



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 1, 2015

No. 86

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 1, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

PATRIOT ACT REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today because last night, at midnight, a wonderful thing happened. In what seems like a constant flow, a tide that has been washing away our liberties since the founding of this country, we experienced something unique.

The tide reversed, thanks to one Senator, Senator RAND PAUL of Kentucky, and now, we have some of our civil liberties restored. If only but for a brief second in history, they are restored. It

may register only as an eddy current, but clearly, we changed the tide last night.

Now, what happened? The PATRIOT Act expired. How does a law expire, do you say? Why do we allow them to expire? It is because, when we enact laws, we know that we don't have the foresight to see how they will be carried out. We don't know everything that is going to happen as time transpires. It is important that we revisit these laws. In this case, this law expired.

I would like to pretend that, if I were here when the PATRIOT Act passed after the attacks on our country, that I wouldn't have voted for it, but I can't say that. I am not going to pass judgment on my colleagues that were here when it did pass. I can barely imagine the incredible pressure they were under from their constituents, from everybody, to do something—to do something to protect our country, and so they passed the PATRIOT Act. I don't blame them. I wasn't here. I might have done the same thing.

We have new facts today, so we revisit this law; we revisit the PATRIOT Act. What are the new facts? What are the things that have changed since it was issued? Let me list them.

First of all, our Director of National Intelligence lied to us, lied to Congress about how the law was being implemented. In fact, he said, "I said the least untruthful thing I could," when he testified. Those were his words. He said the least untruthful thing he could.

That is not good enough. He is in charge of all of our intelligence, and you are spying on Americans, and you lied to Congress about it, so that has changed.

What else changed? The NSA broke the law. How do we know this? The second highest court in the land said they broke the law. Just a few weeks ago, they ruled this. Surely, we can't trust them to enforce the laws that we are

giving them now without some major reform.

What is the next thing that has changed since the PATRIOT Act first passed? The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence failed us. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is privy to information that the rest of Congress cannot have, and I understand that. It would be hard to keep a secret if 435 Members knew about it, so we entrust some of our Members to know the Nation's most important secrets.

What do we trust them with? Oversight, oversight over the intelligence community to make sure that the laws that all 435 of us vote on are being implemented in the way that we intended them to be implemented—and that was not the case, so that has changed.

What is the fourth thing that has changed since the first PATRIOT Act was issued and the last time it was reauthorized? The FISA court, this is the secret court that issues the secret warrants, if you will—if you would call them warrants. I would not call them warrants.

They issued the mother of all general warrants. What are general warrants? These are warrants that are not specific. The warrant they issued would make King George III blush. Think about this: a warrant that covers every—every—American.

Let me read the Fourth Amendment to our Constitution here, and this is specifically about your right to privacy: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

The warrant that they issued, the one that went to Verizon which authorized the collection of everybody's

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3583

phone records, was not constitutional; yet we trusted them with the oversight, and they betrayed us. They betrayed that trust.

Since 1979, there have been 34,000 surveillance orders requested of the FISA court by the intelligence community; 12 of the 34,000 have been denied.

Mr. Speaker, things have changed. I urge my colleagues not to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act. The Freedom Act does not go far enough.

MEDICAL MARIJUANA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there is a quiet revolution taking place across America to reform and modernize our marijuana laws. For over half a century, the official position has been one of prohibition, of incarceration, of obfuscation, and willful ignorance; yet almost 20 million Americans use marijuana every month.

A majority of the public now thinks that that should be legal, and an even larger majority thinks that, whatever their personal opinion about marijuana is, that the Federal Government should not interfere with what the States do, just like how we regulate alcohol.

In the vanguard of the reform movement has been medical marijuana since 1996, when California was the first State to legalize it. It has been followed now where almost three-quarters of the States provide some form of access to medical marijuana, and most of those decisions were made by a vote of the people. Well over 200 million Americans live where they have access to medical marijuana.

There have been many positive benefits achieved for our veterans, who suffer from a wide range of medical problems, many of which stem from their years of service: chronic pain, PTSD, controlling the symptoms of multiple sclerosis, or dealing with violent nausea as a result of chemotherapy; yet our veterans are discriminated against because, even in States where it is legal, their VA doctors are discouraged from working with them to see if medical marijuana is right for them or if it is not.

I am pleased to see some change taking place in Congress. We almost passed my amendment last month which would have given veterans fair treatment, enabling their primary doctor to consult with them. Just this last week in the Senate, there was approved in committee essentially the same amendment, and it is on its way to the Senate floor to give equal rights to veterans for medical marijuana.

This is the latest step in the evolution that we have seen now where four States and the District of Columbia have declared adult use legal, and we are seeing further progress at the local level.

The tide is building. We are turning away from a failed program of prohib-

iting; arresting; and, in some cases, incarcerating, while denying the science.

We as a Nation are turning to approaches that are more honest and workable, that tax and regulate to allow for important research and public education that will allow people to make informed choices about the use of these substances or not.

We are already seeing the social, economic, and law enforcement advantages in this shift at the State level, and we should capitalize on this movement at the national level as well.

It is exciting to see a bipartisan group of legislators in a sea of legislative dysfunction coming together to promote bringing this country into the 21st century in terms of marijuana policies, doing it right.

This week, during consideration of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, we are likely to see numerous amendments dealing with research, hemp, medical marijuana, cultivation, enforcement, and respecting States' laws.

This is an exciting and encouraging development to be able to make the Federal Government a full partner with the evolution that is taking place on the State and local level.

I urge my colleagues to vote in such a way that respects the will of the people and the rights of States to forge these new policies.

FISHING IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the American recreational fishermen that, like myself and my family, used to have the opportunity to fish for red snapper in the Federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

I can't help but think how sad it is that we have people in here articulating why illegal drugs should be made legal while we continue to allow Federal agencies to take away the rights of the American sportsmen and the men and the women who just want to take their kids fishing.

Maybe if we spent more time outdoors fishing and hunting, we wouldn't have the problems that we have in this country with drugs.

Now, technically, Mr. Speaker, we still have the right to fish in the Gulf of Mexico in the Federal waters, as long as you can do it in the crumb of the season that has been left for the recreational fishermen.

Dr. Roy Crabtree and the National Marine Fisheries Services have left a 10-day season for the not-for-hire recreational angler who just wants to take his or her kid fishing, 10 days.

In 2007, Mr. Speaker—if you want to know how fast this has gone downhill—we got to fish 194 days; so, in the short span of about 8 years, they have taken 95 percent of the opportunity of the

American sportsmen to fish in the Gulf of Mexico's Federal waters for red snapper away from them.

When they started the reductions, they promised that, as soon as the stock was restored, the season would be restored. Now, they give us the excuse: Well, because there are so many of them and they are so much bigger, you are catching that many that much faster.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this makes no sense. The commercial fishermen, ships, long lines and winches, and their powerful lobbyists, they get to fish year round for the same species. Dr. Roy Crabtree and the others at the National Marine Fisheries Services again virtually eliminated the fishing season for the recreational angler, reducing it to 10 days.

Now, I support the commercial fishing industry. I like to buy a piece of red snapper at the restaurant. I like to buy it at the grocery store. There is plenty of fish out there for all of us.

The 10 days that we have as recreational anglers—if it is bad weather, well, that is just too bad. If you have got to work that day, well, that is just too bad. You see, they pick the days. You don't get to pick the days, Mr. Speaker; and, if you can't fish on that day, that is just too bad for you. If you can afford it, the charter boat season now is 45 days.

Now, I will just tell you, I have never seen this much bias in anything I have ever done, especially in the rulemaking process, unless someone is being bribed or blackmailed or had a personal financial interest in the rulemaking, which brings me to the next point.

The vote to split the recreational season at the expense of the American angler, who just wants to fish with their family—not being forced to hire a charter boat—this was done by the Gulf Council on a split vote of 7 to 10 in which, according to news sources, 3 of the members that voted to do this didn't disclose that they sit on the board of a group that lobbies for the charter boat industry.

Again, I support the charter boat industry, but the idea that someone could sit there and vote to make a season for themselves 45 days as long as you can pay them to take you, but 10 days if you don't pay them—Mr. Speaker, to be quite honest, Federal law stipulates those with a conflict must disclose it and shall not vote on those issues where a conflict exists.

The conduct of the National Marine Fisheries Services in allowing that vote is in direct contrast to the rights of the Americans who just want to fish in the Gulf of Mexico.

I, for one, am not going to sit back and let this continue; and, when the CJS appropriations act is on the floor, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we have the opportunity to correct what I believe to be illegal actions by the National Marine Fisheries Services and Dr. Roy Crabtree.