

I will miss Minnie Minoso. He is a lesson in why sport are bigger than runs, hits, and errors. It is about human beings and humanity and young kids.

Thank you, Minnie.

#### REST IN PEACE, FATHER TED HESBURGH AND PROFESSOR CHARLES RICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Notre Dame family lost two larger-than-life figures.

One, a Holy Cross priest, Father Ted Hesburgh, served as Notre Dame's president for 35 years and oversaw remarkable growth of the university named for Our Lady. Father Hesburgh was known and recognized around the world.

The other was a layman, Charles Rice, who taught at Notre Dame Law School for 40 years and was a retired Marine, a devoted husband to his wife, Mary, without whom he could never have accomplished his work, a devoted father, and an academic who dove deep into the philosophical underpinnings of the law. It is estimated that he taught half of the living alumni of the Notre Dame Law School.

While much has been written and said these last few days about Father Hesburgh, given the international stage on which he walked, comparatively less has been said of Professor Rice, except for the recognition that countless law students, colleagues, and pro-life and religious liberty advocates have given in the days since he passed away.

To my left is one of those iconic figures from the 1960s. In it, we see Dr. Martin Luther King and Father Hesburgh, standing together for racial equality in Chicago.

What allowed these two remarkable men to come together, in spite of different backgrounds and traditions, was a common understanding of justice that was grounded in our Western and Judeo-Christian philosophy of law.

It was this same philosophy that was at the heart of what Professor Charles Rice taught at Notre Dame.

In Martin Luther King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail," written 2 years prior to the famous Selma March that will be commemorated this weekend, Dr. King addressed his fellow clergymen, many of whom were criticizing his tactics in confronting unjust Jim Crow laws.

One may well ask, Dr. King wrote: "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?"

The answer lies in the fact that there are two types of laws, just and unjust.

I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but a moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to obey unjust laws. I, Dr.

King said, would agree with St. Augustine that "an unjust law is no law at all."

Dr. King then asked, Now what is the difference between the two? How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust?

King answered that a just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas, Dr. King continued, an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law.

These words would be very familiar to any of Charlie Rice's jurisprudence students. Indeed, a significant amount of Professor Rice's work dealt with the concept of natural law.

Natural law principles were recognized in our Declaration of Independence, with Jefferson referencing the "Laws of Nature and Nature's God" and the recognition that individuals are endowed by a Creator with certain inalienable rights, including a right to life.

Charlie Rice was a fierce defender of the right to life. He believed that every human being, whether an elderly grandmother who could no longer care for herself, a young adult who was incapacitated through an accident or a degenerative disease, an unborn child capable of feeling pain, or a 3-week-old unborn child whose heart had just begun to beat, had an inalienable right to life. And for Charlie, those lives, and all human lives, are sacred because they are a gift of God.

In the years since *Roe v. Wade*, Professor Rice never wavered from his core conviction on the right to life. He became increasingly concerned for the religious freedom and conscience rights of individuals when he saw government coercing them into practices that violated those rights.

Professor Rice told his students: "Never be afraid to speak the truth." He certainly never was.

For him, the truth was clear. The right to life and freedom of religion, both of which are specifically mentioned in our Nation's founding documents, are under attack.

But Professor Rice never gave up. He believed that one day those rights would be protected again, and he continued to defend those rights to the day he died.

His work in defending life and religious freedom will continue. It will live on in his wife, Mary, his children, and grandchildren, as well as the countless lives he touched.

May Professor Rice and Father Hesburgh rest in peace.

#### PRIME MINISTER BINYAMIN NETANYAHU'S RECENT ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 23 hours ago, in this Chamber, Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu was given a large megaphone to undercut American diplomatic attempts at restraining Iran's nuclear ambitions. One has to go back to the days of Gen. Douglas MacArthur being fired by President Truman, who was then invited to Congress by the Republican leadership to a rapturous audience.

Yet history has shown that General MacArthur and the Republican leadership were wrong, Truman was right, and is, deemed one of our best Presidents for the hard, difficult decisions he made to much political criticism. And history has not been so kind to the career and personality of General MacArthur and the message he delivered to that Congress.

I suspect that history will not be kind to yesterday's speech and the decision to stage it.

The Prime Minister delivered no alternative vision other than an impossible set of demands that would ensure negotiations by America, our allies, and the Russians fail. He seemed to doom Americans and Iranians to be permanent enemies, even though the Iranian people, distinct from the ayatollahs and their minions, by all accounts, are the only country in the region, other than Israel, that has a positive view towards America. Think about that.

But the flaws in Netanyahu's speech were more fundamental. He had no alternative vision, no outline of a plan that would do anything other than lead to war.

□ 1030

His remarks continued a series of dire predictions that I have heard from him since I first came to Congress in 1995. He had the same certitude when he testified before Congress about what a positive, transformational event it would be for the United States to go to war with Iraq.

It was good politics at the time, probably even for most American politicians, and I am sure it was good politics in Israel. But he demonstrated spectacularly bad political judgment, cheerleading the United States into the worst foreign policy disaster in our history, costing us trillions of dollars with no end in sight, costing hundreds of thousands of lives, and casting the Middle East in turmoil.

Indeed, Iran's ayatollahs were the only winners in the wake of that tragic war urged on by Netanyahu. It allowed Iran to have an outsized influence in the very countries that Netanyahu mentioned. The Middle East is in crisis, on the defensive with ISIS forces that are only slightly larger than the authorized strength of the California National Guard.

Mr. Netanyahu produced a vision that is bound to fail, and at what cost to the American-Israeli leadership? Making Israel a partisan issue harms Israel, according to a good friend of

mine who worked for AIPAC for years. More troubling, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not offer one word about his failure to produce a peaceful, two-state solution. Now, I would have welcomed even a word about the pending humanitarian crisis in Gaza. I am not talking about war with the militants. I am talking about 1.7 million people in a land where 95 percent of the water is already unfit to drink, and by next year it will be the case with all domestic water. If no action is taken, by 2020, that damage will be irreversible.

But I was encouraged by the AIPAC conference. While I don't necessarily agree with all of their policy prescriptions dealing with Iran, I was heartened to see that they had two well-attended panel discussions featuring Gidon Bromberg, an Israeli expert, that highlighted why it was in both the interest of Israel and Gaza to solve the pending water and sanitation crisis and that solution is easily within the power of Israel, the United States, and other donor nations.

I saw that as a bright spot in a troubling day. If we concentrate on simple, commonsense steps where we can work together to save lives and improve the future, I think there is a lot more on the horizon that we can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with Israel. That is why I chose not to undercut our diplomats in the midst of negotiating by attending that joint session. Netanyahu offers one perspective—certainly not mine. But challenging his ideas is not anti-Israeli any more than challenging the ideas of President Obama is anti-American.

I will welcome a feasible alternative to a bad deal, but I have yet to hear one, especially from the Prime Minister. Until then, I will stand with Israel by empowering our negotiators and not undercutting them.

#### SELMA AND THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the 50th anniversary of the Selma voting rights movement and of the Selma to Montgomery marches that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act. Nothing so far has moved me more as a freshman Member of this august body than to sit down and talk with our colleague, JOHN LEWIS, who years ago was the chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

I have had many occasions since the beginning of this Congress to speak with Congressman JOHN LEWIS about the events of 50 years ago. He is the only living "Big Six" leader of the American civil rights movement still with us. It will forever be my honor to have sat next to Mr. LEWIS when President Obama gave his State of the Union Address earlier this year. It was

not lost on me that I was sitting and listening to President Obama while sitting next to a man whose actions 50 years ago helped pave the way for Barack Obama, a Black kid from Hawaii, to become President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the freedom marches mark a significant turning point in America's history. As an ethnic minority myself, I am thankful for those that paved the way for the freedoms and the liberties that all of us as Americans enjoy. They suffered insults and physical harm, yet their spirit remained unbroken.

The right of our citizens to vote is one that runs through the foundation of our country. To prevent or inhibit the vote of a citizen is an action that I feel contradicts the very principles on which this country was established. Even in our current society, there are efforts being undertaken to limit citizens of our country from casting their vote. This is a despicable practice and highlights to me the importance of the Voting Rights Act and the need to remain vigilant against those who seek to reverse the great strides made by this country towards equal rights for all.

The brave actions taken by the civil rights marchers 50 years ago still resonate with our society today. That is why I am proud to join the 50th anniversary of the freedom march.

Looking through the photos of the original Selma protest, I was struck by photos of Dr. Martin Luther King, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and others leading the 54-mile third march, arms linked together in solidarity, wearing what looked like white double carnation Hawaiian lei. Looking into the matter further, I learned, in fact, that they were wearing lei. Why were they wearing lei? I found an answer that drove home for me the importance of standing together for civil rights for all.

Mr. Speaker, many of you may not know this, but Dr. Martin Luther King actually came to speak at the University of Hawaii in 1964. He came for a civil rights symposium being held at the university. It was during this time in Hawaii that he began a deep friendship with the Reverend Abraham Kahikina Akaka, former pastor of Kawaiahao Church in Oahu and the first chairman of the Hawaii Advisory Committee of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. In the spirit of aloha, which means compassion, peace, and love, the reverend sent to Selma lei for the leaders of the protests to wear.

I will be marching this weekend, Mr. Speaker; and to honor the tradition and the bond established many years ago between Hawaii and the Alabama civil rights leaders, Senator MAZIE HIRONO and I will be presenting lei to Congressman JOHN LEWIS and all of our congressional colleagues. These lei are a tribute to the Selma marchers 50 years ago and the knowledge that their efforts reverberated through our Na-

tion and to Hawaii, a State that was only 6 years old.

As we travel across the 54-mile historic trail and cross the famous Edmund Pettus Bridge on Saturday, we will remember those whose lives were lost fighting for our civil rights, remember those who paved the way, celebrate the hard fought victories, and remind ourselves that the fight is not yet over.

I look forward to participating in this historic weekend, and I thank the Faith & Politics Institute for coordinating our congressional pilgrimage to Alabama.

#### WHY PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD IS IN THE U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth time this year that I have addressed this Chamber about Puerto Rico's political destiny. I recently introduced a bill that would provide for Puerto Rico's admission as a State once a majority of Puerto Rico's electorate affirms their desire for statehood in a federally sponsored vote. The bill already has 70 cosponsors—56 Democrats and 14 Republicans.

In contrast to Puerto Rico's current territory status, statehood would deliver to my constituents what all free people deserve: full voting rights, full self-government, and full equality under the law. And unlike separate nationhood, which is the only other non-territory option available to Puerto Rico, statehood would help rebuild the island's shattered economy and improve its quality of life. Indeed, the fact that statehood would be in the best interest of Puerto Rico is beyond reasonable dispute. There will always be politicians in Puerto Rico who claim otherwise for ideological reasons, but their arguments are detached from reality.

Today I want to outline why statehood would also be in the national interest of the United States as a whole. There are three main reasons—one moral, one economic, and one political. First, the moral reason.

In 2012, my constituents held a free and fair vote in which they rejected territory status and expressed a preference for statehood. At a subsequent Senate committee hearing, then-chairman RON WYDEN said that the current relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico "undermines the United States' moral standing in the world." Senator WYDEN posed this question:

"For a nation founded on the principles of democracy and the consent of the governed, how much longer can America allow a condition to persist in which nearly 4 million U.S. citizens do not have a vote in the government that makes the national laws which affect their daily lives?"