

Taylor (McHenry)	Walorski (Fischbach)	Wilson (FL) (Evans)
Thompson (MS) (Bishop (GA))	Williams (GA) (Neguse)	Wilson (SC) (Norman)

ADOPTING CHANGES TO THE STANDING RULES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LAWRENCE). Pursuant to House Resolution 1232, H. Res. 1230 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1230

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SEPARATE ORDER.

On any legislative day through the remainder of the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress, the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 2. CHANGES TO THE STANDING RULES.

(a) PRIVILEGED REPORTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Clause 6(a) of rule XIII is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (2), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (3) as subparagraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (2) the following new subparagraph:

“(3) when the proposed text of such a report has been made available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner prior to the convening of that legislative day; or”.

(b) SUSPENSIONS.—Clause 1(a) of rule XV is amended by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 3. REMOTE VOTING BY PROXY.

Section 3(s) of House Resolution 8 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) any reference to ‘the House’ in sections 1(a) and 2(a)(2)(B) shall be construed to include a reference to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union;

“(5) section 3(a)(1) shall not apply; and

“(6) for purposes of sections 1, 2, and 3 and regulations issued pursuant to section 6, the term ‘Members’ shall include Delegates and the Resident Commissioner and the term ‘state’ shall include territories and the District of Columbia, except that—

“(A) nothing in this paragraph authorizes Delegates or the Resident Commissioner to cast a vote in the House or record their presence in the House; and

“(B) Delegates and the Resident Commissioner may only be designated as a proxy by a Delegate or the Resident Commissioner.”.

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1232, I call up the bill (H.R. 8404) to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York). Pursuant to House Resolution 1232, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Respect for Marriage Act”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF SECTION ADDED TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, BY SECTION 2 OF THE DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT.

Section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 3. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT GIVEN TO MARRIAGE EQUALITY.

Chapter 115 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 1738B the following:

“§ 1738C. Certain acts, records, and proceedings and the effect thereof

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No person acting under color of State law may deny—

“(1) full faith and credit to any public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State pertaining to a marriage between 2 individuals, on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals; or

“(2) a right or claim arising from such a marriage on the basis that such marriage would not be recognized under the law of that State on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals.

“(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

“(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief.

“(d) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘State’ has the meaning given such term under section 7 of title 1.”.

SEC. 4. MARRIAGE RECOGNITION.

Section 7 of title 1, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 7. Marriage

“(a) For the purposes of any Federal law, rule, or regulation in which marital status is a factor, an individual shall be considered married if that individual’s marriage is valid in the State where the marriage was entered into or, in the case of a marriage entered into outside any State, if the marriage is valid in the place where entered into and the marriage could have been entered into in a State.

“(b) In this section, the term ‘State’ means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

“(c) For purposes of subsection (a), in determining whether a marriage is valid in a State or the place where entered into, if outside of any State, only the law of the jurisdiction applicable at the time the marriage was entered into may be considered.”.

SEC. 5. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or any amendment made thereby, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8404.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8404 the Respect for Marriage Act would reaffirm that marriage equality is, and must remain, the law of the land.

Over the past several decades, millions of LGBTQ people in loving and supportive relationships have married and formed families, particularly after the Supreme Court ruled, in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, that the Constitution protects marriage equality.

An estimated 2 million children are being raised by LGBTQ families today. An enormous body of research shows that stable and loving families are the foundation for children’s well-being and success, and children do best when their families have the critical legal protections to care for one another.

Thankfully, marriage equality remains constitutionally protected, and there is no indication that it will be overturned in the foreseeable future. It is—and should forever be considered—settled law.

Nonetheless, the Supreme Court’s recent position in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health*, which extinguished the constitutional right to abortion, has raised concerns among some people that other rights rooted in the constitutional right to privacy may be at risk, notwithstanding the Court’s assurance that *Dobbs* was limited to abortion. This includes the right to marriage equality.

In fact, in a concurring opinion in *Dobbs*, Justice Clarence Thomas explicitly called on the Court to reconsider its decisions protecting other fundamental rights, including the right to same-sex marriage. And although Justice Thomas did not mention the right to interracial marriage, that right relies on the same constitutional doctrines as the right to same-sex marriage, and, therefore, it could be vulnerable to a legal challenge in the future as well.

Even if we accept the Court’s assurance in *Dobbs* that its decision does not call other rights into question, Congress should provide additional reassurance that marriage equality is a

matter of settled law. All married people who are building their lives together must know that the government will respect and recognize their marriages—for all time.

□ 1215

The Respect for Marriage Act, which I introduced with the co-chairs of the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus, the chairs of the Congressional Tri-Caucus, and the House Democratic Caucus chair, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, is an updated version of the bill that I first introduced in 2009.

The first provision would repeal the odious Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA—the 1996 law that discriminates against married same-sex couples. While that law was ruled unconstitutional, it remains on the books, and it must be removed.

The bill would also enshrine marriage equality for Federal law purposes and would ensure that States give full legal effect to valid out-of-state marriages regardless of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of the individuals in the marriage.

This legislation would provide additional stability for the lives that families have built upon the foundation of our fundamental rights. Congress must pass the Respect for Marriage Act to dispel any concern or any uncertainty for families worried by the implications of the Dobbs decision. And it must pass the Respect for Marriage Act to enshrine in law the equality and liberty that our Constitution guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we thought the Democrats were obsessed with President Trump, but Justice Thomas is a close second. This bill is simply the latest installment of the Democrats' campaign to delegitimize and attempt to intimidate the United States Supreme Court.

It started when President Trump nominated Brett Kavanaugh—that was just too much for the left to bear—and they launched a smear campaign in an attempt to derail his nomination.

Then we saw Senator SCHUMER stand on the steps—remember, a leader in the legislative branch—stand on the steps of the Supreme Court, a separate and equal branch of government, and threaten Supreme Court Justices. He said: I want to tell you, Gorsuch; I want to tell you, Kavanaugh, you've released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions.

Just last month, a crazed individual attempted to assassinate Justice Kavanaugh in his home. An assassination attempt on a sitting Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

For months, Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have pursued this narrative that the Supreme Court is somehow illegitimate. Members of the

committee, including the chairman, have introduced a bill to pack the Court to add four associate Justices to our highest court.

The committee has held hearings that can only be interpreted as an attempt to lay the groundwork for an effort to impeach Justice Thomas. Today, the Democrats bring forward a bill that is completely unnecessary.

Why are the Democrats going down this path?

Because, frankly, they have nothing else. We are debating this bill today because it is July of an election year and inflation is at a level not seen in 40 years. It is the highest inflation rate in 41 years. The price of gas, the price of food, the price of daily necessities have skyrocketed. We are debating this bill today because illegal immigration is at unprecedented levels.

Last month, Customs and Border Patrol reported that we have already surpassed the prior years' total for encounters at our southern border, and we still have 3 months left in the fiscal year.

We are debating this bill today because they can't talk about the fact that our country is gripped by an epidemic of violent crime in every major urban area in this country. Every day, Americans are being assaulted, robbed, and murdered in our cities.

We are here because the Democrats have no answers and desperately hope that a manufactured crisis will help them in November. The Democrats want Americans to believe that the Supreme Court at any moment could step in and overturn its opinions in Obergefell and Loving—that is simply not true.

The very decision that Democrats say creates this threat explicitly denies it—explicitly disclaims it. Here is what the court said in the Dobbs decision. The Dobbs decision should not be misunderstood, mischaracterized to cast doubt on precedents that do not concern abortion.

The court condemned the idea that the Dobbs decision would lead to an overturning of other cases, stating, "Perhaps this is designed to stoke unfounded fear that our decision will imperil other rights."

It is this unfounded fear that brings us here today. We are here for a charade; we are here for political messaging. The Democrats can't run on their disastrous record, they can't run on any accomplishments. It is less than 4 months before an election and all Democrats can do is stoke unfounded fears, and so that is why we are here with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat it. I hope it doesn't pass. As I said, it is unnecessary and wrong. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the chair of the Equality Caucus and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today's vote is about love. The love that cou-

ples have for each other and the government's role in respecting that love regardless of their sex or race. Same-sex couples and interracial couples get married for the same reason others get married: to make a lifelong commitment to the person they love.

Yet, for too long, our government has rejected that love. They told these couples they were less than—that their marriages weren't valid; that they didn't deserve the affirmation or protections that come with legal recognition.

The Supreme Court made clear in *Loving*, *Windsor*, and *Obergefell* that this rejection of interracial and same-sex couples and their commitment to one another was unconstitutional. Today, we have the opportunity to send a clear message to worried couples that the Federal Government will continue to recognize same-sex and interracial marriages, no matter what the future holds.

To Mr. JORDAN's suggestion that this is not necessary—tell it to the millions of LGBTQ families that are worried about the Supreme Court's intention to rip away more freedoms. They have taken away the freedom to reproductive care. They have hinted at taking away contraception. Justice Thomas urged them to look at marriage equality. This is real for families.

When you talk about inflation, all families are dealing with the cost of fuel and food, but we don't have to layer on top of that another fear about the sanctity of your marriage. This is about a fundamental fairness in our system, ensuring that people can marry the person they love.

If it is not necessary, then vote for it. If you are right that we are worried and we shouldn't be, reaffirm it. But don't hide behind that to justify your refusal to vote for marriage equality in this country, that every single American has the right to marry the person they love.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsors of this legislation and the leadership of our chairman, and, as well, the millions of families that are, in fact, families.

My good friend from Ohio started out with the litany of violence, of which none of us stands for, we abhor violence. We believe in the freedom of speech and the right to petition. There are countless acts of violence against those who are seeking reproductive freedom and countless acts of violence against the LGBTQ community.

Listen to the violence against transgender parents just trying to help their children, or the violence that started in the early days of this community seeking their freedom and their rights. I know it well from the LGBTQ+ community in Houston and

the Caucus and the leaders who started out in those early years. I know that they suffered from just the simple position that they were different.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Constitution of the United States of America because that is what the Respect for Marriage Act exemplifies. It exemplifies a recognition of the Constitution. As the legislation says, the full credit and faith to marriage equality.

I believe that our friends have gotten it wrong. There is a constitutional right to privacy. And morally there is a right to love who you love and to establish a family as you desire.

It is horrific to believe that with the elimination of the precedent of 50 years of *Roe v. Wade*, one Justice decided to say, wait, there may be more. There may be an ending to marriage equality. There may be an ending to any number of constitutional rights.

Well, I am here today to say, I support enthusiastically H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act, codifying the constitutional right to privacy and the constitutional right to marriage.

Mr. Speaker, over and over again, I would ask my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support of H.R. 8404, the "Respect for Marriage Act."

This Act would enshrine in federal law marriage equality for same sex and interracial couples.

It would also repeal the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) of 1996 that problematically defined marriage as between one man and one woman.

The Supreme Court's backwards ruling in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* that was used to justify overturning the right to abortion could be weaponized in the future to strip away other fundamental rights, including the right to marriage equality.

In his concurring opinion in *Dobbs*, Justice Clarence Thomas explicitly called on the Supreme Court to reconsider its decisions protecting other fundamental rights, including the right to same-sex marriage recognized in *Obergefell v. Hodges*.

Although Justice Thomas conveniently chose not to mention the right to interracial marriage—a right he currently enjoys—that right relies on the same constitutional doctrines as the right to same-sex marriage, and, therefore, could also be on the chopping block.

The night before the *Dobbs* ruling, LGBTQI+ couples and people in interracial relationships went to sleep confident in the legality of their marriages.

They had no reason to believe that the next morning five individuals would pass a ruling that would strip women of their right to abortion and threaten the legality of their marriage unions.

On June 24th, amidst the horror of the Court's ruling against abortion rights, innocent LGBTQI+, Black, and Brown people had to also grapple with the possibility that the legality of their marriages might be violently stripped away.

We cannot and will not allow Republican lawmakers and Conservative Justices to toy with the rights of the American people.

That is why I strongly support the Respect for Marriage Act.

This act would ensure that an individual be considered married as long as the marriage was valid in the state where it was performed.

This ensures that same-sex and interracial couples would continue to enjoy equal treatment under federal law—as the Constitution requires.

This bill would go further by officially repealing the Defense of Marriage Act.

While the Supreme Court effectively rendered DOMA inert with its decision in *Obergefell*, this unconstitutional and discriminatory law, however, still officially remains on the books.

Therefore, H.R. 8404 would repeal DOMA once and for all.

The Respect for Marriage Act would also prohibit any person acting under color of state law from denying full faith and credit to an out-of-state marriage based on the sex, race, ethnicity or national origin of the individuals in the marriage.

It would also authorize the U.S. Attorney General to enforce these protections and would create recourses of action for any individual harmed by a violation of this provision.

If conservative lawmakers and Justices want to wage war against human and civil rights, we are ready to meet them toe for toe.

We will not back down for marriage equality.

We will not back down for racial justice.

We will ensure equal rights for all American people.

I strongly put my full support behind H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act, and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The gentlewoman used the word "violence." Violence? Fifty crisis pregnancy centers and churches have been attacked in the last 11 weeks—50 in 11 weeks. Think about that.

As I said in my opening statement, the leader of the Senate stood on the steps of the Supreme Court and said to two specific Justices: You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. The Speaker of this body waited 4 weeks to give protection to Supreme Court Justices' families after the left had posted online where her kids go to school, where their family attends church on Sunday morning. And in that interim, during that time after that bill had come out of the Senate unanimously, we had the assassination attempt on one of the Justices—one of the very Justices that the Senate Democrat leader had referenced in his comments on the steps of the Supreme Court.

And, of course, the Attorney General of the United States refuses to prosecute anyone who has protested at those Justices' homes in direct violation of the statute while the case was still pending in front of the court. Directly on point.

So concerns of violence—yeah, we all have concerns. She is right about one thing: We all have concerns about violence. But I just want everyone to understand what is going on as we speak. Fifty pregnancy centers and churches in 11 weeks. I don't know if we have

ever seen anything like that—that kind attack on the pro-life community.

Even so much that a witness who came in front of our committee for the second time—she was here a few months ago and came back the second time. The second time she had to bring security with her because of threats against her life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), my good friend and the ranking member on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Subcommittee on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, a champion for freedom from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN). There is a lot to talk about here today, but I have to comment on what he just led in with and this violence that we supposedly all decry. It is a bit of a double standard, isn't it?

These care pregnancy centers are a vital institution in our country. They are in all 50 States. There are over 2,700 of these centers doing vital work every single day. They help millions of American women every year. They employ and work with over 10,000 medical professionals.

Do you know what their singular goal is?

It is to help women who are in difficult pregnancy situations, to help care for their unborn children. Who in the world could be opposed to that?

You know what?

Senator ELIZABETH WARREN spoke for a lot of our colleagues on the other side last week. She came out and shrieked they needed to be put out of business in her State. They needed to get rid of these centers. It is just incredible.

In the debate on the rule here on this floor in the last couple of hours, I went down the litany of all those 50 occurrences—at least the ones we know about, and there are more—where violence has been perpetrated against these centers—these people who are doing extraordinary work down in the trenches to help their fellow man.

I ran out of time, I could not list all of them and all of the vandalism and the destruction and the Molotov cocktails and the hatred that is spray-painted on the sides of these facilities that are funded, by the way, by churches and nonprofits and individuals who care about the sanctity of every single human life in America. Yet, there is just complete silence on the other side. That is a really sad statement about where we are.

□ 1230

I used to be legal counsel for a number of those care pregnancy centers, so I speak to this with personal experience.

Let me get to the issue of the day. This bill is just another superfluous exercise. This bill is completely and clearly unnecessary.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? The sponsors of this bill know that. They

know that we are in a very divisive time in the country, and they are doing this anyway.

This bill is not only unnecessary; it is more of the same. It is yet another effort to delegitimize the Supreme Court. As Mr. JORDAN explained, they have been doing that in earnest. Senator SCHUMER went to the steps of the Supreme Court and infamously called down the whirlwind on Justices Kavanaugh and Gorsuch. By the way, it led to a planned assassination of Justice Kavanaugh, all the lawless protests on their lawns, threatening their children, and doxing the addresses of Supreme Court Justices' children. It is just unconscionable. It is against the law, the plain letter of the law, yet crickets from the other side.

They want to delegitimize the Court. They tried to pack it. They want to put four liberal Justices on the Court because they are concerned about the conservative majority right now. It is a lawless approach and a lawless response to the lawlessness of the radical left. So, this is another effort to delegitimize the Supreme Court.

It is also a continued disregard, an utter and total disregard, for the regular order in this body. I will explain in just a moment why that is so perilous in a situation like this with a bill like this.

It is also more desperation to focus on anything other than their policy failures, which Mr. JORDAN articulated here a few moments ago.

Nonetheless, there is this bill before us today. Clearly, it is about simple fear-mongering. This is a partisan bill to make partisan arguments and to run ads in an election cycle. Do you know why we say that, Mr. Speaker? Because, as Mr. JORDAN said, in the Dobbs opinion, which supposedly precipitated all this, it is clear if you read the opinion that this is not only an unnecessary piece of legislation, but it is divisive and misleading, and they know it. Because why? Anybody can read the opinion for themselves. Justice Alito wrote the majority opinion, of course, and he clarified it.

I am a constitutional law attorney. I used to litigate cases about the Constitution, what it means, and how it should be applied. I did that for 20 years before I got to Congress. Scarcely is there ever language this clear written in a Supreme Court opinion.

Let me give you the quote again, Mr. Speaker, in case anybody missed it, in case you didn't see it or you didn't want to see it. Justice Alito said in the majority opinion: "And to ensure that our decision is not misunderstood or mischaracterized, we emphasize that our decision concerns the constitutional right to abortion and no other right." He continues: "Nothing in this opinion should be understood to cast doubt on precedents that do not concern abortion."

Does everybody hear that? I will say that again: "Nothing in this opinion should be understood to cast doubt on

precedents that do not concern abortion."

Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because abortion is a unique area of the law. Abortion is about taking the life of another unborn person, another person, so the Court recognized that this is different and distinct, and everybody knows that. Everybody recognizes that, even Justice Clarence Thomas, whom they have worked so hard to demonize.

If you look at page 119 of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, you can see it for yourself. Justice Thomas said: "The Court's abortion cases are unique . . . and no party has asked us to decide 'whether our entire Fourteenth Amendment jurisprudence must be preserved or revised' . . . Thus, I agree that"—and he quotes Justice Alito—nothing in the Court's opinion "should be understood to cast doubt on precedents that do not concern abortion."

That language is so clear. Anybody in this country can read that and understand obviously and plainly what that means, every civics student, every child. But, apparently, our friends on the other side don't like that language, or they don't want to see it, so they have manufactured this crisis, this de-meaning and divisive debate, trying to reopen Pandora's box that no one has opened except the Democrats.

This is crystal clear. We ought to take a moment to remember, too, what did not happen after the Obergefell ruling that did happen after the Dobbs ruling. Did anybody harass Justice Kennedy at his home after Obergefell was handed down? No. Did conservatives—those who adhere to the Judeo-Christian heritage of the country, Evangelicals, and Catholics—did anybody vandalize businesses to promote their own viewpoints? Absolutely not. Did Republicans call to abolish the filibuster and add Justices to the Court? No, because we respect the institutions of this Nation.

But that is exactly what we are seeing from the left: a death threat on a Justice, endless protests outside the homes of the Justices, threats on their children, and threats to pack the Court.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an extraordinarily divided time, and reopening this policy, which is under no threat of any legislative or judicial body anywhere, seems more like an attempt by Democrats to stoke fear before the November elections rather than bringing the country together.

Mr. Speaker, we could use an effort to bring the country together right now. To that end, since the Democrats refuse to discuss what Americans are most concerned with, I will take just a moment, since we have the moment here, to walk through the failures of the Democrat policies. It is a quick summary. I won't take long on it.

I have been doing townhalls back in my State of Louisiana, and I can tell you what the people are concerned about, Mr. Speaker.

They are concerned about soaring prices in the grocery store, at the gas pump, and their mortgages.

They are concerned about uninhibited illegal immigration at the border and the utter lawlessness that threatens the very sovereignty, safety, and security of our country.

They are deeply concerned about rising crime in our cities.

They are concerned about the stunning incompetence at the most basic functions of government from the Biden administration.

These are what I am hearing back home as I travel the district holding townhalls and talking to constituents. Those constituents sent us here—the voters, the people—to be their Representatives and to work on their behalf, to work on behalf of them and their ability to provide for their families with little government overreach into their lives.

From economic failures at home to failures on the border, the Democrats have time and time again refused to work with Republicans on how to address the issues at hand. Today is just another example. It is just more of the same. Here we go, from one vote on an unnecessary bill that is only being used as a distraction from those failures that I referenced to a vote on a spending bill that will only make those failures worse.

I mentioned that part of the problem here, too, is the Democrats are rushing this bill to the floor outside regular order. They just completely defied regular order. They released the text for this bill only hours before its consideration in the Rules Committee last night. Democrats have held no legislative hearing and no markups on this bill.

We serve on the Judiciary Committee. This would have been within our jurisdiction. They didn't bother to bring it to a committee.

I remember from civics class that they taught us that this is how a bill becomes a law: You go through the process; you go to the committee. We shouldn't even teach that to kids anymore because it doesn't happen here anymore.

But that recklessness, that carelessness, and that defiance of the rules, order, and tradition here have real consequences because one of the consequences in the language of this bill, just one by way of example, is on page 3 of this private right of action clause. It raised a lot of eyebrows. We didn't have time to analyze that, debate it, and thoughtfully talk about that approach. Would that declare open season on religious persons and institutions? I don't know. It is a question a lot of people are asking today, scratching their heads, but, again, we had no opportunity to delve into that, to talk about it, and debate it. Nothing. So, they present this bill, and they drop it on the country.

Again, I just would reiterate, in summary, people back home ask us, there

are lots of problems with things that are going on there, but this particular bill, what is the problem?

I just summarized it by saying that it is unnecessary, divisive, and misleading. What is worse is that the proponents of the legislation know that.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, much of what the prior two speakers said was absolute nonsense. Some was true.

Unfortunately, pregnancy crisis centers have been the targets of terrorism, and that is deplorable. But so have abortion clinics. They didn't mention that. Abortion clinics have also been the targets of terrorism.

The murder of Dr. Bernard Slepian comes to mind. That is equally deplorable, and we should stop both of them if we can.

The rest of what they said was nonsense.

The Supreme Court logic, the substantive due process logic by which the Court overthrew *Roe v. Wade*, applies equally to *Obergefell*, to *Loving*, and to *Lawrence*, in other words, to the right to contraception, to the right to gay marriage, and to the right to interracial marriage, for that matter.

Justice Thomas mentioned all that specifically. Yes, he said, this case doesn't involve that. We are not deciding that yet, which is the portion of his concurrence that Mr. JOHNSON read, but read the rest of his concurrence where he said specifically that we should overrule or reconsider *Obergefell* and *Lawrence*, which is gay marriage, which is consensual sodomy.

He didn't mention *Loving*, though, for some reason, which is interracial marriage. Maybe the fact that he is intermarried and so is Senator McCONNELL had something to do with it. But the same logic applies there, so that is not nonsense.

Note that they offered no argument against this bill at all. We didn't hear anything about the merits of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this bill, and I think everybody should be in support of it.

It simply says that each State will recognize the other States' marriages and not deny a person the right to marry based on race, gender, or sexual orientation. It urges the Federal Government to do the same thing.

As far as what the Supreme Court said, that we should listen to this and listen to that, the Senate listened to Gorsuch and Kavanaugh when they said that *Roe v. Wade* is precedent. Do you want to listen to them?

Alito, when he was confirmed, said that *Roe v. Wade* is important precedent. Do you want to listen to him?

Listen to Thomas, who told you that we need to look at these cases, and we need to reconsider them. That is gay marriage. He didn't mention inter-

racial, but it is on the same theory. Of course, he is involved in an interracial marriage. He wouldn't be married to justice Ginni but for the *Loving* decision. He mentioned the other case of *Lawrence*.

We need to be concerned. This bill is an American bill. Everybody should be for it. The only reason to be against it is because you really don't want to go on record of being in favor of those rights that have been extended to Americans and that are potentially in jeopardy.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle paint with a broad brush stroke the language offered by Justice Clarence Thomas, a Justice whom I consider to be a friend, a great defender of the Constitution, and a great member of the United States Supreme Court despite being pilloried by the left and laid out as something other than the great patriot that he is.

In his concurrence, Justice Thomas wrote: "After overruling these demonstrably erroneous decisions, the question would remain whether other constitutional provisions guarantee the myriad rights that our substantive due process cases have generated. For example, we could consider whether any of the rights announced in this Court's substantive due process cases are 'privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States' protected by the Fourteenth Amendment."

Now, we could have a robust debate in the Judiciary Committee about this whole issue. We didn't do that. This bill was dropped on the body yesterday afternoon, an hour and a half before Rules. I went and testified before Rules, but we had no benefit of a debate in Judiciary Committee to have a deep discussion about this issue, about the constitutional implications. Nor did we have the ability to debate the reality that the words that this codifies *Obergefell* and *Loving* are simply false. It does no such thing.

I do think in this case, as the chairman pointed out, that it is a full faith and credit recognition issue, but a lot of the rhetoric coming from the left is that this somehow codifies those two opinions. It does not.

It does not do that because those opinions recognized rights under various legal theories, one of which is substantive due process, which Justice Thomas is pointing out he has concerns with because Justice Thomas has concerns with how we make law and how we recognize law. He has concerns about that, the how. It matters, and that is what Justice Thomas laid out. He never said anything about his conclusion on those specific questions but rather the how.

As my colleague from Ohio and my colleague from Louisiana both ade-

quately laid out, the majority opinion lays out very specifically their view about the implication of the Dobbs opinion on these other recognized rights under the previous precedent of the Court. But I think it merits noting that while we are here talking about the substance of the issue that it does matter when the Court steps in and makes law because we end up where we are right here. We end up in a situation with difficult decisions.

For example, when does life begin? When does it begin? When do we have a duty to protect that life?

We could have a very robust debate here in this body if we ever actually debated on the floor of the people's House, but we don't.

□ 1245

When does life begin? It is a complicated question. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't really want to have that discussion, right?

Does life begin at birth?

Does life begin before birth?

You say, Well, it is up to the mother. Well, it is not up to the mother a week after birth. We, society, protect that life, right?

So the debate is: Do you protect that life a week before birth? Do you protect that life at conception? These are actually, difficult complex questions involving faith, involving values, involving life.

But, no, no. We can't have a debate about that here and have a reasoned debate because the Court plucked that out from the people, and the Court manufactured an opinion to define when life begins and how we should deal with it.

Now, we are talking about other issues, talking about marriage. We have had opinions that deal with marriage.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to put forward a bill that is clearly political in nature.

They don't want to talk about inflation. They don't want to talk about wide-open borders. They don't want to talk about rampant crime. They don't want to talk about the state of this country, in decline, heading into a recession, where people are hurting across the country. They don't want to talk about that.

So they bring forward a political bill. And then they want to take different issues and policy choices, marriage, marriage based on race, marriage based on sex, that this body didn't define; that State legislatures did define in varying disagreeable terms across the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. The court steps in in 2015 and now, we are 7 years into recognition of same-sex marriage. And we can have a debate about the policy of that decision, but the Court steps in and says, there you go.

And my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to purposely, for political reasons, conflate lots of different issues.

And I think it is important that my colleagues on this side of the aisle understand what we are doing here today; that we are going to vote on the recognition of marriage, as a body, as representatives of the people. Okay?

Separate from whatever decision a court may make, we are going to make a decision here about the recognition of marriages across State lines where there are differences of opinion still to this day about how one defines marriage.

In the name of full faith and credit, you will go to the people of Texas, by our elected Representatives, to my Republicans on this side of the aisle, Republicans will be voting on this floor today on the question of whether the Federal Government should tell Texas what marriages they have to recognize, irrespective of what the Court has said.

That is a vote; that is a choice; that is a decision. We should not hide behind the use of the Equal Protection Clause with respect to marriage not being impacted because of race, to then say that marriage must be recognized for same-sex purposes by a vote by the body, by the people.

It is a choice, and we should understand that today, and we should understand what we are voting on since we never had the luxury or the benefit or the responsibility of debating this in the Judiciary Committee where we should have debated it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Much of what the gentleman from Texas just said was irrelevant; but he made one correct point. He said that the bill before us today codifies Obergefell. It does, and if Obergefell is not overruled by the Supreme Court, it is not necessary, but it is also not harmful.

If Obergefell is overruled by the Supreme Court, as Justice Thomas hints it might be, then passing this bill becomes vital.

And as to recognizing marriage in one State or another State, obviously, if you get married in Texas and you go to Nevada, you don't get unmarried. You can't be married in one State and not in another State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I think we do understand what we are doing here today; and what we are doing is supporting people's right to love and their equal protection under the law, plain and simple.

Extreme, MAGA Republicans continue to weaponize our government institutions, turning them against the people they are called to protect.

The Respect for Marriage Act will make marriage equality the law of the land.

During Pride Month, the extreme Texas GOP openly declared, openly de-

clared, at their convention their homophobia and bigotry as part of their agenda. They are going as far as labelling same-sex couples as having an abnormal lifestyle.

We will not allow this rightwing obsession to impose their personal religious views on people's private lives to go any further.

To my colleagues across the aisle, and to the Texas GOP, marrying the person you love is not abnormal. It is, frankly, none of your business.

Abnormal is your obsession with what other people do in their private lives and in their homes.

"Love is love." "Amor es amor."

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The chairman of the full committee is right. This legislation would, in fact, codify Obergefell. But what it would also do is reverse the law in 35 States, where those States have said, marriage should be what—you know—traditional marriage. In fact, in 30 of those 35 States, the people of those respective States went to the ballot and voted for that.

So let's be clear. He is right. You can codify what the Court said in that decision, but it would undo what the people in the respective States, 35 States, either in 5 of those States through their elected Representatives in the legislature, or in 30 of those States where the people went to the voting booth and voted, it would undo that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court, in the Obergefell decision, reversed the actions of the people in those 30 or 35 States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, once again, we have gotten a glimpse into the dark future Republicans have in store for Americans unless we stop them.

The Republican-controlled Supreme Court hasn't just stripped women of the right to determine their own future by overturning *Roe v. Wade*, but Justice Clarence Thomas has invited attacks on access to contraceptives, private intimacy between adults, and marriage equality.

Last week, our House Democratic majority voted to codify *Roe v. Wade*, and this week, the House Democratic majority is here to defend your right to marry who you love. I rise in strong and urgent support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

Republicans are intent on turning back the clock to create a group of second-class citizens with limited rights. When they say they want to send these issues back to the States, that is code for wanting to ensure that State legislative bodies can eradicate civil rights protections.

If you think your hard-earned rights are protected, think again, because Republicans are coming for you. Democrats, however, are with you.

To the American public, take note of our votes, and who is with you and who is not.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to see you presiding over this very important legislation. And I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the leadership of bringing this important legislation to the floor. Mr. NADLER has been in the lead on this for decades.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for the Respect for Marriage Act, bipartisan and bicameral legislation to enshrine into law a fundamental freedom, the right to marry whomever you choose.

As radical justices and rightwing politicians continue their assault on our basic rights, Democrats believe that the government has no place between you and the person you love.

Let us salute Judiciary Chairman JERRY NADLER for his persistent leadership on this issue. It was 13 years ago, Chairman NADLER, alongside then-Representative, now-Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, and others introduced a bill by the same name to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act.

Defense of marriage; proposed by somebody who had been married three times. We don't know which marriage he was defending.

And today, we will finally achieve that long-held goal.

I really don't care how many times somebody is married. I care about how they try to impose their hypocrisy on others.

Thank you also to the Congressional LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus Chair DAVID CICILLINE, and all of the members of the Caucus, for being tireless voices in the fight for full equality.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because just 3 weeks ago, the Republican-controlled Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*, ripping away a woman's freedom over her most intimate health decisions.

These radical Justices took a wrecking ball to precedent of the court and privacy in the Constitution and placed even more of our cherished freedoms on the chopping block.

Don't take it from me. Indeed, as Associate Justice Clarence Thomas declared in his concurrence, this is what he said. These are his words: "... in future cases, we should reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including *Griswold*, *Lawrence*, and *Obergefell*. Because any substantive due process decision is 'demonstrably erroneous,' we have a duty to 'correct the error' established by those precedents."

In total defiance of the precedents of the Supreme Court; in total defiance of what some of the candidates for Justice on the Supreme Court testified

that they supported, precedent. And they voted against it. And now, they want to go after other rights of privacy.

Make no mistake: While his legal reasoning is twisted and unsound, it is crucial that we take Justice Thomas and the extremist movement behind him at their word. This is what they intend to do.

Indeed, just yesterday, a Republican Senator declared that the Obergefell decision was clearly wrong, plainly suggesting rightwing interest in taking aim at marriage equality.

We must act now to defend same-sex and interracial marriages from this bigotry and extremism.

In the wake of the Dobbs decision, with marriage rights now squarely in Republican crosshairs, Democrats are ferociously fighting back.

With the landmark Respect for Marriage Act, we ensure that marriage equality remains the law of the land, now and for generations to come. Importantly, this legislation will repeal the unconstitutional and discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act.

The Republicans knew that the Defense of Marriage Act was unconstitutional when they passed it. You know how I know that? Because shortly thereafter, they introduced a bill to overturn—to make sure that the Defense of Marriage Act was not subjected to judicial review. Some of them proclaimed at that time that *Marbury v. Madison*, which established the principle of judicial review was wrongly decided, and they wanted to rid the process of judicial review from the Defense of Marriage Act, recognizing, admitting that they knew it cannot withstand judicial review.

So while it was sent to—the Defense of Marriage—to the dustbin of history with *United States v. Windsor* and *Obergefell v. Hodges*, our bill finally takes it off the books for good. That way, no future administration or majority in Congress can wield this appalling policy as a weapon against our LGBTQ loved ones.

This legislation also guarantees that no married couple can be denied equal protection under Federal law. This is really very important—from tax provisions to Social Security benefits, and more—even if the Court were to erase marriage freedom, God forbid.

Finally, this legislation blocks States from denying recognition to valid, out-of-state marriages, even if a State were to enact heinous restrictions.

By passing the Respect for Marriage Act today, House Democrats, in a bipartisan, bicameral—and I salute the Chairman for that announcement that he made—take another step to defend freedom for the American people.

□ 1300

Last week, our proud pro-choice, pro-women Democratic majority passed two major bills to restore and protect health freedom.

Our Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act will ensure that the fundamental right to travel and obtain needed healthcare remains in the hands of the American people, not in those of extreme rightwing politicians which is the future House Republicans' desire.

Our Women's Health Protection Act will, once again, make the protections of *Roe v. Wade* the law of the land.

Later this week, the House will pass the Right to Contraception Act so that every couple may determine the size and timing of their families as protected by *Griswold v. Connecticut*.

Not just couples; people. Contraception. Contraception. Can you believe they are going after contraception? Well, believe it because they have been going after contraception for decades in the Congress.

Now the Associate Justices have given us clear warning that this is in their sights.

The contrast could not be clearer: While Democrats work to protect and expand freedom in our country, Republicans seek to punish and control our most intimate personal decisions.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous and unconscionable that today, a radical Republican Party seeks to wind back the clock on decades of hard-fought progress.

As we pass this landmark legislation today, we salute the generations of activists and advocates, organizers and mobilizers, who fought relentlessly to advance the all-American ideal of full equality for all.

I say often that our inside maneuvering can just go so far. The outside mobilization produces the best possible results.

Personally, it is with some emotion that I think about my close friends, the iconic Phyllis Lyon and Del Martin of San Francisco. They were an inspiration to so many of us in San Francisco, in California—indeed, the country—teaching us that equality is not about tolerance. It is about respect. It is about taking pride.

This bill makes crystal clear that every couple and their children—imagine if you are the children of a marriage equality or an interracial couple, and you see the Congress of the United States and the Supreme Court of the United States making an assault on your parents' marriage, how damaging that can be.

This bill makes crystal clear that every couple and their children have the fundamental freedom to take pride in their marriage and have their marriage respected under the law.

With that, I urge a strong—hopefully a strongly bipartisan vote for the Respect of Marriage Act. I, again, salute the chairman for his great work.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House just said, "Republicans knew the Defense of Marriage Act was unconstitutional when they passed it."

Did the 118 Democrats who voted for that legislation know the same thing?

Did the President of the United States, President Clinton, when he signed it into law, did he know it was unconstitutional?

I mean, I have heard some ridiculous things said on the House floor in my time here in the United States Congress, but that one—that one—was right up there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), my good friend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have just been treated to a master class of misinformation. The Speaker also just said, "Can you believe they are going after contraception?"

Give me a break. She knows that is not true. There is not a single Republican even talking about that or any of these other categories of the law. This is designed to divide the country. This bill is a shameful effort at that.

Mr. NADLER, when we were talking about our concerns about the care pregnancy centers being under assault, to make his case that pro-lifers are violent, he referenced the terrible murder of Mr. Slepian, an abortion provider, in 1998. That was a quarter century ago.

We are talking about the last 11 weeks. We have had 50 care pregnancy centers vandalized, attacked with Molotov cocktails, spray-painted, threats being made to Supreme Court Justices. There is no equivocation here at all.

Mr. COHEN implied that the conservative Justices misled the Senate in their confirmation hearings. We have got the receipts on that. It is demonstrably untrue.

Justice Samuel Alito, who wrote the majority opinion in *Dobbs*, said during his 2006 confirmation that *Roe* was "... an important precedent of the Supreme Court."

"It was decided in 1973, so it has been on the books for a long time."

But he declined to call the ruling "settled law."

Justice Thomas, in 1991 in his hearings, he declined to comment on his views on *Roe* at all. He said, "I do not think that at this time that I could maintain my impartiality as a member of the Judiciary and comment on that specific case."

Justice Gorsuch, 2017 confirmation hearings, he said *Roe* was "... a precedent of the U.S. Supreme Court. It was reaffirmed in *Casey* in 1992 and in several other cases."

"So a good judge will consider it as precedent of the U.S. Supreme Court worthy as treatment of precedent like any other."

However, he refused to signal how he would rule in future cases on abortion.

Justice Kavanaugh, 2018 confirmation hearings, echoed Gorsuch by saying that *Roe* was an "important precedent," but he indicated during his confirmation that he would be open to overturning "settled law," including

Roe, citing a long list of past Supreme Court cases.

Justice Barrett, she was much more reserved on the Roe precedent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in her confirmation hearings in 2020, she said she was committed to obeying "all the rules of stare decisis," promising that "if a question comes up before me about whether Casey or any other case should be overruled, that I will follow the law of stare decisis, applying it as the Court is articulating it, applying all the factors, reliance, workability, being undermined by later facts in law, just all the standard factors." "I promise to do that for any issue that comes up."

She said that she had to remain neutral on it as an umpire, as they all did.

The record is clear. The quotes are there. Anybody can Google this. What they are presenting here on this floor is not true. It is demonstrably untrue, and they are doing it for partisan purposes. Every time they talk, they reaffirm our position on that.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the far-right 6-3 majority on the Supreme Court is on a rampage against basic freedoms currently enjoyed by the American people.

In his concurring opinion in *Dobbs*, Justice Clarence Thomas gave us a heads-up that the Court is next coming for the ability of same-sex couples to get married.

I am one of only nine openly gay members of this body. For me, this is personal. I still remember where I was on June 24, 2011, the day the New York State legislature passed marriage equality.

I was living with my friends in New York City, but I was still closeted, and I was so afraid, still, that someone might find out the truth about my being gay.

So, instead, I closed the door to my room and cried tears of joy by my lonesome. Finally, my home State of New York had recognized me as a full human being, affirmed all of those scary, yet beautiful feelings that I had bottled up inside for decades; wondering, hoping one day that the world would change.

Four years later, the Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell* sent this same message to millions of LGBTQ+ Americans. I remember being struck then by the words of Justice Kennedy who authored the opinion.

"It would misunderstand these men and women to say they disrespect the idea of marriage. Their plea is that they do respect it, respect it so deeply that they seek to find its fulfillment for themselves. Their hope is not to be

condemned to live in loneliness, excluded from one of civilization's oldest institutions. They ask only for equal dignity in the eyes of the law."

Well, since *Obergefell*, nearly 300,000 same-sex couples have been married. Imagine telling the next generation of Americans—my generation—that we no longer have the right to marry who we love. Congress can't allow that to happen.

I am proud to introduce along with my colleagues, including Representative NADLER, the Respect for Marriage Act, which would codify the right to marriage equality under Federal law, but we have to do more than that. We have to expand the Supreme Court of the United States to protect fundamental rights once and for all.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York, (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans want to talk about anything but marriage equality today. It is almost like they don't have any good arguments to make on marriage equality.

Mr. Speaker, my husband, Randy, and I have been together for 30 years. We have raised three remarkable kids from diapers to college diplomas. During all those years, during all that time together, we have only been legally married since 2014. We had a 22-year engagement before an 8-year marriage.

When I was elected as a Member of Congress in 2012, my husband, Randy, couldn't have health insurance through this body. His spouse ID said companion on it, and we had to fight to get him one of these security pins we all wear.

But through hard work and a historic coalition, through great allies and partnerships, love won. On the day the Supreme Court decided we had equality rights for marriage in this country, a bunch of us stood in front of the Court and sang the national anthem because it is a beautiful thing when your country catches up to you.

Today, we are going to vote for the Respect for Marriage Act to decide and to make clear whether or not we will go back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, whether or not every American, despite their race or their sexuality, has the freedom to marry the person they love; it is a simple choice, and I know where I stand. Every Member of Congress will get to stand and be counted today, and you can choose between equality or discrimination.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Respect for Marriage Act to enshrine the right to marry the person you love under Federal law by repealing the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act.

In the wake of the Supreme Court's overturning of *Roe v. Wade*, the doors have been swung wide open for unelected judges to further strip protections from the American people.

This crucial bill reaffirms our commitment to a promise of equality for all, erasing further discrimination still on the books against same-sex marriage, and protecting the constitutional right to marriage equality, including interracial marriage. We will not allow the clock to be rolled back even further.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative we pass the Respect for Marriage Act.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill—whether or not you support current law on marriage in this country, which includes for the LGBT and the interracial couples across the Nation.

My friend from Ohio said this bill is unnecessary. This bill is very necessary because the extremist-packed Supreme Court recently took away a half a century of law on Roe.

In that decision, Justice Clarence Thomas said they should revisit marriage equality. We have people in this House and in the Senate, like Senator TED CRUZ, who have said the exact same thing.

Here is what I want, I want to make sure that my husband, Phil, can visit me in the hospital, should I have to go back again, like when I had a triple bypass a few years ago.

I want to ensure my husband has my earned benefits for retirement and Social Security. I want to make sure that my husband is taken care of just like your spouses are taken care of.

If I was the entity on the other side of the aisle, I would be more concerned when my own Member is accused of having cocaine-fueled orgies than worrying about the morality of my marriage.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED).

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

With these words, our Founders summed up the entire theory of what

has become our constitutional Republic. But since the Supreme Court's ruling overturning *Roe v. Wade*, we have seen inalienable rights, like the right to choose how and who to form a family with, openly questioned by Justices on the Supreme Court and rightwing politicians.

Mr. Speaker, love is love. It took us far too long to recognize the right for same-sex couples to marry. Within 7 years since it was, millions of Americans have come to expect that they, too, will be able to fall in love and marry the person of their choosing.

What right could be more foundational? Their marriages, their family, their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is worth protecting, and that is why I will proudly vote for the Respect for Marriage Act.

□ 1315

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, before us is a bill, the Respect for Marriage Act.

I woke up this morning, got ready to come over to the Capitol, and as I often do, I glanced over to pictures of my family, and I glanced to a picture of my 9-month-old grandson. I couldn't be happier about the newest addition to our family. I couldn't be prouder of the two people who brought him into the world, my daughter Corey and her wife Hedy.

When my daughter told me she wanted to get married, I told her what every good parent should tell their children, that if this is the person you want to spend the rest of your life with, I couldn't be happier for you.

Shortly after that announcement of wanting to get married, my daughter had some terrible news. Her fiancée just found out she had breast cancer. With decisions facing them, they decided to get married right away.

Given all the complications that come with managing treatment, the decision to get married quickly was incredibly important. As I stood at their wedding, in a U.S. court, with a Federal judge presiding over their union, I knew it was only made possible because of a recent Supreme Court decision.

Today, we consider that legislation. That same Court has opened the door to dismantling families like mine, splitting this little guy's family apart potentially. We can't let that happen.

We are talking about marriage, two committed people, to make sure they have a secure family, and all we have to do is vote "yes." Don't complicate the issue. It is that simple.

I don't speak about the religious beliefs of my colleagues, but I have to ask: What God would find fault in this baby and his two mommies? There is nothing wrong with this. This is pure love. It is what we all should aspire to.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" so we are equal in all States.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act.

Like many Americans, I was deeply disturbed by Justice Thomas' opinion in *Dobbs v. Jackson*, which actually named marriage equality as the next piece of settled case law that he is intent on destroying.

Let's face it, marriage equality is at risk in America, and we must pass legislation to enshrine the right to marry for same sex and interracial couples before it is too late.

Early in my career, when I was a State representative, I supported legislation to ban discrimination based on sexual orientation. I remember discussing this bill with my late father, who grew up during the civil rights movement. He was no activist, but he firmly believed that all Americans should be entitled to equal civil rights.

Just like the Jim Crow laws, which legalized discrimination, that existed during his lifetime, he believed that our Nation's discriminatory treatment of LGBTQ Americans would mark a shameful chapter in our Nation's history.

When the Supreme Court legalized marriage equality, we turned a page granting equal protection under the law for all Americans, no matter who they love. But now I fear that future is no longer guaranteed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill so that marriage equality remains the law of the land.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) have said, we think this legislation is unnecessary.

Justice Alito was very clear—again, it has been read several times—the *Dobbs* decision should not be misunderstood or mischaracterized to cast doubt on precedents that do not concern abortion.

The Court couldn't have been clearer. The *Obergefell* decision undid what 35 States have as law in their respective States. Thirty of those States it was the vote of the people, as I said before. But this legislation is going to, I guess, just go after the decision of the respective States, and, as I said, the voters in those States.

I think it is also, as we have indicated, a further effort to intimidate the Court. We have had Senator SCHUMER's statements on the Supreme

Court steps, we have had the AG's inaction with regard to protestors at Justices' homes, and, of course, we have had the Democrats' introduction of a bill to add four Associate Justices to the Supreme Court to pack the Court, and not focus on some of the things that are so pressing.

I mean, Mr. JOHNSON was right when he talked about 50 attacks on churches and pro-life crisis pregnancy centers in 11 weeks. That last clause is important. In that short a time frame, that sustained effort by the left to go after the pro-life community and places of worship is as wrong as it gets. I would love to have a hearing on that issue and what actions we might be able to take to help stop that because that is not supposed to happen in our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Respect for Marriage Act provides additional stability for the millions of American married couples and families that have ordered their lives around the constitutional guarantee of marriage equality. It has nothing to do with attacks on abortion clinics. It has nothing to do with attacks on so-called pregnancy crisis centers. It has to do with marriage.

This legislation repeals an unconstitutional and discriminatory statute that the Court has effectively rendered inoperative, but which remains on the books. It is time to appeal this abhorrent law and fix the mistake that Congress made a generation ago while we reinforce and cement current law.

As I pointed out before, the *Obergefell* decision is a decision of the Supreme Court. If that decision is not overturned, this bill is unnecessary but harmless. If that decision is overturned, this bill is crucial, and we don't know what this Court is going to do. Despite what Justice Alito said, Justice Thomas suggested that the decision on gay marriage ought to be overruled.

We have seen this Court overrule other precedent in *Dobbs*, so who can be confident that the Court will not overturn the *Lawrence* decision or, rather, the *Obergefell* decision? Who can be confident of that? The answer is no one.

As to the gentleman from Ohio's comment that the people in, I think he said, 33 States or whatever have decided that gay marriage should not be, and it should be up to the people of each State, that is absurd. And that is why we have one of the provisions of this bill. You can't be married in Texas and not be married in New York or vice versa. You can't lose your marriage status by crossing a State line.

This legislation is very necessary to make sure that people have the right to remain married, that gay couples have the right to get married, have the right to stay married, and that is why leading national organizations have endorsed the bill, including the ACLU,

the Equality Federation, Family Equality Council, Freedom for All Americans, GLAAD, the Human Rights Campaign, Lambda Legal, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the National Black Justice Coalition, the National Center for Lesbian Rights, the National Women's Law Center, and PFLAG. They know what is going on. They know what is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, this is a long overdue bill. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Dobbs v. Jackson* demonstrated not only the extremist majority of justices' disregard for constitutional precedent; it also showed their disregard for the individual liberties of the American people. As if depriving women of their constitutional right to reproductive health care weren't enough, Justice Thomas' concurring opinion specifically opened the door to the overturning of *United States v. Windsor* and *Obergefell v. Hodges*—and implicitly we can read this to mean *Loving v. Virginia* as well. These cases established constitutional protections for same-sex and interracial marriage in America.

Today, 1.1 million Americans arc in same-sex marriages. Almost ten times as many are in interracial marriages. One of the very first votes I took as a young state senator in Maryland after my first election to public office was to repeal our state's vile and racist anti-miscegenation law. That was in 1967, five years after the Supreme Court's decision in *Loving v. Virginia*. Fifty-five years have now passed since that ruling. It has been nine and seven years, respectively, since the *Windsor* and *Obergefell* rulings. Americans have become used to knowing that they have a constitutional right to equal marriage. Indeed, American women had gotten used to the security of knowing that they had a constitutional right to reproductive choice for forty-nine years until last month.

Just as was the case with the immediate aftermath of the *Dobbs* ruling, at least thirty-five states already have laws or amendments in their state constitution that would outlaw same-sex marriage if *Obergefell* were overturned. We must do everything in our power to ensure that Republican-controlled state legislatures don't have the opportunity to restrict the rights of LGBTQ or interracial couples in America. Neither government officials nor Supreme Court justices should be able to decide that consenting American adults cannot marry. That's why I'm bringing the Respect for Marriage Act to the Floor today to codify the marriage equality precedents set by *Loving*, *Windsor*, and *Obergefell* into federal statute.

I want to thank Chairman NADLER, Rep. CICILLINE, all the Co-Chairs of the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus, Chairwoman BEATTY, Chairman RUIZ, Chairwoman CHU, and Democratic Caucus Chairman JEFFRIES for taking the lead on this crucial legislation.

We cannot afford to underestimate the risk to marriage equality. We cannot afford to be complacent and take for granted the rights we have under the constitution as Americans. The millions of same-sex and interracial couples throughout the United States should not have to live with the fear that extremist Supreme Court justices—who act as though they are

legislators—could end legal recognition for their families or prevent millions of others from being able to build families with equal legal status. They deserve the assurance that their marriages will always be recognized in every city, county, and state across the country. That is the overwhelming consensus of the American people, and it is the clear view of our constitution.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting 'yes' on this legislation to protect and respect marriages across our country.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Respect for Marriage Act of 2022. Thank you to Judiciary Chair JERROLD NADLER for introducing H.R. 8404, LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus Chair DAVID CICILLINE, and Tri-Caucus Chairs for your leadership to fight for equal rights for all communities.

Everyone should have the equal right to marry whomever they love—whatever their identity, race or ethnicity.

While the Supreme Court ruled the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act unconstitutional, in the wake of the Court's decision to overturn *Roe*, we cannot rely on the Court alone to protect our rights. First, they attacked our reproductive rights, but next, they'll attack our right to marriage. What's next?

It is unconscionable that any person should face a situation where their marriage is threatened or rendered invalid because of the dangerous whims of the few who want to take this country backwards.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the entire House to support this bill, protect our right to marriage, and defend our people from the senseless assault on our liberties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1232, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Adrian Swann, one of his secretaries.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS CERTAIN BILLS

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 9 of House Resolution 1232, I move to suspend the rules and

pass, H.R. 1286, H.R. 2024, H.R. 3222, H.R. 6337, and H.R. 7002.

The Clerk read the titles of the bills. The text of the bills are as follows:

SOUTHERN CAMPAIGN OF THE REVOLUTION
NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR ACT OF 2021
H.R. 1286

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Southern Campaign of the Revolution National Heritage Corridor Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR.—The term "National Heritage Corridor" means the Southern Campaign of the Revolution National Heritage Corridor established by section 3(a).

(2) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The term "Local Coordinating Entity" means the local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Corridor.

(3) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term "management plan" means the management plan for the National Heritage Corridor required under section 5(a).

(4) MAP.—The term "map" means the map entitled "Southern Campaign of the Revolution Proposed National Heritage Corridor", numbered 257/177.271, and dated September 2021.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) STATES.—The term "States" means the States of South Carolina and North Carolina.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF SOUTHERN CAMPAIGN OF THE REVOLUTION NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Southern Campaign of the Revolution National Heritage Corridor in the States of North Carolina and South Carolina, as generally depicted on the map.

(b) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The University of South Carolina shall serve as the local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Corridor.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) AUTHORITIES.—For purposes of carrying out the management plan for the National Heritage Corridor, the Secretary acting through the local coordinating entity may use amounts made available under this Act—

(1) to make grants to the States or a political subdivision of the States, Indian Tribes, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

(2) to enter into cooperative agreements with, or provide technical assistance to, the States or a political subdivision of the States, Indian Tribes, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties;

(3) to hire and compensate staff, which shall include individuals with expertise in natural, cultural, and historical resources protection and heritage programming;

(4) to obtain money or services from any source, including any money or services that are provided under any other Federal law or program, provided that any money specifically authorized for National Heritage areas shall be subject to a 50 percent cost-share requirement;

(5) to contract for goods or services; and

(6) to undertake or be a catalyst for any other activity that furthers the purposes of the National Heritage Corridor and is consistent with the approved management plan.

(b) DUTIES.—The local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Corridor shall—

(1) in accordance with section 5, prepare and submit a management plan for the National Heritage Corridor to the Secretary;

(2) assist Federal agencies, the States or a political subdivision of the States, Indian Tribes, regional planning organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties in carrying out the approved management plan by—