

by their Creator with certain, absolute rights—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness—and governments are instituted to preserve those rights.

It was Philadelphia.

It was July 4, 1776.

It was the Declaration of Independence.

Then, after 8 years of war, this “rabble,” as the British called the colonists, defeated King George III.

We went our own way.

“Independence”—I like the sound of that word. It means that we the people have rule over government, and government will be our servant rather than our being government’s serf.

Liberty, freedom, independence. These three noble words are a reality in this, the greatest of all nations. As a Son of the American Revolution, I thank the patriots who gave us independence.

So, Mr. Speaker, next week on this special day, fly the flag, listen to the band play “Stars and Stripes Forever,” and thank the good Lord for shedding His grace on the United States of America.

And that’s just the way it is.

HUMAN RIGHTS ARE BIRTHRIGHTS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, none of us get to where we are by ourselves.

I was very proud to see the former chairperson of the Financial Services Committee, Chairperson Frank, who is no longer with Congress, not only address DOMA, but also address section 5 of the Voting Rights Act by way of section 4 and the importance of it.

Human rights are birthrights. They are rights that courts can recognize they should not deny. What the Court did with DOMA was correct. I support the dignity of human beings to have equal opportunities in the greatest country in the world.

I thank Chairman Frank, and I want him to know that he stands with us, and I stand with him, and I stand with all persons who are being discriminated against in an invidious way. Human rights cannot be denied, because they are birthrights.

LEAVE NOBODY BEHIND

(Mr. NUGENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday marks the fourth year since Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl was reported missing in action in Afghanistan.

It is on this sober occasion that veterans and concerned citizens across the United States will appeal to their government, asking those who have the means to find every unaccounted soldier, sailor, airman, marine, or guardsman and bring them home.

Currently, less than 1 percent of the American population serves in the Armed Forces at any time. Though their sacrifice is great, many Americans are not touched by this on a personal level because the numbers of our servicemembers are so few.

The men and women who step between us and those who would harm us are young, but they are brave and they are strong, so it’s easy to forget that they are so young, filled with an ambition, passion, honor—and a full life ahead of them with unrestrained potential.

Our troops are the children of concerned parents. Many of them are also parents of scared children, and that collective fear is endured by every family left behind. When warfighters do not come home, when they are held as captives or their whereabouts are unknown, the strain on loved ones is unbearable.

All three of my sons are highly capable and well-trained soldiers, but every time they deploy, I worry about when they are away.

My wife and I know the anxiety of Blue Star parents. Our hearts and prayers go out to Gold Star parents, but I cannot imagine what it is to not know the condition or fate of a child missing in action or held as a prisoner of war. So it is today that we recognize the solemn responsibility a Nation has to servicemembers and their families.

Congressman ANDREWS and I join with our Senate colleagues in this bipartisan, bicameral resolution: to support the military’s efforts to rescue or recover every warfighter; to remind the American people and their elected representatives of our national responsibility to the families of those who protect us; and to assure every member of the Armed Forces—past, present, and future—that we leave nobody behind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that those here remember Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in 2 days, at midnight, by law, the interest rates for the subsidized Stafford student loan program will double, from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, raising interest rates for 7.5 million college students at exactly the time they are taking out loans for next fall’s semester.

What a terrible statement about this Congress that we failed to move forward with legislation to protect those rates. My legislation, H.R. 1595, which had 195 discharge signatures, would have protected that rate.

Again, the leadership of this House turned a deaf ear and insisted that their bill, passed on May 23, somehow protected those college students. The Congressional Budget Office looked at that bill that passed that day, and it concluded that that bill was worse

than doing nothing and allowing the rates to double to 6.8 percent. It is, again, a bill which will put kids into a variable rate system that, over time, we know will be higher than 6.8 percent.

I think of the disgust that America will feel on July 1 when they see that a critical need—higher education—was overlooked and ignored on top of the failure to turn off sequester and to pass a farm bill. It is time for this Congress to act and to protect the lower interest rates for America’s college students.

THE WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to my good friend from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL TODD CLARK

Mr. FLORES. I thank Mr. GOHMERT for yielding to me for a very special few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on June 8, America lost Army Lieutenant Colonel Todd Clark in the war on terror. Lieutenant Colonel Clark was killed in action during an attack at an Army base in Afghanistan.

Lieutenant Colonel Todd Clark was a native of New York, and he attended college in Texas. His father, Jack, was also an Army colonel. Todd was in Junior ROTC while in high school, and, upon graduation, he attended Texas A&M University, where he joined Company B-2 of the Corps of Cadets.

At the time of his tragic death, he was a brigade level advisor for the 10th Mountain Division. During his Army career, he would serve on five separate deployments in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. During his 17 years of service to our country, Lieutenant Colonel Clark earned many awards and decorations, including the following:

Three Bronze Star Medals; the Purple Heart; two Meritorious Service Medals; the Army Commendation with combat distinguishing device “V”; four Army Commendation Medals; three Army Achievement Medals; the Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal; the National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Service Star; the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal; the Kosovo Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star; two Afghanistan Campaign Medals with Bronze Service Star; four Iraq Campaign Medals with Bronze Service Star; the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; the Korea Defense Service Medal; the Army Service Ribbon; three Overseas Service Ribbons; the NATO Medal—Kosovo; the NATO Medal—Combat Action Badge; and the Basic Parachutist Badge.

□ 1140

At the conclusion of his current tour, Lieutenant Colonel Clark's next assignment was to come back to Texas. He was thrilled to be chosen to be the executive officer, or essentially the second-in-command, of the Corps of Cadets' ROTC program at his alma mater, Texas A&M University.

On Friday, June 21, Lieutenant Colonel Todd Clark was laid to rest at the Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery in San Antonio, Texas.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Lieutenant Colonel Clark. He will forever be remembered as an outstanding soldier, husband, and father. We thank him and his family for their service and sacrifice for our country.

His sacrifice reflects the words of Jesus in John 15:13, where Jesus said:

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man will lay down his life for his friends.

I ask that everyone remember to pray often for our country during these difficult times. Please pray for our military men and women who protect us from threats abroad, and please pray for our first responders who protect us from threats here at home.

God bless our military men and women and God bless America.

And I thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. FLORES.

Colonel Clark was a great American. He was a great Aggie. He was just a great man. And I appreciate that tribute to him.

Now, my friend from Texas from the Houston area wished to do a 1-minute, so I will yield to my friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for such time as she may consume.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to thank my colleague from Texas publicly for his commitment to the United States military and certainly for work that we collaborated on to work with a young soldier. We are always interested in making sure that our soldiers and their families have justice and access to justice. So thank you, Congressman, for your leadership on that issue.

And let me thank you for the brief time that I will utilize today and to indicate that I am so proud to be an American. I wish America, as we celebrate our birthday, that we become even more unified, more grateful of the red, white, and blue, and to take that day even to acknowledge our public servants, first responders, to acknowledge the men and women who serve in government, local governments, to those who serve in the United States Government and take every day and opportunity to celebrate those who are in uniform on this soil or places beyond. Let us congratulate them.

That causes me to indicate that the Voting Rights Act was a part of America. Many people are not aware that

this Congress, with 398 votes-plus in the House and 98 votes in the Senate, reauthorized a bill that really means the right to vote for everyone. We take our instruction from the Supreme Court seriously, and what we will intend to do is seek a bipartisan effort to strengthen and to ensure that no vote is denied.

I do express great disappointment in the immediacy of the implementation of the Texas voter ID law and pray for the spiritual community to come together and pray for this Congress, of which we will do on this coming Sunday, June 30. We will pray for the Congress in Houston. And I ask that we pray across America that we will have the opportunity to do this very challenging effort together. The question of voting rights is not one of color; it is one of the freedom of this Nation.

I also want to add the recognition that all marriages are equal and free, and we ask that those who have been so positively impacted by the decision that the Supreme Court issued on DOMA likewise will continue to now recognize their freedom to find that marriage is in respect to all.

Let me conclude by raising this question so that you can see the reality of what the Voting Rights Act stands for. An immediate casualty of the elimination of the Voting Rights Act of 1965—when I say that, it's enforcement provision 4—was the closing of the last African American majority-minority school district, 50 years of history, teachers and workers and police officers and students who graduated and came back to contribute. The North Forest Independent School District, on the very day that the Supreme Court decision was rendered, had been in court ready to be protected by the Voting Rights Act, but now seven trustees of which this community voted for and cherished were eliminated on that Tuesday because of the undermining of the Voting Rights Act.

As a human factor, students who love teachers, teachers who love students, teachers were fired, doors were locked, administrators were thrown out, through no fault of their own. They had progress. They had, as many of us have had, years of some unfortunate history, but look at them now, because of the unfortunate history, the whole district, the community, the homes, the people who invested in this school district. Now, as I leave this podium to my good friend, I have to say that schoolteachers and others who are cut off from any form of health care, individuals who are on dialysis, kidney issues, of course, if they have diabetes, they are shut off, doors locked, papers thrown out, no ability to give recommendations for teachers. What a dastardly circumstance.

I'm prayerful that I can go to the commissioner of education to ask for a pause so that these individuals can continue their health insurance, so that mothers and fathers can get their students in regular order into another

school system and so that we can find common ground just out of our own humanity.

I am prayerful as I leave this podium that one America will commemorate its great holiday together on July 4, and that when we come back, this Congress will expeditiously move to restore an anchor in the name of JOHN LEWIS, who shed his blood on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, who has continued to be a peacemaker in this Congress, that we reauthorize this wonderful legislative initiative so that incidents like North Forest Independent School District and others that have fallen victim to now this nonenforceability of the Voting Rights Act can be restored and we come together as a great and wonderful Nation.

With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, and I was quite impressed and pleased to work with Ms. JACKSON LEE in our effort in helping one of our servicemen.

Some people around the country say, Why can't people get along on both sides of the aisle? When we disagree on issues, we say that. But when we work together, because of our common goal to make the country better and to help those who have been unfairly treated, we work together. It's a pleasure to do so. So I thank my friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

I would like to comment today on the good that the Voting Rights Act did. Back in the 1960s there was racial disparity. There were far too many African Americans who percentage-wise were not voting when compared with the majority of Euro White Americans, and something needed to be done.

The Supreme Court said, because there has been such impropriety, then we will allow this punitive measure to try to force things into being right to where there's not racial disparity, racial discrimination in preventing people of minority races from getting to the polls and being able to vote. Over 45 years later, it has worked. As the Supreme Court pointed out, of the original six States, five of those States have less racial disparity in voting than the whole rest of the country. That's great progress.

But over those four to five decades of time, things change. The Voting Rights Act, as I pointed out to my friend and fellow Republican, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee at the time, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, who had worked so hard to have it extended previously and was working on the reauthorization or the reextension—and to my friend across the aisle that I have great respect for—we have wonderful conversations—Mr. JOHN CONYERS—as I pointed out, you have a problem with equal protection in this extension.

□ 1150

You are punishing States who have cleaned up their act. Now, I don't know of anybody—anybody—in any of those

States who was forced under the 40-plus-year-old formula to be punished who had anybody in their government who was there when racial inequality and discrimination was going on, who's still there. So this act that's done great good refused to acknowledge that good had been done. And even though things had changed and we had gone from Southern States having racial discrimination to now having those Southern States that had less racial disparity, and in fact in numerous cases had more African American turnout than they had white turnout percentage-wise, so things had corrected themselves. I would submit that it won't totally be corrected until we have a much higher percentage of all Americans who are eligible to vote coming out and voting. That's what's supposed to happen.

Anyway, things have changed, and now the most discriminatory State in the Union, ironically, has become Massachusetts. Even Wisconsin has a district with significant racial disparity, indicating a potential for discrimination in that area; and perhaps Massachusetts should be an area that we focus on for trying to eliminate the racial discrimination there. Let's look at the numbers and see where racial disparity exists, determine what the reason is. And if there's racial discrimination, we need to address that because as we've seen, the Voting Rights Act has actually done a great good.

So it's a work in progress. I don't know how many of the two Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts would be willing to join with me to put—to agree to put Massachusetts under the punitive section 5, but I'm certainly willing to go along and do that so that Massachusetts can benefit and get rid of racial discrimination and work toward the day when their racial disparity is back in line with where it should be. It's normally been a forward-thinking State, so it's very sad that it's regressed in that regard. But certainly we can work together on helping improve Massachusetts to the point that, say, Texas is now. I know they would like to be. I know that there are people in Massachusetts that do not want to be the most racially discriminating State, so I'm sure it shouldn't be that difficult a thing to accomplish. So there should be a tribute to the Voting Rights Act.

I happen to represent east Texas. Nacogdoches paper, after the vote on the Voting Rights Act, had unfairly said I was a throwback to Democrats in the fifties because they had not bothered to read my floor speeches to see my own Gohmert amendment that would have required a formula that would apply across the country so the act would apply to everywhere in the country. That was the fair thing to do. I would have voted for the amendment if we had been able to get the Gohmert amendment in, but it was not accepted. So I knew the act would have to go down.

Anyway, the great thing about being in east Texas, most people there are quite fair. And when it was pointed out to the Nacogdoches paper back then, my speech and my amendment, then they did a retraction and corrected themselves. That's the great thing about America.

Now, I'm not expecting the AP to do a correction and the misrepresentation of things I said this week. In fact, I'm quite tickled that after the AP experienced the full force of the executive branch coming after them, grabbing their records, grabbing phone records from up here in the area in which the reporters work and make calls to Congressmen and other things, what a violation, what an atrocious violation of the AP's rights. And I'm glad the AP doesn't feel like they owe me any obligation in being more accurate in their reporting of me. This is America. The AP is totally free to mess up stories as they wish, totally free to slant stories as they want to. That's their prerogative. That's the great thing about America. But I hope that they'll start being a little more vigilant about the abuses by this administration since now they've been the victim of such abuses. We'll see. But, hopefully, they won't continue to be so defensive for the administration and be a little more objective in their reporting.

I did want to address the Windsor decision regarding the Defense of Marriage Act because as a former prosecutor, a former judge—I've been a litigator and a former chief justice—I read these opinions with interest and look for the reasoning, look for the consistency in the citation of the facts, the recitation to prior law, prior precedent, and the reasoning of the Court. And as I read through this Windsor decision regarding Defense of Marriage Act, I was very concerned as I read through, they go through here in the majority opinion, Justice Kennedy wrote, and they've got about 12 pages here where they're talking about, most of the discussion is about standing, because under this case, the administration refused to do their job. They refused to have the Department of Justice defend the law, and it shouldn't be any surprise.

We have the President goes out, including here recently, and says: I don't like the law that Congress passed and prior Presidents have signed, so here's the new law. As recently as the last few days, he didn't like the law as it stands on carbon issues. So as any good monarch would do, he just came up with a new law and espoused that. Unfortunately, it's not appropriate and the Constitution has the wherewithal to stop this kind of overreach and unconstitutional activity by a President that just refuses to enforce laws in being, creates new laws out of whole cloth while ignoring the laws that are in place. That's a problem.

The Founders recognize that it's possible some day, some President, some administration could do that; and if

they do, then the Congress has the powers of the purse, and they can step up and say you're abusing the Constitution, you're abusing people's rights. And, therefore, we as a House and Senate refuse to fund any department that is acting extra-constitutionally. We have the power to do that.

I have people here in my party, the majority party in the House say: You know, we've no leverage. Are you kidding? There is nobody in this entire government in the whole executive branch that can get paid, that can have any money to do their job unless we vote to allow them to have money from the Treasury.

□ 1200

They can't get it. We have that authority. And if we wanted to take a hard line when the Justice Department is refusing to investigate matters properly, they're covering up matters, they come to Congress and misrepresent things, we have the power to stop them from continuing such abuses.

When they, potentially, commit a fraud on the Court and say somebody is a criminal, like James Rosen, and they swear to that before a judge, and swear that he's a flight risk, when apparently they knew all along he wasn't, and now they say, no, no, no, they were never going to prosecute, we have the power to stop that kind of stuff.

We have the power to stop the abuses of going after the AP or Rosen, or any reporters inappropriately abusing and breaching the freedom of the press.

I saw my friend, Mr. NADLER, walk across the back. We have disagreed on so many things, but I have come to appreciate very much his position on the need to hold every administration accountable, and I'm hoping that we're going to be able to work out some legislation that reins in the abuses.

Yes, I know that an administration needs to monitor some things, but I'm quite concerned about the extent to which this administration has moved even farther than the prior administration in monitoring people. I mean, basically, in such an incredibly Orwellian fashion, it's a little scary to those of us that have watched this happen. So I'm hoping we'll be able to work together.

But when you look at this opinion and you see, well, gee, the administration is refusing to defend a law that was duly passed, signed into law by President Clinton, it's a problem. Somebody has to defend the law.

And I was grateful that the Supreme Court, after they analyzed this and got over around page 12 or so, and say, that similarly, with respect to the legislative power—this is on page 12 of the majority opinion—when Congress has passed a statute and a President has signed it, it poses grave challenges to the separation of powers for the executive, at a particular moment, to be able to nullify Congress' enactment, solely on its own initiative, and without any determination from a court.

Of course, then they go through and say, on page 13, they refer to the bilateral legislative group that decided to

defend the Defense of Marriage Act when the administration refused to do the job that was required constitutionally, they refused to defend it, as they have other laws that have been duly passed and signed.

But the Court says, in part—which is one of immediate importance to the Federal Government and to hundreds of thousands of persons—well, they have no basis in fact to make that reference; but, as we've seen, particularly in recent years, the Court has strayed off into areas where they do not have facts to justify their opinions, and they make bad decisions, as they did in the horrendous Dred Scott case.

It happens, when the Court becomes the fact-finder, the, basically, judge, jury and executioner. I mean, they just seem to want to do it all and make references to facts that are not before the Court. And, in fact, they say these circumstances support the Court's decision to proceed on the merits.

So the Court's saying, okay, the administration refuses to do their constitutional job to defend duly passed and signed legislation, so the Members of Congress that passed this law, that pushed it through and voted for it, in essence, they will have standing to defend it.

So it took them a long time to get here, clear over to 13, but they eventually say, okay, we will recognize that, since these people passed the law, they pushed it through, it's their group that got it passed and made it into a law. We'll recognize that they have a legitimate standing to come before this Court and defend the law.

And now, basically, the Court says, now that we've found that the people that passed this law have a right to defend it, significant enough that they have standing, that gives us jurisdiction, as a Supreme Court; and so now we will proceed on the merits.

So then they go through and they analyze, and I had some trouble with some of their representations. You know, King Solomon, many, including me, believe, was the wisest man who ever lived. Of course, then he had too many wives, and that always messes up anybody's wisdom, but he was wise at the time he said there is nothing new under the Sun.

Well, the Supreme Court, apparently, at least the new holy quintet, believes they're wiser than Solomon, even though they show some ignorance. They say here, page 13, for marriage between a man and a woman, no doubt had been thought of by most people as essential to the very definition of that term and to its role and function throughout the history of civilization.

Now, parenthetically, I'd like to insert that shows some wisdom that they would make that comment. And throughout the history of mankind, though many won't acknowledge it, marriage between a man and a woman coming together, or as the Bible says, a man will leave his mother and a woman leave her home and the two will

come together and be one person, one flesh, that's been recognized as a good, healthy building block for a society. And that's been recognized throughout the history of the United States as a good, healthy building block.

And what some seem to not recognize, even though they acknowledge they believe in evolution and how a species evolves by having better and more adaptable offspring, and the strongest produce more and better offspring that evolve the species to a higher level, interestingly, throughout the history of mankind, it, apparently, was not the joinder of a man and a man or a woman and a woman that was able to produce a better and more evolved species.

From best we can tell, you still need a sperm from a man, an egg from a woman. Even if you say, well, yeah, we can clone, if you don't have something that was created by the joinder of something from a man and something from a woman, then you have nothing to clone. So as smart as we think we are, it still comes back to what the Bible says as the two people becoming one person, one flesh.

Anyway, the Court says, and I quote: That belief for many who long have held it, became even more urgent, more cherished when challenged. For others, however, came the beginnings of a new perspective, a new insight.

There is nothing new under the Sun. This kind of assertion has been made, and it's often found toward the end of great civilizations. It doesn't bring about the end of the civilization; but it's often found at the end of a great civilization as, basically, a mile marker that a civilization passes on the way to the dustbin of history.

No nation lasts forever. None does. This country won't. But it's my hope and prayer that we can at least double the length of the short time that this country has existed, since 1775, when the war started, the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the Treaty of Paris in 1783.

So, anyway, the Supreme Court says, talks about this new perspective and new insight. And then they say this:

The limitation of lawful marriage to heterosexual couples which, for centuries, had been deemed both necessary and fundamental, came to be seen in New York and certain other States as an unjust exclusion.

And they go on and they mention, you know, there are 11 States that had adopted this. There are not 11 States that have had the entire State vote to recognize marriage between two men or two women.

But once you move marriage beyond the scope of a man and a woman, you really don't end up with a good place to put a limit, because now that the Court has pushed this boundary out there and eliminated it, then—I think polygamy is wrong, bigamy is wrong. And it's a crime in many places. But how will that be justifiable, even though I believe it's wrong, how will that be justifiable, now that the Court has removed this?

□ 1210

There's some that believe polygamy is the way to go. I do not think it's healthy, overall, for a society, and I certainly don't think it helped Solomon. I think it helped him lose his wisdom.

But the Court goes on and says this at page 16. And its operation is directed to a class of persons that the laws of New York and 11 other States have sought to protect. Again, that's not 11 or 12 States that have had the entire State vote on what marriage is. Most of those have been legislatures. And in some States where legislatures have said one thing, the people have come from the whole State and said, You're not representing out interests, and we're a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and therefore we're correcting you and fixing the law.

The Court said, at page 17:

The definition of marriage is the foundation of the States' broader authority to regulate the subject of domestic relations with respect to the protection of offspring, property interests, and the enforcement of marital responsibilities. The States, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, possessed full power over the subject of marriage and divorce, and the Constitution delegated no authority to the Government of the United States on the subject of marriage and divorce.

So if you've read plenty of opinions and you read that at page 17, you realize this Court is about to do what, for many of us, is unthinkable—become a holy quintet, the five Justices—and basically try to rewrite the laws of nature and nature's God, as most of the Founders believed.

But as I read that—and I had not read the Proposition 8 case from the Supreme Court regarding California's law—I thought, well, I don't like where this is going, but based on this reasoning, I know the Supreme Court will have to be intellectually honest and consistent enough that since they've said Members of Congress that passed a law have standing to defend that law, when the Attorney General and the executive branch doesn't, they'll have to uphold the standing of the group in California who pushed through and voted for and passed—just as Congress does the laws here—through referendum, the law in California, saying that marriage was between a man and a woman.

And when I read this, I said, Oh, this doesn't sound good for the Defense of Marriage Act by the Federal Congress because they're saying it's only the States that can decide what marriage is. And these 11, 12 States have decided for themselves what it is, and so the Federal Government doesn't have any power to say what it is. I still contend the Federal Government does have a nexus and power to say what it is for purposes of certain Federal benefits, but the Court, as the new holy quintet, saw otherwise.

They go on to say in this opinion that which shows that the holy quintet

was either totally dishonest or totally inconsistent—totally ignorant, actually—when they make this statement. This is page 22. “The principal purpose”—talking about the Defense of Marriage Act—“is to impose inequality, not for other reasons like governmental efficiency.”

And that’s a lie. And anybody who will be intellectually honest will have to understand that is a lie by the new holy quintet at the Supreme Court.

The principal purpose was to protect the greatest foundational building block of any society since the dawn of mankind: the home, where a mother and father are there; a home, where the species has offspring and they’re nurtured by a mother and father.

Now, certainly, I saw it in the Soviet Union back in the seventies when I was there as an exchange student. I was shocked. I was actually mortified, because at these day care centers they were saying, yes, the children are the government’s. They’re the state’s. Seems like I saw that on MSNBC recently. They’re the state’s. And the parents are only the brief caregivers, so long as the state allows them to take care of the state’s children. But if they ever say anything inappropriate that the state finds out about, they’ll yank the children out and put them with somebody more deserving.

I was mortified because, even in the seventies, I realized as a young person that, wow, the family is so important. Some of our greatest people have come from single-parent homes, and that will also continue. Thank God, since we’ve now passed over 40 percent, heading towards 50 percent, of individuals being born today to a single-parent home. But that’s not, statistically, the most secure and the best home, generally speaking, for a child to grow up in. Obviously, there are exceptions. You have abusive parents. You have parents that I sent to prison who were an aberration. That can happen in anybody’s home. So I sent them to prison for committing crimes. Well, obviously, a two-parent home, where one of them is committing crimes, is not healthy to a child.

But overall, for the history of this country, the States, Members of Congress, the original Founders, they would never have dreamed we would get to a point where the judiciary, the unelected branch—the only unelected branch—would say, We’re going to rewrite the laws of nature and nature’s God. But that’s, in essence, what they say.

At page 25, the Court says that:

The Federal statute is invalid, for no legitimate purpose overcomes the purpose and effect to disparage and injure those whom the State, by its marriage laws, sought to protect in personhood and dignity.

That’s a tragic decision, and it’s heartbreaking that it will help to generate society as we move forward with fewer and fewer people paying income tax, as this society becomes more and more narcissistic, more focused on our-

selves. How else can you explain one generation saying this generation is so valuable that we are going to force future generations, some who have not even been born, to pay for our narcissism and to be engorging ourselves on the money of future generations?

We’re the first in American history that’s ever been so self-absorbed, and it’s heartbreaking. We’ve got to change this. All the generations before had a majority of that generation that would sacrifice whatever we have to so that our children will have a better Nation than we have. I’ve been the beneficiary of that, and I will work until I take my dying breath to try to change the direction we’re headed, toward national bankruptcy, both financially and morally. But this is a disingenuous opinion, and either the Court realizes it, which makes it dishonest, or they don’t realize it, and it makes them very ignorant.

So, nonetheless, when I finished reading that majority opinion, I knew that surely, as bad as that opinion is, incorporating things that simply aren’t true, disingenuous, when they take up the Proposition 8 case from California, number one, they’ll have to say that the people that pushed through the law and passed it have standing to defend the law that they pushed through and passed and voted for themselves by referendum, just as the Members of Congress were allowed to have standing to defend the bill.

In California’s case, the executive branch, their attorney general, refused to defend the law that was passed by a majority of the Californians. And so I thought, okay, that will be an easy one for the Supreme Court. They can just reference the Windsor case, as these people have the right, they have standing; therefore, we have jurisdiction to take up the merits of the case.

□ 1220

They could cite Windsor, the DOMA case, for the proposition, as they say in the DOMA case, that the States have a right to determine what marriage will be in their State.

Here’s the amazing part: for people, many of whom have educations from Ivy League institutions—I’m not sure, they may all come from Ivy League institutions—sounds like we need some diversity on the Court, though, if that’s the case. They hold that the people that passed the law in California, voted for the law in California do not have standing to defend the law, so we’re not even going to take up the issue that we said clearly, in the case we just decided on DOMA, that only the States have a right to decide what marriage is within their States. So they kick it back to a lower court to dismiss.

It is tragic when people who are supposed to be our best educated have such false reasoning based on a fiction that the law saying marriage is a man and a woman has no other purpose—the primary purpose at least being to cre-

ate inequality. That is tragic. It does not bode well for this Nation when the only unelected branch decides that they will rewrite the laws of nature and nature’s God.

And why do I mention that is because those are terms that the Founders used. When my pastor, David Dykes, was up here with his wife, Cindy, it was the first time I had gone over to the State Department. I mean, I majored in history; I loved history. I owed the Army 4 years for my scholarship at A&M, and I enjoyed history so I majored in it.

I knew all about the Revolution, the Treaty of Paris, but I never actually looked at the Treaty of Paris or a copy of it. Under glass in the State Department building they have an incredible copy of the original Treaty of Paris of 1783. And I was shocked by the big bold letters that start the Treaty of Paris. I had to think about why would they start with those words.

Then you put yourself back in the place of the Founders, those who were negotiating with the British Government in Paris to force them to recognize that the United States of America was a free and independent country, totally free of Great Britain, and totally independent to do what it wished as its own sovereign Nation. So they had to get representatives from Great Britain to sign that. Well, what would keep them from just breaking their oath? I mean, we see it here among politicians. They’ll swear one thing and then they’ll go do something else. What would keep the representatives of Great Britain from doing the same thing?

And the Founders wanted something so profound under which they would make the Great Britain diplomats sign that they would be afraid to ever break that oath. So I thought about it. Well, what in the world would I put in the document to make them sign under? I don’t think having a notary is going to quite do the trick, especially if it’s an American notary. They’d say, well, it wasn’t a British notary.

So what would you do? What would you put in the document to make them swear under? That’s where they came up with the first words of the Treaty of Paris that for the first time truly recognized the independence of the United States by Great Britain. France had already recognized us, but this was the one we had been in revolts with and war with. So the first words, the biggest, boldest words in all the Treaty of Paris were these:

In the Name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.

Now, they knew, both the British and the Americans, that the Trinity represented the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost. They put that as the biggest words in there:

In the Name of the most Holy and undivided Trinity.

They figured if the British will sign this document with those in big bold letters, they will not want to face their

Judge some day if they break that oath.

It's the very reason that John Quincy Adams—a great advocate for abolition, the only man in American history who had been elected President, 1824, defeated in 1828, he decides God's calling him to bring an end to slavery, like William Wilberforce was trying to do in England. So he did the unthinkable. After he was President, he ran to be a Representative in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress and was elected. And he indicated to someone that he was prouder being elected to Congress after being President than he was being elected President, which seems a little strange. But if you think about it, it means after he was elected President, his neighbors still liked him. So that was a big deal.

But over and over he preached sermons on the evils of slavery just down the Hall here. But in the Amistad case that came before the Supreme Court, down in what we call the Old Supreme Court Chamber downstairs, he argued before the Supreme Court—and you can find his whole argument online. Fortunately, they didn't put two-plus days of oral argument in the movie Amistad—Anthony Hopkins, a good Longview; Texas guy named Matthew McConaughey, he argued the case. And you find at the end of his argument—and I don't have it committed verbatim, but basically he goes through asking, Where is Justice so-and-so and Chief Justice John Marshall? Where is the solicitor who last argued the case against me when I was here before? Even the judge that started this case, he had died one night during the days of oral arguments. He ends up concluding, basically, they've gone to meet their Judge. And the most important question that they were asked is will they hear: Well done, good and faithful servant?

Now, if I had had a lawyer argue that before me in the court of appeals or the district bench, I mean, I had gotten the message, you got a lawyer there saying if you don't decide for me, you're going to have to face God Almighty some day, and he's going to judge you and he's going to come down on you if you don't do the right thing in this case. I might not have appreciated it, but the Court found appropriately for John Quincy Adams' side of the case. And those free Africans were allowed to leave as free Africans, as they should have been.

So back then, the lead abolitionist, he knew, he believed with all his heart some day people are going to meet their maker. He's going to be their Judge. I might have enjoyed if John Quincy Adams were able to come back as Lazarus did, when Jesus raised him, and go before the Supreme Court and say, let me tell you, I've been there. You are going to go before your Judge some day. And you better not pretend to be God himself because you're going to meet God himself some day. But this Supreme Court did not have that ben-

efit, so the holy quintet decided to re-write the law.

Now, I want to touch on briefly a law that was just passed down in the Senate. I really appreciated my good friend Senator TED CRUZ's statement down the Hall. I'm quoting from his statement:

Unfortunately, all of the concerns that have been repeatedly raised about this bill remain; it repeats the mistakes of the 1986 immigration bill; it grants amnesty first; it won't secure the border; and it doesn't fix our broken legal immigration system.

This bill doesn't solve the problems because the process it went through was fatally flawed—it was written behind closed doors with special interests; in the Judiciary Committee, the Gang of Eight Democrats blocked all substantive amendments because of a previously cooked deal; and on the Senate floor, the majority blocked any attempts to fix the bill.

Further, in conjunction with ObamaCare, the Gang of Eight bill creates a tax penalty on employers—effectively, up to \$5,000—for hiring U.S. citizens or legal immigrants. But that penalty does not apply to those with RPI—which is registered provisional immigrant—status, giving a powerful incentive for job creators to hire illegal immigrants instead of U.S. citizens or legal immigrants. That is indefensible.

□ 1230

Ted says:

I filed an amendment to fix this defect but was blocked by Senate Democrats from receiving a vote on that solution. Sadly, this bill won't fix the problem with our immigration system and will only encourage more illegal immigration and human suffering.

Quite tragic. Quite tragic.

Senator CRUZ explains it well.

Dr. TOM COBURN, a good friend—hopefully, he would acknowledge that—from Oklahoma, Senator TOM COBURN said this—I won't read the whole statement, there's not adequate time, but a wonderful statement he summarizes very well. He said:

It is a \$48 billion border stimulus package that grants amnesty to politicians who want to say they are securing the border when, in fact, they are not.

Further he quotes Reagan. He said Reagan said:

It was a tall, proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, windswept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace; a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity. And if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will and the heart to get here.

"Walls with doors" is an immigration policy that can unite our Nation. But today, Democrats sound like they want only doors; Republicans want only walls. The truth is we have neither. We have chaos.

Well said.

But the Republicans I know want doors. We want immigration. We want the fresh water flowing into this incredible lake. It's a healthy good thing.

I love the fact that, generally speaking, most Hispanics I know have a faith in God, a devotion to their family, and a hard work ethic. That's what I think

made America great. It's a great thing. We need more of that. That's a good thing.

But it has to be done legally, and it is heartbreaking that this got pushed through the Senate to what many of us believe will be the detriment of this country.

In The Weekly Standard, John McCormack wrote an article that five Senators who support the immigration bill don't know the answer to a key question about it. A great article there in The Weekly Standard.

There are plenty of good articles if our friends down the hall had bothered to read them. Eagle Forum has a great article, a great newsletter, on the Gang of Eight and what they've done to America.

What my friend TED CRUZ was pointing out, under ObamaCare, there is a penalty that could be \$3,000 per employee. For those over 50 you deduct 30. It's a formula. But basically, in most cases it's a \$2,000 penalty for any employer that has over 50 employees that does not provide the level of health care that is required under ObamaCare. So TED CRUZ makes a point I haven't heard anybody else make—it's an excellent point: that under ObamaCare, if you're an employer and you've got 1,000 people working for you, certainly you're under ObamaCare, so you're going to pay a tax of \$2,000 per person on your employees if you don't give them the highest level required of health insurance, so they will end up being under ObamaCare.

Well, businesses compete to stay in business. If someone else has a lower overhead, then they have to try to get down to that level of overhead.

Under the Senate bill, they create these registered provisional immigrants. By that law, the registered provisional immigrants are not under ObamaCare. So if an employer that has, say, 1,000 employees wants to save \$200,000 or so, that employer can fire all of the American citizens and all the legal immigrants that he has working in that manufacturing plant and hire the RPIs, the registered provisional immigrants. Then that employer doesn't have to provide them health care, and he doesn't have to pay the \$2,000 fine per employee and save a couple hundred thousand. If you have 10,000 employees, then you would save a couple million dollars.

It is really profound the detrimental effect it will have on legal immigrants and American citizens.

I see that my dear friend from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is here.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I was watching in my office what the gentleman from Texas was saying, and I

was moved so profoundly because this week changed history. It changed history with the definition of America and the United States, but it also changed our constitutional Republic.

When the Supreme Court of the United States denied equal protection rights to every American by taking away our ability to elect our representatives, have them give voice to what our opinion is, and then the Supreme Court decides to substitute their morality for that of the people's duly elected people, as they did also in California, now we're looking at a supreme betrayal. Not only did the Supreme Court betray us on the issue of marriage, we've been betrayed by the Senate and also by Republicans in the Senate. We have a fake border security bill that is about to give amnesty to millions and millions of illegal immigrants, and we are about to see that bill now come to the House of Representatives.

People are very worried about what they've seen happen this week. One woman was crying to me this morning, saying that, Michelle, our country is falling down around our eyes. So what I told her what we need to do is we need to pray, we need to pray, we need to confess our sins as a Nation, and we need to pray and ask God for his holy intervention and for his forgiveness.

We are not over as a Nation, there is a future, there is a hope. But we need to recognize that this week was historic and, Mr. Speaker, the words of Mr. GOHMERT were exactly right. This is a very, very important decision. It went at kicking out the fundamental building block of this Nation, which is the family. The hub of the family is the marriage between a mom and a dad. That was hurt this week by the Supreme Court. Now we are looking at violating the fundamental rule of law by legalizing millions of illegal immigrants with this fake border security bill that will never ever come into place.

The gentleman has said it well, he said it very well. I want to come up and thank him and congratulate him for his remarks. But to let the American people know there is a future, there is a hope, and we're going to continue to fight here in the House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR PRIVATE CALENDAR FOR 113TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the majority and minority leaderships, the Chair announces that the official objectors for the Private Calendar for the 113th Congress are as follows:

For the majority:

Mr. GOODLATTE, Virginia
Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin
Mr. GOWDY, South Carolina

For the minority:

Mr. SERRANO, New York
Mr. NADLER, New York

Ms. BASS, California

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FITZPATRICK (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of on account of an unavoidable obligation.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 21, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 475. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include vaccines against seasonal influenza within the definition of taxable vaccines.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, 113th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until Monday, July 8, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2035. A letter from the Manager, BioPreferred Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Designation of Product Categories for Federal Procurement (RIN: 0599-AA16) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2036. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Requirements for Acquisitions Pursuant to Multiple Award Contracts (DFARS Case 2012-D047) (RIN: 0750-AH91) received June 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2037. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Solicitation Provisions and Contract Clauses for Acquisition of Commercial Items (DFARS Case 2011-D056) (RIN: 0750-AH63) received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2038. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a response to the Inspector General Report "DoD Efforts to Meet the Requirements of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act in FY 2012"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2039. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 4 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, Section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2040. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Appraisal Subcommittee, transmitting the 2012 Annual Report of the Appraisal Subcommittee; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2041. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Maricopa County, Arizona, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2042. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Iberville Parish, Louisiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2043. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's report on export credit competition and the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2044. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to WestJet Airlines Limited of Calgary, Canada, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2045. A letter from the Department of the Treasury, Regulatory Specialist, transmitting the Department's final rule — Lending Limits [Docket ID: OCC-2012-0007] (RIN: 1557-AD59) received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2046. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Pell Grant Program [Docket ID: ED-2012-OPE-0006] (RIN: 1840-AD11) received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2047. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research--Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program--Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers [CFDA Number: 84.133E-3.] received June 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2048. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research--Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [CFDA Number: 84.133B-1.] received June 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2049. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research--Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program--Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers [CFDA Number: 84.133E-4.] received June 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2050. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research--Advanced Rehabilitation Research Training Program [CFDA Number: 84.133P-1.]