

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

that far exceeds any increases at the height of the Cold War, the Vietnam War, anything since World War II, to build Cold War weapons against enemies that no longer exist. Hopefully this Congress will act soon to rein in this administration, reexert its authority and bring some sanity to these policies.

□ 2030

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

(Mr. PLATTS 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 Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HATE CRIMES LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who asked Members to appear in a Special Order in honor of the United Nations' International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which takes place Thursday, March 21. I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who introduced H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2001.

There is no place in our society for racism, whether in the form of religious and ethnic discrimination or otherwise. Throughout history, wars have been fought over these types of differences. Many lives have been lost and many people uprooted. As in the dark past, today we are still witnessing violence being perpetrated against others with perceived differences. This is something that must be not only rooted out abroad, but we must also root out the ethnic and religious intolerance that we witness in our daily lives right here in our own communities.

Hate crimes, those committed against a group because of racial or religion or sexual orientation, is alive and well in America. Matthew Shepard and James Byrd are notable victims of these types of crimes; but there are many, many other victims as well of this type of crime, this cycle of violence. It has been stated that crimes based on race ranked number one of all the U.S. crimes reported in the FBI's "Hate Crimes Statistics of 2000" status report. The total number of all hate crimes across the Nation increased 3.5

percent from 1999 to 2000. These numbers reflect only the reported crimes. Many crimes continue to go unreported; and many States, because of budgetary reasons, do not keep tallies of crimes that would fall under this category.

The bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) would provide Federal assistance to States and local jurisdictions so that they can more readily report and prosecute hate crimes. It must be understood that violence motivated by race, color, gender, sexual orientation, or disability will not be tolerated.

It is important for Congress to show solidarity with those around the world honoring the United Nations' International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination by showing that we are ready, willing and able to address hate-motivated crimes within our own borders, within our own Nation. Our country and the world is very diverse. It is our diversity that should make us stronger as a Nation, stronger as a world community. Until we eliminate racial, gender, religious, and other types of discrimination, our unity as a country and as a world community will be threatened.

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

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

KIDNAPPING OF LUDWIG KOONS

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I stand here today in utter shock and disbelief and absolute anger.

For 2 years, I have been telling stories about missing children. For 2 years, I have been talking about internationally abducted children. For 2 years, I have been working with Jeff Koons and his attorneys to help bring his son Ludwig home from Italy. For 2 years, I have not seen progress. No change in Italy, and no response from our own government. I cannot express today the outrage that I feel right now about our Justice Department, our State Department, and the government and judicial systems of Italy.

Since 1984, for 8 years, Jeff Koons has been trying to get his son back, a son who he has legal custody of, who has been abused and neglected and forced to live in a pornographic compound in Rome, Italy, by his mother. On March 4 of 2002, this year, the Supreme Court of Cassation confirmed Ilona Staller's conviction for kidnapping Ludwig from his habitual residence in New York. This means Ilona Staller is a convicted kidnapper; yet Italy is still letting her retain Ludwig.

Yesterday, the Minors' Tribunal in Italy held a so-called hearing on the emergency order to keep Ms. Staller from taking Ludwig to another country, Hungary. And it is a so-called hearing because this hearing was nothing more than a dog and pony show. Ms. Staller was questioned for 15 minutes about her lawbreaking, about her intention to once again take Ludwig to another country. The judge questioned Ludwig, a scared, manipulated and abused 9-year-old little boy, about his wishes, alone, in the judge's chambers, with no witnesses, with no attorneys, with no video. And then the judge comes back in and says he is fine with his life as is.

The best psychologists in both countries, Italy and the United States, and doctors, say that Ludwig is on the brink of no return. Unless he is removed now, there is no telling what damage might be done to him physically and mentally. Yet these experts, the top Italian experts, were not allowed to testify at this so-called hearing.

In the end, the emergency request was denied and Mr. Koons was given 30 days to go prepare briefs and another 20 days to respond. Another 2 months of delay. It is contrary to all applicable principles of public international law and procedure to preclude an American citizen minor, who was kidnapped from his habitual residence, any access to his country of birth, even the temporary visits with his father and paternal family in their country of residence.

Ludwig, who is now approaching adolescence, finds himself in a dire situation that places him in imminent danger of grave and irreparable damage. His critical condition is directly related to his mother's continued abuse and neglect of the minor over the years, combined with her willful and systematic breach of Mr. Koons's visitation rights.

I stand here tonight because I am concerned that Mr. Koons may be subjected to further discrimination and inequitable treatment by the Italian judiciary in these impending proceedings. I stand here a part of the United States Government, and I have to say that I am ashamed. Where are our priorities? Where are our values?

I sit and listen to the politicians sound off about family values in this Chamber every day; yet every day our government lets this little boy remain captive against his will. Where is our State Department? Where is our Justice Department advocating for U.S. citizens? Ludwig Koons is a U.S. citizen.

We saw Blackhawk helicopters recently go in to rescue missionaries in Afghanistan, people who had been there of their own will. Yet our government will not send a letter or make a phone call demanding that this kid be sent back to our country. Do we only go to bat for citizens being held by those who are not our allies? Should we not go to bat for everyone?