

Additionally, the collaborative was able to build boat rigs, complete the building of administrative and recreation facilities for the Forest Service and an airstrip for aviators, as well as provide road maintenance for administrative sites.

I am so proud to highlight the men and women who stepped up and made a difference for the benefit of all in the Hells Canyon river area. I look forward to hearing about more good work from them.

□ 0915

#### CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS THE DEBT CEILING

(Mr. LEVIN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a looming crisis facing our country. This one is a man-made crisis, one born out of cruel political calculations.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the threat of some of our Republican colleagues to refuse to raise the debt ceiling next year, unless their most extreme demands are met, and they have made clear what those demands are.

They believe this threat is how they can finally force cuts to the Social Security benefits that millions of Americans have earned. This threat is how they are going try to raise the retirement age. This is how they want to force cuts to Medicare.

They are prepared to force a default and create catastrophic consequences for our economy and America's standing in the world, so they can slash Social Security and Medicare.

We can't let that happen. We must address the debt ceiling. The consequences if we don't act are too grave.

To all of my colleagues, we must not hold Social Security and Medicare hostage. We must address the debt ceiling as soon as possible.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID "WALLY" WALLER

(Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of David "Wally" Waller, a Polk County, Florida, native who passed away last month at the age of 67 following a courageous battle with cancer.

Wally was a hero to our community in more ways than one, beginning with his 25-year career in law enforcement. After retiring, he became a hero to countless children while serving as program coordinator for the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve's Toys for Tots program.

Under Wally's leadership, Polk County's Toys for Tots was named the top program in the United States last year

with more than 57,000 toys collected for over 14,000 children. Those who volunteered with him said he was the heart and soul of Toys for Tots, a title he richly deserved.

On behalf of our community, thank you, Wally and "Well done, thy good and faithful servant."

#### RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1510, 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, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Respect for Marriage Act".

##### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) No union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family.

(2) Diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises. Therefore, Congress affirms that such people and their diverse beliefs are due proper respect.

(3) Millions of people, including interracial and same-sex couples, have entered into marriages and have enjoyed the rights and privileges associated with marriage. Couples joining in marriage deserve to have the dignity, stability, and ongoing protection that marriage affords to families and children.

##### SEC. 3. 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. 4. 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. 5. 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 between 2 individuals and 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 between 2 individuals and 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. 6. NO IMPACT ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND CONSCIENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to diminish or abrogate a religious liberty or conscience protection otherwise available to an individual or organization under the Constitution of the United States or Federal law.

(b) GOODS OR SERVICES.—Consistent with the First Amendment to the Constitution, nonprofit religious organizations, including churches, mosques, synagogues, temples, nondenominational ministries, interdenominational and ecumenical organizations, mission organizations, faith-based social agencies, religious educational institutions, and nonprofit entities whose principal purpose is the study, practice, or advancement of religion, and any employee of such an organization, shall not be required to provide services, accommodations, advantages, facilities, goods, or privileges for the solemnization or celebration of a marriage. Any refusal under this subsection to provide such services, accommodations, advantages, facilities, goods, or privileges shall not create any civil claim or cause of action.

##### SEC. 7. STATUTORY PROHIBITION.

(a) NO IMPACT ON STATUS AND BENEFITS NOT ARISING FROM A MARRIAGE.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to deny or alter any benefit, status, or right of an otherwise eligible entity or person which does not arise from a marriage, including tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense.

(b) NO FEDERAL RECOGNITION OF POLYGAMOUS MARRIAGES.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to require or authorize Federal recognition of marriages between more than 2 individuals.

##### SEC. 8. 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.

##### MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Nadler of New York moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 8404.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1510, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 in which 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, I rise in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act. I first introduced a version of this legislation in 2009, and I am very proud that after a long journey it will soon be headed to the President's desk and marriage equality will be enshrined in law.

The House took an important step in July when it passed the bill with the support of 47 Republican Members. Now that the Senate has passed an amended version, also with bipartisan support, it is up to us to finish the job.

I find it deeply poignant that as we prepare to bring the 117th Congress to a close, we are on the cusp of a great bipartisan moral victory in defense of a fundamental right of all Americans, a victory that will provide stability and reassurance to the millions of LGBTQ and interracial families that have come to rely on the constitutional right to marry.

The Respect for Marriage Act does three things: First, it repeals the so-called Defense of Marriage Act, which blatantly discriminates against same-sex couples, and which still officially remains on the books.

Second, it enshrines marriage equality for Federal law purposes, requiring the Federal Government to consider a person to be married if the marriage is valid in the State where it was performed.

Finally, it prohibits anyone acting under color of State law from denying full legal effect to a valid out-of-state marriage based on the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of the two individuals in the marriage.

The Senate amendment does not change any of these substantive provisions. Rather, it adds language that explicitly affirms that existing constitutional and other legal protections for religious liberty remain in effect. The Senate amendment does not create any new substantive legal rights, but rather, it clarifies that the bill does not affect the existing legal rights or benefits of religious persons or entities. It also explicitly clarifies that the bill

does not require or authorize the Federal Government to recognize polygamous marriages.

It is because of this compromise—the result of the hard work of Senators TAMMY BALDWIN and SUSAN COLLINS—that the amended bill passed the Senate by a vote of 61–36 with 12 Republican Senators voting in support.

While marriage equality remains constitutionally protected today, we have learned in recent months that rights once thought to be fundamental and forever secure can, in fact, be taken away. Indeed, in the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*—a decision overturning nearly 50 years of precedent recognizing a constitutional right to abortion—Justice Clarence Thomas went out of his way to write a separate concurrence calling on the Court to reconsider all of its substantive due process decisions, including *Obergefell v. Hodges*, the decision recognizing a right to marriage equality.

In light of this concurrence, even if one accepts the *Dobbs* majority's assurances that the constitutional right to marriage equality is settled law, Congress must use this opportunity to provide additional reassurance to the many American families who have come to rely on this guarantee. After all, we were told that the right to abortion was settled law.

The Respect for Marriage Act cements respect for married couples, which all Americans—including those in this Congress—should support and value.

I thank the co-chairs of the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus, the chairs of the Congressional Tri-Caucus, and incoming House Democratic leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES for joining me in introducing this legislation. I also thank my chief of staff, Amy Rutkin, who helped to do so much to guide this legislation through the House.

I urge all Members to support this Senate amendment to H.R. 8404, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats want Americans to believe that the Supreme Court at any moment—in fact, the chairman just referenced this—at any moment could step in and overturn its opinions in *Obergefell* and *Loving*. It is just not true. The Supreme Court is not poised to overturn its opinions in either of those decisions.

Just look at what the Court has said. The *Dobbs* opinion does not undermine other substantive due process rights in any way. Just in case anyone is not clear on the meaning of does not undermine them in any way, the Court later reiterated that the *Dobbs* decision should not be misunderstood or mischaracterized “. . . to cast doubt on precedents that do not concern abortion.”

The Court condemned the alarmist idea that the *Dobbs* decision would lead

to the overturning of other cases as “perhaps . . . designed to stoke unfounded fear that our decision will imperil those other rights . . .”

It is that unfounded fear that brings us here today.

Democrats have conjured up this nonexistent threat based on one line in Justice Thomas' concurrence in *Dobbs*, and they are misunderstanding or deliberately misrepresenting what Justice Thomas wrote.

Justice Thomas made the same point that he has made for years: that the collection of rights secured by the doctrine of substantive due process is better understood as being a function of the Constitution's privileges and immunities clause. That is it.

From his statement that a body of law should flow from one place in the Constitution instead of another comes the hyperbolic arguments that we have heard about the necessity of this bill.

After the House last considered this bill in July, the Senate was forced to make significant changes to the bill. Unfortunately, those changes do not go far enough in protecting religious liberty.

For example, the Senate amendment does not protect a private entity that is determined to be a State actor as a result of the services they provide on behalf of a government. These entities could be adoption agencies, shelters, or other service providers operated by a religious organization under contract with a city or State.

Across the country, people of faith serve their neighbors and their communities through these charitable efforts, but this bill could force them to abandon their faith or abandon the service. That is an unacceptable outcome in the United States.

For years, the Democrats have been playing a dangerous game with the Court. They want Americans to believe that the Court lacks transparency and struggles with its ethics. That is simply not true.

This bill is simply the latest installment of the Democrat's campaign to intimidate the highest court in our land. They have engaged in a smear campaign against sitting Justices and nominees. Democrats have stood on the steps of the Court and threatened Justices by name for not ruling the way they want in high-profile cases. Democrat members of the Judiciary Committee, including the chairman, have introduced a bill to pack the Court; to add four Justices to our highest court—not one, not two, not three, but four, because they simply want to take it over.

Democrats have held hearings to showcase fringe legal and conspiracy theories about the Court and its rulings.

In fact, later today, the Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing to again suggest that the Court has somehow been compromised based on a totally unsubstantiated allegation that Justice Alito leaked information 8 years

ago about an opinion in the Hobby Lobby case.

There is just one problem: Justice Alito denies this allegation. The individual who allegedly was the conduit for the leak denies it ever happened. Even the media admits there are holes in the story.

Politico said this:

We spent several months attempting to corroborate the allegation but was unable to locate anyone who heard about the decision directly from Alito or his wife before the release of the case.

The New York Times reported that there are “gaps” in the allegation. The New York Times is the one who broke the story. They reported there are gaps in this allegation about a leak from Justice Alito 8 years ago. Gaps in an allegation.

Do you know what that is? That is liberal-speak for that story doesn't add up. But the Democrats are determined to not let the truth get in the way of their story and their intimidation tactics on the Court.

This is not the way we are supposed to operate. I hope that we can vote this bill down. I hope it does not pass because I think it is dangerous and takes the country in the wrong direction.

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).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote for equality and against discrimination by finally overturning the exclusionary, homophobic Defense of Marriage Act and guaranteeing crucial protections for same-sex and interracial marriages.

By passing the Respect for Marriage Act, we will ensure that all Americans continue to be afforded the same rights by the government—no matter what the Supreme Court may decide in the future.

As we take this vote, we can take pride in the progress that we have made but also must acknowledge the work that lies ahead.

The idea of marriage equality used to be a farfetched idea; now it is the law of the land and supported by the vast majority of Americans. Marriage bans used to be a partisan tool. Now, the Respect for Marriage Act has received strong bipartisan votes in both Chambers.

Protecting marriage equality is now a bipartisan idea that I hope all my colleagues will embrace. I urge all those here today who previously voted against this bill to reconsider, be part of history, and join us in voting for its passage today.

Today's vote is a monumental win in the fight for LGBTQ+ equality, but the work does not stop here. We remain the only minority group in America where in a majority of States it is still legal to discriminate against us in several key areas of life.

We must continue to work for full equality for the LGBTQ+ community,

including by enacting additional protections at the State level and finally passing the Equality Act to ensure explicit Federal protections against anti-LGBTQ+ discrimination.

I want to end by thanking Chairman NADLER for his extraordinary leadership. He has been a champion of this bill for more than 13 years. I was proud to join him and others in introducing the Respect for Marriage Act again this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” vote for equality, and vote to be certain that we live in a country where all Americans have equal access to the important institution of marriage.

□ 0930

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to adamantly oppose H.R. 8404, the disrespect for marriage act. This unnecessary and misguided legislation not only disrespects the importance of traditional marriage for the health of a family, but also disrespects people and organizations of faith who have the constitutional right to carry out their mission in accordance with their most deeply held beliefs.

With a crisis at the border, inflation skyrocketing, and a Federal budget that is nowhere to be seen just a week before Christmas, Democrats have made it abundantly clear that this disrespectful policy is their priority.

Let's be clear: Obergefell is not in danger, but people and institutions of faith are.

This bill only serves to further demonize biblical values by establishing a private right of action against organizations who believe in natural marriage, opening the floodgates for predatory lawsuits against people of faith. The bill's only purpose is to hand the Federal Government a legal bludgeoning tool to drive people of faith out of the public square and to silence anyone who dissents.

Sadly, the Senate rejected three amendments that would have eliminated the private right of action and prevented the government from infringing on the freedom of religion.

Instead, a flimsy amendment that includes vague language unlikely to protect anyone was included.

Unfortunately, and likely intentionally, this hollow amendment provides no tangible protections for religious schools, no protections for faith-based adoption and foster care agencies, no protections for Christian businesses who contract with the government, and no protections for civil servants who justly believe marriage is between one man and one woman.

The bill's implications: submit to our ideology or be silenced.

This is yet another step toward the Democrats' goal of dismantling the traditional family, silencing voices of

faith, and permanently undoing our country's God-woven foundation. This is the Democrats' priority.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you my priority: Protect religious liberty, protect people of faith, and protect Americans who believe in the true meaning of marriage.

I hope and pray that my colleagues will find the courage to join me in opposing this misguided and dangerous bill.

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

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to say that we received amazing news this morning. Brittney Griner is coming home.

This is a huge relief for her, her wife, Chelle, and her family after months of uncertainty in Russia's sham justice system. I thank President Biden, Secretary Blinken, and all at the State Department who made this happen.

Today, in a strong symbol of the stark differences in the freedoms between our two Nations, the U.S. Congress will vote in a bipartisan way to pass the Respect for Marriage Act enshrining marriage equality into Federal law and protecting marriages just like Brittney's.

I am proud to vote today to say that love is love no matter who you are or where you live and no matter what any future extreme or out-of-touch Supreme Court may say.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” and standing up for freedom.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the so-called Respect for Marriage Act. Honestly, this bill should be called the disrespect for marriage act.

This bill certainly disrespects God's definition of marriage, a definition that has served His creation well for more than 5,000 years of recorded history. And His definition is the only one that really matters.

This bill would codify into Federal law the Supreme Court's wrongly decided Obergefell decision and ensure that the marriage laws in the most liberal State—irrespective of how more radical they might become in the future, think polygamy, bestiality, child marriage, or whatever—must be legally recognized in all States.

It was wrong when the Supreme Court made law in the Obergefell decision requiring that the marriage law in Massachusetts had to become the law of the whole country when Massachusetts approved gay marriage.

This was overriding the will of the people and their elected Representatives as no other State to that point had been able to pass through referendum or State legislature a gay marriage law.

The fact is that traditional, biblical marriage is the foundation of a strong society and a strong culture.

I will say it once again: almost everything that plagues our society is a failure to follow God's design for marriage, morality, and the family. The perfect, omniscient, and immutable God knows what He is doing.

But this legislation repeals the correct definition of marriage in Federal code and requires the Federal Government to recognize any marriage if the marriage was valid in the State where it was performed.

Perhaps even worse, this bill eliminates all religious freedom protections for churches or other faith-based organizations and requires everyone to participate in and recognize gay marriage.

It empowers the IRS with their newly hired 87,000 agents who apparently need something to do to go after the religious institutions that simply seek to operate according to their beliefs. In fact, the bill does nothing to prevent the IRS from attacking and harming the religious organizations that have made an incredible impact in our communities across our Nation.

It is simply designed to undermine marriage as a union between one man and one woman. God's perfect design is, indeed, marriage between one man and one woman for life, and it doesn't matter what you think or what I think. That is what the Bible says.

This proposal is yet another Democrat attempt to undermine the fundamental values which formed our Nation and continue to hold our country together: recognition of the institution of marriage as between one man and one woman and respect for the freedom to operate according to your sincerely held religious beliefs.

The legislation we are considering today is a sobering indication of the erosion of the moral values that made this Nation great.

As President Reagan once said: "America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

All great nations in societies fall from within. With Democrats threatening all sense of values and decency and family today by sexualizing kids in school, redefining sex and gender, and trans-surgery and mutilation of minors, it makes no sense for any Republican to support their efforts to codify their views on marriage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues in this body to join me in strongly opposing this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, it is never too late to do the right thing. Thanks to bipartisan work in the Senate, the Respect for Marriage Act comes back to the House with added language that should allay anyone's fears or misunderstandings, yet still ensure we can legally recognize marriage as it is currently recognized in this country.

It would be wrong to say that my husband, Phil, and I have a marriage that is any different from anyone else's

marriage here in this body. My workplace health insurance should extend to my husband just like yours extends to your spouse. I should be able to visit my husband in the hospital, if need be, just like you can visit your spouse. My earned benefits for retirement, Social Security, our property rights, our benefits through our taxes, and so much more should be no different, regardless of if your spouse is named Samuel or Samantha.

That is what we will do today. With the revised Respect for Marriage Act, denying legal recognition to any legally married couple would be so far out of the mainstream that it would actually be discrimination. I am sure no one here would intend to discriminate against me and my spouse, as I would never against you and yours.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone's support for this bill.

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

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Respect for Marriage Act. Over my time in Congress as the first openly gay Member of color elected in history, the fight for LGBTQ equality has remained a critical and personal focus of mine. Last week, the Senate took long-overdue action to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, and when my colleagues and I pass the Respect for Marriage Act in the House today, it will mean the world to me, my loved ones, and to millions of Americans.

Nearly 10 years ago, at the start of my career in Congress, the Supreme Court ruled in *Obergefell v. Hodges* that marriage equality is a fundamental protected right. We took to the streets in fervent celebration of this cornerstone victory for our community.

This bill will pass today, but it is a reminder of the necessity of our vigilance in the fight for human rights and the need to hold the judicial branch accountable. We must rise to the challenge, and we will prevail.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to what I believe is the inappropriately named Respect for Marriage Act because if what my colleagues have just said were actually all that was here, it would be a different story to some degree. But that is not what we are talking about.

The bill betrays our country's commitment to the fundamental right of religious liberty by depriving religious and faith-based organizations of their tax-exempt status and depriving individual people of faith of being able to carry out fully their faith without repercussions. Licenses and government contracts are also put at risk here with this legislation.

As a result, religiously affiliated and faith-based organizations will be at risk of being compelled to make hiring decisions in contradiction to their tenets. And I am not just talking about Christian religions. We are talking about all that are impacted by this.

It puts us at risk for Catholic Charities' ability to find foster and adoptive homes for children in need; or a gospel rescue mission's ability to serve the homeless; and it would likely be the end of the school choice initiatives that rely on religious schools—schools of faith—to serve at-risk children trapped in failing schools. Additionally, businessowners across the country who conduct their businesses based on their sincerely held faith, beliefs, and principles would be subject to lawsuits simply because they have a traditional view of marriage.

Again, if all that my colleagues have just even recently said were the only thing about this legislation, it would be another story; but it isn't, it goes way beyond. A deep appreciation for and commitment to following science in the positive endeavor of continuing the human race is important.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for opposition to this legislation and a more thoughtful approach.

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

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, my wife, Cheryl, and I were married 14 years ago when one of the first States in our country allowed us to do so. It took years and a Supreme Court ruling to acknowledge and grant the legal protections that come with marriage across this great land. In the ensuing years, we raised our four sons, and we expanded our family of six to nine, adding two daughters-in-law and a grandson to that mix.

I am standing here today because in the year 2022, families like mine are, once again, concerned that an activist, out-of-step Supreme Court is going to take those rights away. Just so we are clear, that Supreme Court and the Members in opposition of this legislation today are out of step with the American people.

Today, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Respect for Marriage Act, a bill that takes the longstanding and overdue step of repealing DOMA and ensures that same-sex and interracial marriage is recognized in every State, no matter who is sitting on the Supreme Court.

We have made progress. Mr. Speaker, let's not go back.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just first say, the previous speaker talked about being out of step with the American people.

Are you kidding me?

The Democrats are the party who think men can use women's restrooms; the Democrats are the party who think boys can participate in girls' sports; the Democrats are the party who think you can take the life of an unborn child

right up until their birthday; and the Democrats are the party who actually had a witness in committee who said that she thought men could get pregnant.

And we are the ones who are out of step?

You have got to be kidding me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, what is our job here?

We are going to take an oath in a couple of weeks here really outlining our job: supporting and defending the Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies foreign and domestic.

I took that oath as a member of the military; I have taken that oath numerous times as member of the U.S. House of Representatives. The U.S. House of Representatives, a bicameral body, 435 of us, are meant to do the work of protecting we the people of the United States of America who elect us, and I want to quote our colleague on the other side, Ms. SCANLON, who was talking about what we don't have time for here as our colleague, CHIP ROY, was asking for amendments to ensure that we the people's religious freedom was not prohibited, that the free exercise thereof was not prohibited.

□ 0945

Adopting an amendment by our colleague, CHIP ROY, she said, would unsettle the Senate. God forbid the work that we do here in the House of Representatives unsettles the work that is done in the Senate. Our job must be to just do their bidding of what they decide in the Senate and not represent as 1 of 435.

But, no, that is not the real case. Our job is to represent our constituents, we the people, not to worry about whether we unsettle or don't unsettle the Senate.

Let me give you another quote from our colleague about why we don't have the time to prohibit or to prevent prohibiting the free exercise thereof. She said that this Congress is coming to a close, and we don't have time to make changes to this legislation.

We don't have the time? Wait a second. In the U.S. House of Representatives, our oath is to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. It is our singular job here, and we don't have the time to do it?

That is what the majority is telling us: We don't have time to make changes to the bill, to ensure that the free exercise thereof, of our people's religions, is not infringed upon. They are saying we don't have time.

What the hell are we doing here if we don't have the time to do it? What the hell are we doing?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, why are we here this morning? We are

here because dignity should be part of life in America. We are here because the Founding Fathers, imperfect as they were, said we are here to create a more perfect union.

We are specifically here because a Justice on the United States Supreme Court, Justice Clarence Thomas, appallingly stated that other cherished, fundamental rights should be subject to abrogation, writing: "In future cases, we should reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including *Griswold*, *Lawrence*, and *Obergefell*."

It is shameful that we would have to be here today, but I proudly stand with my community, those who understand and recognize that it is crucial for the Respect for Marriage Act to pass so that respect can go for the loving relationships, the families, the daughters, the sons, the aunts and uncles, and all the husbands and wives that come as family.

Let me be very clear: I am the only Member in the Texas delegation that voted against the Defense of Marriage Act. I voted against it.

DOMA was wrong then, it is wrong now, and I continuously stand with all of you to pass H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support for H.R. 8404, the "Respect for Marriage Act" and the collaboration in the Senate last week that enabled it to pass the Senate and return to the House for today's vote.

I am very concerned that the archaic dictum that the Supreme Court used in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* to justify overturning the well-established and reaffirmed right to abortion could be further weaponized in the future to strip away other fundamental rights, including the right to marriage equality.

Specifically, in his concurring opinion to the *Dobbs* decision, Clarence Thomas appallingly stated that other cherished, fundamental rights should be subject to abrogation, writing, ". . . in future cases, we should reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including *Griswold*, *Lawrence*, and *Obergefell*."

Thomas left no doubt about his regressive, byzantine intentions, adding, ". . . we have a duty to 'correct the error' established in those precedents, *Gamble v. United States*, 587 U.S. \_\_\_\_ \* \_\_\_\_ (2019) (THOMAS, J., concurring) (slip op., at 9). 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."

To prevent Thomas's dream scenario from inflicting a nightmare on the rest of the country, the Respect for Marriage Act would codify in federal law our essential rights conferring marriage equality for same sex and interracial couples, protecting the rights of Americans to marry who they choose.

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

I am always concerned when someone's rights are being infringed, which is why I

wholeheartedly supported the version of this bill that passed the House earlier this year.

Even with the Senate amendment, I still recognize the great strides that will be achieved with passage of this bill in its current form. The Senate's embrace of this legislation, with strong bipartisan support, demonstrates the bill's alignment with bedrock American values and its strong support among the American people, across political ideologies.

After witnessing the Senate's passage of the Respect for Marriage Act, I am proud to say that we are on a path to guaranteeing marriage equality for every American.

The Supreme Courts' rulings in *Loving v. Virginia*, and *Obergefell v. Hodges* were founded on the promise of unenumerated rights and due process for all American people as guaranteed in the 9th and 14th amendments of our nation's Constitution.

The 9th Amendment states that the federal government does not retain final authority over rights not listed in the Constitution—which, in effect, includes the right to marry someone regardless of their sex or race. That very personal and intimate right is retained by the people.

Additionally, the 14th Amendment ensures that no right afforded to the American people can be taken away without due process of law, while also guaranteeing to all Americans that they shall have equal protection under the law.

The same law that applies to a Black man wishing to marry a Hispanic woman must be applied equally to an Indigenous woman wishing to marry a White woman, a nonbinary individual wishing to marry a man, and so on.

That is the Constitutional promise in the United States.

Marriage Equality is not a right that can be stripped away by a conservative faction of the United States Supreme Court, nor by extremist Republican legislators.

It is a fundamental aspect of our democracy.

The assurances of the 14th Amendment became part of our national governing documents as a protection against those who would use their power to wipe away the freedoms of others without restraint or consent of the governed.

It is unfortunate that we must rely on its strength again today.

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

That is why I strongly support the Respect for Marriage Act and commend my friends in the Senate for garnering bipartisan support for this 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 still officially remains on the books.

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 those in the marriage.

It would also authorize the U.S. Attorney General to enforce these protections and would allow recourse for any person harmed by a violation of this provision.

We will not back down from demanding marriage equality.

We will not back down from demanding racial justice.

We will not back down from demanding equal rights for all of the American people.

I strongly support H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act, and encourage my colleagues to pass this bill.

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

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

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give my strongest support for the Respect for Marriage Act.

It is hard to believe that today, in 2022, we are still fighting to protect the right of all Americans to marry the person they love.

The Supreme Court's actions this summer have shown us that we cannot take our rights for granted. No one should have to live in fear that a Supreme Court decision could invalidate their marriage in the blink of an eye.

The Respect for Marriage Act enshrines the right to marry the person you love, regardless of gender, race, or identity, into Federal law.

It finally repeals the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act from our lawbooks, and it reaffirms our commitment to a promise of equality for all by ensuring critical Federal and State protections for same-sex and interracial marriages.

I have spent my career fighting for the rights of the LGBTQ+ community, both at the State and Federal levels, and so I am proud to stand on the House floor today in support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

Sending this bill to the President's desk sends a powerful message that love is love, that family is family, and that this Congress stands together against hate and discrimination.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), a member of the committee.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support people's right to love and their equal protection under the law. The Respect for Marriage Act will reaffirm marriage equality as the law of the land.

All Americans, no matter who they are and who they love, deserve dignity and equal treatment under the law.

Madam Speaker, back home in my State of Texas, people are literally scared. Entire families are considering fleeing Texas for fear of what the MAGA GOP will do to their partners and their loved ones.

Earlier this year, the far-right Texas GOP declared homosexuality as an abnormal lifestyle choice in their official platform. Yes, they put it in their platform.

Last month, Texas Republicans pre-filed 17 bills targeting the LGBTQ+ community for our next legislative session in Texas.

To my LGBTQ constituents and neighbors back home, know that I am here for you. House Democrats will not waver in our fight for human dignity and equality under the law.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

Growing up in New Hampshire as a gay person, I wasn't sure if there would be a place for me or if I would be able to have a family of my own. I was lucky to be surrounded by people who embraced me for who I am and to live at a time when hearts, minds, and laws were changing for the better.

Next year, I will marry the love of my life. It is unthinkable that if the Supreme Court heeds Justice Thomas' call that our marriage might be recognized in New Hampshire where we live but not across the country.

That is the reality that many couples fear, one that will jeopardize their ability to visit a spouse in the hospital or access all the benefits that couples do, one that would strip millions of Americans of their rights and their dignity.

That is a threat that we can't ignore. I hope my colleagues will heed the calls of their constituents and the call of history and cast a vote in favor of the Respect for Marriage Act to say that love is love and to respect people's individual freedoms in this country.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act, a bill to ensure critical protections for same-sex and interracial marriages.

Madam Speaker, 19 days ago, Coloradans woke up to the news of yet another mass shooting impacting our community. This violence was the direct result of intolerance and discrimination. It was the direct result of efforts by some elected officials to seize on hate and villainize the LGBTQ+ community.

Today, we have the opportunity to reject the ugly vitriol and stand with the LGBTQ+ community in Colorado and nationwide. Today, we have the opportunity to protect all Americans, regardless of how they identify or whom they love.

The Respect for Marriage Act will uphold marriage equality under Fed-

eral law, repealing the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act. This bill ensures that the Federal Government won't stand in the way of a person's right to marry whom they love.

I thank Chairman NADLER for leading this effort and the Congressional Equality Caucus for their ongoing work to promote equality for all, regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I dedicate my remarks to two civil rights icons, Edith and Judith Windsor.

Today, we repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, which degraded marriage under the pretense of defending it. Today, we put the equality of same-sex love in its rightful place under the protection of Federal law.

We will not leave it to the forces of hate and the relics of the past to be the final word on the fate of love.

We, in the LGBTQ community, will be the arbiters of our own legal equality and the authors of our own marital destiny, our equal right to marry the people that we love in the country that we love with the pride that we love.

Today, that right makes America a more perfect union.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

In all my decades of public service, I have never wavered in my support for the LGBTQ+ community. In 1990, I introduced the first legislation in New York State history to grant legal recognition to same-sex couples.

When the Defense of Marriage Act was introduced in 1996, I was one of 67 House Members to vote against it. I knew then what I know now: DOMA was a bigoted, discriminatory solution to a problem that never existed.

It never made sense that I, or anyone in this body or in this country, could get in a cab and marry the cabdriver that same day or some stranger on the street, but a bold, brave New Yorker and a friend of mine named Edie Windsor could not have her marriage recognized.

She sued. She won in court. Today, this law will codify her court case. I dedicate my remarks to her and thank her for her lifelong commitment to LGBTQ rights and equality.

Madam Speaker, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Respect for Marriage Act because every American deserves to have their union recognized and respected in law.

Since the Obergefell and Loving decisions, millions of families rely on the constitutional guarantee that marriage equality affords. Yet, we just saw what happens when half our population relies on this High Court to protect our sacred rights.

Recent far-right Court nominees broke their pledges to respect the precedent of Roe, and look at the legal chaos, unequal treatment, and financial and physical ruin they have unleashed.

We can no more rely on their word than we can their apologists who say these legal extremists will uphold marriage equality.

This bill ensures that by guaranteeing that same-sex and interracial couples have a legal right to build a life with someone who shares their love.

I am honored to stand with the LGBTQ+ community to make this a more just, equal, and perfect union. Without these rights and this legislation, America can never truly aspire to that.

Madam Speaker, I remind all of my colleagues that history is watching, and I urge them to vote “yea” on the Senate amendment.

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

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

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Respect for Marriage Act. Today, we celebrate equality, fairness, and love.

Since the Supreme Court’s ruling in Obergefell, all loving couples have had a right to marry across our country. However, if the Supreme Court won’t protect Americans, especially in light of the repeal of Roe, we in Congress must do everything in our power to defend those freedoms.

The Respect for Marriage Act ensures Federal marriage equality by guaranteeing the Federal rights, benefits, and obligations of marriages. Today’s legislation provides certainty for those couples, and all future couples, that the Federal Government will continue to recognize their marriages, no matter where they live or who they are married to.

I am proud to support this historic bill alongside members of both parties to protect the rights of San Diegans and Americans across the country.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of marriage equality.

The bills we write and pass regularly affect millions of lives. Rarely is the legislation we vote on so personal as the bill we are voting on today, the Respect for Marriage Act.

My daughter and her wife are two of the estimated 26 million Americans whose freedom to marry will be protected by this bill. Their son, my 1-year-old grandson, Reza, can now grow up without risk to his family. Love is a precious thing.

Madam Speaker, I know my daughters will now know our Nation respects their marriage. You cannot legislate love, but you can give love the protection of our laws. I thank the gentleman and I urge my colleagues to vote for this.

□1000

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with our LGBTQ+ community who have fought for equal dignity under the law for decades.

For far too long our LGBTQ+ neighbors have been discriminated against simply for being who they are and loving who they love. Today, if that case is overturned, same-sex couples would not be allowed to marry in the State of Michigan.

Every single American, no matter their faith, race, gender identity, or sexual orientation has the right to marry the person they love.

I am proud to be here today in the people’s House as Congress takes this historic vote to send this legislation to President Biden’s desk.

Today, we take one more step toward equality and justice for all. May we continue to build upon this progress by ensuring that all LGBTQ+ neighbors have what they need to thrive and be protected under law.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a member of the committee, and the soon-to-be Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair for yielding and for his leadership.

The founding document of this country, the Declaration of Independence, reads:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equally, entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those words were eloquent in their articulation and complete in their application.

As the great Barbara Jordan once pointed out, initially they didn’t apply to enslaved Africans or women, Native Americans, poor people of every race,

and certainly it didn’t apply to the LGBTQ+ community. But through a process of constitutional amendment ratification, court decision, and legislation, those words have increasingly been brought to life as we journey toward a more perfect union.

That is the work that is being done today with the Respect for Marriage Act, particularly because of a radical, right-wing, reckless, and regressive Supreme Court majority that threatens freedom and marriage equality.

Madam Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to support the Respect for Marriage Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CRAIG). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I support the Respect for Marriage Act, I respect freedom, liberty, and justice for all.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong and joyful support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

As the mother of an incredible trans daughter, I am here to fight for her rights and those of all LGBTQ+ people, who for too long have been denied the dignity and the respect that they deserve. And as someone who is myself in an interracial marriage, it is far past time that we codify those rights.

An extremist Supreme Court and hateful State legislators want to roll back the hard-won progress that we have made. But we are here to say in a bipartisan way, we will not tolerate this, we will codify these rights once and for all.

This is the beginning. I also call on the Senate to pass the Equality Act to ensure that LGBTQ+ people can enjoy the same rights as everyone else in the country.

But today, Madam Speaker, let’s get this bill done. Vote “yes” on codifying the right to marry the one you love. Vote “yes” on the Respect for Marriage Act.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I am going to miss this 1 minute, let me tell you that.

This bill was passed with a very bipartisan vote in this House this past July. I rise in strong support of the Respect for Marriage Act, which this bill has been slightly amended and sent to us.

Like many Americans across the country, I was sickened and deeply sorry by the violent attack on an

LGBTQ+ nightclub in Colorado Springs just a few weeks ago. It was a manifestation of hate, a manifestation of prejudice, a manifestation of bigotry, a manifestation of thinking one is better than the other, that somehow we are not all equal in the eyes of our Constitution and in the eyes of God.

It was a somber reminder of how safe spaces still are not safe for so many. One of the Club Q survivors, a young man named Anthony, said that as he lay wounded on the floor his first thought—not surprisingly, which he believed may be his last thought—was of his husband of 14 years, Jeremy.

What the Justices said some years ago and what we have said in our legislation is that who you love is your choice. One of the first votes I cast in the Maryland State Senate in 1967 was the repeal of the miscegenation statute. The Supreme Court, that same year, had ruled that unconstitutional. That because a Black male wanted to marry a White woman or a White woman wanted to marry a Black male or an Asian or of some other ethnicity or race, that somehow we would interpose our own judgment denying that all people are created equal, endowed by their creator—not by us, not by the Constitution—by their creator with certain unalienable rights, among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Certainly, the pursuit of happiness means that you can love whom you chose.

The love that Anthony felt for his husband in that moment reflected a basic emotional instinct that makes us all human.

Madam Speaker, I rise today for the millions of people like Anthony and Jeremy who deserve to continue living proudly and happily and safely in same-sex and interracial marriages.

In doing so, I stand for all Americans who cherish the liberty, equality, and justice promised to them under our Constitution.

Last summer, the Supreme Court, largely the Republican faction of the Supreme Court—they will resent that phrase, I am sure—violated that sacred promise with their radical ruling in *Dobbs v. Jackson*, breaking nearly 50 years of precedent, contrary to what some of those Justices said to the United States Senate their premise would be. They deprived women of their constitutional right to reproductive healthcare, to control their own bodies, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In the process, they also opened the door for future challenges to *Obergefell v. Hodges*, *United States v. Windsor*, and *Loving v. Virginia*, which dealt with you couldn't marry a person of another color.

The *Obergefell* and *Windsor* precedents protecting same-sex marriage have stood for 7 and 9 years respectively, not the half a century that the others had, but the same proposition. It is not your business. I am shocked that conservatives who have a liber-

tarian bent believe that somehow we ought to get involved in this.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this.

I remember the most conservative member of the State Senate, in which I served for 12 years, got up in talking about a woman's right to choose, and said: It is not my business. It is not government's business. It is not the legislators' business. It is my business. It is her business.

The Loving precedent protecting interracial marriage has stood for 55 years. Justice Thomas perhaps would opine that it is not a right that is found in the Constitution.

After the Supreme Court disregarded decades of precedent to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, we have no reason to expect it won't do the same to marriage equality. We believe that all men are created equal and all women, and men and women together.

Americans have grown accustomed to knowing that they have a constitutional right to equal marriage. Those living in same-sex and interracial marriages should not have to live with the fear that their government could rescind legal recognition of their families at any moment. That is not America. That is not content of character, as Martin Luther King urged us to pursue—character.

They must be able to live confidently, knowing that their marriages will be recognized wherever they go in America—no matter the city, county, or State.

Our Democratic House majority knows that no State ought to be able to deny full faith and credit to legal marriage between consenting American adults, and a lot of Republicans agree with us.

This is not a partisan issue. I hope it is not a partisan issue in this vote. It certainly was not a partisan issue when we passed it to the Senate. It was not a partisan vote in the United States Senate.

We know the best way to protect that most basic right to marriage equality is to enshrine it in Federal statute. That is why we took swift action last summer to pass the Respect for Marriage Act through the House and why I am proud to bring it to the floor again today.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER and the staff of the committee. I thank Representative CICILLINE and all the co-chairs of the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus. This is not a caucus issue; this is a country issue. This is a constitutional issue. This is a fairness issue. This is justice for all.

I thank Chairman RUIZ and the Democratic Caucus chairman, Mr. JEFFRIES, who has been very involved in this bill, and Chairwoman BEATTY, they all have worked hard on this bill.

Similarly, I appreciate the House Republicans who joined us in supporting this bill—a significant number of House Republicans. I would hope that all Republicans would do it on the the-

ory that this is not our business, that people are free to make their own decisions, not the government making these decisions.

I also thank the 62 Senators, including 12 Republicans that came together to advance this critical legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, all 435 of us, to stand up and say this is a free country. It is a country that believes in equality for all. This is a country that the representatives of our Constitution, our Declaration, and of our laws would stand up united in saying: You are free to love who you choose. It is not our choice.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, what happened in Colorado, as the gentleman referenced, was wrong as wrong could be. We all understand that.

But you know what else is wrong?

The 100 churches and crisis pregnancy centers that were attacked in the aftermath of the *Dobbs* decision—actually, when the leak happened. Dozens and dozens of those attacks happened between the leak of the opinion and the opinion itself, all designed to intimidate the Supreme Court.

And what did this body do while that was happening and Supreme Court Justices' homes were being—protests, harassed, all kinds of things said about their family, an assassination attempt on one of those justices, Justice Kavanaugh—what did this body do?

They waited a month to pass legislation to give our highest court members the protection they needed. This body did that.

There is no place for violence. But let's be clear: Let's condemn all of it. Let's do what we can to protect against it, and let's not stay on this concerted effort to intimidate the Court.

By the way, Madam Speaker, we have yet to have a hearing on the leak of the *Dobbs* decision, but in 1 hour and 15 minutes we are going to have a hearing on the fake leak that was brought up about Justice Alito in the Hobby Lobby case.

Why can't we get to the bottom of what happened earlier this year with the *Dobbs* decision that resulted in all that violence—over 100 churches and crisis pregnancy centers attacked?

I would like to have a hearing on that. I hope at some point the chairman will—we will look into doing that next year when we convene the new Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

□ 1015

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I just want to make clear, the gentleman indicated that we did nothing. The Justices of the Supreme Court had full protection. The issue was the families and the families of Members, but it ought to be on the public record that



the Supreme Court Members were protected.

Mr. JORDAN. Reclaiming my time, the fact is, the Senate passed the bill and you guys waited a month before we passed it on the House floor, and you know that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, you represented that the Justices were unprotected. That is not accurate, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. Justices' families; I will correct that. But you guys waited a month to do that when they were being threatened. That is my point.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I have been listening to this debate on the Republican side and it is self-contradictory. On the one hand, don't worry about it. Obergefell is not threatened. It is the law of the land. The Supreme Court has decided it. There is no threat. You guys are exaggerating the threat to Obergefell.

On the other hand, this bill is catastrophic. My God, it will change things.

Well, how will it change things if Obergefell is going to keep going? This bill will threaten the institution of marriage somehow.

Really? I don't think it will threaten the institution of marriage, especially since it is irrelevant since Obergefell is going to continue. You can't argue out of both sides of your mouth.

I would also point out, as I will in my closing statement, that contrary to the fears expressed about religious liberty, almost every church group in the United States has endorsed this bill. I will read a list in my closing statement.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for the Respect for Marriage Act, an historic step forward in Democrats' fight to defend the dignity and equality of every American.

Let us salute those who have legislated and advocated relentlessly to make this bill the law of the land. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JERRY NADLER, Equality Caucus Chair DAVID CICILLINE, and all of the members of the Equality Caucus, and the grassroots activists out there, without whose mobilization so many pieces of legislation to expand freedom in our country would not be possible.

I say that because when I came to this floor 35 years ago, my first speech on the floor, after I was sworn in, was to talk about—say that I came here to fight HIV and AIDS. What I learned after that is we had to fight against discrimination against people with HIV and AIDS.

Two people who were so significant in that are Phyllis and Del, Del Martin

and Phyllis Lyon, champions in our country. Well, I will talk about them in a moment.

First, I want to salute the Senate for its strong bipartisan legislation, the leadership of Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER and Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, and the bipartisan, strong support that this House gave the legislation to send it over to the Senate.

Marriage equality has been law across our country since 2015 and, proudly, even longer in the State of California. Indeed, my thoughts today are with Phyllis Lyon and Del Martin, two dear friends and iconic trailblazers. I have brought their picture to the floor time and time again to talk about freedom and dignity and respect so many times.

Nearly two decades ago, their enduring love made history as they joyfully, joyfully said their vows in San Francisco City Hall, the first. In the years since, the same euphoria has blessed couples and bonded families in every corner of America.

Yet, since the Supreme Court's monstrous decision overturning *Roe v. Wade*, rightwing forces have set their sights on this basic personal freedom.

In his concurrent opinion, Clarence Thomas explicitly called on the Court to reconsider its ruling in Obergefell. While his legal reasoning is twisted and unsound, we must take Justice Thomas at his word and the hateful movement behind him at their word.

We must act now, on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, to combat bigoted extremism and uphold the inviolability of same-sex and interracial marriages.

Once signed into law, the Respect for Marriage Act will help prevent rightwing extremists from: Upending the lives of loving couples, traumatizing kids across the country, and turning back the clock on hard-won progress.

This legislation takes several steps to uphold marriage equality under Federal law.

First, it tears the bigoted, unconstitutional Defense of Marriage Act off the books for good. When that bill was passed, our colleagues understood that it was not constitutional. Why else would they have tried to strip the judicial review of the Defense of Marriage Act if they thought it could take the test of judicial review?

Today's vote will codify a legal reality already handed down by the Supreme Court and ensure DOMA can never again be used to justify hateful discrimination.

Second, the Respect for Marriage Act will enshrine married couples' right to equal protection under Federal law, from tax filings to Social Security, to bereavement and veterans' benefits.

Third, this legislation will require that every State recognize all valid out-of-state marriages, regardless of any heinous restrictions imposed by particular State law.

This legislation is the latest step in House Democrats' fight to win full equality for LGBTQ Americans and

forge a more perfect union that our children and their children, all of our children deserve.

Fighting alongside tireless advocates, we transformed the fight against HIV/AIDS, here at home and around the world; and I thank President Bush for his leadership in that regard as well, all of our Presidents—well, up until a certain point.

We tossed Don't Ask, Don't Tell into the dustbin of history. We enacted fully inclusive Federal hate crimes legislation, protecting Americans from the scourge of bigoted violence, with the Matthew Shepard Act; our friend, Barney Frank, our former colleague, was so instrumental in passing that legislation.

Today, we will include marriage equality into Federal law now and for generations to come.

I am just going to speak personally for a moment because, as I mentioned earlier, my first words on the floor of this House were about fighting against HIV and AIDS and discrimination that goes with that.

My final bill as Speaker the first time, one of the final bills that I signed was the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Now, one of the final bills that I will sign in the enrollment will be this beautiful legislation, the Respect for Marriage Act that we are passing today.

Today, we stand up for the values the vast majority of Americans hold dear, a belief in the dignity, beauty, and divinity, divinity, spark of divinity in every person, an abiding respect for love so powerful that it binds two people together.

San Francisco's—when we talk about freedom, I think of Harvey Milk. He once told his supporters: "I have tasted freedom. I will not give up that which I have tasted."

Thus, today, this Chamber proudly stands with the forces of freedom, not going back, and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a resounding bipartisan "aye" vote in favor of the Respect for Marriage Act in loving memory of Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon, my dear friends, and iconic pioneers, and I urge a strong bipartisan vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "no" vote based on arguments we have made on the floor today. I think this is—I just urge a "no" vote. I think this is the wrong way to go.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Senate amendment to the Respect for Marriage Act represents a carefully negotiated compromise that

maintains all of the bill's substantive protections for marriage equality, while affirming that the religions liberty and conscience protections available under current law remain unaffected by the bill.

For these reasons, leading national organizations have endorsed the bill as amended by the Senate, including the ACLU, GLAD, PFLAG, Human Rights Campaign, and Lambda Legal.

In addition, a broad interfaith coalition that includes the Interfaith Alliance, the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the United Church of Christ, the Presbyterian Church USA Office of Public Witness, the Union for Reformed Judaism, the Anti-Defamation League, the Hindu American Foundation, Muslims for Progressive Values, and the Sikh Coalition, all endorse the Senate amendment to this bill.

This is a long-overdue bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it with a big vote.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I am in strong opposition of H.R. 8404, the so-called Respect for Marriage Act.

I remain steadfast in my longstanding belief that marriage, as has been the tradition in this nation and around the world, is between one man and one woman.

To my colleagues who may be swayed by the inadequate attempts made in the Senate to increase religious protections in this flawed piece of legislation: The changes simply do not do enough to protect those that could face the harmful effects of this bill.

The overly vague provisions of this bill leave far too much to be interpreted and decided by the courts. We, as Members of Congress, should be compelled to protect the religious freedom of Americans and should not leave this cornerstone of our Constitution to the whim of the courts.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . ."

In passing this bill, our government is making a law that prohibits the free exercise of religion. These are not just words. They are fundamental to our country and who we are as a people.

Moving forward, court cases concerning private entities exercising their religious freedom, much like cases heard this week at the Supreme Court, will face new challenges. They will now be litigated under the rubric of a national policy in which the court could interpret someone not recognizing same-sex marriages, or even abstaining from providing website design services for a same sex marriage, as akin to racial discrimination.

This bill goes far beyond the protection of same-sex marriage. Instead, it exposes private entities to government discrimination based solely on their deeply held religious beliefs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no on this legislation before us today.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of The Respect for Marriage Act because everyone should be able to marry who they love. This important law will protect same-sex and interracial marriages.

When I was serving in the Oregon State Legislature in 2007, I helped pass the Oregon

Family Fairness Act to give same-sex couples many of the rights afforded to married couples. In 2014, a federal district court judge found that Oregon's ban on same-sex marriages violated the Oregon Constitution, and in 2015 the United States Supreme Court held in Obergefell that all people have the right to marry who they love.

It is imperative that we pass the Respect for Marriage Act because Justice Thomas cast doubt on rights grounded in privacy, including same-sex and interracial marriages, in his concurring opinion in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. The Respect for Marriage Act will enshrine this fundamental right into law and so it continues to be protected.

Although it is essential that we pass the Respect for Marriage Act, this legislation is a compromise. The bill as passed includes an overly expansive exemption for faith-based nonprofit organizations. This exemption is disappointing because it will allow legalized discrimination and undermine the fundamental principles of fairness this legislation is intended to uphold.

As Vice Chair of the Congressional LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus, I am proud to continue standing with members of the LGBTQ+ community and their allies as we pass the Respect for Marriage Act. I remain committed to continue fighting against discrimination, including by enacting the overdue Equality Act to close gaps in civil rights protections.

No one should face prejudice and violence because of who they are or who they love. I urge my colleagues to support the Respect for Marriage Act and swiftly send this bill to President Biden's desk.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to underscore the crucial importance of the religious liberty provisions in the Respect for Marriage Act and to ensure the legislative intent behind these provisions is crystal clear.

As you know, the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges* from 2015 established a constitutional right to same-sex marriage. When *Obergefell* was argued, then-Solicitor General Verrilli was asked whether recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage would lead to churches, religious organizations and other not-for-profits potentially having their tax-exempt status reconsidered, in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Bob Jones University v. U.S. Solicitor General Verrilli* responded that "it's certainly going to be an issue." In recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage in 2015, the United States Supreme Court did not reconsider the *Bob Jones University* precedent, leaving this "issue" unresolved.

The Senate Amendment to the Respect for Marriage Act that we are voting on today, answers this question, and a number of others, providing strong protections for religious liberty, especially when combined with the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

It is my understanding that section 2 of the Respect for Marriage Act, in light of the Supreme Court's *Bob Jones v. United States* decision in 1983, would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from successfully arguing that the United States now "national policy" favoring same-sex marriage use this national policy to deny tax-exempt status to religious organizations.

Section 2 of the bill states that a variety of reasonable views on the role of gender in

marriage exist today, based on both decent and honorable religious and philosophical beliefs. The bill states that all views are due proper respect by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, Section 2 of this bill states that the Federal Government recognizes religious liberty as an integral component of our national policy regarding marriage. Section 2 of this bill was explicitly included to ensure that the provisions of the *Bob Jones* case relating to the tax-exempt status of organizations are not applicable to this bill.

*Bob Jones University v. U.S.*, decided in 1983 before Congress enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, upheld the IRS' decision to rescind *Bob Jones University's* tax exemption on the basis of a "firm and unyielding" national policy against racial discrimination. Section 2 affirms that diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises. This finding preempts an analogy between the Court's analysis in the *Bob Jones University* case about race and beliefs about marriage, and is a statement of policy respecting diverse views about the role of gender in marriage.

I'd like to discuss another provision which is central this bill—section 4, which grants "full faith and credit" under Article IV, Section 1 of the United States Constitution to marriages performed in each of our states, strengthening federalism and making our constitutional structure work.

Section 4 of the bill states that no person "acting under color of State law" may deny 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." The phrase "acting under color of State law" is also used in our civil rights statutes to refer to the actions of state and local government officers and employees with respect to rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and Federal law.

It is my understanding that use of this phrase in section 4 of the bill is intended to incorporate the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of this term, including but not limited to the *Rendell-Baker v. Kohn* and *NCAA v. Tarkanian* cases.

I'd like to now turn to section 6 of the bill, which provides that no church or religious non-profit will be forced to solemnize or conduct a marriage ceremony under this bill.

It is my understanding that section 6(b) bars any civil claim or cause of action relating to a nonprofit religious organization's refusal under that section to solemnize or celebrate a marriage and that such a refusal cannot create a civil claim or cause of action.

The text of section 7 also makes no reference to "compelling governmental interests." Section 7 provides that nothing in this bill should be construed to deny or alter the benefit, status or right of an otherwise eligible individual or legal entity in relation to tax-exempt status, tax treatment, contracts, loans, scholarships, licenses and other agreements not arising from a marriage.

It is my understanding that, in conjunction with section 2, which eliminates a successful analogy to the *Bob Jones* case, section 7 would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from using the Respect for Marriage Act to

alter or remove the tax-exempt status of an entity for expressing beliefs in opposition or support of same-sex marriage. This bill is intended to enshrine a national policy of respect for all views surrounding marriage, and to enact some of the strongest religious liberty protections since the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993. This legislation also ensures that religious liberty will have more of a central role in future debates in our courts and in the halls of Congress.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to underscore the crucial importance of the religious liberty provisions in the Respect for Marriage Act and to ensure the legislative intent behind these provisions is crystal clear.

As you know, the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges* from 2015 established a constitutional right to same-sex marriage. When *Obergefell* was argued, then-Solicitor General Verrilli was asked whether recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage would lead to churches, religious organizations and other not-for-profits potentially having their tax-exempt status reconsidered, in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Bob Jones University v. U.S. Solicitor General Verrilli* responded that "it's certainly going to be an issue." In recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage in 2015, the United States Supreme Court did not reconsider the *Bob Jones University* precedent, leaving this "issue" unresolved.

The Senate Amendment to the Respect for Marriage Act that we are voting on today, answers this question, and a number of others, providing strong protections for religious liberty, especially when combined with the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

It is my understanding that section 2 of the Respect for Marriage Act, in light of the Supreme Court's *Bob Jones v. United States* decision in 1983, would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from successfully arguing that the United States now has a "national policy" favoring same-sex marriage, and use this national policy to deny tax-exempt status to religious organizations.

Section 2 of the bill states that a variety of reasonable views on the role of gender in marriage exist today, based on both decent and honorable religious and philosophical beliefs. The bill states that all views are due proper respect by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, Section 2 of this bill states that the Federal Government recognizes religious liberty as an integral component of our national policy regarding marriage. Section 2 of this bill was explicitly included to ensure that the provisions of the *Bob Jones* case relating to the tax-exempt status of organizations are not applicable to this bill.

*Bob Jones University v. U.S.*, decided in 1983 before Congress enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, upheld the IRS' decision to rescind *Bob Jones University's* tax exemption on the basis of a "firm and unyielding" national policy against racial discrimination. Section 2 affirms that diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises. This finding preempts an analogy between the Court's analysis in the *Bob Jones University* case about race and beliefs about marriage, and is a statement of policy respecting diverse views about the role of gender in marriage.

I'd like to discuss another provision which is central to this bill—section 4, which grants "full faith and credit" under Article IV, Section 1 of the United States Constitution to marriages performed in each of our States, strengthening federalism and making our constitutional structure work.

Section 4 of the bill states that no person "acting under color of State law" may deny 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." The phrase "acting under color of State law" is also used in our civil rights statutes to refer to the actions of State and local government officers and employees with respect to rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and Federal law.

It is my understanding that use of this phrase in section 4 of the bill is intended to incorporate the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of this term, including but not limited to the *Rendel/Baker v. Kohn* and *NCAA v. Tarkanian* cases.

I'd like to now turn to section 6 of the bill, which provides that no church or religious non-profit will be forced to solemnize or conduct a marriage ceremony under this bill.

It is my understanding that section 6(b) bars any civil claim or cause of action relating to a nonprofit religious organization's refusal under that section to solemnize or celebrate a marriage and that such a refusal cannot create a civil claim or cause of action.

The text of section 7 also makes no reference to "compelling governmental interests." Section 7 provides that nothing in this bill should be construed to deny or alter the benefit, status or right of an otherwise eligible individual or legal entity in relation to tax-exempt status, tax treatment, contracts, loans, scholarships, licenses and other agreements not arising from a marriage.

It is my understanding that, in conjunction with section 2, which eliminates a successful analogy to the *Bob Jones* case, section 7 would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from using the Respect for Marriage Act to alter or remove the tax-exempt status of an entity for expressing beliefs in opposition or support of same-sex marriage. This bill is intended to enshrine a national policy of respect for all views surrounding marriage, and to enact some of the strongest religious liberty protections since the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993. This legislation also ensures that religious liberty will have more of a central role in future debates in our courts and in the halls of Congress.

The SPEAKER. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1510, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 169, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

YEAS—258

Adams	Golden	O'Halleran
Aguilar	Gomez	Oberholte
Allred	Gonzales, Tony	Ocasio-Cortez
Armstrong	Gonzalez (OH)	Omar
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pallone
Axne	Vicente	Panetta
Bacon	Gottheimer	Pappas
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Pascrell
Bass	Grijalva	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Pelosi
Bera	Hayes	Peltola
Beyer	Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Blumenauer	Himes	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Hinson	Pingree
Bonamici	Horsford	Pocan
Bourdeaux	Houlihan	Porter
Bowman	Hoyer	Pressley
Boyle, Brendan	Huffman	Price (NC)
F.	Issa	Quigley
Brown (MD)	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Brown (OH)	Jacobs (CA)	Rice (NY)
Brownley	Jacobs (NY)	Rice (SC)
Bush	Jayapal	Ross
Bustos	Jeffries	Royal-Allard
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Calvert	Johnson (TX)	Ruppersberger
Cammack	Jones	Rush
Carbajal	Joyce (OH)	Ryan (NY)
Cardenas	Kahele	Ryan (OH)
Carey	Kaptur	Sánchez
Carson	Katko	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Keating	Scanlon
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Case	Khanna	Schiff
Casten	Kildee	Schneider
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Schraeder
Castro (TX)	Kim (NJ)	Schrier
Cheney	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cherfilus-	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
McCormick	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Chu	Kuster	Sherman
Cicilline	Lamb	Sherrill
Clark (MA)	Langevin	Simpson
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Slotkin
Clyburn	Lawrence	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Lawson (FL)	Soto
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Spanberger
Cooper	Lee (NV)	Speier
Correa	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Costa	Levin (CA)	Stanton
Courtney	Levin (MI)	Stefanik
Craig	Lieu	Steil
Crow	Lofgren	Stevens
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Stewart
Curtis	Luria	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Suozi
Davis, Danny K.	Mace	Swalwell
Davis, Rodney	Malinowski	Takano
Dean	Malliotakis	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Carolyn B.	Titus
DeLauro	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
DelBene	Manning	Tonko
Demings	Matsui	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	McBath	Torres (NY)
Dingell	McCollum	Trahan
Doggett	McGovern	Trone
Doyle, Michael	McNerney	Turner
F.	Meeks	Underwood
Emmer	Meijer	Upton
Escobar	Meng	Valadao
Eshoo	Mfume	Vargas
Espallat	Miller-Meeks	Veasey
Evans	Moore (UT)	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	Moore (WI)	Wagner
Fletcher	Morelle	Waltz
Foster	Moulton	Wasserman
Frankel, Lois	Mrvan	Schultz
Gallagher	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Galleo	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch
Garbarino	Neal	Wexton
Garcia (CA)	Neguse	Wild
Garcia (IL)	Newhouse	Williams (GA)
Garcia (TX)	Newman	Wilson (FL)
Gimenez	Norcross	Yarmuth

NAYS—169

Aderholt	Balderson	Biggs
Allen	Banks	Bilirakis
Amodei	Barr	Bishop (NC)
Arrington	Bentz	Boebert
Babin	Bergman	Bost
Baird	Bice (OK)	Brooks

Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Conway  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Davidson  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)

Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Jackson  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (PA)  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)

Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Nehls  
Norman  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Hill  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sempolinski  
Sessions  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Steube  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Van Drew  
Van Dуйne  
Walberg  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1115

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I object.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

**MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE ON CONCURRING IN THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8404, RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT**

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERLMUTTER of Colorado moved to reconsider the vote on concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 8404.

**MOTION TO TABLE**

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cicilline of Rhode Island moves to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 164, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

YEAS—224

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Armstrong  
Auchincloss  
Axne  
Bacon  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bourdeaux  
Bowman  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brown (MD)  
Brown (OH)  
Brownley  
Bush  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carey  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)

Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Luria  
Lynch  
Mace  
Malinowski  
Malliotakis  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCollum  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meijer  
Meng  
Mfume  
Miller-Meeks  
Moore (UT)  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Neguse  
Newhouse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (NY)  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David

NAYS—164

Aderholt  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Carl  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—4

Brady  
Hollingsworth

Kinzinger  
Zeldin

□ 1111

Ms. LEE of California changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

**MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS**

Axne (Pappas)  
Baird (Bucshon)  
Bass (Cicilline)  
Beatty (Neguse)  
Brooks (Fleischmann)  
DeFazio (Pallone)  
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)  
Gibbs (Smucker)  
Gohmert (Weber)  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gosar (Weber)  
Hayes (Neguse)  
Herrera Beutler (Stewart)  
Huffman (Levin)  
Jacobs (NY)  
Sempolinski

Johnson (LA)  
(Graves (LA))  
Johnson (OH)  
(Fulcher)  
Johnson (TX)  
(Pallone)  
Kahele (Correa)  
Kildee (Pappas)  
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)  
Lawrence (Garcia (TX))  
Lawson (FL)  
(Evans)  
Lieu (Beyer)  
Long  
(Fleischmann)  
Meeks (Meng)  
Napolitano  
(Correa)  
Newman (Correa)  
O'Halleran  
(Pappas)

Palazzo  
(Fleischmann)  
Pascrell  
(Pallone)  
Payne (Pallone)  
Peltola (Correa)  
Pressley  
(Neguse)  
Ruppersberger  
(Sarbanes)  
Rush (Beyer)  
Simpson  
(Fulcher)  
Sires (Pallone)  
Suozzi (Cicilline)  
Swalwell  
(Correa)  
Titus (Pallone)  
Welch (Pallone)  
Wexton (Beyer)  
Williams (GA)  
(McBath)

Castro (TX)  
Cheney  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleave  
Clyburn  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Cuellar  
Curtis  
Davids (KS)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
Brown (OH)  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaunier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher  
Frankel, Lois  
Gallagher

Gallego  
Garbarino  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Gimenez  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Hayes  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hinson  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs (CA)  
Jacobs (NY)  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jones  
Joyce (OH)  
Kahele  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick

Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Garcia (CA)  
Gibbs  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Issa  
Jackson  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Katko  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Luetkemeyer  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McClain  
McClintock  
McKinley  
Meuser  
Miller (WV)

Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Nehls  
Norman  
Oberholte  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sempolinski  
Sessions  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Van Drew  
Van Dуйne  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym