

protection of religious liberties granted under our U.S. Constitution.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I appreciate very much his commitment to many causes, especially this cause.

I recognize the gentleman from California that has arrived, and I point out that we are down to 3 minutes.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) to hear what he might have to say about this topic.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Iowa. Thank you for a little bit of time on this.

It is indeed something I know a lot of people are grieving over with the Supreme Court decision, first on the morality issue.

Those of us that believe in the Bible, that believe in God, feel that the Bible is pretty clear on this subject of homosexuality and the application of marriage.

But even more so, beyond that, it is a choice. People can choose to follow that path of biblical values or they can choose not. They will make that decision, and they will be held accountable for that decision one way or the other.

So what I am looking at is that the court, in this ruling, has usurped the process of the American people in the legislative process and replaced it with the opinions of five court members.

Where that ruling was on Friday, the following Monday, the court upheld that the people would draw their own lines in Arizona and, by extension, California.

So the people's voice is heard on district lines as seen by the court, but the people's voice is ignored when California passed two different initiatives to uphold marriage.

So there is not even consistency on the court on what the Constitution is supposed to mean on the people's voice, and that is very troublesome.

It indicates to me that we are not far from a constitutional crisis with the way this court usurps the people's voice and the legislative process.

So I appreciate the time from the gentleman here tonight. Thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a list of solid constitutionalists here this evening that are not only committed to their oath to support and defend the Constitution, but, also, each committed to their own marriage throughout these years that, if we added them up, it is well over a century of us together. Marilyn and I are 43 years.

I am steeped in the Constitution and the rule of law. I have great respect for the Supreme Court of United States, but I have greater respect for the supreme law of the land, which is the Constitution of the United States.

If the law doesn't mean what it says and if the Constitution can have divined within it certain rights that are imagined only by this court and not imagined by the people that rati-

fied the very language that they are ruling upon, then what have we come to?

I believe that this decision, this Obergefell v. Hodges decision on marriage, right behind the decision of King v. Burwell—that, if the court continues down this path, Mr. Speaker, they will render our Constitution an artifact of history and this country will not respect a court that doesn't respect the language and the text of the Constitution.

□ 2030

We are here to reject and criticize the decision of the Supreme Court that imposes same-sex marriage on all of America and requires each of the States to recognize with reciprocity those marriages. That is a decision this Congress couldn't make for the American people, and it is a decision that should be left up to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit that I am one who is prepared to support the simple elimination of civil marriage because this government has gotten into it so far that holy matrimony will not be protected from the further litigation in this Court unless we separate it from civil marriage itself.

The next litigation that comes will be that that sues our priests and our pastors to command them to conduct same-sex marriages at their altars, and that is where the First Amendment freedom of religion comes into conflict with the distorted view of the 14th Amendment which is part of this Obergefell, and that, Mr. Speaker, will be a constitutional crisis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

A MATTER OF HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). 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 heard earlier discussions from my friends—and I literally mean that, friends; I am not being sarcastic, they are friends—talking about the shootings. It sounds like they were certainly racist shootings in South Carolina when an evil man shot brothers and sisters of mine as fellow Christians.

Now there is this big race to go after the Confederate flag. So, Mr. Speaker, I saw this article by Daniel Greenfield and felt like this was worth noting, historically, information that Mr. GREENFIELD has published this month. Just touching on parts of the article—I started to say “he,” but it says “Daniel.” Maybe it is a man, maybe it isn't. I don't want to be biased based on a name.

But anyway, in his article he says, talking about President Obama: “When Obama condemned Christianity for the Crusades, only a thousand years too late, in attendance was the Foreign Minister of Sudan, a country that practices slavery and genocide. President

Obama could have taken time out from his rigorous denunciation of the Middle Ages to speak truth to the emissary of a Muslim Brotherhood regime whose leader is wanted by the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity, but our moral liberals spend too much time romanticizing actual slaver cultures.

“It's a lot easier for our President to get in his million-dollar Cadillac with 5-inch thick bulletproof windows, a ride Boss Hogg could only envy”—Boss Hogg being a reference to the name of the show “Dukes of Hazzard”—“and chase down a couple of good ole boys than it is to condemn a culture that committed genocide in our own time, not in 1099, and that keeps slaves today, not in 1815.

“Even while the Duke boys”—again, references to “Dukes of Hazzard”—“the Duke boys were chased through Georgia, President Obama appeared at an Iftar dinner, an event at which Muslims emulate Mohammed, who had more slaves than Robert E. Lee. There are no slaves in Arlington House today, but in the heartlands of Islam, from Saudi mansions to ISIS dungeons, there are still slaves, laboring, beaten, bought, sold, raped, and disposed of in Mohammed's name.

“Slavery does not exist under the Confederate flag eagerly being pulled down. It does exist under the black and green flags of Islam rising over mosques in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and America today.

“In our incredibly tolerant culture, it has become politically incorrect to watch the General Lee”—talking about a car—“jump a fence or a barn, but paying tribute to the culture that sent the slaves here and that still practices slavery is the culturally sensitive thing to do. In 2015, slavery is no longer freedom, but it certainly is tolerance.”

The article goes on: “Slavery was an indigenous African and Middle Eastern practice, not to mention an indigenous practice in America among indigenous cultures.”

The author here is talking about, for those who don't understand indigenous cultures, he is talking about Native Americans. There were Native Americans that had slaves, just like in Africa and Middle Eastern practices.

The article goes on: “If justice demands that we pull down the Confederate flag everywhere, even from the top of the orange car sailing through the air in the freeze frame of an old television show, then what possible justification is there for all the faux Aztec knickknacks? Even the worst Southern plantation owners didn't tear out the hearts of their slaves on top of pyramids.”

This is a reference that obviously in history we understand Aztecs did pull out hearts of slaves that they sacrificed on top of pyramids.

Anyway, the article says: “The romanticization of Aztec brutality plays a crucial role in the mythology of Mexican nationalist groups like La

Raza promoting the Reconquista of America today.”

I wasn’t aware of that, but the article says: “Black nationalists romanticize the slave-holding civilization of Egypt despite the fact that the narrative of the liberation of the Hebrew slaves from bondage played a crucial role in the end of slavery in America. The endless stories about the ‘Amazons’ of the African kingdom of Dahomey neatly fit into the leftist myth of a peaceful matriarchal Africa disrupted by European colonialism, but Dahomey ran on slavery.”

“The ‘Amazons’ helped capture slaves for the Atlantic slave trade. White and Black liberals are romanticizing the very culture that captured and sold their forefathers into slavery. ‘In Dahomey,’ the first major mainstream Black musical was about African Americans moving to Dahomey. By then, the French had taken over old Dahomey and together with the British had put an end to the slave trade.

“The French dismantled the ‘Amazons’ and freed many of Dahomey’s slaves only for the idiot descendants of both groups to romanticize the last noble stand of Dahomey fighting for the right to export Black slaves to Cuba and condemn the European liberators who put a stop to that atrocity.

“If we crack down on romanticizing Dixie, how can we possibly justify romanticizing Dahomey or the Aztecs or Mohammed?

“If slavery and racism are wrong,” which clearly they are, the article says. “If slavery and racism are wrong, then they are wrong across the board . . . Dahomey and Mohammed had bought, sold, and killed enough Black lives to be frowned upon.

“If we go back far enough in time, most cultures kept slaves. The Romans and Greeks certainly did. That’s why the meaningful standard is not whether a culture ever had slaves, but whether it has slaves today. If we are going to eradicate the symbols of every culture that ever traded in slaves, there will be few cultural symbols that will escape unscathed. But the academics who insist on cultural relativism in 19th century Africa reject it in 19th century South Carolina, thereby revealing their own racism.

“And so instead of fighting actual modern-day slavery in Africa and the Middle East, social justice warriors are swarming to invade Hazzard County.

“Most of the cultures of the past that we admire, respect, and even romanticize had slaves, but when we look back at their achievements and even try to forge some connection to them, it does not have to mean an endorsement of their worst habits. This is a concept that liberals understood but that leftists reject.

“The recent hysteria reminds us that the nuanced reason of the former has been replaced by the irrational, destructive impulses of the latter. The left is so obsessed with creating utopias of the future that, like the Taliban

or ISIS, it destroys the relics of past societies that do not measure up to its impossible standards. And then it replaces them with imaginary utopias of the past that never existed.

“As Ben Carson pointed out, we will not get rid of racism by banning the Confederate flag. Even when it is used at its worst by the likes of Dylann Storm Roof, it is a symptom, not the problem. Roof was not radicalized by the dead Confederacy, but by the racial tensions kicked off”—I am not sure I want to say that.

But, anyway, interesting take, but all of this talk about eliminating any references or uses of things that remind us of the horrors, the abomination that slavery was in the United States should be eliminated. That is what we are hearing.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in thinking about that—and the suggestion was made by my friend, another judge from Texas, Judge CARTER, so I had to go look it up. I think there is an entity that was so evil in supporting slavery, in fighting against civil rights, in fighting against the Christian brother that Martin Luther King, Jr., was, fighting against those who wanted equality that the Constitution guaranteed, we ought to look at those symbols, and we ought to look at what they stood for and perhaps ban any political organization from participating in Congress for upholding the abomination that slavery was to this country.

So I was able to get a copy of this platform, this political platform from 1856. This is the number one plank in the platform of this hideous political organization, and this is what they believed and they asserted.

□ 2045

I am reading from the number one plank in their party platform: “That Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution”—then, here it goes—“that all efforts of the abolitionists, or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.”

That was the official number one plank in this hideous political organization’s platform from 1856.

They go on. Here is number three: “That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of territories, and to the admission of new States, with or without domestic slavery, as they may elect—the equal rights, of all the States will be preserved intact.”

They are saying they want to preserve slavery in any State that wants to have it.

They finish up by saying: “Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a constitution, with or without domestic slavery.”

It sounds like something the Ku Klux Klan would have done. They are demanding that they have the right to have slavery, the worst abomination in the history of America, that even Thomas Jefferson put in his original draft of the Declaration of Independence that it was a horrible grievance against the King of England for allowing slavery, this horrible abomination, from ever starting in America.

Well, they didn’t learn their lesson. This hideous political organization’s platform in 1860 said they were adopting all the things that they had said in 1856 about the right to keep this heinous, offensive slavery intact.

They include this, though, additionally in their platform of 1860: “Resolved, That the enactment of the State Legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect.”

They want to make it clear that not only were they avid supporters of slavery in America, but that it was their right to own people in America. This disgusting political organization also found the fugitive slave law to be, as they say, hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution.

Again, this sounds like something from the Ku Klux Klan. Will we want the Ku Klux Klan participating here on the floor when this is their history? It is the worst abomination.

The horrors of slavery finally were overcome, largely by abolitionist churches and pastors, people who believed that it had to stop, that people couldn’t be treating brothers and sisters in such a way.

It took the life work and even laying down of the life of Martin Luther King, Jr., to push us to the level where brothers and sisters, as he was in Christ, could treat brothers and sisters as equal people. That is where we should have been all along. It is where he was pushing us to be against the hideous type things from 1856 and 1860.

If we are going to eliminate everything that reminds us of a hideous past that supported slavery and the oppression, the horrors that slavery entailed—breaking up of families, molestations, the beatings, just the horrors—John Quincy Adams was right. God could not continue to bless America while we were treating brothers and sisters by putting them in chains and bondage.

He was right. So many abolitionists were right. Daniel Webster was right.

Republicans that stood up to these hideous political organizations were right. There should be no place for slavery in America.

If we are going to have a complete cleansing of this country of anything, any symbol, then this platform from the Democratic Party in 1856 and 1860—and it wasn't the Ku Klux Klan; it sounded like it, and there were a lot of Democrats who were members of the Ku Klux Klan. I don't know that you can find Republicans that were members of the Ku Klux Klan, but there were certainly plenty of Democrats that were.

I think it is time not for the Washington Redskins to change their name, but for the Democratic Party to change its name because all you have to do is go online and look up the history of the Democratic Party. It is one of oppressing African Americans. It is one of supporting slavery and the horrors that occurred in the United States, even up through the 20th century on into the 1860s.

I think we had a Democratic Senator who was a member of the Ku Klux Klan. I think he has got a lot of things named after him. I hope that my friends who will ultimately want to change the name of the Democratic Party because of its horrible history will also want to change the names of things that were named after somebody that was a big supporter of the Ku Klux Klan.

The fact is the families of the victims in Charleston, South Carolina—brothers and sisters in Christ, for those of us who are Christians—wow, did they send a powerful message. I didn't see or hear them demanding the Confederate flag be taken down. I heard them forgive the one—the evil, horrible person—that committed such a vile act on people at a prayer meeting, of all things.

They showed the kind of love Jesus showed, the kind of love that was embodied by Father Damien, whose statue is right down at the southern entrance of this building beneath us right now. The plaque on his statue—God forgive anybody who would ever want to change this, because it is so powerful—are the words of Jesus in John 15:13: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Jesus did that; Father Damien did that; Martin Luther King, Jr., did that—many have so that we could have the freedoms we have today, many of our American military forces have, not just for your freedom, but freedom around the world.

Let's recognize the good with which we have been blessed. Let's stop the name calling, the race baiting, the division politics. Let's fuss and disagree over issues, but let's quit trying to tear this country apart because of things of the past in which not one person in this room would have taken part in.

Let's work together. Fuss, disagree, push for what we believe is best for the

country, but let's stop the race baiting because, if we are really going to go there, we have got to end the Democratic Party. Its history is so interwoven with starting, keeping, trying to push slavery on beyond anything that it should have been through.

We don't need to end the Democratic Party. We just need to work together in the present. That doesn't mean we can't disagree. We do all the time. Let's stop the race baiting. Let's look at the example of the victims' families in Charleston, South Carolina, and say: Wow, there are incredible believers and followers of Jesus Christ. That is somebody we can emulate.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral in district.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 728. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 891. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 1326. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office".

H.R. 1350. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building".

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 9, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 91. To amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans.

H.R. 891. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 1326. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office".

H.R. 1350. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building".

H.R. 728. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office".

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 10, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2103. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress entitled "Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials for FY 2016", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2228; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2104. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Tioga County, PA, et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] received July 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2105. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Act Title V Operating Permit Program Revision; Pennsylvania [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0119; FRL-9930-30-Region 3] received July 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2106. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Determination of Attainment of the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Standard for the Liberty-Clairton Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0175; FRL-9930-23-Region 3] received July 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2107. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Kansas; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0104; FRL-9926-48-Region 7] received July 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2108. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0345; FRL-9929-58-Region 9] received July 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2109. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California