

and in the process we expose ourselves to great danger. Instead of replacing today's international government, the United Nations, the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO, the international criminal court, with free and independent republics, it is more likely that we will see a rise of militant nationalism with a penchant for solving problems with arms and protectionism rather than free trade and peaceful negotiations.

The last thing this world needs is the development of more nuclear weapons, as is now being planned in a pretense for ensuring the peace. We would need more than an office of strategic information to convince the world of that.

What do we need? We need a clear understanding and belief in a free society, a true republic that protects individual liberty, private property, free markets, voluntary exchange and private solutions to social problems, placing strict restraints on government meddling in the internal affairs of others.

□ 2015

Indeed, we live in challenging and dangerous times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Jo ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINOJOSA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. KERNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KERNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING MS. DIANE S. ROARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, in the past, usually during consideration of the Intelligence budget, I have risen before this body and mentioned the superb and thoroughly knowledgeable staff that resides in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, of which we are very proud. These individuals are specially selected because of their knowledge and their understanding of the intelligence world, a world that is actually very arcane and confusing to people who do not spend time in it.

We do not talk a lot about these folks and they do not seek recognition. They are not that kind. They understand that much of the work must be done in secret so as not to betray the sensitive information they handle, but let me assure my colleagues and the American people that this group of dedicated people works very hard, and they dig very deeply into the operations of the Intelligence Community in order to ensure that there is oversight of intelligence activity and that our Nation is secure and the Intelligence Community is playing by the rules.

I want to specifically recognize one of these dedicated people who has served the committee and our country diligently for almost 2 decades. Her name is Diane Roark, and I am sorry to say that when this body reconvenes in April Diane will no longer be on our staff. She is retiring from the House and from government service.

Madam Speaker, Diane first joined the committee in April 1985, having previously served in the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, and just prior to joining us, on the National Security Council, where she was Deputy Director of Intelligence Programs. Since joining the committee, Diane has excelled in the very difficult, technical areas of our oversight. She was the program monitor for the National Reconnaissance Office where she not only challenged the embedded bureaucracy and made it become more innovative in approaches to future election, but she also forced the office to restructure and reform their fiscal accountability system so that oversight was assured.

Most recently, Diane has been our program manager for the National Security Agency, a vital agency for us. This agency has many, severe challenges, Madam Speaker, and if it were not for the efforts of Ms. Roark, I do believe that our committee's efforts to oversee and advocate for NAS would have been much less effective, and for that she has my personal thanks.

Diane is known as a very dedicated, tough-minded program monitor who digs into the issues and forces agencies to see and understand what they sometimes miss themselves. She is also known as a very knowledgeable task master, and her arrival at an agency is often anticipated with apprehension.

Those managing the community know that she is usually on the mark with her assessments and that she takes the public's trust very well to heart. Recently, one of the senior managers within the community commented on her performance by saying that our staff "is very aggressive in their oversight and has a very serious and in-depth knowledge of our programs, sometimes a better understanding than some of the senior managers do."

I think that this is the type of oversight capability that the American people are entitled to and should de-

mand. I cannot think of any greater tribute for Diane than knowing that agency leaders throughout the community recognize that her instincts and assessments are sound.

So, Madam Speaker, it is with some sadness that I rise today to say farewell to a public servant who has dedicated a career to ensuring our security, each and every one of us. Diane's departure is truly our loss, although I know that her younger son, Bryce, will enjoy having Mom around home more. We are going to miss her.

On behalf of the committee I thank Diane for her professionalism, her dedication, her unfailing commitment to our Nation and its security. We wish her well in her future endeavors, whatever they be. Know that she has served her country well and she will be missed. Job well done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMENDING LOCAL UNITED WAY CHAPTERS FOR CONTINUING SUPPORT OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the 97 percent of all local United Way chapters which continue to support the Boy Scouts of America despite the national campaign to demonize this wonderful organization.

The pressure to abandon the Boy Scouts has been just as intense as the pressure on the scouts themselves to abandon their moral standards and to take God out of the scout oath. Powerful business interests and Hollywood moguls like Steven Spielberg have severed their links with the scouts, and the taxpayer-funded public broadcasting system have attacked them as well. However, an overwhelming majority of the United Way chapters and the American people themselves have not cowered and have stood tall against this disgraceful campaign of intimidation.

In my own constituency, for instance, the Orange County United Way Chapter has given local scout troops and organizations \$1.3 million over the last 3 years and has no sign of letting up. Just recently, the City of Huntington Beach, for example, has named itself the Tree City USA for its greenery. Many of those trees in Huntington Beach were planted by local boy scout troops doing their good deeds and community service.

The United Way chapters that did cave into the pressure were mostly

from liberal university towns where ordinary decency is often treated with scorn and derision, but in the American heartland, in communities where families jealously guard virtues like loyalty and bravery and reverence, the support for the Boy Scouts has remained steadfast, and I would encourage every American to inquire as to what their local United Way is doing in this controversy.

One of the supreme ironies with this campaign against the scouts is that local Americans, ordinary Americans have stepped up and stepped into the breach to support the scouts when the United Way has pulled its support. This overwhelming backing for the scouts has exposed the opposition for what it is, marginal and well financed and vocal but a vitriolic minority nonetheless.

Mainstream America obviously believes that the Boy Scouts have the right to set their own moral standards and to include God in the scout oath. By the way, the Girl Scouts of America, which have many wonderful programs and are celebrating an anniversary this year, gave in to political correctness when it came to God and their scout oath. It is no longer required for Girl Scouts to acknowledge God in the scout oath. This is especially sad when young girls need a spiritual foundation to cope with the challenges and the temptations faced by today's young people.

The argument of those attacking the scouts has been that the scouts are being discriminatory. Well, yes, but they have a right to base their organization on certain beliefs like in God or in certain standards of behavior, sexual or otherwise. It is called freedom of association, and to those who call this discrimination, I ask, is this not what gay groups and even AIDS organizations do, discriminate? Some ask what do I mean?

Well, does anyone doubt that Christian fundamentalists are being excluded from these organizations, from homosexual and AIDS organizations because these religious fundamentalists might want to preach at these people? Is this not a discrimination against those people's religion? Well, of course, it is a discrimination against their religion, but those groups, just like the scouts, have a right to have associations based on shared values.

When gays were targeted by police for personal abuse and victimized by hatemongers, their rights were obviously being violated, and good people stood up. They united to end this injustice.

Today, it is the right of people with more traditional values, like the scouts, who are being under attack simply for trying to live their own lives with their own moral standards. The scouts in Orange County, for example, have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees in order to protect their right to have God in the scout oath. This is intolerable and the

scouts are not the only ones facing this stupid political correctness.

Recently the Red Cross in Orange County canceled an appearance of a local school chorus before one of their meetings because the songs that were planned to be sung at that meeting mentioned God, like America the Beautiful. Well, later on the Red Cross apologized but only after a hailstorm of criticism.

What is going on here? Americans have a right not to be forced to participate in what they do not believe, but do not people with religious persuasions have a right to have their own standards? Wake up, America. It can get worse and it will get worse unless we stand tall and we stand together against this kind of nonsense.

NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion within the Bush administration about where to take the military campaign against terrorism next. The President has already sent military advisers to the Philippines and the Republic of Georgia. His axis of evil comments lumped Iran, Iraq, and North Korea together as potential targets for future U.S. military action. He also indicated he wants to get the United States more deeply involved in Colombia's civil war by helping the government fight guerrilla armies rather than targeting the drug trafficking done by all parties in the war in Colombia.

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the exclusive authority to declare war. As commander-in-chief, the President conducts or would conduct day-to-day operations of our U.S. military. The Constitution and the War Powers Resolution of 1973 grants Congress the prerogative to decide whether or not to send U.S. troops into hostility.

The use of force resolution approved by Congress specifically safeguarded Congress' war powers by noting nothing in the resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

While Congress overwhelmingly authorized the President to use military force to respond to the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Congressional authorization was limited in scope. Specifically, the joint resolution stated the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attack that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

Thus far, the United States intelligence agencies with their secret \$32

billion a year budget could not predict the attacks and cannot uncover any links between Iraq and the attackers. Now, many in the administration are latching on to a magazine article written by Seymour Hirsch in the New Yorker who does not get \$32 billion a year from the taxpayers, who has uncovered purported links between some Kurds and the al Qaeda as a potential excuse to attack Iraq.

In December, I sent a letter along with a number of other Members of Congress to the President pointing out the limitations on the use of force authorization and reminding him that he would have to come, as his father did, to the United States Congress for authorization if he desired and felt there was a case to be made to attack Iraq. I have as yet to have a substantive response to that letter.

We at this point, I believe, have sort of a budding imperial presidency, the likes of which we have not seen since Richard Nixon.

There are other areas that are very troubling with this presidency. The nuclear posture review. According to a leaked version of the classified nuclear posture review, the Bush administration is contemplating using nuclear weapons as offensive weapons rather than merely to deter an attack against the United States. They now say they would target seven countries, Russia, China, Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea. This, in fact, includes countries who are not known to have nuclear weapons, an extraordinary change in U.S. policy. They want to develop small, more friendly nuclear weapons that could be used, they believe, in limited instances.

Of course, this would blur the line between conventional nuclear arms, would undermine the nonproliferation treaty which 187 countries have signed, including the United States of America, and that is a very disturbing trend. As Ronald Reagan once said, a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

We have the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the most successful treaty on arms limitations in the history of the world, which the President wishes to unilaterally abrogate, calling it a relic of the Cold War. The Constitution is more than 200 years old. I would hope that the President would not find that to be a relic. It is still very relevant today, as is the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. If it is scrapped as the President wishes, if he can legally do that, that is in question, it is likely that China, Russia and other countries would engage in a new crash program to expand nuclear weapons against our potential defenses which, of course, as we all know, the Star Wars fantasy does not work in any place, but it is a great place in which to dump two or three or \$400 billion of hard-earned taxpayers' money.

Finally, in the defense budget we have seen an extraordinary proposal that we should have a 1-year increase