

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 ROHRBACHER 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 ROHRBACHER 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 cannabis 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 cannabis 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 en-

forcement 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 essen-

tially 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 referendum.

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 ROHRBACHER, 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 cor-

ner 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 gentleman 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 ROHRBACHER 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 ROHRBACHER 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 ROHRBACHER and Senator RAND PAUL because they have taken positions that I do not believe are in consonant 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 ROHRBACHER 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 ROHRBACHER, 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 Mex-

ico, 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