

approximately 650 members of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious meeting in Orlando, FL issued a public statement imploring President Donald J. Trump to engage in dialogue and negotiation:

At this critical moment for our country and global community, we—the approximately 650 members of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious gathered in assembly—have discerned the Gospel call to embody love for the sake of the world.

We believe that love is more powerful than fear, dialogue more productive than rhetoric, and connection more transformative than threats of destruction.

We call on President Trump to engage in constructive dialogue and negotiation to resolve the current crisis between the governments of the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a manner that guarantees the peace and security that all people seek.

We commit ourselves to promote non-violence and a compassionate response to the thirst of the world for integrity and communion.

DACA TERMINATION

(Ms. CLARKE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the administration's cruel and inhumane decision to terminate the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA.

President Obama first implemented DACA in 2012, to ensure that the hundreds of thousands of immigrant children, many of whom are young adults and have lived in the United States for years and known no other home other than the United States, have a place here in America. This program was rooted in the best of our political tradition and intended as a temporary fix until Congress chose to take action.

In 2013, the Senate rose to the challenge and passed a bipartisan reform proposal. However, this Chamber callously refused to even consider the Gang of Eight proposal and instead let it die a slow and painful legislative death.

We are now being called upon to resume the fight, and we must not squander this opportunity. What my colleagues need to understand here and now is that this is not a game. The fate of nearly a million people hangs in the balance. Today's coldhearted decision will impact their health, wellness, families, and earning potential for years to come. DREAMers are generally beginning the most productive years of their lives.

This is not a hypothetical question. It is real. We need to get to work, Mr. Speaker, right away.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, before I get into a rather elongated discussion about one fundamental issue that we are having to decide in the next few days, I would like to just mention that we have just heard severe criticism of our President.

Let me just note about President Trump and his rhetoric supposedly making things worse in Korea. The rhetoric of our President has not made the situation worse in Korea.

What made the situation in Korea a major threat to our country and to our people and to the world was that, during the Clinton administration, President Clinton pushed through this Congress a package of aid for North Korea. Yes, we gave billions of dollars of aid in the form of energy and other types of issues and things that they needed. We gave them billions of dollars of aid under the agreement that North Korea would not be developing their nuclear weapons.

At that time, Chris Cox, a Member of the House of Representatives at the time, and myself fought aggressively against that deal. The North Koreans ended up being the recipient of billions of dollars of aid, even though they were the most antidemocratic institution, the greatest threat, and the greatest tyrants in that part of the world.

Yes, they knew that they didn't have to worry about the United States of America. That is when they, again, slowly but surely, after receiving billions of dollars from us, pushed through by President Clinton, that is how they have gotten to this point now where they are exploding weapons and launching rockets.

They are blaming that on our President, who just recently became President, and they are blaming it on his rhetoric rather than his policy? It is ridiculous.

The other thing we have heard about our President again is how heartless he is because he is not permitting young people who have been designated as DREAMers to stay here in the United States, even though they are in this country illegally, and they were brought here illegally.

Now, what is the impact? What will be the impact to those young people, who are probably wonderful young people? Most of them, I am sure, are wonderful young people. But the bottom line is, our interests and our moral obligation must be to the well-being of American young people. That includes American young people who are of every race and every religion and every ethnic group.

Approving the people who have come here illegally will hurt American young people, especially American-Hispanic young people. The DREAMers will be competing with their jobs and, yes, bidding down the wages of our own young people and our other people who are trying to struggle right now to get by. No, what the President has done is watch out for the right young people: Americans.

Yes, we have had millions of people—in fact, for the last few years, over a million people—legally immigrate into our country. We have nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to apologize for. We are the most generous when it comes to legal immigration into our society of any country in the world. In fact, at times recently, the amount of legal immigration we have been allowing into our country represents more than all the other countries of the world in what they have permitted to legally immigrate into their society.

We all feel for young people throughout the world who deserve a better life. But if we permit people to come here as young people illegally, and then legalize their status, every parent in the world will see that decision. Every parent in the world will say: Oh, my gosh, that young person who comes from Guatemala, or wherever it is, made it to America. He went in illegally, and now he is going to a junior college. He has had some health problems. The American taxpayers have paid for it. Why can't I bring my children there?

Well, it will dawn on them that millions of people—hundreds of millions, perhaps—that if they are going to come to the United States illegally, you better bring the kids, because Americans think more of those kids than they do their own kids.

I applaud the President for what he has done to slow down this betrayal of American young people by allowing young people to come in here illegally and thus expect that they are going to get legal status by wearing us down and appealing to our emotions.

One thing we have to note, in closing on this issue, those young people, if they are legalized, that is not the end of the game. At that point, when they are legalized, they have a right to make applications so that their parents can have their status legalized. They can bring in family that they left back in their home countries. Now they can apply to have them come in under family reunification.

This isn't just about a group of young people who came in. Even to legalize their status would be wrong. Otherwise, millions of other people will come here. Remember the trainloads of young people who were put on trains headed to the United States? Yes, we can expect more of that. Why not? If you love your children and you live anywhere else than the United States and you are living a poor life, of course you want to bring your kids here.

We should not be encouraging that, and we should not be attacking the President of the United States for standing up for our own young people, rather than trying to bring a massive flood of illegal immigrant children into our society and pay for their education and their healthcare, et cetera.

With that said, the issue that I am hoping to discuss in detail tonight is something on a totally different level, in terms of issue. This is an issue, whether you are Republican or Democrat, you go across the board; whether

liberal or conservative, there should be a close look at what is happening right now in the House of Representatives.

A decision will soon be made by the House Rules Committee—they are meeting tonight and tomorrow—that will have a dramatic and direct impact on the lives of millions of Americans. Although the issue will have such severe consequences on so many people, Members of Congress may or may not have had the opportunity and may not have the opportunity in the future to vote on the provision that is being discussed tonight.

What I am talking about at issue is an amendment submitted to the Rules Committee. For those who don't know, the Rules Committee is a committee here in Congress that decides what will come to the floor for a vote—what bills—and what will be included; what amendments will be permitted, what amendments won't, and if there will be any.

That is their job. They do a good job of it, but it is important that they do a job that reflects the American people and the interests of the American people.

So what we have is an amendment that has been submitted to the Rules Committee for consideration with this week's appropriations bill. What I am talking about is an amendment which prohibits any of the money or resources in the appropriations bill for the Department of Justice; it prevents that money or the resources that come from the Department of Justice, purchased by that revenue; it says that the Department of Justice can't use that money that is being given to them in the appropriations bill to supersede a State law when that State has legalized the medical use of marijuana.

Now, that is my amendment. That amendment has been around. As many of my colleagues know, this amendment has a long history. The House has considered this issue numerous times since former Representative Maurice Hinchey of New York introduced the first amendment of this nature in 2001. I joined him and supported that provision.

Eventually, I became the lead sponsor of the amendment when Mr. Hinchey left. That year, in 2012, my amendment failed in the House by a vote of 162–262.

So, in 2012, my amendment, which would have legalized medical marijuana—basically, saying that you can't have the Federal Government supersede States when they have legalized medical marijuana—lost by 162–262.

Two years later, I teamed up with Representative Sam Farr, who is also now retired, and saw the amendment pass—the very same amendment we were able to reach out to our colleagues and say that we do not want any of the money that is being allocated for the Department of Justice to be used to supersede States' rights. That cannot supersede a State that has legalized the medical use of marijuana.

The passage of the amendment in 2004 led to the inclusion of this provision in last year's omnibus appropriations bill, which was signed into law December 2014. The following year, the amendment passed by an even larger margin. Let me note that the last time it came here for a vote on the floor, it passed by 242–186.

What we are talking about is that the people of the United States, over these years, over and over again, have expressed themselves to the Federal Government by passing laws in their own States to legalize the medical use of marijuana.

□ 1945

And now we have a move to try to prevent those reforms that we put into place for the last 6 years that insisted that the Federal Government respect the State laws that have been changed so that the State laws that have given their own people permission to use medical marijuana for medical purposes, now what we see is an effort to try to prevent that from happening.

In other words, the status quo for 4 years has been the Federal Government will not interfere because the Department of Justice is not permitted to use its resources to supersede a State that has legalized the medical use of marijuana. And the States, in these 4 years, over and over and over again, have reaffirmed and have sometimes put in place brand-new law that permits their people to use medical marijuana.

Changing the status quo here by not adding that amendment that has been in the bill for the last 4 years, we are changing the status quo in a way that undermines the rights of the States and the people therein to make their policy, a right that we had acknowledged for the last 4 years.

Since it was first enacted into law, the provision has been updated and extended through a series of continuing resolutions. That is the bill that says we will respect State marijuana laws and omnibus appropriations bills, the last of which was signed into law by President Trump on April 5.

So, on April 5, we signed the omnibus bill. In that bill was the amendment that said the Justice Department will not use its resources to supersede State law. And since the first vote in 2014, the Senate Appropriations Committee has taken up the issue and has adopted this amendment on a bipartisan basis every year for the last few years.

As a result of this provision, the Federal Government has been prohibited from arresting or attacking those providing cannabis for medical purposes in the States that have passed such laws through their State legislature or through a direct vote of their own people.

So, to date, what are we talking about? We are talking about 46 States that have legalized some form of cannabis for medical purposes.

Yet we see, today, this Republican Congress is seriously considering what?

Superseding those States, 46 States that have actually said: We will determine what is good for our people, and our people have voted overwhelmingly to permit medical marijuana to be used by the people of this State.

We are considering changing the status quo tonight by not permitting the amendment that always gave the rights to the States to make that decision.

With this movement by the States, we have witnessed the emergence of a new and a major industry in America. Billions of dollars now are being invested in the exploding cannabis industry, an industry where now marijuana is being grown to provide clinics, which then they work on the cannabis itself. They put it into and they catalog it in terms of strength and in terms of dosage, and they work with doctors to make sure that this can be used for helping people with their maladies.

Those involved, all who are doing this, the ones who are providing the cannabis, the guys who are processing it, the people who are selling it, the people who want to make sure that everything is designated right, the strength and the character of what is being sold, and, of course, a book-keeping system that makes sure everybody knows, total, who is doing what, all those involved in this new industry, billions of dollars' worth of industry, are respectable businessmen and -women.

Yes, they are seeking profit, but these are men and women who are eager to be, yes, seeking profit and to be responsible and transparent; and just like any other member of the business community, they want to do a business efficiently, and they want to be held accountable for what they are doing.

Money should be accounted for, yes. Ingredients of products must be verified and labeled. Standard business practices ought to be applied, and, of course, taxes and regulations are part of that equation.

Well, throughout the country, this industry is taking the public away from gangsters, away from criminal drug dealers. Now, who is being helped? But first let me note on that.

If we eliminate this right of the States to basically legalize the medical use of marijuana and put it in the hands of those people whom I have just described, honest businessmen who are going to be held accountable and held with transparent types of operations, no, they will be replaced by whom? They will be replaced by drug dealers. They will be replaced by the Mexican drug cartel. That is who is being helped if we eliminate this provision that has been part of the appropriations bill for the Department of Justice for the last 3 years.

So why are we thinking about helping, not only just superseding what the people locally have voted for—why aren't we thinking about that?—but worse than that, why are we thinking

about transferring those billions of dollars now in this industry directly into the pockets of the drug cartels? That is what the vote is.

The vote is not, oh, we are going to stop anybody from using marijuana because marijuana is bad. That is not the vote. That is not the result of the vote. The result of the vote will be billions of dollars immediately transferred into the pockets of the drug cartel. That is what will happen.

So I implore my colleagues to look closely with this vote. I hope that the Rules Committee will see the error of its ways and permit a vote on the floor on this issue. If not, I will be calling on my colleagues to join me in opposing the rule that is coming to the floor that prohibits us from voting on this issue.

If we vote on the issue, let's all vote on the issue and let the voters hold us accountable for our vote, but don't just let nobody have a vote on it and hide behind anonymity. No, let's let the people know what side we are on.

Do we want to have drug cartels being handed billions of dollars? That is what this is about.

Oh, yes, we are going to say, well, fewer people will use marijuana. No, I do not believe that for an instant. And especially people who are using it for medical purposes, there won't be fewer of them. Those people still need medical marijuana, and they have arthritis and all kinds—the Vietnam—actually, not Vietnam vets, but the vets coming back from the Gulf. The veterans are coming back, and they know that this can help them.

We are now turning off the supply of medical marijuana to people who can be helped, and then what are we doing? We are giving the money that is being made by honest businessmen now in a transparent way, trying to run something where taxes are paid and everybody is held accountable, anything they sell is labeled—no, no. All of that is out the window because someone thinks marijuana, itself, is evil.

Children, especially those who are afflicted by seizures, have been treated through the use of CBD oils. That is a derivative of cannabis, and it appears to be effective.

Senior citizens are both physically and psychologically assisted in dealing with some of the challenges that often come with old age. Alzheimer's, arthritis, chronic pain, these are things that our seniors, when they are sitting in old folks homes or wherever, they suffer, and we say: No, you can't try marijuana; no, we are not going to let you legally be able to obtain that as something that might help you with your suffering. How ridiculous is that?

All Americans who suffer from diseases ranging from Crohn's disease to cancer, the potential to receive medical benefit from cannabis is clear.

And the wounded American soldiers coming home from the Middle East, they have come to our offices. They have been in my office, and I am sure

they have been in other people's offices to explain the positive effects of cannabis in dealing with PTSD.

In fact, the American Legion, an organization chartered in the aftermath of World War I to represent veterans, adopted a resolution last month urging the Federal Government to allow VA physicians to discuss and to recommend the use of medical marijuana in accordance with State laws.

My goodness, I will just have to say that for us to turn our back on these seniors, to say that these people who have young children who had seizures and they couldn't stop them and to turn our back on those people, to turn our back on our veterans, that is what this vote is all about.

This isn't about, oh, well, somebody can just go smoke marijuana.

And, by the way, if an adult is smoking marijuana in their backyard, yes, I don't think that we should waste police resources and billions of dollars of law enforcement money to try to stop an adult from using marijuana in his backyard.

But that is not the issue. The issue is whether States that have legalized the medical use of it should be superseded by us here, by the vote that we are going to have here in the next few days.

Let me tell you something about how I didn't know how the public would respond to the fact that I am one of the leaders in this whole effort to legalize the medical use of cannabis.

You know, I was Ronald Reagan's speechwriter, and I have been a Republican all my life. I get the top score on conservative groups that, you know, are giving you a score of how you voted and everything. I have received very high marks in all of those groups, and I have been a conservative voter. I have a conservative, libertarian background. I was Ronald Reagan's speechwriter for 7½ years in the White House.

I got elected in 1988, the last year of Reagan's term in the White House, and I sort of slipped into this issue because it is a principled issue to me. The principle is freedom, liberty, justice, and if you are not hurting somebody else; but especially we should let people who are suffering, at the very least give them some leeway when it comes to medical uses.

Well, I knew that I was getting a lot of publicity on this, and a fellow came into my office to talk to me about a totally different issue, about an aerospace issue. I am one of the senior members of the Science Committee, and I said—now, this guy represents, to me, my typical voter, my conservative voter in Canton, California.

The conservative voter was a guy who has been a commander or a captain in the U.S. Navy, a pilot. He was now in aerospace, and I am sure he always voted Republican. And so I asked him, I said: Look, what do you think about the fact that the guy you have been voting for all this time is now the leader in the fight to legalize medical

marijuana for the people of this State and this country?

He looked at me, and he said: DANA, you really don't know me very well.

I said: Well, I know you are a former pilot in the Navy and you are now in aerospace and you are a conservative vote.

And he says: Yeah, but you don't know that I have three sons—three sons—and the day after 9/11, they all marched off and joined the military. And then what you don't know also is, a few years later, two of them came back, but the third one who came back wasn't my son anymore. The third one that came back was on the floor in seizures because he had been in some kind of an explosion that had rattled his brain, and he was on the floor over these seizures and they wouldn't stop. How would you feel about your child on the floor having seizures that you cannot stop?

And now when I tell these people: We don't care about that; you are not going to get to try medical marijuana—well, this guy said he tried everything. He took him to the VA, and it didn't help. After about a year, this guy said one of the guys at the VA hospital pulled him aside and said: Hey, you want to help your son? See me off campus.

They saw him in his office off the VA hospital, and the guy said: Look, your son needs marijuana. Here is the prescription. Here is how to use it. Go do it.

And do you know what the guy said to me there in my office? He said: My son hasn't had a seizure since that day. You wonder what I want to do about you being the point man on legalizing medical marijuana? I want to go over and give you a big hug.

That is what he said.

□ 2000

Now, I hope that my colleagues take this seriously because there are children on the floor having these seizures. There are veterans waiting there in seizures. There are old folks who are having arthritis and they can't move their hands, or they have lost their appetites in these senior citizen homes.

There is nothing wrong with us using cannabis to help alleviate their pain. We have been doing that for 3 years, and now the Rules Committee may not even permit us to have a vote on it, and they will take it out of this bill. We will be taking this away, without even having our people have to vote on it or not.

Well, I say if you disagree with me, that is fine. If you don't think the drug cartels will be enriched, fine. Come up and make your arguments.

When I lost this vote on a number of occasions, before we won 3 or 4 years ago, I lived with it. I said: Fine; I lost the vote. I respect those people's opinion, and they beat me.

Well, I expect that is what a democracy is supposed to be all about. That is what it is supposed to be all about.

Let people be held accountable for this. Don't take it out of the bill. If they take it out of the judiciary appropriations bill, I am asking my colleagues to stand up and vote against a rule that is shielding us from accountability, shielding us from having to have, basically, responsibility for handing billions of dollars over to the drug cartels.

Now the argument, of course, is: Oh, there is an opiate—you know, some kind of, what do they call it, an epidemic. An epidemic that is crossing America is opiates. Well, yes, there is.

When young people, or old people, are given opiates by their doctors, that is what happens: they get addicted to the opiates. If their doctors have no alternative, like cannabis, to provide their patients with something that might help them with their challenge, well, then you are going to get opiates, and that is what has happened. Our doctors have been passing out opiates as if they are candy.

It is the legalization of medical marijuana that makes it more likely that we will defeat the opiate epidemic and get our people back to a point where they can actually control their own lives. No one has ever died from an overdose of marijuana.

Now, I can tell you this. I understand that people really want to help young people, and others, not to get addicted to drugs. And I will say, no one has ever overdosed on cannabis. Yes, there are some serious concerns of why you don't want young people, in particular, using cannabis.

But to make it illegal, to put people in jail for using this, for basically leaving the distribution of marijuana in the hands of criminals, is far worse in what happens than any of the things that happen if young people—or, well, if anybody—start smoking a joint.

And let me just say, I think young people, we need to talk to them seriously. When we tell them we don't even think marijuana should be used for medical purposes, they tune out. But if we say, we know there are some legitimate uses for this, but when you are 20 years old, it is going to hurt your mind development, do not use marijuana until at least you are over 20 years old, and we are only making it legal now in this bill, or if you have some medical problems.

Well, the fact is that young people can understand that. That is one of the reasons why we have got to have research into cannabis, other than just leaving these opiates as the easy answer for doctors. In fact, one of the greatest sins, I believe, committed against the American people in the last 100 years has been really a lack of research into cannabis as a potential healthcare device or, shall I say, entity so that, instead of doing research into cannabis for the last 100 years, research has been suppressed.

There could be some really wonderful things, and we are learning about them now. A few years ago, for example,

Israel had to lead the way on this and introduce a major research effort into cannabis, and their results have been spectacular.

Why does that happen in Israel and not here? Don't we care about whether those things that they discovered there that affects their people will help our people as well? No, no. We couldn't do that because we have people who are still living in the 1960s when to them cannabis—marijuana—means everybody growing their hair long, smoking dope in the park, and fornicating in the park, and failing in life, becoming hippies, and all of that.

The bottom line is that image is destroying the well-being of millions of Americans today. We have got to get over that image because that is not what medical cannabis is all about.

And as I say, young people under 20 years of age, I have no problem outlawing it for them and having some kind of severe penalty for people selling that to them. We need to protect them because it does impact negatively on kids who are under 20 years of age, or in that age group.

But let me also note: those kids shouldn't be drinking as well. The same studies that show that marijuana will really hurt the development of their brains and affect their electrical system also says that when they overdrink at an early age it has that same type of impact.

So those trying to protect us Americans from ourselves are well-intentioned. They certainly understand these negative impacts, and there are negative impacts of everything. There are negative impacts of too much sugar; there are negative impacts of eating the wrong things, or not getting any exercise, or sitting down in front of your computer, or only sitting and watching TV.

But if we go down the road and we let the government just protect us from ourselves, and that we are saying the government needs to just control our lives for us, no, that is not going to happen. That is not what our Founding Fathers were all about, and that is not what this country is all about.

Yes, there are things that we don't want young people to be involved with when it comes to cannabis. It is true with so many other things. And, also, we can't control that if we leave the drug cartels as the major player.

Perhaps the most serious downside of using cannabis over the last 50 years has been the financing of these drug cartels in Mexico and developing countries. But now, with the continued enactment of Rohrabacher-Farr, the vast majority of States have charted another course, rather than what we have had before, before our things passed. Well, the billions of dollars, this multi-billion-dollar industry has been taking shape, and it is taking a huge market share away from the cartels and the gangs.

Number one, it is important that we make sure young people, veterans,

older people, people who need this, people who are infirmed and need this help with cannabis and it can help them, first and foremost, let's let the States decide whether or not that is going to be a right for people to try to treat themselves with cannabis in those States. Okay, that is number one.

But, number two, let's make sure that the money that is now being spent and organized to try to provide those people with their supply, and doing it in a very professional way with how much and what strength they are getting, et cetera, and people held accountable, let's not turn that off and eliminate that and just send these people to the drug cartels. It is ridiculous.

And, finally, for me and many of my conservative colleagues, this has always been an issue of federalism and freedom. This has always been an issue that goes right back to the fundamentals.

Our Founding Fathers did not expect that the Federal Government would assume such a prominent role when it comes to policing our lives. Rather, they intended the States to take the lead when exercising police powers.

The 46 States have, thus far, sought a different course when it comes to medical cannabis. These States should not be stymied by an all-powerful Federal Government dictating what we, and the citizens of this country, shall do in our private lives. The States, and the people therein, should be left to make these decisions and to regulate these activities, or not regulate them, as they see fit.

What has happened now, because we have gotten away from this idea that Federalism will decide, the issue of Federalism, the 10th Amendment, what we have now are situations where we have different armies, like the DEA and others, who have had raids taking place throughout our country. This was not what our Founding Fathers had in mind.

This effort to try to put in jail anybody who is even using marijuana for anything, what we have done is in the Black and Chicano communities, in particular, minority communities who have less money, they have suffered the most because if their children—let's say a 20-year-old young man gets arrested in the ghetto, well, he is not going to have a lawyer like that, like people who live in more affluent areas. So that record will stick with him for the rest of his life.

We have wasted billions of dollars of their lives that they could be having better jobs 10 years down the road by hanging this on their back. We wonder why people can't get jobs. Well, somebody from a more affluent home, there is a lawyer waiting for them at the police station if he is ever caught with a baggy of marijuana.

Well, that is not good to have that young man in the ghetto, or anywhere else, or even in the affluent communities, to have to have a criminal record for something that, yes, might

have a negative impact on him. We should instead—let me just offer this as a solution. Let's go forward with some positive programs, rather than superseding State law with a heavy-handed, iron-fisted enforcement of laws controlling people's private behavior and their private consumption of what they want to consume. Let's put our effort into offering a positive alternative.

For example, in high schools and colleges, and even in grade schools, we can have drug testing. In our military, we can have drug testing. But it is not drug testing to put someone in jail. If you do it that way, you can't do that legally. You can't force someone to testify against themselves. But if you say: We want to see if you have a problem, and you are not going to get a driver's license if you don't pass drug free; and you can be given a drug test in high school at any time, and if your test comes back negative, you talk to the family of a young person who has been tested and has been using some kind of drug.

We can do those types of things. We can do those things that aren't aimed at obliterating someone's future by giving them a felony conviction for having a little bit of marijuana on them. That is ridiculous.

And we don't need to give the drug cartels all the money in making sure that people in the old folks' home down the street don't get to smoke marijuana to take care of their arthritis. That is all ridiculous.

Now we are facing this challenge here. This will be a vote this week. I would ask my colleagues: Please, let us have the amendment that we have had for 3 years, keep the status quo of letting the States handle this issue, let the States do that. This is a States' rights issue. Thomas Jefferson would be for us.

At the same time, if we do not get a vote on this and they try to hide behind it—we are not even going to get a chance to vote on it, thus we are not going to be held accountable for eliminating this freedom that we have and this federalism that we have—if we don't get that vote, I am asking my colleagues, especially my Republican colleagues—and I ask the public to pay attention to how people vote—a vote for the rule if this amendment, if the Rohrabacher-Blumenauer amendment is not permitted, then a vote for the rule is a vote for giving money to the drug cartels, it is a vote for eliminating the law as it is today, which is leaving it up to the States and bringing the Federal Government back to our local and State areas in an enforcement mode. We don't need that.

If we don't get this, if my amendment, the Rohrabacher amendment, is not permitted, I would hope that my colleagues would join me in voting against the rule, which sends that bill back to the committee, to the Rules Committee, where they will then either add it or not, but at least gives us a

chance to have a direct vote on it again if we defeat it the first time.

So I say strike a blow for freedom, make sure we have reaffirmed the idea of federalism, personal responsibility, not government controls over our lives, let's do what our Founding Fathers did, let's strike a blow for liberty.

That is what this is about: liberty. And it is not about having power in the hands of the Federal Government to come down and tell us how to run our lives and centralizing power in Washington, D.C.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for my amendment if it is permitted on the floor and, if it is not, to vote against the rule on the appropriations bill for the Justice Department.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2347

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3354, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-295) on the resolution (H. Res. 500) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LAMBORN (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today on account of flight delays.

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical leave.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of husband's health.

Mr. SUOZZI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of mother's funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 6, 2017, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2348. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Volatile Organic Compounds Rule Revision and Stage II Vapor Recovery [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0167; FRL-9965-62-Region 6] received August 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2349. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Major New Source Review [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0052; FRL-9966-78-Region 3] received August 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2350. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0798; Amendment No.: 71-49] received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2351. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Hilo, HI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0222; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-8] received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2352. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Incorporation by Reference of ICAO Annex 2; Removal of Outdated North Atlantic Minimum Navigation Performance Specifications [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9154; Amdt. No.: 91-348] (RIN: 2120-AK88) received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2353. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D