impression that this is a matter of great contention. The Senate has what we call ''shutdown avoidance language'' for the Nation's Capital in its D.C. appropriations bill. The President's budget had such language too.

My own colleagues here, Mr. ISSA, for example, is for anti-shutdown language. The appropriators have indicated the very same.

I am hoping that as the appropriation bill passes—sorry—comes to the floor, it will have that shutdown avoidance language in it. Indeed, I am hoping it will have budget autonomy in it.

The President's budget had budget autonomy language. The Senate appropriations now has budget autonomy in it.

Hasn't the time come to say to the Nation's Capital, the residents who raise their own money here in the District of Columbia, that if you raise it, you can spend it, and the Congress does not have to be a pass-through for you?

Isn't it time to say that, at least, because Wall Street charges D.C. a penalty because, after it passes its balanced budget, the city has to come to the Congress, which passes no balanced budgets. Any time somebody else has to look at your budget, there is an additional layer. You pay for the extra layer because it should not be there and is not there for any other jurisdiction.

If all of this seems strange and against American traditions, imagine legislation coming here. That one, the last one I want to discuss is Kafkaesque in the extreme.

The District of Columbia passes a bill, it is supposed to lay over here before it can take effect for 30 legislative, not calendar, days, and 60 for criminal matters, except our legislative days are far and few between. So bills have to lay over here long past a 30-day period, usually for at least 3 calendar months.

Now, you are running a big city. Let me give you one of the more laughable examples that is not atypical, but I give it to you because you can see that this is the kind of subject matter that would never interest the Congress.

The congressional review, or layover, period for the change that the District made in its laws to exchange the word ''handicap'' for ''disability'' took 9 months. It took 9 months. In order to keep legislation from lapsing, the District has to pass temporary legislation and then another extension of legislation. And it has to keep passing various kinds of temporary bills of its final bills until it finally gets through these review days.

The council estimates that about 65 percent, up to 65 percent, of the bills it passes could be eliminated were it not for this make-work procedure.

Now, this isn't painless. The council says it takes 5,000 employee-hours and 160,000 sheets of paper per Council period; and you'd better be precise, because if you miss one of these periods, and there are usually three different periods during which these bills pass until you get to the 30 legislative days, the bill could lapse, and then you would have to start all over again.

That would be bad enough if Congress had a reason for requiring these bills to come here. Congress never looks at these bills. If there is something that the Council of the District of Columbia does that the Congress thinks it shouldn't do, it knows exactly what to do, at least in its own view.

Why bother with introducing a bill here, having it come to the floor, and doing the same thing in the Senate?

Why not simply try to attach your objection or amendment to something else?

So the Congress simply uses the appropriation bills and attaches whatever it wants to overturn. At the moment, there is only one such matter and that is the abortion rider; and it simply tucks that into another bill.

On only three occasions has the Congress ever used the review, or layover period, to overturn a D.C. law: 1979, 1981, and 1991. And two of those directly involved Federal interests, so Congress was within its rights.

In fact, if the truth be told, the District was not trying to defy the Federal Government.

In fact, I would have been with the Congress on this because Federal interests were involved on two of them. The District mistook, was mistaken in the extent to where there was a Federal interest involved.

So those were not even attempts to try to challenge the Federal Government. Those were mistakes. Had I been here at the time, I would have tried to correct them before they got very far by going to the District before they ever got here.

In any case, you have a Sisyphus-like process, keep rolling up the hill, keep spending all that money, keep exerting all those employee-hours, for a process that Congress has long abandoned and pays no attention to.

My bill says to a Congress which regularly passes paperwork-reduction bills, this is a classic example of where it is needed. I do not believe there is the slightest opposition here. It is a matter of inertia. I am trying to make it rise above the ground where it has laid since I have been introducing this bill.

I don't believe for a moment that there is a single Member that wishes the District, or any other jurisdiction, or any part of this government, to engage in such a labor-intensive, costly process, even if it had an outcome, but particularly one that the Congress itself abandoned and has abandoned into disuse.

So, Madam Speaker, I brought these matters of local concern to the floor today because they are, I think, every last one of them, matters about which most Members are unaware, and for good reason.

Members are dealing with their own districts and with the Nation's business. They really don't have any reason to care about whether or not the District spends its local money one way or the other, about what laws it has passed, and if it is shut down. In the case of D.C. bills only three out of 4,500 D.C. bills have been overturned. It has abandoned one of these processes altogether.

The District had a budget autonomy referendum that, technically, is law. It is in some danger, so I am trying still to get budget autonomy through the Congress and to the President.

I can not believe that, with many conservative Members of this House who believe in local matters for local folks, that I would not have support here. I recognize that abortion is a controversial issue, and I have the deepest respect for those who disagree with me on that issue; but I think most Members would agree that that is a matter for local jurisdictions to decide.

Wherever we stand on the Nation's business, we are as one on local principles. Local matters are for local jurisdictions. That cannot be your principle for every jurisdiction in the United States except the District of Columbia. The matter of democracy, which we have tried to spread throughout the world, cannot be a matter for every nation on the face of this Earth except the Nation's Capital.

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 9, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 667. To redesignate the Dryden Flight Research Center as the Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center and the Western Aeronautical Test Range as the Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 13, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Robert B. Aderholt, Rodney Alexander*, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Ron Barber, Lou Barletta, Garland ''Andy'' Barr, John Barrow, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Kerry L. Bentivolio, Ami Bera, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Jo