

I want to tell you how we are getting to work. This was not just a one-way talking-to with millennials. Through #futureforum, through medium.com, through the article we wrote and posted there, and through the information we have collected across the country, we are actually putting the ball in the court of the young entrepreneurs and students who are charting this new economy. We told them to help us crowdsource ideas that can move America forward, and they gave us some at these visits.

With student loan debt being, probably, the biggest, most pressing issue, there was a general consensus that there are two groups affected by this. The first group is of the students who are enrolled right now and paying tuition and accruing debt. The second group is of the 41 million young Americans who already have student loan debt.

The solutions that were thrown at us for the students who are in school now or who will be in school was, one, treat public education as a public good. Find a way to make sure that any qualified, capable person who wants to go to college can do so, and keep the costs as low or as next to zero as you can.

We had people who were so excited about the Future Forum who had graduated college 30, 40 years ago who came out and talked to us, and they harkened back to a time in California when, in the UC and Cal State systems, tuition was essentially free—they even threw in the yearbook—yet the return on investment was a whole generation of educated individuals who would contribute to the greatest economy in the United States: California.

Their eyes popped out when they saw how much it costs today to go to UC Berkeley: \$33,000 today is what it costs a year for a student to go to UC Berkeley. People who had attended 20, 30 years ago talked about when it was almost next to nothing. It is \$33,000 a year.

Congressman GALLEGRO looked at that number—and he went to Harvard. Harvard is the Berkeley of the East. Congressman GALLEGRO looked at that number, and he said: That is about what I paid when I graduated from Harvard in the early 2000s, \$33,000 a year.

Treat education as a public good. Keep interest rates as low as possible. The consensus among people who met with us—these current students and entrepreneurs—was that the government should make no money on interest rates on loans that it gives to students.

What about the 41 million young Americans who have the \$1.3 trillion in debt? There was a general consensus that those debtholders should be able to refinance their student loans. You can refinance an auto loan. You can refinance your home loan, but for the 86 percent of loans that are the Federal loans of those 41 million Americans, you can't refinance them.

Congressman JOE COURTNEY, a colleague of mine from Connecticut, has a

bill that would allow just that. Our Future Forum members are on that bill, and we are hoping that it gets a vote in this Congress because this should be a bipartisan issue.

Those 41 million Americans are not Democrats—they are not all Democrats, and they are not all Republicans. They are hopeful, aspirational young people who should benefit from the same refinancing laws that you can use with your home mortgage or with your auto loan.

There were other big ideas, and no idea was too big or small for this crowd. There was the proposal to have a jubilee for all of the federally funded student loans—to take every borrower, return that money to those borrowers, to put them at zero, and watch where the money would go.

The hypothesis was, if these students did not have to pay anywhere from \$100 to \$1,000 every month, they are not going to pocket the money; they are going to put the money back in the economy, and it would essentially be a stimulus.

I encourage everyone across the country—every young person, every parent of a young person, every grandparent of a young person—to give us your ideas. Future Forum is just getting started. We already are working with our colleague Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL, who is excited and eager to host us in Michigan, and with other colleagues who want to bring us to their States to talk to young people.

Give us your ideas. You can tweet them at #futureforum. Put it on Instagram. You can find us on Facebook. Tweet. Facebook. Instagram. Use social media, #futureforum. Give us your ideas because the goal is for us to listen to you and then to work here in a bipartisan way to act on your behalf.

This conversation will continue. Our work will go on until we have lifted the burden that stands in the way of young, aspirational entrepreneurs.

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

INTERNATIONAL CORPORATIONS DESTROYING THE PATENT RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the American people and my colleagues to an issue that is rapidly coming to the floor of the House, and it is an issue that is coming so rapidly that some people might not notice the overwhelming magnitude of this issue.

In fact, it is an issue that most people are bored with. They don't like to discuss it. They think it is so complicated that they don't pay any attention. Unfortunately, the fact that little

attention is being paid to this issue may result in there being major damage to the well-being of the American people.

What I am trying to say is there is legislation that will cause great harm to the American people, to our security, and to our prosperity. It is something that is coming to a vote, and we could well lose unless the American people mobilize and the people in this Hall pay attention to the interests of the American people as a whole and not to major international corporations that have been manipulating this issue.

What am I talking about? I am talking about an issue that has over the years been taken for granted, that America would be the preeminent technology power in the world. In fact, it has been our technology superiority that has led to the prosperity of average Americans, to the standard of living that we have, and also to our safety and security as a nation.

It isn't that Americans have worked so hard—and we have worked hard—but we have coupled work with technology. In fact, people work hard all over the world, but they have not had the patent protection, the protection for the intellectual rights of ownership in the development of new technology. The people around the world haven't had this; thus, they have had standards of living very low for ordinary people and then, of course, the rich at the top.

What we have had in our country is a protection of intellectual property rights by inventors. It is actually written into our Constitution. In fact, the word "right" is only used once in the body of the Constitution. There are the Bill of Rights in the latter part, but the word "right" is only related to the right that the Constitution declares for those who are writers and inventors who have created something, and they have the right to control it and to own it for a given period of time.

This has worked so well for the United States. We have made sure that our people were competitive with the overseas populations, that our people produced the wealth that was necessary for high-paying jobs, produced the wealth that was necessary for standards of living. It comes back to the fact that we have recognized, as a right of ownership, the creativity genius of our own people.

Over the last two decades, most people have not understood that there has been a concealed effort to destroy the patent rights of the American people.

Let me repeat that. For the last two decades, we have been fighting quietly—people haven't even noticed it—against large international corporations, multinationals, who would destroy the patent rights of the American people.

□ 1900

Why did they want to do that? Because they want to steal the creation of our own inventors without having to

pay for that right. This is the ultimate little guy versus big guy, David and Goliath fight that I have ever seen in Washington, D.C., but it is also one of the quietest and one that people have tried their best to keep out of the public eye.

So how is it that Congress could even conceive of this, where you have big corporations coming to say let's neuter the rights of the little guy or of little Americans? How would this happen? How could anyone imagine that a representative body like the House of Representatives would do anything like that?

Well, of course, they are not coming to this body—and they are not going to the committee of jurisdiction, which is the Committee on the Judiciary—claiming that they want to steal from little guys and that they want to take people's ideas and use them without paying compensation for them. No, they don't say that.

They have had to create what I call the straw man argument. Now, that is a traditional way of debate. It is in the debate books. If you can't beat your opponent in a debate, create a straw man, create an image that you are actually attacking this guy, the straw man, when in reality you are attacking somebody else. Somebody else is going to suffer the pain.

So this man's arguments, the straw man arguments, you can handle them. You can say how horrible that straw man is and his arguments mean nothing, well, because that is not really the guy who is being attacked. It is the other man and woman down there, the small inventors. They are the ones who are going to feel it. But yet you don't hear that from those proponents of the legislation that, as I am warning people, is on the way to the House floor.

This straw man argumentation was first used 20 years ago when I got here. They were trying to suggest that we have to make major changes in our patent law because there are these heinous submarine patents. Over and over again, the submarine patents were having such a horrible impact on business because they would come up and charge people for patents that the business didn't even know existed.

Well, submarine patents, that went away. They no longer talk about submarine patents. Now the boogeyman that is helping them create a straw man argument that will result in the massive theft of intellectual property rights from America's most creative people, the boogeyman now is called the patent troll. That is it: the patent troll. These huge corporations have spent millions—tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions—of dollars over these last few years trying to promote this image that there is a patent troll out there—that sounds sinister, doesn't it?—that has to be defeated. They have proposed legislation in the name of defeating a patent troll, because that sounds very sinister, rather than legislation that permits large corporations

to get away with stealing the patent rights from small inventors in the United States.

Well, how did this "troll" word come about? It is a relatively new word. As I say, when I first got here, they were calling them "submarine patents," that is the evil force. Well, "troll" came about—I had a businessman who was an executive of a major company who has actually now changed sides, and he has decided, my gosh, no, he can't go along with this destruction of Americans' rights to own what they have created. He told me about how it was decided.

He was in a room with senior executives, mainly from the electronics industry. They went around the room saying, now, what is the most sinister-sounding word that we can come up with in order to divert the attention of the people away from the fact that our real target is these small inventors, because everybody has a soft spot in their heart for small inventors, so they are going to create a false image some way. What can we do? What word can we use to fool the American people into thinking that this is an evil force that we are trying to stop when, in reality, they are trying to beat down small inventors?

Well, they went around the room, the guy was telling me, and he said: I actually suggested that they use the word "patent pirate," the "patent pirate." That is how horrible it is. But, no, by the time they got around to the end of the group, to the last part of the group, they had all heard "patent troll," which is even worse than "patent pirate." So they all agreed that this would be the word that we will use to deceive the American people. That is what it was all about. This businessman was very upfront with me about the cynical nature of this type of manipulation.

Well, obviously no one could come here and say, "We want to eliminate the rights of the American people to sue for damages," and we can't eliminate the rights of small inventors to actually try to get their money for something that they have invented and spent their whole lifetime trying to create, but what they can do is try to get legislation that will eliminate the ability of patent trolls to function.

Well, unfortunately, every single item that is being presented as a means to control patent trolls actually does what? It hurts every single one of them, does damage to little guys trying to protect their patent rights.

By the way, everything they are presenting in this legislation would be the equivalent if someone says: Well, we have got this horrible thing about frivolous lawsuits. Because, in fact, what the businessmen often are complaining about and claiming that trolls are being the ones who are doing this, what they are really talking about are frivolous lawsuits.

Well, there are frivolous lawsuits throughout our entire justice system

and court system. Would we then say that because there are some lawyers who are willing to scam the system or that we know that there are some people who will file frivolous lawsuits that we should eliminate the rights of the American people to sue for damages when they have been damaged by someone or sue to protect their rights when their rights have been violated? No. But that is what is going on here.

In the name of stopping the trolls, which they made up the term, we are being asked to support legislation that dramatically eliminates the rights and protections of honest inventors, although that is not what is being said every time there is a debate—"We are for the small inventor; we are for the small inventor," when every single one of the provisions hurts the small inventor.

What is happening, basically, is we are seeing that the legislation being pushed forward now is under a bill, which is H.R. 9. It is already in the committee. It was a bill that went through last year. What happened is, yes, it went through last year with the same sort of, "Oh, we are not really trying to hurt the little guy," but knowing that is what it was doing because what happened is, yeah, the legislation passed this body. The legislation passed this body.

To show you how bad it was, I managed to lead the fight and have one amendment that got one of the bad provisions out. You know what that provision was? The provision was, if a small inventor feels that the Patent Office has not been dealing with him on a legal basis, on a legitimate basis, that he no longer has the right to take his case to court. They were eliminating the right of our inventors to take their case to court when their government isn't operating legally.

Now, we managed to push that one back. Unfortunately, the other provisions of the bill moved forward. But guess what. Even though it would hurt small inventors and technology inventors and universities, that bill went forward out of this body, but it was stopped in the Senate. It was stopped in the Senate because some of these technology laboratories and some small inventors as well, but mainly the universities, stepped forward and said: Wait a minute. You are trying to supposedly get patent trolls, but what you are doing is going to undercut us. It was analyzed that the result of that legislation, if signed into law and passed through the Senate, would have decreased the value of patents owned by our universities.

Now, that is a major source of their income is their patents because they have laboratories and research centers. That would have negated about half the value of the patents that they own. This would have been a disaster. Luckily, the universities spoke up, and they need to speak up in the House this time because it is the same bill they are trying to put through the House, and they

are trying to ship it over to the Senate again. We need to make sure that we mobilize and let those people in elected office, whether they are a Congressman or a Senator, know that they have to pay attention to what the effects of this will be on our universities, what it will be on—yes, and on the small inventors. It is unconscionable that we have these huge multinational corporations in a power grab like this.

Why is it that they are able to do this, this attack on little guys, on average Americans who have dedicated their life to developing a new technological idea? Why? Why is that? Well, because they are able to give major campaign contributions. I am not talking about anybody's vote being bought. I don't believe that that happens here. I know that a lot of people claim that, but I don't claim that. What I do know is that contributors get the attention of the Member of Congress or the Senator. That is what happens.

These big megacorporations—and they are multinational corporations by and large—have bought the attention of these people and have made their argument. So we have 90 percent of the Members of Congress and the Senate who are yawning and nobody is talking to them about the bill, but they have got these other 10 percent with their best friends who have donated to their campaigns actually are able to make the argument.

If we are to protect our prosperity, if we are to protect our security, we have got to move forward and interact with those people who are elected to represent us in the Congress and the United States Senate. That is the only thing that will thwart these multinationals and their ability to buy the attention of a certain number of Members of Congress.

The Congress will not pay attention unless the universities, unless the average working people, the voters in their district come and see them and talk to them and say: We do not want our rights to be diminished. We don't want any of our rights, but especially our patent rights, which are the rights that protect our jobs because it makes us competitive with overseas. It produces wealth enough for average people to live well in our country.

Well, we need to make sure that these huge corporations don't run roughshod over the rest of us because they, themselves, now, as I say, they haven't bought votes; they bought attention. We need to call attention to this issue, and it is up before the Committee on the Judiciary. We are talking about H.R. 9, a piece of legislation that will do a tremendous damage to the American people by cutting off the very constitutional right that our Founding Fathers knew was so important, and that is the right to own, for a given period of time, any type of technology creation and creative genius that you have as a writer or an inventor.

This is the little guys versus the big guys. This is David versus Goliath. I

will tell you, we little guys need to stick together. If we do, we will win. That is what America is all about. We can and will win. We will not let cynical, powerful forces like those who sit around the room and say: What is the bad word that we can come up with that will scare everybody into supporting our restrictions and our diminishing of patent rights? The cynical people came up with the word "troll."

Well, what is wrong with this, by the way? Let me just note that this bill, H.R. 9, will greatly diminish patent protection, but, for example, it destroys the right of discovery. It means that if people actually invest in a small inventor—let's say someone, a small inventor needs an investor. Of course they do. They are not like these huge corporations. They need someone to invest. But later on, the big corporation does what? Steals that invention. In order to what? These big corporations are sued all the time for infringement.

□ 1915

What infringement means is they are arrogantly taking something that belongs to somebody else, something that has been patented, and ignoring the patent, putting it into their product, and then say, "Well, sue me," knowing that the little guys have trouble suing because they don't have the money.

Well, if anybody has invested in that inventor and the investor sues for infringement—let's say his lawyers aren't as good and he loses that case—well, now, they are changing the rules here. All of a sudden, all of the expenses of that big company, the legal expenses, will have to be picked up by that small inventor.

Oh, my gosh, what happens when that happens? You will never get anybody to invest in that small inventor because the law not only says the inventor will pay for the cost of asking for the infringement case, but anybody who has invested in his invention will also have to bear that burden. Who is going to want to become liable if a big company starts stealing and they can't prove it in court?

The bill destroys treble damages. Right now, if a big company decides to steal from a little guy—well, if the little guy can prove this guy knew that that was my patent and he is stealing my intellectual property, if he can prove that, he will get treble damages. That is triple damages.

Well, that has been what we have had all along. That permits the little guy to have legal counsel because, if it is just simply getting the money back that he has lost, this is damages, because he gets a certain amount because he has been violated.

Well, if you eliminate that, how will these little guys get a lawyer? Now, these big guys are trying to eliminate triple damages so the little guys can't get lawyers. By doing these things, H.R. 9 will dramatically decrease the value of patents held by our major universities, held by retirement accounts,

held by our laboratories—the people who own these patents.

Now, by the way, let me tell you what they claim a patent troll to be and how they claim that this is bad. A patent troll, according to these huge corporate interests, is someone who didn't invest in something but now has the rights to sue them because that investor—the "troll"—has purchased the patent rights to certain technologies.

Let me note that a patent sometimes runs around 10 to 20 years that a patent owner can own his patent. An inventor gets granted the patent, and for 17 years, they own that patent.

Well, many of them don't have any money, and they can't even develop it, so they have to have investors. Some of them face the theft of their technology, and they don't have the money to put out, and they, themselves, challenge in court that their rights have been violated.

It is like a piece of property. If somebody comes and builds a railroad track across your property and refuses to give you any compensation for it, well, you have a right to sue; but some of the little guys don't have enough money to sue.

Well, in this case, what we have got is legal entities that are not involved with actually the invention, but they will come in and say, I will invest in your patent so you will have enough money to sue these big guys because they are stealing from you—or they just buy the patent outright, and then they own that property for a given period of time, and then they sue.

There is nothing wrong, I believe, with someone stepping forward and buying the property rights of an inventor and then enforcing it through our court system. There is nothing wrong with that, but we have been told that these are all frivolous lawsuits by the trolls.

Well, they are not. Some of them are like this, a troll—supposedly, by that name—is nothing more than an investor who has bought the property rights of an inventor, of the person who owned the property in the first place.

What we have is these multinational corporations trying to vilify someone who comes in and buys patent rights from small inventors and then using that person to destroy all of the patent rights of the small inventor.

Luckily, we have a bill in the Senate, which is S. 632. It is CHRIS COONS from Delaware who actually has a piece of legislation to try to strengthen people's patent rights, and it eliminates some of the—you might say—bad tactics that were used by people who were involved with frivolous lawsuits in the technology area. He takes care of that without greatly diminishing the patent rights of real inventors.

We also have a bill with Representative JOHN CONYERS here in the House, and that bill protects the small guy while trying to improve the Patent Office. By the way, what his bill does is ensure that all the patent fees that go

into the Patent Office stay there and, thus, improve the quality of the patents that our people have.

Over a billion dollars has been taken from the Patent Office in the last 10 years and goes into the general fund when it should be spent trying to protect—and trying to make the system work—intellectual property ownership by inventors.

That is the last I have on that piece of legislation, which is H.R. 9, which deserves the attention of the American people.

I would like to end my time tonight talking about one other issue very quickly. Today, I introduced legislation, H.R. 1940, which basically says that the Federal Government shall not interfere in those States that have eliminated the penalties on marijuana use and sales or have allowed the operation of medical marijuana dispensaries.

This legislation, H.R. 1940, would basically leave it up to the States as to whether or not people should be permitted to use marijuana, especially medical marijuana.

I don't see any reason why the people of the United States should face the type of controls and the type of police state activity that impacts their lives by people—whether they are well meaning or not—who have set up, basically, a bureaucratic law enforcement state that activates and prevents people from living their own lives.

If, indeed, someone is using marijuana—for medical purposes especially, but also even for recreational use—if someone is in their backyard, smoking some marijuana, we should not spend limited dollars.

We have limited tax dollars here. We are cutting off veterans' benefits, cutting down on people who need help, but then we are spending it on trying to put in jail someone who is smoking marijuana in their backyard or trying to supply someone with the marijuana to smoke in their backyard. That is absolutely absurd.

My bill, H.R. 1940, will insist that, if a State has legalized the use of marijuana or the medical use of marijuana, the Federal Government cannot infringe upon that.

It is sort of like you see a guy over in the corner of a park, and he is surrounded by policemen, and they throw him to the ground, and they handcuff him and put him in jail, and they go through the court procedures with the judges and all these expenses for smoking marijuana, versus the other end of the park, where some lady is getting raped, but there is no policeman there, and they spend all of their money focusing on the people who are smoking marijuana. That makes no sense.

When you have limited dollars, we should especially respect people's right to live their own lives; and, if they make mistakes, which they do, they will have to live with those mistakes.

I would ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1940, which is consistent with

criminal law should be made at the State and local level and not at the Federal level. We should not have a Federal police force knocking in doors, going into people's homes, and spending huge amounts of money in order to prevent people from personal consumption behavior.

I would ask my colleagues, if you believe in liberty, believe what our Founding Fathers believed in, support a strong patent system and oppose H.R. 9 and support my legislation, H.R. 1940, which will restore to the American people and to the States therein the right to control criminal law and their own personal behavior.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today on account of attending a Presidential visit to the Everglades National Park in his district.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for April 21 through April 23.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the first series of votes today on account of medical appointment regarding foot surgery.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 971. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program; to the Committee on Ways and Means; 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.

S. 984. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on Ways and Means 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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 535. An act to promote energy efficiency.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 23, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1239. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-39, "Public Charter School Priority Enrollment Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1240. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-40, "Chancellor of the District of Columbia Public Schools Salary Adjustment Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1241. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-41, "Health Benefit Exchange Authority Financial Sustainability Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1242. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-42, "Educator Evaluation Data Protection Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1243. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-38, "Wage Theft Prevention Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1244. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-43, "At-Risk Funding Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1245. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-37, "H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1246. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 20-492, "Student Nutrition on Winter Weather Days Act of 2014", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1247. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-48, "Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1248. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-49, "Marijuana Possession Decriminalization Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1249. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-44, "Vending Regulations Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to