

So in 1860, the Supreme Court moved up from the floor below to the beautiful old Senate Chamber, as it is called now, but it was actually the Supreme Court chamber from 1860 to 1935.

I think it was in 1931 the current Supreme Court building was built because before that, the Supreme Court got hand-me-downs for most everything. And, of course, after a decision like *Dred Scott*, they probably deserved nothing but hand-me-downs.

But nonetheless, our only President to have been President and also be on the Supreme Court, William Howard Taft, because of his political ties, he was in a position to seek and get funding for a new building. He didn't get to be Chief Justice in the new building.

But in a documentary that was done not too long ago—I was not aware—it pointed out that when the Justices of the Supreme Court were taken through this new Supreme Court building in 1935, showing them their new chambers, the new Court, many of them were appalled. They were shocked because it appeared to them to be a palace. They didn't even have a room for a while. Then they got the hand-me-down from the old, old Senate chamber. Then they got the old Senate. And now they are looking at a palace that they, as Justices, weren't supposed to have.

The documentary pointed out that there were some Justices who didn't move into offices for a long time because they just felt it was inappropriate for Justices in the United States of America to be in a palace.

Mr. Speaker, some may not be aware, but they are comfortable with the palace now, of course. But it was interesting that for a while, some of them felt that it looked too much like a palace, and it sent the wrong message.

When I was a judge, when I was a chief justice, we had many programs on ethics to teach, you know, what the general feeling on ethics was, what the rules are. And generally, if there was a case in which it appeared a justice had already made a decision in advance, that was a judge or a justice who should, in order to remain ethical, recuse themselves or recuse him or herself.

Well, we have two Justices, I read, that had performed marriage ceremonies for couples that were the same sex. There could be no more clearer evidence that a Justice had decided whether or not same-sex marriage was appropriate when such Justice was performing that.

But one of the flaws in our Supreme Court justice system that only exists for the Supreme Court of the United States—no other court in the land has this problem—they have no one to whom anybody in America using the court system can appeal on ethical issues. Congress can impeach after the fact, if something is done inappropriately. But, for example, if someone made a motion to recuse me as a judge, then I could hear it. But then that

could be appealed to another judge, and there were methods of appeal.

But if you believe that a judge, or a Justice, in the Supreme Court's case, making their views very clear that they have very strong feelings for same-sex marriage and that they believe it is perfectly appropriate before the case comes before them, and yet they decide, I am not doing anything unethical, should stay on the Court—because they have come so far from those days when they didn't even have a courtroom for about 21 years to where they now have a lovely palace—there is no one else that they allow an appeal to. They could set up a panel to make decisions about ethical issues.

But when you, as a Court, began replacing God with your own decisions, when you began to replace the laws of human nature with what you think the laws should be, then naturally, you are not going to set up a panel that second-guesses your decision on ethics because you are the be-all and end-all for such decisions.

So it grieves me very much for our Court system to have Justices who have made their positions very clear, sit on a case as if they hadn't, decide a case as if they are fair and unbiased, and then say, this is justice in America.

We have badly regressed. The days of humility for some Justices are gone. There was a time when Justices had such a sense of humility that they thought this was a palace they should not be in. Those days are gone. There was a time when Justices could be embarrassed about such a horrendous decision, like *Dred Scott*. I fear those days are gone as well.

But they will make a decision, and they will decide either—I hope they decide that this is a decision for each State, that since the Constitution does not speak to the issue of marriage and the 10th Amendment makes very clear any power not specifically enumerated is reserved to the States and the people, that they will ensure that they are not the arbiters of morality in America any longer, at least not on this issue; that they will decide that they are not going to go so far as to condemn people who believe firmly in the teachings of the Bible, Old Testament and New Testament, people who believe in the Commandments, that the man depicted as the only full face in this whole gallery above these doors, the man who was considered the greatest lawgiver of all time when this was decorated in this way, Moses—that is the same Moses that, if you go into the Supreme Court and you are looking at the Supreme Court, and you are seeing them struggling to become God in their decisions about religion, if you look up at the marble wall above you, to the right, you will see Moses depicted, holding the Ten Commandments and looking down.

They will decide whether they are going to inject themselves and tell people what the Pilgrims heard in Europe,

what Christians heard around the world who came to America so they would not be persecuted as Christians. They will tell America very clearly: We don't care what your religious views are. This Supreme Court is going to decide that we are going to prohibit the free exercise of religion because we are more important, and our views are more important than the clear language of the First Amendment when it says that the government will not prohibit the free exercise of religion.

Well, we will find out. I hope and pray that the Supreme Court has a time of humility, their hearts are touched to the point that they will not decide that the Pope is an idiot, that they, as the popes of America, know what is best for the people, more than any religious leader in the country, that they will substitute their judgment for those of the Bible.

It is kind of hard to get around Romans I, if you really believe the New Testament.

Nonetheless, that decision is coming. Mr. Speaker, I am truly hopeful that Americans will realize the seriousness of this decision and the ultimate breakdown that it will be. And I hope we don't degenerate in this country into more violence.

But we see what happens around this country when we get God—we don't even want God mentioned anywhere, even though, for this country's history, the Bible has been the most quoted book right here in this Chamber, the Chamber down the hall, the most quoted book ever in our government's history.

So when I am talking like this on the floor, we usually get calls from people that are going berserk, how dare him mention God.

Just in the last week or two, I have quoted from Abraham Lincoln, who wrote an official United States Government proclamation, begging, imploring the people to have a time of prayer, humility, and fasting. And in the proclamation, he makes clear that the problem at that point, as slavery was a huge problem, the Civil War was ongoing at the time of this proclamation. But he knew those were symptoms of what happens when you turn from the religious morality of the Bible. And he said, We have forgotten God.

I hope the Supreme Court will not, once again, inject themselves as gods but that they will observe the true meaning of the First Amendment.

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

□ 1145

THE COURAGEOUS LADY FROM BALTIMORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, within the last hour or so, there was a decision by the Baltimore City State's Attorney Marilyn Mosby in the investigation of the death of Freddie Gray, a Black man who died under questionable circumstances; circumstances that kind of made us all wonder where the truth lies; circumstances that cause young people and others to take to the streets across this Nation; circumstances that brought into a sharp, bright light the question of justice in America, the question of police misconduct in America, the question of mayhem in America, the question of poverty in America, and the question of bias in America.

Freddie Gray's murder, Freddie Gray's death, and the questionable circumstances around his death brought into sharp relief all of these issues of race and living in an urban center—brought into sharp relief, Mr. Speaker, 50 years or more of abject, determined, and callous disinvestment in our urban areas, 50 years or more of joblessness, bad schools, bad housing, bad health care, and 50 years of hopelessness.

In the last few minutes, Mr. Speaker, this brilliant, young, African American woman, Baltimore City State's Attorney Marilyn Mosby, made a decision; and she decided that, yes, notwithstanding all the differences of opinion, the changed stories, the moving target, notwithstanding all of these things that happened, she decided that Freddie Gray was murdered—Freddie Gray was murdered—and that she would indict the police officers who were responsible.

By indicting the Baltimore City police officers who were responsible for Mr. Gray's murder, she made a giant, enormous step for justice for young people, young African American men and women, young people who live in our urban areas.

By her decision today, just a few moments ago, she has done this Nation an invaluable service, especially for young people, especially for the African American and other minority youth. These young people have, for decades now, sought and yearned for justice as it relates to police misconduct, police brutality, and, yes, police murder.

This new standard for justice is a standard that now transcends Baltimore and transcends even the entire State of Maryland. It transcends and it reaches to other points all across this Nation—Ferguson, New York City, Chicago, Cleveland, and other places all throughout this country.

Mr. Speaker, as an African American male who represents the South Side of the city of Chicago, I know firsthand about police misconduct, police mayhem, and police murder.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that, in my 68 years living mostly in the city of Chicago, I have never seen the wheels of justice move so profoundly, so pointedly, and so purposefully as I have witnessed with Baltimore City State's Attorney Marilyn Mosby's actions.

She has raised all kinds of standards. She has captured the imagination of all of us who fight for justice, who want to see justice delivered in the true American way, and who want to see an end to all the machinations, excuses, turning away, and closing our eyes to police misconduct in our urban areas.

This wonderful, courageous, young city State's attorney has raised the standard for prosecutors all across our great Nation. She has raised the standards for mayors, chiefs of police, and other law enforcement officials. She has raised the standard for even those who are in this body. Open your minds, open your eyes, and see the truth.

Let me just say right now, Mr. Speaker, that the police officers of this Nation, the overwhelming majority of them, are good, hard-working defenders of the community. They are not lawbreakers. They are there to serve and protect.

We honor them, and we lift them up; but there are a few who think that they can get away with all kinds of illegal actions just because they can get away with it because the system has a tendency and a habit of rising to protect even those who violate not only the laws of the Nation, but the spirit of the laws of this Nation, these laws that keep this Nation together, these laws that make us have an identity as one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

These police officers, this minority of those on the urban police forces across this Nation, these are the ones that abrogate the Constitution, short-circuit our Constitution, short-circuit our quest for justice, our appeal for justice, our right for justice, and short-circuit those just for their thrill of the moment.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, being handcuffed and leg-cuffed, laying down facedown in the back of a paddy wagon driven not accidentally recklessly, determined by those police officers who were driving, who had him in custody, to maim, harm, and brutalize him, different speeds driven by the driver of that van, tossed about because of sudden stops?

You are in the back of a paddy wagon, handcuffed and leg-cuffed, and these police officers are getting a thrill out of tossing you around in a steel-encased paddy wagon, not caring about the broken parts of your body that might occur, not caring about whether you really live or die, not even caring about their oath that they were sworn to when they were hired and when they took that oath to serve and protect.

All those things became secondary to their thrill of seeing how much havoc and harm they could cause to this Black man in Baltimore. Yeah, they thought they would get away with it, that no one would even think to question their decisions, their thrill-seeking, their conduct.

Thank God there is a woman in Baltimore who said to them, to all the police officers who are like minded such

as them, said to this Nation: No more. No more, not this time. You are going to be indicted, and you are going to be charged, and that is the way it is.

Grieving mothers, Mr. Gray's mother, his father, his relatives, his loved ones, his friends, and his neighbors can all now say that there will be justice for Freddie Gray. I said, in Chicago, there will be justice for Freddie Gray. From this Nation's borders, young people are rejoicing now. The day is soon to be justice for Freddie Gray.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Mosby's actions, her courage, her dedication, her commitment, and her decisiveness have spoken to the idea that is creating this movement for justice all across this Nation.

□ 1200

She has very clearly and profoundly and without hesitation spoken to all of us, to this Nation. Her actions have shouted out that Black lives do matter, that Black lives do matter, that all lives in America matter, and that Black lives matter also.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 5, 2015, at 11:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1348. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Kenneth E. Floyd, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1349. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Accomack County, VA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8379] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1350. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Minority and Women Inclusion Amendments (RIN: 2590-AA67) received April 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2014