

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Amy Wright, the co-founder of Bitty & Beau's Coffee Shop in Wilmington, North Carolina, on being named CNN Hero of the Year.

When Amy and her husband, Ben, found out that 70 percent of adults living with disabilities do not have jobs, they opened the doors of Bitty & Beau's in January 2016 with the goal of providing these worthy individuals the opportunity to interact, contribute, grow, and succeed in the workplace.

As those in Wilmington know, Bitty & Beau's is more than just a place to grab coffee. It is a warm, inclusive environment with exceptional customer service. Named after their two children who have Down syndrome, the coffee shop employs 40 exceptional individuals with disabilities.

Congratulations to Amy on this very special honor. Her and Ben's contribution to our community and our fellow man is truly remarkable and an inspiration for us all.

HONORING KEVIN LYNCH

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend, Kevin Lynch, who passed away following a 5-year battle with cancer just this week.

Kevin was a great Hoosier, a public servant, a tremendous leader, and a tireless advocate in advancing southeastern Indiana. He served as a Dearborn County commissioner and as the president of the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments.

Kevin was a giant Reds fan and a loyal friend, with a positive spirit, quick with a smile, and an encouraging word.

Kevin served Lawrenceburg and Dearborn County with pride, but his most important priority was his family. He was the loving husband to Mary Jo—"Joey"—for 27 years and the proud father of Michael. Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with the entire Lynch family and all those who knew Kevin well.

Congratulations to my good friend Kevin on a tremendous life well done. Godspeed my friend.

□ 1730

HONORING MR. SAM POLLAK

(Mr. FASO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Mr. Sam Pollak on the occasion of his retirement. Mr. Pollak is retiring after 20 years of dedicated service to the Oneonta and Otsego County commu-

nity as editor of the Oneonta Daily Star.

Having worked for decades in newsrooms throughout the Nation, Mr. Pollak brought many years of experience and a proactive leadership to The Daily Star.

I thank Mr. Pollak for his commitment to the people of the State of New York, and I wish him and his wife, Julie, every happiness as they embark upon this new chapter in life.

TAX CUTS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in light of the passage of once-in-a-lifetime, once-in-a-generation tax relief for millions of middle-income families, including the vast majority in my district.

Some, however, are not satisfied with cutting taxes for every income level and are unnerved at the thought of seeing more money in their own monthly paycheck.

I am here to tell those people today that there is a very simple solution to their problem.

As you can see here—outlined on page 92 of the IRS handbook, those individuals who feel right now that they are undertaxed and want to pay more of their income to the U.S. Government can do exactly that. When filing their income tax return, one can simply include a check payable to the Bureau of the Fiscal Service.

The best part is they can help pay down the debt without raising taxes on everyone else—America's hardworking families who deserve a tax break.

So just a reminder, no one is stopping those who are feeling undertaxed from paying as much additional money to the government that they would like. I am sure Uncle Sam would appreciate the Christmas present.

So don't complain about what your neighbor is paying. If you are feeling guilty about it, when you have the opportunity, feel free. Send it in.

UNITED NATIONS JERUSALEM VOTE

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express deep disappointment in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/ES-10/L.22 and state my serious concern over the anti-American and anti-Semitic behaviors of the United Nations.

Today, the United Nations continues its ugly legacy of singling out Israel for condemnation. According to the NGO, UN Watch, 86 percent of the U.N. General Assembly resolutions criticizing countries between 2012 and 2015 have targeted Israel.

It is a sad and confounding sight to watch Syria, North Korea, Cuba, and other human rights abusers degrade our ally, Israel, and attempt to nullify a decision made by the United States regarding our own Embassy.

I applaud Ambassador Haley for her resolute remarks and strength of spirit as she stood against rogue regimes for democratic values and American interests.

I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues in Congress to reassess our foreign aid commitments and realign them with our values and our strategic interests.

44 YEARS OF HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to commemorate 44 years of home rule. The Home Rule Act was signed by President Richard Nixon on Christmas Eve 44 years ago after the Home Rule Act was passed by a bipartisan vote.

Although it was a Democratic Congress, I think it is worth noting what President Nixon said in his signing speech. I am going to quote a few of his sentences:

"As a longtime supporter of self-government for the District of Columbia, I am pleased to sign into law a measure which is of historic significance for the citizens of our Nation's Capital. I first voted for home rule as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1948, and I have endorsed the enactment of home rule legislation during both my terms as President."

Then he went on to say: "It is particularly appropriate to assure those persons who live in our Capital City rights the privileges which have long been enjoyed by most of their countrymen."

The bill enjoyed bipartisan support throughout those congressional deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, surely we can get back to that moment. The District of Columbia is proud and pleased that it has been steeped in American history ever since the site of the Nation's Capital was chosen by George Washington himself.

We are proud to be not only hometown D.C., but the Capital of our country.

So this evening, I want to speak about those two roles and about the role of Congress as we move past December 24, 44 years ago—1973—to today, when D.C. residents have every reason to believe that our country is ready and overdue for D.C. statehood itself.

Now, my Republican colleagues understand fully our role as the Nation's Capital. They understand it because they welcome their own constituents,

the tourists who come here. There are something upwards of almost 20 million. Many of them come to their own congressperson's offices first. But Republicans often dissolve the District's role into their role without making the appropriate distinction.

Now, I appreciate it is not easy to understand a jurisdiction that has a double identity, a hometown identity and a Capital identity.

No, we are not schizophrenic here. So let's discuss this evening what this means. I want to discuss it in part because the inevitable turnover in the Congress means that I should come to the floor and explain this dilemma of our creation periodically.

The first thing we want to do is to avoid the slander that the Framers of our Constitution, the Founders of our country, meant to create a Capital City whose residents were not the equals of residents everywhere in the country, because if that had been the case, you wouldn't have had the Capital in the first place.

The Capital was created from two jurisdictions, Maryland and Virginia, where residents had the right to vote and where they had every single right of American citizens. Those two States were convinced to give the territory that is now the District of Columbia for the Nation's Capital. They were not about to give up their votes in the Capital and did not.

Isn't it interesting, during the transition period, the Representatives from Maryland and Virginia continued to vote as they always had and continued to be recognized in their own jurisdictions, all the while, for a 10-year period, when the land was, in fact, being transferred to become what is now the District of Columbia?

The relationship that the District has to the Federal Government, to the Congress of the United States, is an accident of history. It is an anachronistic accident that you would have thought would have been put aside within a few years after the District became the Nation's Capital in 1801.

During the Revolutionary War when the Capital was Philadelphia, Revolutionary War soldiers marched on the Capitol, then in Philadelphia. They wanted their pensions, and they wanted funding. When the Founders saw these men marching on their Capitol, confusion reigned. Whom to turn to bring order? Who was going to protect the Capitol? Was it Philadelphia? Was it Pennsylvania? There certainly weren't any Federal police as yet.

So what developed was fear that the Capital might find itself with that dilemma wherever it was located. Of course, that is not the case. The District is protected by 31 Federal police forces, and the D.C. National Guard and from the Capitol Police to the Park Police. I won't even name them all, there are so many of them.

That is not to mention, and I already have said, of course, the National Guard, and if necessary, the Armed

Forces of the United States. Remember, we are talking about a Federal Government in formation. We can understand that mistake then. What we cannot abide is that mistake being part of the denial to American citizens the same rights that others enjoy.

Protection of the Federal sector is certainly not an issue, or the Federal sector and the Capital itself, more than two centuries later, is not an issue. But what should also not be an issue is that anybody, any resident, any American, would pay taxes and not be represented on this floor and in the Senate.

As I stand here this evening, I represent almost 700,000 American citizens who have been put precisely in that position though—and this is a number to be remembered—they are number one per capita—number one—in taxes paid to support the Government of the United States.

Thus, one of the oldest U.S. jurisdictions, the District of Columbia, is the most—indeed, the only—unequal jurisdiction, that pays taxes without full representation.

To be sure, I vote in committee, and everybody knows that in the committees is where the primary work is done. But imagine the insult to the people I represent who pay huge taxes—\$12,000 per person every year—that matters come up on this floor including matters affecting them, and nobody whom they have voted for can represent them on this floor.

The D.C. budget was just in that continuing resolution that passed. What is it doing over here? Nobody in Congress looked at the D.C. budget. Nobody in this body except me would know what to do with the D.C. budget. But it has to come here to be passed along with the Federal budget.

This is form without substance, Mr. Speaker. The sole reason that the D.C. budget comes here is for Members to try to overturn some of D.C.'s laws that they happen to disagree with. But, in a Federal Union, you can pass your laws. I don't like your laws, but you can't do anything about my laws—except if it is the District of Columbia.

So I think I ought to call the roll on what the District has to abide from Members of this body and the Senate and why, on this 44th anniversary of the Home Rule Act, the District of Columbia is seeking to become the 51st State.

Let's take guns. Senator MARCO RUBIO from Florida and Representative TOM GARRETT from Virginia have a bill to eliminate all the District's gun laws.

□ 1745

It hasn't passed, and most of the bills I will speak of are pending but won't pass, because I have to spend a good deal of my time not only working affirmatively for what the District of Columbia wants, but for keeping bills like this from being passed.

Imagine your Nation's Capital as a city where anybody can have a gun. The most controversial figures in the

world come to your Nation's Capital. They eat in our restaurants. They stroll in our streets. You sometimes see that police stop traffic to let their cars pass in the street.

We keep this City as safe as we can for ourselves, the 700,000 or so who live here, but also for the millions of people who come to do business or to have leisure or to see their iconic monuments.

Representative TOM MASSIE from Kentucky has introduced a bill. We were able to keep it from being passed. But imagine this bill that would say that the District of Columbia had to recognize any and every concealed carry permit as long as you had it from another State.

Some States have very strong concealed carry requirements. Others are very lax. Whatever your State has, just bring it into the District of Columbia.

Mind you, this body, this Congress, my Republican colleagues have seen to it that you can't bring a gun into this Chamber. They want to be protected here, but they don't want to protect even their own constituents in the streets of the District of Columbia and in the hotels and restaurants of the District of Columbia.

Senator TED CRUZ from Texas and Representative MARK MEADOWS of North Carolina have introduced a bill that would require the District of Columbia to use its own funds to send children to private schools. All you have to do is come and ask the District for it.

There have been bills on this floor to allow private school vouchers—none of them have ever passed—but here come two Members wanting the District to give our local funds to anybody who wants to go to a private school.

Are you joking?

I am standing here to say that will never pass as long as I have anything to do with it.

Senator JAMES LANKFORD from Oklahoma and Representative BRAD WENSTRUP from Ohio have introduced a bill to wipe out the District's death with dignity law.

That bill was actually passed in committee. It didn't get to the floor I think because there are six States that have such laws and two of them are States of our Republican leadership.

This is a controversial bill, but other States have similar laws. It allows people to take their own lives if they follow a very strict protocol.

You don't like it here?

Well, you don't live here. You don't pay taxes here.

President Trump's budget also had this provision.

Again, these are pending, and I am telling you that most of them will not pass. But that is because I have had to fight them tooth and nail to keep them from passing. That is unfair to the District and it is an unfair use of my time.

The Local Budget Autonomy Act that passed by 83 percent of the voters in the District of Columbia to keep our own local funds—we raise almost \$8 billion on our own—from coming here for

no purpose except to attach amendments to overturn our laws.

The Local Budget Autonomy Act still stands, but Congress has continued to appropriate the budget. "Appropriate" means simply pass it without looking at it, when it comes to the District of Columbia. Congress has not repealed the Local Budget Autonomy Act. I will stand firm to keep that from happening.

We have been able to overcome attempts to overrule a D.C. law passed to protect private reproductive decisions. The District passed a law that prohibits discrimination within the District—it has nothing to do with the Congress—against any family because of the reproductive health choices of family members.

What am I doing, what is Congress doing, what is the District doing even knowing what your reproductive choice is?

What kind of Congress that believes in local control would so intrusively insert itself into such private matters?

Here is another that was almost laughable. It is a wipes labeling bill.

Representative ANDY HARRIS from Maryland offered—and I thank him for withdrawing it—an amendment at markup. Representative HARRIS is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He would have prohibited the District from using its own funds to keep certain kinds of non-flushable products from being sold in D.C.

Pardon me, but what is Representative HARRIS doing in our toilets and sewers?

To his credit, he did withdraw his proposed amendment.

It was important to the District because these non-flushable materials stop up sewers. They are our sewers. It is our town. Stay out of our business.

The marijuana matter. First, Congress tried to overturn the District's law that enables possession of a couple of ounces of marijuana. I was able to find a flaw in the proposed language. So the marijuana law still stands.

But Congress keeps D.C. from commercializing marijuana, as is done in several States. I think there are eight States. It keeps D.C. from regulating marijuana further. That is dangerous. D.C. ought to be able to regulate marijuana to keep it out of the hands of children, for example.

The interference of this body in the affairs of a local jurisdiction about which it knows nothing is not only outrageous on its face, but yes, it can be dangerous.

The abortion rider or amendment comes annually. It keeps the District from spending its own local funds on abortions for low-income women, although there are upwards of 17 States that use local funds for abortions because they have the autonomy that we seek.

Then, at the last minute this year, there was something that Representative STEVE KING decided that he had to do.

You see, I think when Members intrude in D.C. affairs, they must not have enough to do, and I am calling on their constituents to watch them. If you have a Member that does what—and here I am going to indicate this one shortly, but the ones I have just spoken of—if they have a Member that spends his time writing laws about someone else's jurisdiction, they ought to call him to account.

Representative STEVE KING is from Iowa. He introduced a bill that would make it a Federal crime to commit violence within the District in connection with a legitimate labor dispute.

Well, maybe it ought to be a crime and there may be some Federal legislation that deals with this matter nationwide, but if not, and it takes place within the District of Columbia and there is a legitimate labor dispute and there is violence, we have got enough cops to take care of that, Representative KING. We do not need this to be a Federal crime in D.C. alone.

So, after calling the roll on those proposed anti-home rule provisions, let me indicate most of them I have been able to keep off of the D.C. appropriations bill, the only way they get them passed.

It would be very difficult to get them passed by coming here, get the votes, and then go to the Senate and get the votes. So Members try the easy way: just attach it to the D.C. appropriations bill that should not be here in the first place.

The budget matter really does gall us. More than 7 in 10 Americans believe that the District of Columbia should control its own budget. That is what this board graph shows. More than anything else, the American people guard their own money. That is why this is so important.

Republicans pose as the champions of local control. In fact, they want the Federal Government out of much of its own Federal business and let the States and the localities handle it.

How could they then abandon their cherished principles when it comes to the Nation's Capital?

Look at these numbers, red and blue on this chart. The numbers show that Democrats and Republicans believe D.C. should control D.C.'s budget, slightly more in red or Republican States.

I think numbers like that show that what I am saying about local control and about equality in this body represents the views of the American people. I defy anyone in this body to show differently.

Ultimately, we recognize on this 44th anniversary of the signing of the Home Rule Act that there is no substitute for statehood.

I should mention that Congress experimented with home rule for some time before the Home Rule Act was finally passed in 1973. It gave D.C. home rule in 1820. Sometimes it would take it back, and then try again. Imagine living in a city where they can take back your local control.

To their credit, after the Civil War, the Republican Congress gave D.C. home rule and a Delegate. I am called a Delegate and a Congresswoman. They gave D.C. home rule. That version of home rule is precisely what D.C. has today. The 1973 Home Rule Act essentially is a replica of the home rule given to D.C. by the Republican Congress after the Civil War.

How did we lose it?

The Democrats, controlled by Southerners, took back home rule after Reconstruction and left the District for 100 years struggling to get back the self-government that the Republican Congress had given the District after the Civil War.

This all started with Republicans. It ended with the Home Rule Act, Richard Nixon, and bipartisan support in the Congress.

There is no substitute for being equal to the States. You can't have some second class citizens in the United States today, not in 21st century America.

□ 1800

We are seeking the major elements of statehood, even before we get statehood.

For example, the District of Columbia government has actually shut down when the Federal Government is shut down, even though the D.C. budget is balanced and nobody in the Congress has even looked at it. I have now been able to get a bill every year that allows the District to stay open even if the Congress closes the Federal Government down.

We don't know what will happen over in the Senate even today. We have just passed a continuing resolution—pitiful, though it was—to keep the government open for just a few more weeks. That passed this House. It has to pass the Senate. I can't take the chance that the District will close down for no reason except that the Congress doesn't know how to take care of its own business.

I was finally able to convince the Congress to extricate the District from their fights to keep open, whatever you do to us—and you certainly haven't extricated us altogether because our budget still comes here. But you certainly don't mean to close down a big city like the District of Columbia, its budget, which handles vital matters like the police and keeping order.

I don't mean to say that all Republicans have failed to see this. My hat is off to Representative DARRELL ISSA, who headed the committee that has jurisdiction over the District of Columbia.

He called witnesses from the District of Columbia—the mayor, the city council chairman, the chief financial officer—on a routine hearing since, yes, Congress can do that. It rarely does. He heard—even more important, he listened to—their testimony. And when he heard these officials from the District of Columbia testify about the financial condition of the District of Columbia, its reserves, that its growth

was among the best in the Nation, Representative ISSA—listened.

Maybe you don't think Members of Congress are always listening to your testimony. He was listening to this testimony. Because after hearing that testimony, Representative ISSA from California endorsed D.C. budget autonomy, and he has worked tirelessly with local officials and with me to secure the autonomy of the District's budget so it wouldn't come to Congress.

I haven't asked him, but he may not be for statehood, and I doubt that he is. He is a Republican. But I think he understands, perhaps better than most of his colleagues, that no one has any business, in a Federal public handling somebody's local budget in this Chamber, and I will be forever grateful.

I want to say my thanks, as well, to former Representative Tom Davis, who resigned from the Congress a few years ago, and was instrumental in helping the District get votes for a vote for D.C. in the House and in the Senate. That bill, the D.C. Voting Rights Act, actually passed the House and passed the Senate.

So why don't we have at least the vote in the House now? The reason is that the National Rifle Association convinced some Members to place an amendment that would have wiped out all of the District's gun laws; and, therefore, the residents of the District of Columbia, after helping me for years to achieve their first vote on this floor, had to leave that vote on the table.

I will be forever grateful to Representative Tom Davis for his help.

Now, what kind of jurisdiction are we talking about? It is very important for us to remember that we are talking about a city with a \$14 billion budget, which is larger than the budget of 12 States. Why shouldn't D.C., therefore, have statehood like those States?

We are talking about a city that has a \$2.5 billion surplus. That is the envy of the States. Ask my colleagues how many of them have a surplus that large.

The per capita income of the people I represent is higher than that of any State.

Now, that is an interesting figure that should be explained. There are many poor people in the District of Columbia, but there are many high earners, too; and when you put them together, that is one of the reasons you get the highest per capita taxes paid. That is why you get \$12,000 per year in Federal taxes from D.C. residents.

The personal income of the people I represent is higher than that of seven States; the per capita of personal consumption in expenditures is higher than that of any State; and the total personal consumption expenditures are greater than those of seven States. This is a very productive, a very hard-working city that pays its own way and contributes, as well, mightily to our country. And Americans understand that because the District is attracting residents in large numbers.

We have had, in this city, a 15.3 percent increase in residents since the last census. That becomes, on a monthly basis, 800 new residents coming to live in your Nation's Capital every month—almost 700,000, a larger population today than Wyoming and then Vermont, but these States, they have two Senators. They have the same number of Representatives as the District of Columbia—one.

If the truth be told, the District is about the same in population as seven States. Those seven States have two Senators each and one Representative who votes on this floor. They and I are equivalent in every respect except, of course, for the taxes per capita D.C. residents pay, and yet they have the vote. Notwithstanding that the District is number one per capita in taxes District residents pay, those seven States have the congressional vote and we do not.

This week, in fact, just today, we passed a new tax bill. So imagine how the residents I represent feel about a new tax bill. They are going to end up paying more taxes because SALT, the State and local tax deduction, has been capped. It has been with us for almost 100 years. So instead of taxation without representation, my constituents will have double taxation, at least when it comes to that particular matter, the State and local taxes, double taxation without representation.

So when the bell rang for the tax vote, I did not come down because I could not vote for the citizens of the District of Columbia. When there are votes on this floor for matters involving our military and life and death, I do not come down because I cannot vote.

Still, I remember the purple fingers from the citizens of Iraq and Afghanistan, where they not only were signifying that they had voted, but they were signifying who gave them the vote: members of the military from the United States, including members from the District of Columbia, who have fought and died in every war since the war that created the United States of America.

District residents have overpaid for the equal citizenship they seek, and this chart illustrates it tragically:

World War I, 635 District of Columbia residents lost their lives in that war. That was a figure greater than three different States.

World War II—that was a big one—3,573 District of Columbia residents lost their lives. That was five times greater than the District's losses in World War I, and it was greater than losses in four different States.

Moving on to the Korean war, 547 District residents lost their lives. That figure was greater than the loss of life by the military in eight different States.

And finally, the Vietnam war, 243 casualties in that war. That was a figure greater than 10 different States.

All told, this city, which is a relatively small city, has had almost

200,000 residents serve in the military, and that is only since World War I. I hasten to add that there has never been a war—and I have not counted the 19th century wars—there has never been a war where the residents of your Nation's Capital were not among those who fought and died.

Now, I must ask if there is any Member of Congress who would stand for the Federal Government dictating a local budget or her local matters coming to the House floor after showing what I have shown here this evening about the District of Columbia. Maybe there will be some understanding of why we must protest and resist the treatment of the District of Columbia until the District is given the equality to States by becoming the 51st State.

As I have indicated, it is impossible to lay our present predicament on the Framers of our Constitution. Remember, they went to war, it is they who gave us the slogan of "taxation without representation." They were willing to die, to commit treason, largely because they were paying taxes to the crown and had no representation. How can we possibly lay the present predicament of the District on the Framers? It is not them. It is on us today.

□ 1815

In the 21st century, Congress cannot continue to ask the residents of the Nation's Capital to watch democracy in operation for everybody else except them.

If a matter involves the District of Columbia and has to come before us, then everybody gets to vote on that matter except the Representative of the District of Columbia. You can't justify that alongside American principles, given how much in Federal taxes the people I represent pay, given their sons and daughters who have always gone to war for their country, all of that without a vote in the House and the Senate required by consent of the government.

Well, we have two choices, but when you think about it, we have only one. Congress can continue to exercise autocratic authority over the American citizens who live in their own Nation's Capital, treating them—if I may quote the words of the great Frederick Douglass, whose bicentennial we will be celebrating in 2018 (who was a resident of this City), and who said our country was "Treating the District and its citizens as aliens, not citizens, but subjects."

We are not subjects. We are American citizens. The only alternative today is to live up to the Nation's promise and ideals and pass the Washington, D.C. Admission Act to make the residents of your Nation's Capital equal by affording them the right to live in the 51st State of the Union of States called the United States of America.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been quite a week: ups and downs and not knowing whether bills would be passed or the government would be funded, whether we would be able to help America with a much-improving economy in the new year by passing the tax cut bill. But we got it done, and it ended up being a good week, and here we are.

This will be the last opportunity to speak before we are out for Christmas, and I heard some good news today about Ukraine. We have the annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast the first Thursday of February each year, except when the first Thursday is on the 1st, and then it is on the 8th, which it will be this February.

We had representatives from the Ukraine Government come to our National Prayer Breakfast here, and they started one there and began to grow. Now, for the first time, Ukraine legislature has passed a bill recognizing a celebration of Christmas, the day of Jesus' birth. We celebrate Jesus' birth on that day, December 25.

Apparently, from what we are told, it emanates from them coming over, being part of our Prayer Breakfast, where the President comes, and then starting one. And then now we are going to be celebrating the birth of Jesus in America—all those who care to—at the same time the Ukrainian Government will do so. So that is a big bit of news there.

I was listening to the Delegate from the District of Columbia and it took me back to when I first got here as a Member of Congress and I saw the license plate saying, "Taxation Without Representation." I know from studying history—never ceasing to study history that that was one of the war cries for the Revolution: Taxation without representation is tyranny.

And as Benjamin Franklin once said: If we do not get to select even one of the people in Parliament, then that Parliament has no right to place any tax on us.

And then upon hearing that, Puerto Rico, Guam, Mariana Islands, U.S. Virgin Islands, all of the territories where they have a Delegate or Commissioner but they don't have a full voting member, those are areas that are not required to pay any Federal income tax. In fact, when I found out, the more I looked into it, there is only one place in America where people do not elect a full voting Member of Congress, yet they have to pay Federal income tax, and that is here in the District of Columbia.

For that reason, I filed a bill—because they had tried to get a full voting Member of Congress. But to do that, you have to have a constitutional

amendment. Everybody knew that and agreed to that back in the late 1970s. The proponents of having a full voting Representative got it through the House, got it through the Senate, but they never did get the requisite number of States to sign on, so it failed without ever being ratified by enough States.

I feel sure that would be the case if that were attempted again, but it does require an amendment. And since that doesn't appear it is going to happen anytime soon, then I believe in each of the sessions of Congress I have been, I have filed a bill that would correct that injustice, because it truly is an injustice for the people who live in the District of Columbia, and it is very simple. It just says, basically, that until when and if the District of Columbia has a full voting Representative, they are like any other U.S. territory, they will not have to pay Federal income tax.

I felt like that would certainly make people appreciate that, that they were treated like those in other places that don't elect a full voting Member of the House. So far I haven't been able to get Ms. HOLMES NORTON to sign on as a cosponsor. I am hoping to get her to sign on at some point because it really would help those people who live here in the City of Washington not to have to pay any Federal income tax.

Of course, Puerto Rico pays no Federal income tax, yet they have a higher local income tax than the Federal income tax. You know, a lot of States—I think somebody told me that Californians are paying 10 percent or so. But Puerto Rico, where, I think, over one-third or about one-third or so of the people there work for the government, then the government load is just overwhelming.

Puerto Rico is so beautiful. Even after all the disaster that needs to be cleaned up and fixed, I would hope at some point they become less heavy on the government and more heavy on free-market opportunities. I could see Puerto Rico becoming the Hong Kong of the United States, where that is where people want to go, that is where businesses want to locate because it is such a great place to live. But the taxes have run people out of that area, even though they don't pay Federal income tax. I don't think that would happen here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, the last session before Christmas. It has been amazing. The most often cited book in Congress for our country's entire history has been the Bible. There is no book that comes close to the recitations from it that has the Bible.

Throughout our history, we were recognized as a Christian nation. I believe President Obama was right when he said we are not a Christian nation. We were, but we are not anymore. But even the Supreme Court, when it was a much more enlightened Supreme Court well after the Civil War—in fact, 30 years after the Civil War was over—the

Supreme Court looked at all of the evidence and declared in an opinion that the United States was founded as and is a Christian nation.

Not that everybody has to be a Christian here. They absolutely don't. I would humbly submit that the only way any people can truly have freedom of religion is if they have a constitution that is founded on Judeo-Christian principles that recognize that all true rights: life, liberty, pursuit of happiness—you don't have a right to happiness, but a right to pursue it—those come from God, and the Founders recognized that.

It is a shame to hear people deceiving young people in school, teaching them that, no, the real Founders were only deists. They didn't believe in God; Ben Franklin being the leading deist. If they would just teach the children what Ben Franklin said in June of 1787 at the Constitutional Convention. After 5 weeks of nothing but arguing back and forth, 80-year-old Ben Franklin, 2 or 3 years away from meeting his maker, got recognized.

Somebody wrote that President Washington looked so relieved when Dr. Franklin sought recognition. He finally stood up. He had gout and he had terrible arthritis. He was well overweight, but he got up and gave the speech that so many Christians are aware of, where he said what no deist would ever say, despite how many teachers these days say he was a deist. His words were—we know what his words were because he sat down and wrote it down afterwards when he was asked for a copy of what he said.

And he said: "I have lived, Sir, a long time; and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—God governs in the affairs of men. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writings, that 'except the Lord build the House, they labour in vain that build it.'"

He said: "I firmly believe that."

Mr. Speaker, which means he wasn't a deist.

He said: "I also believe that without His"—without God's—"concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the Builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests . . . and we ourselves will become a power down through the ages."

Mr. Speaker, it was at the conclusion of that day's session in the Constitutional Convention that Randolph from here in Virginia, or across the river in Virginia, made a motion that since here we are at the end of June, we are about to celebrate our Nation's birthday, and we all know we have not been able to accomplish anything.

As Franklin said: "We have been going for nearly 5 weeks. We have more noses than ayes on virtually every issue."

And then Franklin went on to say: "How has it happened, Sir, that we