

person looks or you don't like the person's perceived sexual orientation. The law has been changed, and it punishes you if you decide that you are going to commit this type of crime.

This resolution celebrates 2012 as the first year in which all 50 States had at least one LGBTQ elected official. All 50 States have now at least one person who is a part of the LGBTQ community holding public trust. People have come to understand that it is not the color of skin, it is not sexual orientation; it is the character within a person that determines whether or not a person ought to hold public trust, whether or not a person ought to be respected appropriately. It is the character, not the way the person is perceived in terms of color or sexual orientation.

This resolution celebrates Senator TAMMY BALDWIN being sworn in as the first openly gay United States Senator in January of 2013, and she has served her country well and merits this sort of recognition.

The resolution highlights the importance of the Supreme Court ruling in the United States v. Windsor on June 26, 2013, which found that section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act, DOMA, found it unconstitutional and determined that the Federal Government cannot discriminate against married lesbian and gay couples for the purpose of determining Federal benefits and protections.

This is the Supreme Court of the United States of America, the same Supreme Court with conservative and liberal Justices on it. We don't have to agree with everything the Supreme Court does, but I thank God I live in a country where we respect the decisions. We can differ with them. Even the Justices themselves differ about various opinions, but they respect the rulings of the Court. This Supreme Court has made such a ruling as it relates to the Defense of Marriage Act.

This resolution celebrates the 37 States and the District of Columbia where it is now legal for same-sex couples to get married. Literally, more than half of the States in the United States of America now permit same-sex couples to get married—more than half of the States.

This means that this country is moving toward, without a ruling from the Supreme Court, the notion that same-sex couples should be allowed to not only love each other, but to marry each other, to have the same benefits that heterosexual couples have when they marry.

□ 1915

Marriage is a great institution. I celebrate the institution of marriage. But the law, under the 14th Amendment, seems to indicate that we cannot prevent people who are of the same sex and who love each other from having the same opportunities that benefit from the institution of marriage that other people who are heterosexual have the opportunity of benefiting from.

So the States that have decided that they would do this should be recognized. By the way, many of these States recognize same-sex marriage because of judges in those States who have made rulings, because of legislatures in those States who have legislated, and because of people in those States who have voted.

There are 37 States. The States include Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut. They are all States that recognize same-sex marriage. Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, and Idaho are States that recognize same-sex marriage. Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Minnesota all recognize same-sex marriage. Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Ohio all recognize same-sex marriage. Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin are all States in the United States of America that recognize same-sex marriage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present the resolution. And I am honored to do so because I know the importance of having people who were not of African ancestry who supported causes that made it possible for me to be here.

I have a debt that I owe. I hope that tonight I have made a down payment on the retirement of that debt. Because somebody suffered so that I could have the opportunity to stand in the Congress of the United States of America and make this floor speech. No one could have—or would have—predicted at my birth that I would have the opportunity to be a Member of the Congress of the United States of America.

For me to be here, somebody had to find out what a 90-pound German Shepherd bites like; somebody had to find out what a high-pressure water hose stings like; somebody had to find out what going to jail feels like; somebody had to find out what losing someone that you love dearly to a cause hurts like.

I am not here because I am so smart. I am here because there are people who were willing to make great sacrifices so that I could have the opportunities that I have. And because I have them, I have a debt that I owe. And I am here tonight to say that I am proud to stand with the LGBTQ community to help bring about the kind of justice for this community that I have enjoyed.

Now let me be perspicuously clear about one thing. I am not saying that we have reached the panacea as it relates to the African American community. There is still great work to be done as evidenced by what happened in Charleston, South Carolina. There is still work to be done and still heavy lifting to do. But I am also very proud of some things that happened there.

I happened to be in a position to be at the bond hearing that took place, and as I listened, I could not believe

my ears when I heard a mother say, "You took my son"—took her hero, "but I forgive you. I forgive you." Time and time again, persons said, "I forgive you."

I had tears well in my eyes because it takes a special person to say "I forgive you" so close to the event that is being forgiven or that the forgiveness addresses. It takes a special person.

And I want to compliment the families of the persons who lost their lives in church. My God, in church, lost their lives in church. I want to commend those families for having what Dr. Martin Luther King called the strength to love. The strength to love. He wrote the book, "Strength to Love." It is a collection of his sermons. And he makes it known to us in that book that it is not easy to love your enemy. It is not easy to forgive those who would persecute you. But he also makes it known in the book "Strength to Love" that that is what love is all about: loving those who would do ugly things to you, who would be spiteful, who would be evil.

I think that the family members in Charleston who have shown the strength to love are a supreme, superb, sterling example to the rest of this country of what we must do if we are to continue to live together such that we will have a future that will be void of the kind of behavior—the ugly, dastardly deed, if you will—that took place in that church.

Dr. King reminded us also that we have a duty—an obligation, if you will—to learn to live together as brothers and sisters. We must learn to live together as brothers and sisters. Because if we don't learn to live together as brothers and sisters, we will perish together as fools.

I thank the people of South Carolina for exhibiting the ultimate in the strength to love, and I thank God that I have been blessed. I pray that God will continue to give me the strength to be a blessing to others.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### FAITH THROUGH THE BIBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I enjoy hearing my friend from Texas, a former judge down in Houston, talk about love. I do love him as a Christian brother. We can disagree and still love each other.

I have been surprised in recent years to find some of those of us who believe in the Book that used to be read here. It was a pretty common practice on the floor of the House on Sundays down in Statuary Hall, and even in this room, back when church services were held in the former House Chamber.

It was attended by the man that first coined the phrase, "separation of church and State." It is not in the Constitution. It was in his letter to the

Danbury Baptists. He came to a non-denominational Christian worship service down the hall. Of course, Thomas Jefferson would even bring the Marine Band and have them play hymns. Because although he made clear he believed in separation of church and State, and used that phrase, he didn't see any problem with singing hymns and having the Marine Band play the hymns to accompany right here in the U.S. Capitol.

I have been surprised in recent years at how prominent the Bible was in our founding, so much so that toward the end of June 1787, the Constitutional Convention was at wits' end, having a great deal of trouble, and Randolph from Virginia made a motion that they all convene together on the Nation's birthday and worship God together in services under the auspices of the Bible. They came back and were able to reach a conclusion that we call the Constitution. People like Alexander Hamilton said that clearly the finger of God was in that, and it all came into place after they worshipped the Lord and used the Bible in worship there in 1787.

But it is amazing now, after the Bible was such a prominent part of our founding throughout our history, now those of us that believe what is in the Bible are the ones who are now discriminated against. I have suffered it right here in this town, not to the extent of being harmed physically, of course. Physical threats are not uncommon, but they were there when I was a judge as well.

So I am just going to read without comment the Book that has been read in this Capitol throughout our history, Romans 1:16:

For I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in the righteousness of God is revealed from faith for faith, as it is written "The righteous shall live by faith."

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppressed the truth and unrighteousness, because that which is known about God is evident within them, for God made it evident to them. For since the creation of the world, His invisible attributes, His eternal power, divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made so that they are without excuse.

For even though they knew God, they did not honor Him as God or give thanks, but they became futile in their speculations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image in the form of corruptible man and of birds, four-footed animals, crawling creatures.

Therefore, God gave them over in the lust of their hearts to impurity that their bodies might be dishonored among them, for they exchanged the truth of God for a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.

For this reason, God gave them over to degrading passions. For their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural; and in the same way, also the men abandoned the natural function of the

woman and burned in their desire for one another, men with men committing indecent acts.

Because I believe the Scripture—love those who don't, love those because we have all sinned one way or another—there is no room to hate anybody that has sinned, because we all have. We have all fallen short.

But I am sure my office, Mr. Speaker, will be getting nasty, angry, bitter calls, as we often do when we refer to the Bible that helped give us our founding.

□ 1930

But that is what the Bible said, and I am deeply concerned that we have Supreme Court Justices, two of whom who have actually participated in same-sex weddings, thereby showing how biased and partial they are in favor of such things, against the dignity and history of marriage in the country, marriage in the Bible.

It has been said many times here over our history, Moses said it came from God, that Moses, depicted right up above the center door, that a man shall leave his father and mother and a woman leave her home and the two will become one flesh.

When Jesus was asked about marriage, he repeated it: For a man shall leave his father and mother, and a woman leave her home, and the two will become one flesh. And Jesus added: What God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

So we have two Justices that have already indicated they believe otherwise than the law of Moses and Jesus, and they have shown themselves to be anything but impartial.

So, under the law, 28 United States Code 455, it is mandatory, they shall disqualify themselves. And if it turns out that they sit in judgment on a case in which they are clearly disqualified and a part of the majority, that cannot possibly be a legitimate law change, judges substituting their law for the law that this country has utilized throughout its history.

Yes, courts all over the country have substituted their judgment for State constitutions and laws. And for those who don't believe the Bible, you have got nothing to worry about. But the indications are, in Romans 1, God's protective hand will be withdrawn when we continue to abandon the Nation's founding.

Thank God churches fought for, so many were involved in, the movement to make the Constitution mean just what it said. We really shouldn't have had to have a 14th Amendment. Everybody should have been equal under the law. But it took an amendment, took a civil rights movement, to apply it across the board.

Now we have judges that will be oligarchs, as they have been, and they will be making decisions, rather than elected officials, and we will see how much longer the Nation lasts.

There is no hate, just a broken heart in me, but I will be accused of being

hatemonger this, hatemonger that. That is not the case.

I would like to congratulate our own leadership, Mr. Speaker. This is The Hill: "Obama Poised for Huge Win on Trade."

I would like to congratulate our Speaker, our Republican leadership, for pushing through the trade deal, leader MCCONNELL, down the hall. The President could not have gotten this ability to fast-track, to make deals that we won't know about, without the Republican leadership making that happen for him. Of course, nobody that I know of on the Republican side ran promising that we would get such ability for President Obama, but congratulations go there.

Some people say I am not quick enough to congratulate my own Republican leadership. I mean, I have congratulated our Speaker before when he was chairman of the Education Committee. As President Bush cited in his book, our now-Speaker was very important, very instrumental in getting No Child Left Behind pushed through.

Of course, when we won the majority in November 2010, got it back that December, deals were worked out that cost the country a lot of spending, raised the debt a great deal. Since then, although we continue to promise that we are going to do something about the debt, we continue to give the President almost a blank check.

But congratulations on all these. Congratulations on enabling the President to make these kind of deals. Then we will see if this law, TPA, is finally one the President abides by and gives us notice, timely, as he hasn't done in so many other areas, like Guantanamo and releasing people from Guantanamo.

But we have an article here, I guess, congratulations then would go to the Commander-in-Chief. Because I don't know that this would be the lion lying down with the lamb, if this lamb is the Iranian military-backed forces.

But this article from Bloomberg, June 22, Josh Rogin and Eli Lake, says:

The U.S. military and Iranian-backed Shiite militias are getting closer and closer in Iraq, even sharing a base, while Iran uses those militias to expand its influence in Iraq and fight alongside the Bashar al-Assad regime in neighboring Syria.

Two senior administration officials confirmed to us the U.S. soldiers and Shiite militia groups are both using the Taqaddum military base in Anbar, the same Iraqi base where President Obama is sending an additional 450 U.S. military personnel to help train the local forces fighting against the Islamic State. Some of the Iran-backed Shiite militias at the base have killed American soldiers in the past.

Some inside the Obama administration fear that sharing the base puts U.S. soldiers at risk. The U.S. intelligence community has reported back to Washington that representatives of some of the more extreme militias have been spying on U.S. operations at Taqaddum, one senior administration official told us. That could be calamitous if the fragile relationship between the U.S. military and the Shiite militia comes apart and Iran-backed forces decide to again target U.S. troops.

American critics of this growing cooperation between the U.S. military and the Iranian-backed militias call it a betrayal of the U.S. personnel who fought against the militias during the 10-year U.S. occupation of Iraq.

"It's an insult to the families of the American soldiers that were wounded and killed in battles in which the Shia militias were the enemy," Senate Armed Services Chairman JOHN MCCAIN told us. "Now, providing arms to them and supporting them, it's very hard for those families to understand."

The U.S. is not directly training Shiite units of what are known as the Popular Mobilization Forces, which include tens of thousands of Iraqis who have volunteered to fight against the Islamic State as well as thousands of hardened militants who ultimately answer to militia leaders loyal to Tehran. But the U.S. is flying close air support missions for those forces.

The U.S. gives weapons directly only to the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi Security Forces, but the lines between them and the militias are blurry. U.S. weapons often fall into the hands of militias, like Iraqi Hezbollah. Sometimes the military cooperation is even more explicit. Commanders of some of the hard-line militias sit in on U.S. military briefings on operations that were meant for the government-controlled Iraqi Security Forces, a senior administration official said.

This collaboration with terrorist groups that have killed Americans was seen as unavoidable as the U.S. marshaled Iraqis against the Islamic State, but could prove counterproductive to U.S. interests in the long term, this official said.

The militias comprise largely Shiite volunteers and are headed by the leader of the Iraqi Hezbollah, Abu Mahdi al-Muhandis. He was sanctioned in 2009 by the Treasury Department for destabilizing Iraq. Al-Muhandis is a close associate of Qasem Suleimani, the Iranian Quds Force commander, who has snapped selfies with the militia leader at key battles.

Other militias that have participated in the fighting against the Islamic State include the League of the Righteous which, in 2007, carried out a brutal roadside execution of five U.S. soldiers near Karbala. The group to this day boasts of its killing of U.S. soldiers. In an interview in February, a spokesman for the militia defended the killings and said his militia had killed many more American soldiers.

Members of these groups have also been deployed by Iran to defend the Assad regime in neighboring Syria. James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, confirmed in a June 3 letter to seven Republican Senators, which we obtained, that "Iran and Hezbollah have also leveraged allied Iraqi Shia militant and terrorist groups, which receive training in Iran, to participate in the pro-Assad operations."

The militias also stand accused of gross human rights abuses and battlefield atrocities in Sunni areas where they have fought. The State Department heavily criticized Iran's support for the Iraqi militias and those militias' behavior in its annual report on worldwide terrorism, released last week.

Further down:

With the deadline approaching for a nuclear deal that would place up to \$150 billion in the hands of Iran, the U.S. is now openly acknowledging in its annual report on international terrorism that Iran is supporting a foreign legion, comprising Afghans, Iraqis, and Lebanese fighters to defend Iranian interests throughout the Middle East.

But the U.S. response to this is inconsistent. In Iraq, America is fighting alongside Iranian-backed militias. In Syria, U.S.-

supported forces are fighting against those same militias. The tragedy of this policy is that the Islamic State has been able to hold and expand its territory in Iraq and Syria, while Iran has been able to tighten its grip on Baghdad.

Then another article from Daniel Horowitz, *Conservative Review*:

Anyone who visits Walter Reed Hospital will immediately see the irrevocable destruction of Hezbollah. Thousands of our troops have been incapacitated and mangled by IEDs from Hezbollah and other Shiite groups in Iraq, all funded by Obama's ally, Iran. Anyone who was around in 1983 will remember the 241 American servicemen who were killed in the Hezbollah terror attack in Beirut.

Guess what Obama is doing with them?

Eli Lake reports at Bloomberg News that our troops are sharing a base with Hezbollah-controlled Shiite forces, and we are bailing them out of their humiliating loss to the Islamic State.

□ 1945

The article goes on, but it is just exceedingly tragic; but it explains why the President has been unable to state that we have a clear strategy in the Middle East because, on the one hand, we have had the United States military give their lives fighting against the tyranny and the atrocities of Hezbollah.

On the other hand, we now have the President, the Commander in Chief, who commands over our forces that he has put in the same camp with Hezbollah. The hope, apparently, of the administration is, even though they are still bragging in Hezbollah about killing American soldiers, that maybe by having them camp in the same camp, they won't be killing them now. You have got to love that optimism.

As we see the Commander in Chief's troops being forced to come together with people like Hezbollah—that want to kill them, have killed them, have maimed them, Hezbollah is clearly supported by Iran—then we get this, "AP Exclusive: Document outlines big-power nuke help to Iran," George Jahn, dated today, from Vienna.

The United States and other nations negotiating a nuclear deal with Iran are ready to offer high-tech reactors and other state-of-the-art equipment to Tehran if it agrees to crimp programs that can make atomic bombs, according to a confidential document obtained Tuesday by the Associated Press.

The draft document—one of several technical appendixes meant to accompany the main text of any deal—has dozens of bracketed texts where disagreements remain. Technical cooperation is the least controversial issue at the talks, and the number of brackets suggest the sides have a ways to go not only on the topic but also more contentious disputes with little more than a week until the June 30 deadline for a deal.

With that deadline looming, Iran's top leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, on Tuesday rejected a long-term freeze on nuclear research and supported banning international inspectors from accessing military sites. Khamenei, in comments broadcast on Iranian state television, also said Iran will sign a final deal provided all economic sanctions now in Iran are first lifted—in a sign the Islamic Republic may be toughening its stance ahead of the deadline.

In any event, that is great news.

Of course, the Senate and House passed a bill that turned requirements for authorization of treaties upside down. Instead of having two-thirds of the Senate required to approve a deal, we have flipped it. Now, it will take two-thirds of a vote in the House and Senate to disapprove a deal. That makes it easier for the President to give Iran the nuclear reactors they are hoping.

Mr. Speaker, I brought this up in past years; but here, in negotiating with Iran, one of our lead negotiators was the same person who was involved in the Clinton administration negotiations with North Korea, where they cut this wonderful deal basically saying, in essence, we will give you nuclear reactors for power if you will just promise that you won't use them to make nuclear weapons.

This dishonest, evil leader said: All you want is a promise from a dishonest leader that I won't use them to make nukes? Sure, I will promise you that. Bring on the nuclear power plants.

Those came, and they were converted. Now, North Korea is helping with parts of the evil empire to develop nuclear weapons of their own.

When you have somebody involved in that kind of deal with North Korea sent to negotiate with Iran, we should have known that this would be coming: Hey, we will give you nuclear reactors. We will help you make it happen. We just don't want you to use them to make nuclear weapons.

Since Iran has been—at least the leaders have been so evil in the way they have pursued Israel, in the way they have pursued Americans, continuing to brag about killing Americans, I don't think anybody should really be surprised if this deal gets cut and then Iran goes ahead and uses what we provide them or the P5+1 provides them in order to make nuclear weapons more quickly than they could have without this kind of deal.

But "congratulations" again go to the Republican leaders in the House and Senate for pushing through the authority for the President to have the ability to make these kinds of deals. Who says I can't be magnanimous and thank Republican leaders?

I hope the American public will wake up and understand, the deal that has been negotiated is deadly to our ally Israel; it is deadly to the United States. Make it clear that any party that hopes to have any chance of having a President elected from their party better not be part of the deal with Iran because it is going to get more Americans and Israelis killed.

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

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed