



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 18, 2009

No. 76

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HIRONO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 18, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

PROTECTION OF INNOCENT LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to make a comment on the appearance yesterday at my alma mater, the University of Notre Dame, by President Barack Obama. As I said, I am a graduate of the university. My dad is a graduate of the university. My two brothers are graduates of the university. My son is a graduate of the university. I have three nieces who have graduated from the university. It is al-

ways an honor when the President of the United States addresses your university, particularly when he gives its commencement address.

I have known the former president of the University of Notre Dame, Father Hesburgh, for almost my entire life, having met him when I was about 6 years old, and consider him a friend to this day. His record on civil rights is unparalleled in this country, and he is one of the great leaders of the civil rights movement. Now in his nineties, I am sure it was with genuine joy that we saw tears in his eyes as the President of the United States addressed the University of Notre Dame yesterday.

However, Madam Speaker, I must register my concern about the President's address yesterday, and it is because the President has, through his actions and his statements, made very clear his position on a fundamental issue to this Nation, to the question of ethics and morality and public policy. And it is an issue that has generated much controversy, but goes to the essence of the Catholic Church's teaching on the value of life.

The church teaches that there are a number of moral principles upon which there can be serious discussion and disagreement: areas such as a just war; areas about social welfare policy; areas in which the Commandments of our Lord must guide us, but the manner in which those are applied can differ. Those moral judgments are called prudential judgments where we are called upon to use our prudence to come to the conclusions as to our proper actions, both individually and as a society.

But there are a few, and very few, principles upon which there is not prudential judgment but upon which there is specific moral guidance, and protection of innocent life is among them. The question of whether one is ever able to take the innocent life of another intentionally lies at the root of

not only Catholic doctrine, but lies at the root of the Judeo-Christian tradition which has given voice to the Constitution where it says we have the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, with life being the first of those three.

So the question was when the President appeared at the University of Notre Dame, was he engaging in a dialogue in which there was an exchange of ideas of substance, or was it an episode in which there would be moral confusion afterwards in which the question of the taking of innocent life was just a prudential judgment type of issue which was the same as many other issues that we can debate and disagree on about whether we should go to war, how we should conduct war, how much money we should pay for welfare programs, what the level of education is, and so forth.

And that's the question that bothers me. I guess the question I could ask would be whether this administration at the University of Notre Dame would have asked Stephen Douglas or Abraham Lincoln to deliver the commencement address following the great debate that took place between those two some 150 years ago. Because one was successful, that is Stephen Douglas, he was elected, he was considered a great man in many different ways, a great statesman; and the other was Abraham Lincoln who had failed in several attempts at election. And the one said that slavery was one of those things upon which you could not essentially disagree when you really looked at the question of whether one man could own another man.

And while he was unsuccessful in that, he carried the moral argument of the day, and the suggestion here is: Was there any dialogue and would the suggestion be that all we have to do is reason together and use better words rather than essentially go to the substance of the issue.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5673

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of the ages, ever-present to Your people today, You befriend humanity by revealing Yourself to all and inserting Your acts in our history through strong manifestations of Your Power and the inner strength of Your Word.

Your grace flows in relationships once personal attitudes change and a fresh openness occurs toward another. Such is the subtle way Your love works in us and through us.

Be with the Members of Congress and all Americans this week. May they imitate Your initiative to befriend others and give You the glory.

Lord, bring forth honest words from us, even when born out of hesitancy and anguish. May affirmative actions follow which will reach across the gap of difference and indifference, so You will lead us to new understandings, healing and transformation of the world. This will inspire new hope in Your people and give glory to Your Holy Name, both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TONKO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ADMINISTRATION CLOSES
PRIVATE CHRYSLER DEALERSHIPS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the administration closed 900 Chrysler dealerships overnight last week and put an estimated 100,000, mostly non-

union workers, on the street and out of work. Even though many of these dealerships were profitable, it didn't make any difference to the Auto Task Force, since these unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats have absolute power ever since the government nationalized Chrysler.

And I thought the administration promised more jobs, not fewer ones.

In Chicago-business style, the administration is strong-arming these businesses and workers with a process that leaves them without legal recourse and sticks the business owner with millions of dollars of unsold vehicles by forcing them to close.

It should hardly escape anyone's notice that this is just what Dictator Hugo Chavez did earlier this month when he nationalized two U.S. oil company production facilities in Venezuela. Echoing a scheme that handed a U.S. company's assets over to Chavez's cronies, the administration nationalized these auto businesses and rewarded their own special interest groups, and once again, is picking the winners and losers in Chicago-style politics.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING THE ARKANSAS
ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATION OF BLIND
AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED FOR 25
YEARS OF SERVICE

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Arkansas Association For Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired for 25 years of dedicated service to the people of Arkansas.

This important organization provides support to the professionals who work with the visually impaired. I have seen the results of the work this organization does through my involvement with the AER, working with the Arkansas School for the Blind in Little Rock and also as an optometrist practicing in Rogers, Arkansas.

This important resource for Arkansans has been recognized recently as the AER chapter showing the greatest increase in membership over the past year. This national recognition is one reason why Arkansas was selected to host the 2010 AER International Conference.

With the help of organizations like this, Arkansas is building a brighter future for the visually impaired community. I commend the service providers for their good work and wish them continued success for another 25 years.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPPS) laid before the House the fol-

lowing communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 15, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*The Speaker, The Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Friday, May 15, 2009 at 11:50 a.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies the Congress he has extended the national emergency with respect to Burma.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-39)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. I have sent the enclosed notice to the Federal Register for publication, stating that the Burma emergency is to continue for 1 year beyond May 20, 2009.

The crisis between the United States and Burma arising from the actions and policies of the Government of Burma, including its engaging in large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma that led to the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997, as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13310 of July 28, 2003, Executive Order 13448 of October 18, 2007, and Executive Order 13464 of April 30, 2008, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Burma and maintain in force the sanctions against Burma to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 2009.