decriminalized it. The District of Columbia has been very responsible.

Who is irresponsible is Representative ANDY HARRIS because the irresponsible thing to do is to mess with my district. You are not accountable to

the voters of my district. You are seeking a free ride through an act of congressional bullying. And that is the way we take it.

And like anybody who is bullied, we don't know how to do anything but fight back. We don't like to be patronized. We will not be bullied. And we will not have a Member tell the residents of the District of Columbia, who have no way to hold him accountable, what we may or may not do.

So I ask the Members of the House to be consistent, particularly my Republican friends with your own small Federal footprint approach as a core value, because of your own notion of local control, as opposed to Federal control, the hallmark of your values, I ask you simply to apply the same principles to me and to the District of Columbia that you are insisting upon for you and for your own constituents.

I will remind you that we are all Americans, that there are no second-class Americans, and that the Americans who live in the Nation's Capital insist upon being treated fully equally with all of you, all of us who are fortunate to be citizens of the United States of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESS HAS THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ACT ON IRAQ NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I joined today with Representatives WALTER JONES and BARBARA LEE to introduce a privileged resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 105, to direct the President to remove U.S. troops from Iraq within 30 days, or no later than the end of this year, except for those troops needed to protect U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel. We did this for a simple reason. Congress has the responsibility to authorize the introduction of American troops where hostilities are imminent.

In less than 3 weeks, in three separate deployments, the U.S. has sent at least 775 additional troops to Iraq. Now is the time for Congress to debate the merits of our military involvement in this latest Iraq conflict openly and transparently.

Do we approve of these deployments and any future escalation? If so, we should vote to authorize it. If we do not support it, then we should bring our troops back home. It is that simple, Mr. Speaker. Congress has the responsibility to act on Iraq now.

Mr. Speaker, we did not introduce this privileged resolution lightly. By doing so, we have started a process to hold a debate on our engagement in Iraq later this month. We are using the special procedures outlined under the War Powers Resolution.

While this is an imperfect tool, it requires the House to take up this bill

after 15 calendar days. Like most of my colleagues, I would prefer for this House to bring up a bill authorizing our engagement in Iraq. And nothing in this resolution inhibits such important legislation from being drafted and brought before this House for debate and a clean up-or-down vote. Frankly, I wish that were happening, but I have not heard that such authorization is even under discussion, let alone being prepared for debate.

So my colleagues and I are introducing this concurrent resolution because we strongly believe Congress has to step up to the plate and carry out its responsibilities when our servicemen and -women are, once again, being sent into harm's way.

□ 1200

The time for that debate is now, not when the first body bag comes home from Iraq, not when the first U.S. airstrikes or bombs fall on Iraq, not when we are embedded with Iraqi troops trying to take back an ISIS-held town, and—worst-case scenario—not when our troops are shooting their way out of an overtaken Baghdad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the time to debate our new engagement in Iraq, before the heat of the moment, when we can weigh the pros and cons of supporting the al-Maliki government—or whatever government is cobbled together should al-Maliki be forced to step down—now, before we are forced to take sides in a religious and sectarian war; now, before the next addition of more troops takes place.

Make no mistake—I firmly believe we will continue to send more troops and more military assets into this crisis.

Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, before we are forced to fire our first shots or drop our first bombs. Now, Mr. Speaker, is when the House should debate and vote on this very serious matter.

For those who say it is too early, too premature for this debate, I respectfully disagree. The longer we put off carrying out our constitutional responsibilities, the easier it becomes to just drift along. This is what Congress has done over and over and over and over, and it has to end, Mr. Speaker. Congress must speak, and Congress must act.

This resolution, should it pass the House, would direct the President to bring our troops home from Iraq within 30 days—or should that pose security questions, no later than by the end of this year, nearly 6 months from now.

It would not require those troops that have been deployed to safeguard the security of our diplomatic facilities and personnel from withdrawing. They could remain and carry out their crucial roles of protecting our civilian personnel on the ground in Iraq.

This is why we need to take up this resolution later this month, debate our military engagement in this latest war in Iraq, and have a clean vote on this resolution, up or down, about whether

we stay in Iraq or whether we bring our troops home.

We owe this much to our troops and their families, we owe this much to the American people, and we owe at least this much to our own democracy and democratic institutions that require Congress to be the final arbiter on whether our troops are sent into hostilities abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join Representative JONES, Representative LEE, and me as cosponsors of this resolution. I look forward to debating the merits of the Iraq war later this month and voting on whether our troops should stay or leave Iraq.

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

THE THREE COEQUAL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I appreciate your being down here with me. I think about the just a couple of years that you and I have served in this Congress, and I think back, and I hope "Schoolhouse Rock" was on TV when you were coming along.

The thing I did when the Internet came out—yes, I was old enough to remember when the Internet came out—was I looked up the "Schoolhouse Rock" video, and I looked up "I'm just a bill sitting here on Capitol Hill" because it tells the tale—and we learned that before we learned all of our times tables, we learned about how a bill becomes a law.

We learned about what this great experiment in self-governance is, and it is the United States of America. It makes me sad that it comes on less on Saturday mornings than it used to, and now, parents are down on watching as much TV on Saturday mornings.

I hope "Schoolhouse Rock" is still required viewing in every family in America because the whole process of how a bill becomes a law is critically important to who we are as a people—as a people.

I know it happens to you, Mr. Speaker, like it happens to me. I go back home, and I am the Congressman. I am the Congressman. I am holding the townhall meeting. I am standing up in front of the room. Maybe I am up on the stage, I have got a big microphone.

There are all these folks sitting out there in the audience, and it dawns on me that I am the servant, and all the bosses are sitting out there. That is what is so wonderful about what goes on here. You and I have the great privilege of representing a small slice of America; and, in my case, it is the Seventh District of Georgia—but the bosses live at home.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't do this the way "Schoolhouse Rock" laid it out, if