was between a man and a woman, and it is a Christian position. I mean, it is in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. Jesus, himself, said that a man shall leave his mother and a woman leave her home, and the two will become one flesh, and what God has joined together let no man put asunder.

That is marriage, Biblical marriage. Anybody who retains the belief that Jesus had and that Moses conveyed as he got it from God was that it was between a man and a woman.

If you hold that position now, it has become widely accepted that, gee, you should lose your job, that you should lose money, that you should have the Nation turn in hatred upon you and your family. Heck, some people want you to go to jail. They want you prosecuted. They want the IRS—they want everybody—after you just because you believe the same thing that Senator Obama said he believed before he became President and that Jesus said was actually the law of God and that Moses said was the law of God. Yet, nowadays, if you take that Christian position, you are a hate monger, and we want to destroy you, which is in direct opposition to the quote that was so often stated during the Revolution. It was attributed to different people. I think more people attributed it to Voltaire:

> I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

It used to be that on college campuses they would invite different people so they could get good arguments and good debates among the students. Now they don't want anybody who doesn't fit the cookie-cutter, liberal mode of whoever is in charge at the university. For heaven's sake, who would have ever dreamed at Brandeis University's founding that, when a Muslim woman stood up against the evils of radical Islam, she would be refused to be allowed to come to the university.

It is time we stand up for freedom, liberty here and everywhere.

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

HOME RULE FOR THE NATION'S CAPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor this afternoon to take the opportunity to fully inform Members—and, yes, also members of the public—of the actual rights of the people who live in the District of Columbia, who demand respect for their local laws the way every Member would demand respect for the local laws of her own jurisdiction, and yes, if necessary, to call out Members who violate their own principles of local control of government against Federal interference.

I am very pleased that very few bills that trample on the local rights of the people who live in the Nation's Capital have been signed into law and that very few have gotten out of this House even recently. Part of that is because we stand up and fight, but we are at some disadvantage. The District of Columbia delegation consists of me, and we have no Senators. But no red-blooded American would sit down while somebody tramples over her local jurisdiction without getting up and saying something about it and, yes, without doing something about it.

I want to be fair to my colleagues because some of this, I think, has to do with simple ignorance. Some of it has to do with a blind spot. The blind spot is very troubling. The blind spot means that principles that easily soak into them with respect to every single district in the United States somehow haven't made it into their hearts or their heads when it comes to the District of Columbia. It troubles me, but I believe that, when Members think about their own principles, they will think before they simply jump into the jurisdiction of another Member's district.

Particularly when this happens repeatedly, we think that the constituents of the Member should be informed, and we try to inform the constituents. Indeed, we inform the entire State where the constituents are from. If a Member insists upon inserting herself into the affairs of another jurisdiction many miles from home, and if she needs to be called out, that is what we have to do.

Congress 40 years ago passed the Home Rule Act of the District of Columbia. It is too bad it took that long to pass. The culprits there were Democratic and Republican, and indeed, for much of the 20th century, whether they were Democrats or Republicans. The Democrats finally got understood, and the Home Rule Act of 1973 was passed. That act gave all local affairs of the District of Columbia to the local government—to the council and the Mayor of the District of Columbia. My job is to see to it that Members remember the Home Rule Act of 1973 and do not invade the local jurisdiction of our city, Washington, D.C.

I was a little troubled, although I see no real effect thus far, about a memorandum that came from David Mork—the Chief of Staff of Representative PETER ROSKAM, who is the chief deputy whip for the House GOP—inviting Members to insert special provisions, even of a partisan or an ideological nature, into the upcoming appropriations bills. We have checked, and, actually, we have seen very little of that so far. Our concern, of course, is with such inserts that affect the District of Columbia.

By the way, it is interesting that there would be a whole memo inviting Republicans to do so. They haven't done so very much on the appropriations bills that have come through thus far, but I think that probably has a lot to do with how little policy the Republicans have been able to get through the Congress of the United States. So, when you are driven to appropriations bills for policy, you have been driven to a very low level for a lawmaker. The bait hasn't been much bitten, and I am pleased of that for the Nation. I simply want to say, if such ideological policies attached to appropriations are inappropriate for national appropriations, imagine how totally unsuitable they are for an appropriation that may affect the District of Columbia.

□ 1430

One may wonder, what is the District of Columbia local appropriations bill doing in the Congress of the United States?

Very good question. The District of Columbia wants budget autonomy—but we haven't quite gotten there yet, and I very much appreciate that we have had Republican and Democratic support for the proposition that the $6 billion we raise in the District of Columbia is for us and us alone to say anything about.

Imagine, in a Tea Party Congress, how they would react if somebody had anything to do with their local funds.

Well, that is exactly how I am going to react. I am not going to stand for it. I am not going to stay quiet for it, and I am going to see that your constituents know you are meddling into somebody else's business, in violation of your own principles.

It continues to happen, but it happens at far less of a rate than it used to. When I first came to Congress, I used to have to stand on the House floor for hours at a time rebutting attempts to attach to the D.C. appropriation anti-local control amendments. Those are far, far fewer.

Appropriators don't like it. The appropriators simply want to get their appropriation bills done. But occasionally, some of these attachments will come through—to date, only one remains.

. . . Others come through as free-standing bills. And I appreciate that the Speaker doesn't often let those bills get to the floor.

But we feel quite insulted when a Member decides to introduce a bill to, essentially, erase what the local government has put into law. A favorite one of those issues that continues to apparently invite such meddlers is, of course, D.C.'s gun laws.

The District of Columbia has some of the strongest gun laws in the United States. After all, we are a big city. We are the capital of the United States. Foreign dignitaries routinely are in our streets. Every Cabinet official is routinely in our restaurants, and we don't need a lot of guns in a city like this.

We had an even stricter gun law. That was struck down by the Supreme

Court of the United States. We believe in obeying the Supreme Court and in obeying Federal law, so the local government rewrote its local gun laws.

We still have among the strictest gun safety laws in the United States, and the courts have upheld these new gun laws every time they have been attacked. They have been attacked in the courts.

Our gun registration requirement was recently attacked in the courts, and the courts upheld the District's gun registration requirement.

The District's ban on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines was attacked in the courts, and the courts upheld the District's ban on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines.

Recently, somebody shot a gun outside of the White House that reached the window, the upstairs, the second-floor window of the White House. You surely wouldn't want a lot of those running around the District of Columbia, and the courts have understood that.

Yet, there will be attempts to go at the city on guns. I don't care about guns in your district. I ask you not to care about guns in mine.

Yet, Representative JIM JORDAN of Ohio has introduced a bill that would wipe out all the gun laws of the District of Columbia. Can you imagine that?

Take every last one of them and wipe them off the books.

Those are local laws passed to protect our local citizens. What is he doing in this?

We keep winning in court, and this Member, Representative JIM JORDAN of Ohio, has introduced only five bills in this Congress. He needs to think about national bills, not bills that trample on the rights of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

We have made a decision, the courts have upheld our decision. I thought that is what the Framers founded the United States of America for, to allow local governments to remain local, to have a Federal Government that took care of things that were not local.

This is local. The gun laws of the District of Columbia protect 650,000 people who live here and visitors who come here. They have nothing to do with Representative JIM JORDAN's district.

Now, to the credit of the majority, this bill has not moved. It hasn't moved in committee, and it certainly hasn't moved to the floor. But we resent that it was filed at all because it didn't have to do with anybody's district except the District of Columbia.

The Member who was just on the floor, Rep PHIL GINGREY of GA has introduced an interesting amendment, Representative PHIL GINGREY of Georgia, expressing the sense of the Congress—now, understand a sense of the Congress measure has no legal effect. And he has, when questioned by the Court, indicated that this was ''a message bill.'' So he is a messaging bill not using his own constituents but using mine.

This messaging bill says that Active Duty military personnel, in their private capacity, should be exempt from the gun safety laws of the District of Columbia, but not from any other district.

For the third year in a row, I am going to get this one taken care of. Twice he introduced it as a part of the defense authorization bill, and twice I have been able to have it taken off.

It got passed again in this House. I am going to get it taken off again.

In this country, we respect local control. If you were to ask me which side of the aisle speaks most vociferously about local control, I will tell you that side of the aisle. So when Republicans interfere with local matters of the District of Columbia, they are in violation of some of their most threshold principles.

Representative JORDAN, interestingly, introduced, and I think this may not have had to do with the fact that it was the 1-year anniversary of the Newtown shooting, but that is when he introduced the bill. There were services all over the country then.

I think he just introduced it because that is when he thought of it, and it was on his National Rifle Association checklist.

Most recently, Representative MARK MEADOWS of North Carolina has introduced a bill that would keep the Federal Government from deducting, as an employer, the union dues of Federal employees. It is a labor right. If you vote that your employer can deduct your dues, he can do so, private and public employer.

Well, I wouldn't be on this floor if this were only a national bill. That is consistent with Representative MEADOWS' views. But Representative MEADOWS has reached into the District of Columbia.

Now he says, not only Federal employees, but he is saying that the District of Columbia government cannot also deduct union dues, as the union members have asked them to, even though these employees who have asked the District to do that are paid for 100 percent by local funds.

Who would take that in this House?

Well, I am not going to take it. And he does so by redefining the District of Columbia to be a Federal agency. And here is the ultimate insult.

Seeing that he has no right to do that, he redefines the District of Columbia as a Federal agency for purposes of this bill.

Well, I am here to tell you that 650,000 people who are number one in Federal taxes paid, number one to the Federal Government, $12,000 per capita per year and they are not simply going to take that kind of treatment from individual Members of Congress.

You don't redefine us. We have been defined as American citizens, and we are going to be treated that way. We are no more a part of the Federal Government than North Carolina, where Mr. MEADOWS is from, is a part of the Federal Government.

One of the favorites is, of course, abortion. A bill to expand the Hyde amendment treated us as a part of the Federal Government. There has been a 20-week D.C. abortion ban bill.

Now comes marijuana decriminalization. The House had a hearing on D.C.'s marijuana decriminalization law. I objected that there would even be a hearing. There should have been no such hearing.

There had been four prior hearings—and those prior hearings had not mentioned, even the two jurisdictions, there were two of them, that had made marijuana legal, and there are about 18 that are decriminalized.

The only hearing that was held was held on the decriminalization of the District of Colombia.

Who will take that in this House?

Well, I asked to testify, and to the credit of Mr. MICA, the chairman of the subcommittee, I was given the right to testify.

When the 20-week abortion bill relating only to the District of Columbia was introduced, I was denied even the right to testify.

Well, I am going to find some place to testify, even if it is on the floor of the House of Representatives because you are not going to treat the 650,000 Americans I represent as second-class citizens. You are not going to do it without protest from their Member.

A Member, Representative JOHN FLEMING of Louisiana, was permitted to sit in on the D.C. marijuana decriminalization hearing. He is not even a member of the committee. It is all right with me. But the first thing he did afterward was to violate his 10th amendment principles.

He went out and said, well, I know what I am going to do. I am going to try to keep this D.C. marijuana bill from becoming law. And then when we called him out on it, and the press went to him, he said, well, wait a minute. I haven't said I was going to really do it. I am really waiting to see whether I should do it.

□ 1445

Well, I am waiting too, Representative FLEMING, because you said you were going to do it because you could do it because you think you have the jurisdiction to do it.

Well, you don't. Technically, of course, Congress can reach into the Home Rule Act and violate the Home Rule Act. You can do that, but who would say that was in keeping with your own 10th Amendment principles, your own principles of small government, your own principles that all that matters is local government, your own principles that the Federal Government shouldn't even be in what the Federal Government is doing?

This is a controversial subject, but that is what we have local jurisdictions and States for, to respect our differences. We are a Union of States, and we are not all the same. At least 18 States also have marijuana decriminalization laws.

Representative FLEMING should not be interfering with a jurisdiction 1,000 miles from his own. He has introduced only 11 bills in this Congress. I have introduced 57, and none of them have interfered with anybody else's business, and I am not going to take it when you come here to interfere with mine.

This is interesting. At the hearing, there was open disagreement among Republican Members in Congress because there are Republican libertarians in this Congress. Sometimes, they don't abide by their principles, but they are more likely to do so.

He was called out by the Member who has since introduced the amendment to the FY 2015 COmmerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill that passed this House, that keeps the Federal Government from interfering with medical marijuana laws that have been sanctioned by the local jurisdiction. Guess what? That passed this House with 49 Republicans voting for it.

I want to say here how much I respect my Republican colleagues who try to put their principles into effect when they see such legislation, national or local; and I ask you to put yourself in my position.

Should I sit still when you treat the people I represent as if you could toy with them, use them for messaging, forget that they are number one in Federal income taxes paid to support the government of the United States?

I don't even have the same vote you have on this floor, and no Senators do I have. I have only myself and my will and my determination to call every one of you out, not only on this floor, but to every newspaper in your district, every newspaper in your State, all of those who sent you to Congress because you said you were for small government and local control. Well, if you are for it, I am going to hold you to it.

I don't know what is going to happen with the D.C. marijuana decriminalization bill. I do know this: that I don't expect the District law, which is here now on a so-called layover—what an insult that is. We have to bring our local laws here and let them lie here and if it is a criminal law, for 60 days, to see if anybody wants to jump up and overturn our local laws.

I don't think that is going to happen because I don't think there are that many hypocrites in the Congress of the United States.

There was a bill—and I am not going to call out this Member's name because it was never introduced, but it was passed around for cosponsors. It was a bill that reached into something—I don't even think it was ideological—it was just meddling—that would keep the District of Columbia from using automated traffic enforcement systems.

You know, they are the kind of systems we have in 521 jurisdictions, 24 States, and I don't know if this Member or his staff had gotten a ticket. He didn't say so. All I know is: What in the world are you doing interfering with how we keep people from being struck by cars? Maybe we shouldn't have those in some States. We have them in the District.

The Member did not introduce it, so I am not going to call his name on this floor. I can only thank him for thinking about this bill, and I have come to ask for Members to think very carefully as to what they would do if they were in my place.

You have been sent to the House of Representatives to represent your constituents. You have been sent to protect them, as well as to enable them to have whatever other people in our country have.

Suppose your constituents were number one in Federal taxes paid to the government of the United States. Is there one of you anywhere who would not do as I am doing this afternoon and insist that the people you represent be treated as the fullblooded American citizens that they are?

That is what we are. We intend to be treated that way, and we will never be quiet about it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about the Federal Reserve, and if you want a real stemwinder of a conversation here on the House floor, Mr. Speaker, I recommend the Federal Reserve to you. It is nonstop laughs and giggles and interesting information.

I can't get started without referencing my friend from the District of Columbia who just spoke, and she spoke with such passion. I have the great pleasure of serving on the House Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. As you know, it meets right behind the wall up there. It is the only committee that meets in the Capitol, and the Delegate from the District of Columbia is often there, speaking just as passionately on behalf of her constituents.

It is hard because, as she spoke with absolute certainty about the role that the District of Columbia plays, the Constitution speaks with similar certainty, and that is what makes it a difficult conversation to have.

The Constitution set up this governing district and gave those responsibilities to the U.S. Congress to administer.

Now, the Home Rule Act—and if folks haven't looked at the Home Rule Act, it is a fascinating read. Like so many things that we do in this Chamber, it was done for all the right reasons and has its fair set of unintended surprises along the way.

Here is what the Constitution says in article I, section 8, and it says, in part, this:

> Responsibilities of the Congress, to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district, not exceeding 10 miles square, as may, by cession of particular States—you will remember, Virginia and Maryland both ceded real estate in order to create the District of Columbia, we used Maryland's half, we gave back Virginia's half—and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be.

Exclusive jurisdiction granted to the Congress by the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, but then we passed a statute that gave certain home rule rights and responsibilities away.

Now, that statute, of course, is secondary to the Constitution. The Constitution is controlling. The statute is secondary, and that statute grants the rights and the privileges that the Delegate was referencing.

That happens so often here, Mr. Speaker, that we have constitutional responsibilities, and then we have statutory authorities, and sometimes, those come into conflict.

I happen to have one of those on my mind tonight, and it is the Federal Reserve Act, Mr. Speaker. If you are ever looking for a good read, can't quite get to sleep in the evening, let me suggest the Federal Reserve Act to you.

It is not a fascinating read, but it is an incredibly important read, and it says, in part, this—this is the Federal Reserve Act, Mr. Speaker. You can't see it from where you are, but it says this:

> The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee shall maintain long-run growth of the monetary and credit aggregates commensurate with the economy's long-run potential to increase production, so as——and this is the important part——so as to promote effectively the goals of maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates.

The authority to control the Nation's money supply lies here in Congress. The authority to control interest rates, as they are related to the money supply, lies here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress delegated that to the Federal Reserve Board through the Federal Reserve Act, and the Federal Reserve Board's mission, again, is to:

> Promote effectively the goals of maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had this conversation before. If you have ever been in a high school economics class, you are thinking, hey, wait a minute; can I really promote full employment and interest rate moderation with the same language? Don't I lower interest rates in order to get maximum employment? Don't these things sometimes run countercyclically to one other?

It is a very difficult mandate that we had given the Federal Reserve. I want to talk about how they have handled that because, Mr. Speaker, the frustration I hear from folks back home is: