and the President signs this legislation, we can all be proud that we are, at last, acting as a great nation should.

I urge my colleagues to keep the word of our Nation and act expeditiously and favorably on this legislation as it proceeds through the Congress.

CODEL WELDON, OBSERVATIONS AND DIRECTION

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues tonight to talk about what we have seen in a part of the world that has vexed American policy makers for generations.

First I want to commend Chairman WELDON for his high-energy, unyielding approach to seeing as much as possible on these delegation trips. Our focus is always on bringing back information that will enlighten and inform U.S. policy makers, both in the Congress and in the Administration.

At this difficult moment in the world, our trip was a good opportunity to speak to our legislative colleagues in the Russian Duma. We arrived in Moscow in the wake of the historic signing of the strategic arms reduction treaty by Presidents Bush and Putin. While we were there, NATO nations met in Rome to agree to limited membership for Russian in NATO, India and Pakistan danced dangerously close to a nuclear confrontation, the cycle of violence continued between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and the war on terrorism continued in Afghanistan. So there was a great deal on our plate with which to deal.

We last went to Russia in September 2001, after the attacks on the United States and after the war began, and came away with a real partnership with many of our colleagues in the Russian Duma. We began then to talk about areas of commonality through which members of our respective legislatures (the U.S. Congress and the Russian Duma) could work. In our last visit, we presented a document entitled: ''U.S.-Russia Partnership.''

In our visit this time around, we were told that our document's recommendations were the basis for the Russian initiatives presented to President Bush during his recent visit in Russia. Discussions in Russia generally followed concerns such as: combating international terrorism, using academics and science to address political problems, joint environmental—and economic—efforts, and engaging young people of both countries in issues of mutual interest (such as sports and cultural events).

Russia is an important strategic partner for the United States and for NATO. After entering the 21st Century through columns of fire, our relationship with Russia is on a considerably stronger foundation. For the first time, there is mutual agreement on goals and values, and on a shared vision for the security threats we both face in this world.

When we met with Uzbekistani President Karimov, I was impressed with the geopolitical environment of the region. He, too, supported Chairman WELDON'S proposal to establish a joint U.S. Congress-Uzbek parliamentary working group, based on the success of the U.S. Congress-Duma work of last year.

The best part of being in Uzbekistan was seeing the satisfaction on the faces of the young men and women serving in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. They are the ones carrying our battle to our enemies, and they are gung-ho about their mission. We got a good deal of intelligence on the ground—literally—intelligence about the daily activities of our troops and how they see their jobs every day. We had the privilege of distributing homemade cookies baked by people here at home for these brave men and women. They very much enjoyed the special gifts from home.

As always, I saw a host of Texans stationed in Uzbekistan doing then-duty for the United States, including Specialist Harwig from Corpus Christi, Texas.

We also went to Beijing, China, to talk with senior officials about a host of defense-related and economic-related topics. With China, as always, the topic of Taiwan was paramount in the minds of the Chinese. They continually expressed the importance of the ''one-China'' policy. We emphasized the wide breath of things on which the United States and China agree, and urged both nations to find agreement rather than disagreement.

Several members of our delegation surmised that the issue of Taiwan will diminish as a divisive issue over time due to the large—and increasing—investment by Taiwan interests in mainland China.

India and Pakistan are adjoining neighbors, and the nuclear saber-rattling in the subcontinent is unnerving all the nations of the world . . . most noticeably the Chinese. Both nations are China's neighbors, and they continue to hope the difference over Kashmir can be solved peacefully. This is no place for a hair-trigger on a nuclear weapon.

The CODEL also met with members of the government of the Republic of Korea (ROK, South Korea) and thanked the ROK for their prompt and significant support for the United States after 9–11. The ROK stepped up quickly to support our war against the Taliban and al Queda in Afghanistan, providing shipping, aircraft and a field hospital to support U.S. operations in the area.

We were particularly disappointed that the North Koreans refused to meet with us. The ROK, we were told by the foreign ministry, continues to talk of peace with North Korea, but the pace of discussions was extraordinarily slow.

Chiefly, discussions with the ROK centered on trade, U.S. forces in Korea in the DMZ, our war on terrorism, political and military stability on the Korean Peninsula, and the strong desire—on their part—for reunification. We even had significant discussions about internet voting in the ROK, ''E'' government initiatives, and the digital divide in the ROK.

There are also a number of Texans serving in uniform as we visited the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). The DMZ never ceases to amaze me . . . it stands as a tribute to the standoff between ideologies along the Pacific Rim, and on the south side of it is the best reason for the conflict in the first place: democracy and free commerce in the highly developed south, with the north side practicing communism and starving their citizens and their economy.

Our trip proved, once again, the importance of going beyond our borders to see first hand, and hear first hand, the particular situations in the nations of our friends and those whom we hope to make our friends.

HONORING FLINT POWERS CATHOLIC CHARGERS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chargers of Flint Powers Catholic High School, on winning the 2001–2002 Michigan High School Athletic Association Class B State girls basketball championship. The Chargers defended their 2000–2001 championship in a repeat of last year's final game, defeating the Detroit Country Day Yellowjackets 54–53. It was certainly an exciting game that showcased some of the best talent the state of Michigan has to offer.

The Chargers are a true testament of what hard work, determination, and a passionate desire to win can accomplish. Under the guidance of 26-year Head Coach Kathy McGee, and Assistant Coaches Brad Terebinski, Betsy Kreston, and Kae Edison, the championship served as a wonderful finish to a remarkable year, marked with a perfect record of 28–0. In addition, the Michigan High School Coaches Association named Coach McGee Women's Basketball Coach of the Year.

The Chargers' roster includes: seniors Rachael Carney, Rebekah Sirna, Ellen Tomek; juniors Brittney Brindley, Elizabeth Flemming, Jessica Guilbault, Michelle Landaal, Victoria Lucas-Perry, Shannon Rettenmund, Ann Skufca; sophomores Erin Carney, Lauren Goggins, Maddison Snow; and freshmen Tia Duncan, Cari Pigott. These young women, led by team captains Carney, Lucas-Perry, and Tomek, proved to be leaders in the classroom, the basketball court, and the community. They are all shining examples of the Lansing Diocese's strong commitment to success in all aspects of life.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the accomplishments of the Powers Chargers, and share the joy of their victory with Powers students and alumni and especially the people in my hometown of Flint. I ask my colleagues in the 107th Congress to join me in congratulating these fine ladies.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF HALA SALAAM MAKSOUD

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, a memorial service honoring the work and achievements of Hala Salaam Maksoud will be held on Wednesday, June 5 at Georgetown University. Hala Maksoud was a great champion for civil rights and human rights. It was truly a sad day on Friday, April 26, 2002, when she lost her hard-fought battle with cancer.

Hala Maksoud was a passionate and vital advocate for Arab American concerns. As president of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) from 1996–2001, she helped propel the concerns of Arab Americans

to the forefront of our national debates. She led ADC in combating defamation and negative stereotyping of Arab Americans in the media and wherever else it is practiced. Her commitment to defending the rights of Arab Americans and promoting Arab-American cultural heritage was not only visionary but necessary. I would like to share with my colleagues the ADC Press Release mourning the loss of Hala Salaam Maksoud.

[From ADC Press Release, Apr. 26, 2002.]

ADC MOURNS LOSS OF HALA SALAAM MAKSOUD

It is with a profound sense of loss and sadness that the Board of Directors and the national office staff of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) mourn the passing of Dr. Hala Salaam Maksoud, who died today after a long illness. Funeral arrangements will be announced by the family after they are finalized.

One of the most influential and important leaders in ADC's history, Dr. Maksoud served as ADC President from 1996 to 2001. Dr. Maksoud had been actively involved with ADC since its inception in 1980, and was a member of the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors for many years.

Dr. Maksoud held a Ph.D. in political theory and an M.A. in government from Georgetown University, and an M.A. in mathematics from the American University of Beirut. She taught courses at George Mason University and at Georgetown. In addition to her academic career, Dr. Maksoud was a prominent Arab-American leader and participated in the founding of several organizations, including the American Committee on Jerusalem, the Association of Arab-American University Graduates, and the Arab Women's Council. Dr. Maksoud was a nationally recognized advocate of civil and human rights, and was the recipient of a lifetime achievement award from the American Immigration Law Foundation in March 2002.

Dr. Maksoud is survived by her husband, Dr. Clovis Maksoud, former Ambassador of the League of Arab States to the United States and the United Nations, and current professor of international relations at American University.

ADC President Ziad Asali said ''this is a devastating loss for the entire Arab-American community, as well as for me personally. Hala was a visionary leader who charted a path to empowerment we will be following for many years to come. Her extraordinary command of politics was matched by exceptional compassion and a genuine commitment to human rights. She had a remarkable ability to communicate effectively with and inspire people of very different cultural and political backgrounds and across lines of religion and social class. Leaders of Hala's caliber are exceedingly rare and we shall miss her guidance and wise counsel. Our task now at ADC is to try to live up to the standard she set for us all.''

FISCAL YEAR 2003 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, PART IV

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. DeFAZIO Mr. Speaker, today I rise to conclude my remarks about H.R. 4546, the fiscal year 2003 Department of Defense authorization act. As I outlined previously, H.R. 4546 continues to fund, to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars, weapons that have little or no relevance to the threats our nation faces in the 21 st century.

My previous remarks detailed the amendments I offered to eliminate or reform the Crusader artillery system, the Comanche helicopter and the F–22 Raptor fighter jet program.

I want to switch gears a little bit and move away from my concerns about unnecessary weapons systems. I'd like to conclude my remarks on the defense authorization bill by focusing on the most solemn obligation of Congress, our constitutional powers to decide issues of war and peace,

The final amendment I offered to H.R. 4546 was a ''Sense of Congress'' amendment relating to congressional war powers under the U.S. Constitution. This was a bipartisan amendment I offered with Representative Ron Paul of Texas.

Our amendment was in response to the public musings of members of the Bush Administration about where the United States should project our military force next in the campaign against terrorism. Iraq is the most talked about target, but several other countries have been mentioned as well.

I am concerned that the Administration believes it can wage war anywhere, at any time, for any reason, at any cost. The executive branch seems to forget that the sole authority to declare war is reserved under the U.S. Constitution for Congress.

The amendment I drafted noted that the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power ''to declare war,'' to lay and collect taxes to ''provide for the common defense'' and general welfare of the United States, to ''raise and support armies,'' to ''provide and maintain a navy,'' to ''make rules for the regulation for the land and naval forces,'' to ''provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions,'' to ''provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia,'' and to ''make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution . . . all . . . powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States.'' Congress is also given exclusive power over the purse. The Constitution says, ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law,''

By contrast, the war powers granted to the executive branch through the President are limited to naming the President ''commander-in-chief'' of the armed forces. While this means the President conducts the day-to-day operations of a given military campaign, the President does not have the authority to send U.S. troops into hostile situations without prior approval from Congress.

This right was recognized by the earliest leaders of our nation. In 1793, President George Washington, when considering how to protect inhabitants of the American frontier, instructed his Administration that ''no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after [Congress] have deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure.''

In 1801, President Thomas Jefferson sent a small squadron of frigates to the Mediterranean to protect against possible attacks by the Barbary powers. He told Congress that he was ''unauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense.'' He further noted that it was up to Congress to authorize ''measures of offense also.''

John Jay, generally supportive of executive power, warned in Federalist paper number four that ''absolute monarchs will often make war when their nations are to get nothing by it, but for purposes and objects merely personal, such as a thirst for military glory, revenge of personal affronts, ambition, or private compacts to aggrandize or support their particular families or partisans. These and a variety of other motives, which affect only the mind of the sovereign, often lead him to engage in wars not sanctified by justice or the voice and interests of his people.''

Henry Clay said, ''A declaration of war is the highest and most awful exercise of sovereignty. The convention which framed our Federal constitution had learned from the pages of history that it had been often and greatly abused. It had seen that war had often been commenced upon the most trifling pretexts; that it had been frequently waged to establish or exclude a dynasty; to snatch a crown from the head of one potentate and place it upon the head of another; that it had often been prosecuted to promote alien and other interests than those of the nation whose chief had proclaimed it, as in the case of English wars for Hanoverian interests; and, in short, that such a vast and tremendous power ought not to be confined to the perilous exercise of one single man . . . Congress, then in our system of government, is the sole depository of that tremendous power.''

During congressional consideration of a war with Mexico, Daniel Webster said, ''It must be admitted to be the clear intent of the constitution that no foreign war would exist without the assent of Congress. This was meant as a restraint on the Executive power.'' He went on to say, ''If we do not maintain this doctrine; if it is not so—if Congress, in whom the war-making power is expressly made to reside, is to have no voice in the declaration or continuance or war; if it is not to judge of the propriety of beginning or carrying it on—then we depart at once, and broadly, from the Constitution.''

Abraham Lincoln outlined the rationale for placing the war-making power in the Congress. He wrote to a friend, ''Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention [U.S. Constitutional Convention] understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the constitution that no man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.''

Senator Robert LaFollette made a similar point during the floor debate on whether to enter World War I. He said, ''We all know from the debates which took place in the constitutional convention why it was that the constitution was so framed as to vest in the Congress the entire war-making power. The framers of the Constitution knew that to give to one man that power meant danger to the rights and liberties of the people. They knew that it mattered not whether you call the man king or emperor, czar or president, to put into his hands the power of making war or peace meant despotism. It meant that the people would be called upon to wage wars in which they had no interest or to which they might