product of the will of the people emerges out of the House and the Senate and goes to the President's desk for his signature or a veto and an attempt to override a veto. That happens once in a while. That's supposed to be the voice of the American people, and we expect it because of the structure of this republican form of government.

I want to emphasize the Constitution guarantees us not a democracy. The Constitution guarantees us a republican form of government.

That means representative.

That means we don't go out there and take the temperature of the public and do a poll and decide it's the will of the people today, so let's race in that direction. We have an obligation to listen to the people and understand what they want and have a very sensitive antenna to pick up on the will of the American people.

It doesn't end there, Mr. Speaker; it starts there.

Our job is to be full-time paying attention to all the facts and the figures and all of the components and to be making the best decisions possible because we are representatives here in a republican form of government. This Republic is not a democracy. It isn't two coyotes and a sheep taking a vote on what's for dinner.

We have liberty. We have American liberty.

We have rights that come from God that are guaranteed to us in the Constitution.

Now, I believe that God moved the Founding Fathers around like men on a chessboard to shape this Nation, and I believe that for a lot of reasons. One of them is I can't go back on this Monday morning of 2011 and redraw the course of history and even imagine that I could come up with a result that would be half of what has been produced by this great gift of liberty and freedom—freedom of speech, religion, and the press. All the people who came here to exercise their religious liberty, their free enterprise liberty, their property rights, to be protected from double jeopardy, and to have a jury of their peers and face their accusers, a lot of that comes from Roman law.

The reasonable Western Civilization culture that lets us analyze our problems is part of who we are. They landed on a continent with unlimited natural resources at the dawn of the industrial revolution and settled it from sea to shining sea in a blink of a historical eye.

That's America.

We are a vigorous people.

We've got the vigor of every donor civilization on the planet. And now they want to impose ObamaCare on us? They want to raise the debt ceiling by $2.4 trillion or $4 trillion and ask us to go further and deeper into debt and put that on our grandchildren and children not yet born?

My youngest granddaughter, Reagan Ann King, entered this world with $44,000 that she owed Uncle Sam. That has got to stop, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## CONGRESS: DON'T TREAD ON DC

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On any given day, if the American people listen to the speakers on the floor of the House of Representatives, they will come to the conclusion that many Members sure do hate government. At the very least, they certainly don't want the Federal Government involved in the lives of the American people in any way. Well, I've come to the floor not to give a lecture, but to offer an explanation because the American people are probably puzzled at something they recently saw.

They saw the residents of the Nation's Capital embarking on what I must tell you is a new phase of an old struggle: to preserve the right to local self-government—a battle residents won almost 40 years ago.

You would think that the speakers on the floor who hate government would be very quick to say what is also true about themselves. They like local government. They don't want the Federal Government involved with local government or certainly interfering with local government. Yet the very same speakers are the prime movers of interference with the local government of the District of Columbia.

So the residents of your Nation's Capital have embarked on a new phase of their struggle. I'm not talking about the storied fight for voting rights and statehood, because many Americans now know that this is the only jurisdiction in the United States whose residents pay Federal income taxes, go to war—have fought in every war since the Nation was created—but don't have full voting rights in the Congress.

No, I'm not talking about that because, unfortunately, today, the city is forced to fight simply to maintain local government—the local rights that are unquestioned everywhere in the United States except by some on the floor of this House.

After Republicans took control of the House in January, their obsession with the DC government became so fierce that the mayor and members of the city council—almost the entire legislative and executive branches—were arrested for sitting down in the streets in front of the Capitol in an act of civil disobedience. The world, at that time, was focused on people in the streets of the Middle East, who were demanding freedom, but was riveted by civil disobedience in the U.S. capital city, which included the highest officials of our own local government.

The sit-down occurred after the city was caught in a Federal Government dispute over cuts in the Federal budget, which had nothing to do with the city. The city government barely avoided being shut down, although the city's local funds were no part of the fight, but the Congress would not even allow the city to spend its own local funds to keep the city open.

That is the very essence of autocracy.

Congress still holds onto the antiquated practice of approving the city's locally raised budget, a budget that the Congress did not put one red cent in—$4 billion raised by the residents of the District of Columbia.

□ 1500

And House Republicans repeatedly refused my amendments to let the District government stay open by spending its own local funds. House Republicans have long rationalized such irrational treatment of the residents of the Nation's capital, but holding the District hostage in a Federal shutdown fight was a new nadir.

Republicans finally succeeded in getting hefty budget cuts in the 2011 appropriations bill, but still refused to seal the deal until their demands to take some of the District's home rule were met. They insisted on two riders. One prohibited the District from using its own local funds for abortion services for low-income women—which is done in 17 red and blue States because it's a matter of local money and local law. And they imposed private school vouchers on the city because that was the pet project of another Republican, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER. Mind you that this city has almost half of its children going to public charter schools. It's about the last city in the world that you would impose an alternative school system on since it has already grown its own home-rule alternative.

The bold autocratic insistence of these anti-home-rule provisions, as well as the near shutdown of the city government, finally led to an equally bold response from the city. You have to imagine that only the most provocative actions could have led the mayor of a great city and other elected officials to be escorted away in handcuffs.

House Republicans have devoted their first months in power to slicing away at the city's local home rule. They took control of the House on the promise of jobs, but have yet to introduce a jobs bill. From the first day of the 112th Congress, the House Republican majority has been preoccupied—mesmerized—with the internal affairs of a city whose local government, like many other jurisdictions, differs with them on some matters. This is America, get used to it. With heartbreaking audacity, they began by withdrawing the District's vote on the House floor in the Committee of the Whole. And this vote was only granted by rule—which is why they could withdraw it—but it had been approved by the Federal courts. Thus, Republicans in this House have withdrawn a legitimate vote of American citizens who pay

their full freight in Federal taxes and have fought in every war since the Republic was established, including the war that established the Republic itself.

After taking DC's limited vote, Republicans turned to taking away the city's home rule. A House-passed harsh anti-choice bill affecting the Nation's women contained an unprecedented prohibition affecting only the District of Columbia. Instead of the DC abortion rider—you have to add these riders on an annual basis—Republicans want a permanent law barring DC from spending its local funds on abortion services for low-income women. Imagine the Federal Government telling a local jurisdiction that, forever, it can no longer spend its local money on local matters that dozens and dozens of local jurisdictions spend money on every year and on a matter that is fully constitutional.

Most Americans support the right to abortion, although many others oppose it. In the District of Columbia, we respect those differences. Federal funds already may not be used to pay for abortions. But no one questions the long-standing practice of the 17 States I mentioned that use their own funds for abortions for low-income women. Now I understand that the anti-home-rule riders that some Members add to the DC appropriations bill are controversial. That's why we have a Federal union. There are some things we can do at the local level that you do not do in the Nation as a whole. We ought to have that respect for the residents of the District of Columbia just as we give that respect to every other jurisdiction.

This struggle continues now that the 2012 appropriation season has begun. The Appropriations Committee-approved bill includes only one DC rider, but that of course is one rider too many. However, it does show that there is some response to an expanded coalition that's been formed, and yes, to the civil disobedience and protest of the residents of the District of Columbia. More riders could still come on the House floor, but then more protests will come.

So great, though, is the continuing danger of interference with the District's right to govern itself that a national coalition of 100 organizations which, together have millions of members, has come forward with a weapon DC residents do not have. The national organizations have activated their members who live in congressional districts to warn Members of Congress that if they meddle in the affairs of the District of Columbia, their members will make it known throughout their districts. Most Members cast these votes almost anonymously. We know about them here in the Nation's capital, but it was hard to get word of them out. Now organizations are fanning out across the country telling on those, as we say, who meddle with the affairs of a local jurisdiction instead of attending to the affairs of their own district.

Nor has the District focused only on the Republicans. When it comes to local government, whoever makes a move is, as far as the residents of this city are concerned, subject to the same kind of protest. So hundreds of residents, just a few weeks ago, went to the White House and held a huge rally, the largest yet. Thousands of people from throughout the country and from all over the world were there and saw unprecedented civil disobedience right at the White House to protest the fact that the President of the United States, who is strongly supported in this city, nevertheless signed the anti-home-rule 2011 budget deal. I believe that this indicates that the residents are acting in a principled manner, not in a political manner. And they are saying as clearly as they can that they will not surrender any part of the home rule it took them 128 years too long to get. Can you imagine that the Nation's capital, until only 38 years ago, did not have a local mayor or a local city council, and was run by three commissioners appointed by the President of the United States? That had a lot to do with Southern Democrats who got a hold of the ''District Committee''—since abolished. Although the District was a majority white city until the 1960s, they kept the District from getting home rule and voting rights because there were a sizeable number of African Americans in this city. That's just how deep this went. Republicans have taken over the role, not because of race, but entirely because of politics. Whichever way you cut it, they take away our rights. And when you don't have your rights, you see no difference. You don't ask the motive. All you know is everybody else has their rights, and you are an American citizen and you are entitled to the very same rights. You raised the funds. You and your local jurisdiction, you alone, get to say how those funds will be spent.

□ 1510

The Congress of the United States finally ceded its power over the District of Columbia in 1973. It took the civil rights movement to get it done. Essentially it shamed the southern Democrats into finally giving the District home rule. Actually, protesters overthrew the South Carolina Democrat who was in charge of the District Committee, and when the District Committee lost that Democrat, there were enough Members of Congress who believed in democracy so that the District got home rule. The city makes its own decisions on virtually everything, until somebody in the Congress pops up and says, ''That isn't in my ideological playbook, so you can't do it.'' As un-American as it gets.

Interestingly, many of the newest Members of Congress are among the most robust, the loudest, in making clear that they do not support Federal interference. I quote from the Republican Study Committee, which has a 10th Amendment task force, and I quote it as saying that the intent of the Republican majority's was ''to usher in a new era of federalism and to disperse power from Washington back to regions, States, local governments and individuals.'' How can people who have that principle now put the big foot of the Federal Government on the local government right here in their face, in defiance of their own professed principles? You can't have that principle as stated and not apply it right here as you vote on matters affecting the District of Columbia.

Remember that we're only talking about controversial issues: issues like marriage equality or reproductive choice or gun safety. These are controversial issues, but we allow people in local jurisdictions to vote one way or the other on how they want to handle these issues. Take their votes against DC needle exchange programs, for example, which have kept HIV/AIDS in large cities and small rural areas from being transmitted. What happened? DC got the highest HIV/AIDS rate in the United States. The DC needle exchange rider is an example of a rider that has killed people, that led to terrible suffering, that led to people getting HIV/AIDS. What did the people in the House of Representatives, in the Senate of the United States, have to do with the desire of the people of the District of Columbia to use the same weapons that are now used throughout the United States to control this terrible virus?

So those who want to dismantle our own self-government, our home rule, piece by piece, they should be prepared to fight and they better be prepared to fight where they live for they are now being targeted where they live, and not because, frankly, of these underlying issues that are very controversial but because of the overarching principle of self-government, and local self-government at that.

The first trial of the 74 residents who were arrested is going on right now. A number of those arrested paid a fine and chose not go to trial. Some of them are insisting on going to trial so that the point will never be lost. The first is an advisory neighborhood commissioner, Keith Silver. He pleaded not guilty on charges of unlawful assembly and disorderly conduct. He faces up to $250 in fines and 90 days in jail. He would not be the first American. When I was a very young woman, I was a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and going to jail seemed to us to be just about the right thing to do when we were denied our rights. Now the only Americans denied such basic rights, ironically, are right here in the Nation's Capital.

May I inquire of the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, what has been most encouraging to us is that we

now know we are not in this fight alone. Imagine having to fight against the almighty Congress when you are one jurisdiction, obviously without the means to let the entire country understand what is happening, and so most Americans had no idea until the arrests took place. Just as the District has been fighting for a vote in the people's House, the House of Representatives, and over and over again we found that most Americans thought we had the vote. There has been a nationwide survey done, and it is very interesting. It shows that more than 60 percent of the American people are for voting rights for the District of Columbia, and that survey has been cut open so as to see whether there are differences as to where people live, north and south, whether people have served in the military or not, whether people go to church or not, and the encouraging thing to those of us who live in the District of Columbia is that no matter how you cut it, Americans believe that if you pay Federal income taxes, you ought to have a vote in this body.

Yes, I have a vote in committee. Yes, I can speak as I am now. Yes, I have every privilege of the House—except that privilege that created the Nation, the privilege to vote, to cast the final vote. But, I have gone to funerals of young men who died in Iraq and Afghanistan, yet I could not vote yea or nay on whether they should have been there in the first place. Surely, if the American people realized that, there would be shame cast on the Congress.

Now the District is struggling, not for the voting rights and statehood it deserves but for the home rule and self-government it already has. It is far too late in history for any Americans to be struggling for the right to govern themselves at the local level as they see fit and to spend the funds they raise at the local level in any way they choose. That, my friends, if you are looking to the Founders, you will find that that was for them a first principle.

And so other Americans have now come to our assistance, and the difference between them and the residents whom I represent is that they have that vote on the floor of this House while we do not. As Members voted to take away some of the local rights of the district I represent every Member of this body could vote on that matter except the Member who represented the Nation's Capital that was the object of that vote.

□ 1520

You will not find any American anywhere who will say that that represents what they believe or what our country stands for. That is why every Member of this House has been sent or will be sent a letter, and I am reading from just one part of it, because this letter comes from the coalition of a hundred different national organizations: ''Should lawmakers continue to advance attacks on the District of Columbia's autonomy, we will make certain that our members—in every District—know how their representatives are spending their time in Washington: meddling in the affairs of a local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia, rather than focusing on their own residents and on the Nation's true, pressing business.''

I have spent my entire service in the Congress trying to rid the District appropriation of anti-home rule attachments. We were successful in clearing the DC appropriation bill of all of the anti-democratic attachments for the first time last Congress. We did not engage in that fight only to have them put right back on. We did not enjoy seeing Congress play shutdown chicken with the American people either, and Congress must not even think about shutting down a local government ever again over a Federal fight again.

During the civil rights movement we called our approach passive resistance to tell the world we were nonviolent. But that was all that was passive about us. The operative word was ''resistance.'' Once we resisted, civil rights workers found we were not alone. Today, District residents are joined by allies who stand with us and are working with us. On this we have no doubt. The American people are with District residents when we say local laws are for local residents alone, and most especially when we insist that when it's our money, we mean ours and only ours.

The Nation's Capital should be the 51st State by now. The city's taxpaying citizens should at least have a vote in Congress, the very Congress that demands that the citizens who live here abide by the laws that the Congress enacts.

DC residents and their local leaders are fighting with all they have. What they need most now, and what I am gratified that they are receiving, is the support of other Americans who do have the basic rights that the citizens of the Nation's Capital are still seeking. ''Don't tread on DC.''

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1552

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEST) at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. COBLE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after noon on account of constituent appointments in the district.

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

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 18, 2011, at noon for morning-hour debate.

## EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the second quarter of 2011 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JENNIFER STEWART, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 26 AND MAY 30, 2011

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Jennifer Stewart | 5/27 | 5/28 | Belgium | | 244.00 | | (3) | | | | 244.00 |
| | 5/28 | 5/29 | Afghanistan | | 28.00 | | (3) | | | | 28.00 |
| | 5/29 | 5/30 | Estonia | | 242.00 | | (3) | | | | 242.00 |
| Committee total | | | | | | | | | | | 514.00 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

Ms. JENNIFER M. STEWART, June 29, 2011.