

was a genocide that took place 100 years ago.

I am a friend of Turkey's. I believe that the Turkish people and the people of the United States need to be close. We were in the cold war, and I am grateful to their contributions to our security over the years; but this doesn't mean that we should not be totally honest with each other and with them as friends in that all of us have made mistakes. Certainly, the United States has committed errors in its past that we should agree to acknowledge.

In this demonstration today, we are putting ourselves in solidarity with the families of those who were victimized 100 years ago by the Armenian genocide. We also express ourselves to our friends in Turkey that this is the time to just acknowledge that, in the past, mistakes were made and that, indeed, it is time to move on and to make sure that people today in Turkey are treated with greater respect for their rights and in continued cooperation with the United States and with other free people in the world.

I thank my friend Mr. BRAD SHERMAN, who has been a leader on this issue, for acknowledging and being here today to make sure that this gets into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this very important day.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I am here on the House floor where we, today, should be voting on a resolution to recognize the Armenian genocide. Several of us, I believe including the gentleman from California, introduced the Armenian Genocide Truth and Justice Resolution, but that resolution is not on the floor today because of the pressures, arguments, and an incredibly expensive lobbying campaign by the Turkish Government.

It was 100 years ago today, as I pointed out in the beginning, that 650 writers, lawyers, poets, doctors, priests, and politicians were rounded up, deported, and murdered by the Ottoman Government. No one should give any credence to the argument that somehow these were a few individuals who were acting alone, that this was not a coordinated governmental campaign. There were 1 million to 1.5 million people who died, and it was because of a premeditated and carefully planned effort by the Ottoman Government.

Now, we are told that Turkey is an ally of the United States and that, therefore, we dare not recognize the genocide here on the House floor.

First, I believe that there is nothing that we could do that is more important for the people of Turkey than to recognize the genocide and to urge them to do so as well. How will Turkey be a great country in the future if it is so focused on lying about its past? What relationship would we have with the government in Berlin if it were engaged in a Holocaust denial? Who in the world would trust American leadership if the government here in Wash-

ington were lying or denying slavery? Every nation has a past. Every nation ought to honestly come to grips with that past.

Then we are told that we cannot recognize the genocide because of threats from the Turkish Government.

Never have I been more ashamed of this Congress than in its kowtowing to threats that turn out to be not only outrageous but illusory. Turkey threatened harsh retribution for those countries that recognized the genocide and then took only token steps against Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Argentina, and 10 other countries. Some 40 American State legislatures have recognized the Armenian genocide and have not lost a single dollar of exports to Turkey. The greatest attempt by the Turkish Government to muzzle a national legislature was their effort, roughly a decade ago, to prevent France from recognizing the genocide. They threatened an economic boycott. In the 6 years that followed France's courageous recognition of the genocide, exports from France to Turkey increased fourfold.

The only thing worse than kowtowing to ridiculous and outrageous threats is kowtowing to ridiculous and outrageous threats that turn out to be illusory paper tigers.

Finally, I have to comment on just how outrageous it is for Turkey to be threatening the United States, because look at what we have done for Turkey.

In the years since World War II, we have saved them from communism and the Soviet Union. We disbursed over \$23 billion in aid. We prevented the creation of a fully sovereign and independent Kurdish state. We helped build the pipeline that brings them oil today, and we have been the loudest voice in urging that Turkey be admitted to the European Union. After we have done all of that, they say it is not enough and that we have to be accomplices with them in denying and in hiding the first genocide of the 20th century.

This is outrageous. It is time for this Congress to show that America is worthy of world leadership, not only because of our values of freedom and democracy, but because we have the courage to acknowledge the facts that actually occurred, and we are not tempted to gain some sort of illusory alliance advantage by denying the greatest crime that a nation can commit.

I think, as we see the last persons who survived the genocide—or the nieces and nephews of those who died—come to the end of their days, that America should recognize this great genocide.

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

DEMOCRACY IS IN GREAT DANGER

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, let us note in this great hall of freedom that this is the culmination of over 200 years of sacrifice and hard work and commitment by generations of Americans who started back in the 1700s to build a country that was based on freedom, liberty, and a democratic ideal of which all people's rights are respected and laws are made by the consent of the governed and that, indeed, we could have established a government at the Federal level which had its areas of authority but where other authority was vested in the States and in the people, themselves. This great, wondrous experiment of democracy is in great danger today from a number of areas.

Overseas, of course, we see radical Islam on the rise, and they would like to terrorize the population of Western civilization, especially those of us in America. We also have people who fear forces within our own society. Ironically, one of the things most our people fear is that our own government is out of control and that we have a government today that in no way matches the model that our Founding Fathers had in mind for the United States of America and for the people of this country at this time.

They looked forward to a shining city on a hill, and what we have instead is an evermore control-centered government that is not democratically oriented but is, instead, run for special interests, run by crony capitalists, run by bureaucrats in the Nation's Capital themselves, run by rogue elements within our own government, run by a too decentralized system that has emerged over these last several decades.

The United States was created by individuals who proclaimed a commitment to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness and life. Even as the Declaration of Independence declared our independence from Great Britain, we declared we were, instead, not just a country that was free of Great Britain but that we were going to be a special country in which people's rights were respected.

Even as we did declare our independence in that same document, what did we do?

We listed the horror stories that were going on of the great oppression that our Founding Fathers were experiencing by the British, who were trying to suppress their desire for liberty and independence—many of those items that were declared in our own Declaration of Independence that were reason enough for us to declare independence and to declare ourselves revolutionaries and patriots. Instead, we see many of those same items now being part and parcel of our own government. Our own bureaucracy claims the right to do some of the things that our Founding Fathers felt should have been left to the people and should not be permitted by any government.

Today, I would like to mention two significant issues that are at play in

Washington, D.C., that will play a prominent role in the degree of freedom that is enjoyed by our people. The second issue that I will mention gets a lot more publicity than the first, but the first issue that I would like to talk about today, which is a dramatic diminishing of the freedom and liberty of our people, is a bill that is designed to dramatically change our patent system. All of a sudden, there are yawns. "Oh, the patent system. Who can understand that?" No. It is very easy to understand.

□ 1430

Our Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution that Americans would have the right to own and control the product of their own creative genius for a period of time, that way we would encourage people to innovate, to come up with new ideas. And, in fact, that patent concept was so revolutionary that it was what catapulted America into a major power in the world.

It was a power in which the security and the prosperity of the average person and the rights of the average person were respected. Much of this can be traced back, yes, to the Constitution, to rights, and especially the patent rights because people had a right to own for a period of time the product of their own creative genius.

We developed the technology that uplifted America's middle class. We have a working group in this country who have always had a higher standard of living than other countries in the world. Now, why is that? People all over the world and in the United States work very hard. There are hard-working people all over the world, but it was here where hard-working people were able to prosper; people were able to live in dignity, to have families, to look forward to owning things of their own that they could then possess and enrich their own lives. There was nothing wrong with that, and, in fact, it was our technology that permitted that to happen.

Well, that technology was based on a legal foundation, as I say, in our own Constitution. Benjamin Franklin saw to it, that wise man, and our other Founding Fathers who listened to him and were captured by the idea. Thomas Jefferson, another man who believed in technology, Benjamin Franklin, these were people who knew that with freedom and technology there is no limit to what America can accomplish, and they set out to build the most creative, the freest, the most prosperous land of all, and they succeeded.

But today they are taking elements away from our freedom every day. This attack on the patent system, while it is stealth and not many people are seeing it, is a huge attack on the well-being, the prosperity, the security of the American people.

Now, what we have got—and who is trying to bring about these changes in our patent law that will hurt the little guys, hurt the individual inventors,

make sure that the American people don't see this as an individual right but look at it as something that corporations do? No, no. What we have are huge multinational corporations that are trying to do their best to undermine the patent rights that we have enjoyed as Americans for over 200 years.

Yes, it is a sinister attack on the rights of the American people, and we are talking about crony capitalism at its worst in that these are huge corporations having their say in the Nation's Capital and in Congress because they have influence here.

Now, I am not saying that people are being bought off in their votes. I am not saying that at all. But as this system works, every Member of Congress and every person here, just like most Americans, is busy with their lives and busy with specific responsibilities; and what we have are these huge multinational corporations that have basically given campaign donations, not to buy a vote, but to buy someone's attention.

So only about 10 percent of the people here know anything about these patent proposals that are now working their way to the floor of the House. These 10 percent, unfortunately, they know. Over the years, they have been given donations by major multinational corporations who explained their point of view. It is just that the other side has never gotten explained, and nobody knows about the other side.

So, thus, what we have is coming to the floor a bill, H.R. 9, that will greatly diminish the patent rights of average Americans, of the little guy in a way that it will help these great multinational corporations steal the technology that they did not create. This is the big guys versus the little guys; and I will tell you that the little guys don't always win, and the big guys don't always win. But if the little guys become active and they make sure that their Representative in Washington knows what is going on and knows that they stand for a strong patent protection of the American citizens, of patent rights for the American people, the little guys will win; otherwise, the crony capitalists, these major, huge multinational corporations who don't care about the American people. They care about their profit at the end of the year, which may or may not go into America's warehouse or America's banks. It may go overseas, because these are multinational corporations who know no allegiance to the United States.

So what we have got is a bill coming before the House, H.R. 9. Every one of the provisions in this bill has been designed to weaken the ability of American inventors to be able to defend their patent rights in court against major corporations that are trying to steal from them.

Now, how did it get this way? How did we get to this point where a bill may come to the floor—and it passed last year. We stopped it in the Senate.

But how is that possible? Well, it is possible not because these multinational corporations said: Oh, we want to weaken the patent protection of America's inventors. No. They said: We have got a problem with trolls.

Trolls, yes. "Trolls," what a sinister-sounding word.

By the way, when I came here 20 years ago, they weren't talking about trolls. They were talking about submarine patents. There is always some sinister-sounding threat that is being used in order to try to diminish the actual patent protection of our average inventor. Today it is "trolls."

Now, by the way, what does a troll mean? A troll, according to these corporations, is someone who did not invent something but has purchased the patent rights from the inventor mainly because that inventor maybe doesn't have the money to actually go and to enforce his or her own patent rights upon some huge corporation. So you have some people who come along who have got resources and say, "I will be your partner;" or, "Hey, I will just buy these rights from you."

This has played an important part in our whole process. You take that away—which is what these big corporations want to say: Unless you invented it, you can't make a profit from it. No, no, no. This is a property right, and if they take that away, individual inventors will never be able to raise the money for their own research, individual inventors won't be able to sell their product. Thus, the number of people who can buy it from them will be so greatly diminished that the value of their patents will be dramatically cut by this bill.

But of course these huge corporations don't care. They just want to use other people's ideas and creations for their own profit. They don't care what happens to these little guys; although we know that it is the small inventor that comes up with the genius that changes the lives of people. But of course these huge multinational corporations are only interested in a profit at the end of the fiscal year.

Well, this is a huge threat, and people are being told that the trolls—these are people who didn't invent, and thus, again, they are going to benefit anyway by bringing the lawsuit. Well, what they describe and try to claim are that the lawsuits brought on are mainly frivolous lawsuits. Well, let me just note, we have a problem with frivolous lawsuits throughout our system.

Throughout our government, we have frivolous lawsuits in every area of our economy. Yes, there are frivolous lawsuits, but this is the equivalent of saying, because some lawyers have frivolous lawsuits, we are going to totally decimate the rights of the American people to sue anyone who has caused them damage. No, no. We don't want to eliminate the rights of the American people because someone has frivolous lawsuits.

Let me note that the frivolous lawsuit end of this equation has already

been corrected in the courts, but they continue to press for H.R. 9 because their real goal is to diminish the rights of American inventors to sue huge multinational corporations who are stealing their technology.

Let's just note the trolls. The trolls, where did this come from? To show how cynical this debate is, the word "troll" has actually been created as a PR device to trick the American people into believing that the changes they are bringing about are going to hurt some scurrilous person, a troll, when in fact every provision we are talking about hurts the honest little guy who is struggling to develop new technology or the fact that, if he develops something important but doesn't have the ability to enforce it, he can at least enforce it by selling it to someone who will give him a price for his property. By the way, it is only for about 15 years or so that someone is going to own that, but he has a right to do that. But we are going to eliminate that right for the little guy so that he and nobody else can sue a multinational corporation that is stealing from him.

Well, how did that word "troll" come about? I talked to a business executive who was in the room with various business executives from major corporations trying to decide: How will we deceive the American people? What we can do is build up a straw man and make it sound like, oh, this is a horrible person, this straw man; thus, we are going to pass laws against that straw man when, in reality, they are trying to get the little inventor over here.

So what were the names? They went around: What really scurrilous name can we think of? My friend told me: Well, I actually put into the hopper that we should call them patent pirates. Well, that wasn't scurrilous enough. That wasn't sinister enough because one of them came up with trolls, patent trolls. Well, okay, patent trolls. That is just how cynical this is, that we have businessmen who are sitting in a room trying to decide what word can be used to fool the American people into acquiescence into letting their inventors have their patent rights decimated.

One big problem is it is not just the small inventors that are hurt by this change of patent law. Our universities, which now have many patents, our laboratories, which come up with so many new innovations, they are hit dramatically by this. This would probably decrease the value of our patents and people who have whole collections of patents as part of their economic package; it decreases their value perhaps by 50 percent.

The major universities stepped forward and stopped it in the Senate, this bill, last time. Well, H.R. 9 is coming up again. We need to stop it here, and we need to stop it in the Senate. Whether you are someone who depends on a job that is a technology-related job, whether you work at a university

or a technology laboratory, we need to make sure that the freedom of technology development is maintained in our country. This is necessary for my colleagues and the American people to become active. The little guys can win as long as we are active. We can beat the crony capitalists who try to diminish our freedom.

The second bill I would like to mention today is H.R. 1940. H.R. 1940 was submitted by me yesterday. Basically, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues and the American people to the importance of H.R. 1940. What it does is sets a policy concerning the Federal Government that if a State government has legalized the medical use of marijuana last year—now, we are going to include whatever marijuana laws are on the books of various States—that the State law should be what is respected and not the Federal Government coming in to States and local communities where people have decided that they don't believe that the police and Federal action and court action should be used against people who use marijuana.

Last year I had a bill that became part of our appropriations process and for DOJ and basically said, for medical marijuana, if a State has a law that legalizes medical marijuana, the Federal Government cannot come in and supersede that State law. In H.R. 1940 I extend that. It will be the same as it was before, only this will also include States that have basically made marijuana for personal use legal.

What this bill says is let's respect the 10th Amendment to the Constitution. Let's respect states' rights. Let's respect local communities' rights to control what is going on in their communities. Let us not have an aggressive Federal law enforcement bureaucracy making decisions for us and superseding what local people want to do with criminal justice in their own neighborhoods.

□ 1445

H.R. 1940 has been submitted. I would hope my colleagues read this and take this into consideration, perhaps coming on board to support this effort.

Last year, we passed a bill just for medical marijuana and put it in as an amendment that said that the Federal Government can't use any of those resources to supersede State law. We got that in last year. And there were 50 Republicans that signed onto the argument that the States have a right to make their determination on these types of things.

Our Founding Fathers didn't mean the Federal Government to have criminal justice control over this country. That was supposed to be left at the local level and at the State level. Our Founding Fathers did not want there to be a Federal police force.

But yet what we have done is create a militaristic Federal police force that comes into people's neighborhood and now is insisting that even if a State

and local community doesn't want something illegal, we are going to enforce a Federal law on them that is a criminal justice law that the local people don't even want.

That is not what our Founding Fathers had in mind. Our Founding Fathers wanted local people to control their communities and wanted criminal justice to be a State issue. They didn't want to have the Federal Government to have such control over our lives.

And to show you how heinous this is, we passed that law here in this Congress—it won by a solid majority—that we would not supersede State law when it came to medical marijuana. Yet we have prosecutors in the United States who are still moving forward, filing charges, bringing people to court, even though the States in which they are in have agreed to legalize the medical use of marijuana. These rogue prosecutors are thumbing their noses at the law.

This is what happens when government gets out of line, gets away from the Constitution. The Constitution want us to control our lives at the local level and the State level. They want the Federal Government to handle things that are international and across State borders and are important for trade, et cetera, and our national security. They did not have in mind that we would have Federal prosecutors coming in and stepping on local authority and stepping on local prosecutors and insisting on people being prosecuted, even when the United States Congress is telling them not to do it.

To say that this is arrogance and a threat to our freedom is an understatement. We need to pay attention to this because we have built up in the name of protecting people from themselves a law enforcement drug policy that is a dramatic threat to the freedom and well-being of the American people.

We don't need a militarized police force. Policemen used to be known as peace officers. When I was a kid, they were peace officers. "I am a peace officer." That means they were there to protect us from each other.

Now, we have over the years evolved into the police being called law enforcers. Well, think about what that does. You change the relationship between the law, between the police, and between the citizenry. We have created animosity, we have created fear, we have created violence where there wasn't violence.

When someone breaks into a home because they have a baggy of marijuana, that is unconscionable. Breaking into their home with guns drawn—and this happened. And, of course, we have an Attorney General who is insisting not only are we going to supersede states' rights, but we are going to have asset forfeiture. So if someone is providing medical marijuana for one of our veterans or for some people who are suffering, we are not going to give the parents the choice, or someone

whose older father or mother is in agony, the chance to try medical marijuana. No, no. What we are going to do if somebody does that is seize their property. We are going to seize the property of the person that sold them the marijuana to alleviate their suffering.

This is contrary to everything our Founding Fathers had in mind. This is contrary to the ideal of American freedom and respect for individual rights.

I was one of Ronald Reagan's speech writers, as everyone knows, and I have been a Republican all my life, and here I am with my fellow Republicans, and we talk about getting the government off our backs. We talk about states' rights. We talk about individual responsibility all the time. And we talked lately about the doctor-patient relationship as being so important to us.

And then we turn around and a majority of my colleagues on the Republican side vote to have the Federal Government come in and step all over state's rights, step all over the rights of the individual to control his life and consume for himself, make his own determinations.

Individual freedom, limited government—these are things that we supposedly believe in, but when it comes to the drug issue, no, no; we think the Federal Government has to come in and make that determination for people in their own lives.

This is a threat to our freedom. My legislation will take a long step forward to making this a public issue. We should be debating this.

I have been sponsoring legislation. My first legislation that was successful was last term in Congress, the one that these arrogant prosecutors are ignoring now that has actually been put into law that they can't use their own resources, meaning their pay, their time, and their office in order to prosecute medical marijuana, but yet several of them are doing exactly that. That shows you how the law and how our constitutional rights are being threatened.

I didn't know what reaction my friends who are more conservative would have. I did not know that. I didn't know that maybe some of them would just say: Well, that is a lot of baloney, and just go on using the clichés about the states' rights and individual freedom and not really confront my argument. That is what I thought most of them would do.

But I asked a conservative friend of mine just to see what he would say. He is a retired naval officer—a pilot—and he is a typical conservative voter in my district, or in our area in southern California.

I asked him: What is your reaction to the fact that the guy you supported these years is now the point person in legalizing medical marijuana? And this officer said to me: You know, you don't know me very well, do you?

I said: Well, I know you supported me. You are a retired military officer,

and you are now engaged in the aviation business. And he said: Yes, but what you don't know is I have three sons. The day after 9/11, they all enlisted.

I said: Yeah. And he said: Let me tell you what happened. Two of my sons came home whole. One son came home having seizure after seizure after seizure every day.

Think of that. Your child, your hero marches off to war, and there he is, and you can't control the situation. He is having seizures.

They took him to the veterans hospital, and the veterans hospital couldn't do anything to help him. And then one veterans doctor pulled him aside and said: Come and see me off campus. I have got to tell you something. He said: Here is a prescription for medical marijuana. That is what your son needs. I am not permitted to tell you that at the VA hospital.

They did it. And this supporter of mine said: My son hasn't had a seizure since. I saw him just a while ago, and he said: It has been 4 years, and my son is still not having seizures. How do I feel about you being the point man on legalizing medical marijuana? I want to give you a big hug.

Well, guess what? There are people whose parents are dying or their family, their children, are going through seizures. My child recently had a problem with leukemia. Why would I think that, if she was having a seizure and that would help stop it, that the Federal Government should step in and prevent that?

That is what we are doing. The American people need to wake up. My bill will take us a step in the right direction.

I am asking my colleagues to support H.R. 1940. Do it because we believe in freedom. Do it because we believe in the well-being of the American people, and we believe in the system that our Founding Fathers decided of ultimate individual responsibility and freedom. That is what we are deciding, as well as the issue of whether or not some poor suffering soul shall be prevented from getting something that might alleviate their suffering.

That is not the job of the Federal Government. We need to stand tall on this. My colleagues need to be honest and open with their own constituents, and they will find that they are more supportive than they think.

With that said, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LIPINSKI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 27, 2015, at 8 p.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 172. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse" (Rept. 114-89). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1690. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse" (Rept. 114-90). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1981. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee's 'regular rate' for purposes of calculating overtime compensation will not be affected by certain additional payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr.

DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1982. A bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to confirm that a customer's net equity claim is based on the customer's last statement and that certain recoveries are prohibited, to change how trustees are appointed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1983. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure that the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security trust funds are not included in a unified Federal budget and to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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.