

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary three-war veteran, Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Daube.

Colonel Daube is a highly decorated veteran, having served in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, amassing over 5,000 flight-hours between the Navy and the Air Force. He flew the P-51 Mustang, multiple fighter jets, and heavy metal. He even served in the space program. His name is enshrined on the Wall of Honor in the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum.

Colonel Daube's record of service is emblematic of why we all revere the Greatest Generation. Now, at 95 years old, he is still the cheerful warrior. He lives in Callaway, Florida, near his son, Dr. Skip Daube, who has been my friend for over 25 years.

I was honored to serve them both Thanksgiving dinner at Tyndall Air Force Base this year, and it was a time of great comradery.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting a living hero from our father's generation, Colonel Daniel Daube.

HONORING THE DONUT DOLLIES OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 627 brave civilian women who served as Donut Dollies for the Red Cross' Supplemental Recreational Activities Overseas Program during the Vietnam conflict between 1965 and 1972.

The name Donut Dollies was coined during World War II to describe the Red Cross volunteers who passed out hot coffee and donuts from the backs of military vehicles. While the women who volunteered in Vietnam did so much more than hand out donuts and coffee, the name Donuts Dollies was applied to them.

The young women of the Donut Dollies were stationed throughout Vietnam, from Saigon up to Quang Tri. They lived in tents and abandoned villas. They endured incoming fire, and they flew over enemy territory just like our military personnel.

These brave women quickly became to be known as angels in a combat zone for their bright smiles and powder blue uniforms that lifted the spirits at every base they toured.

The Donut Dollies hosted daily recreational events at large bases, such as pool tournaments, fashion shows, and various contests to provide fun and relaxation for off-duty military personnel. They helped serve food in chow lines, and they brought Kool-Aid to the night sentries working in perimeter towers.

Others were assigned to the Clubmobile program, which toured more remote bases, often requiring heli-

copter transport to reach them. They would gather the troops, usually beside a bunker or tank, to play competitive audience participation games.

For the hour or so that they were there, the Donut Dollies brought laughter and a sense of lightheartedness that was deeply missed in the war zone. Because death was so close, the laughter was healing, funny things were funnier, and their laughter helped join everyone together. One soldier once said it was the miracle of making the war disappear for a little while.

The approximately 1,500 visits of the Clubmobile program logged over 2.1 million air miles. Their primary goal on these visits and at the events at larger bases was to boost morale and to provide the men with a sense of home before going out in the field.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions of the Donut Dollies represented a changing role of women to serve their country at a time when women had previously been limited to noncombat roles. Their patriotism helped bring warmth, light, and laughter to the darkness of war-time.

My wife, Gina, and I are honored to recognize the women of the Donut Dollies and to thank them for their important and sacrificial contributions that they made for our country during the Vietnam conflict.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our military men and women who protect us, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

HONORING CHRIS AND PEGGY OSBORNE OF
BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 33 years of service and ministry of Chris and Peggy Osborne to Central Baptist Church and to the community of Bryan-College Station, Texas.

Central Baptist Church was founded in 1925 as a mission-minded ministry dedicated to sharing a passion for God's Word. Today, Central Baptist Church has become an integral part of the Bryan-College Station community, where a strong sense of discipleship has led to the creation of many outreach programs, children's ministry events, and college ministry groups.

Even as the church has grown, Central Baptist Church remains committed to their original mission-minded goals, and through the efforts of the congregation, thousands of people have found the joy, peace, and contentment that spring from a fulfilling and personal relationship with Jesus Christ.

For the past 33 years, Pastor Chris and his wife, Peggy, have been a source of light and encouragement and joy for the entire Central Baptist Church community. Under the leadership of Pastor Chris, Central has seen significant change and growth. The relocation of its church to its current 3,500-seat worship center and the more recent addition to the children's wing have provided members of the Central Baptist

family with ever-increasing opportunities for worship and community.

Chris's commitment to outreach and involvement have made him a pillar of the Bryan-College Station community, serving as chaplain for the police department, hosting cook-offs and baking competitions, and participating in charity golf tournaments.

Pastor Chris' dedication to service has not gone unnoticed, and hundreds of members of his congregation have experienced life change from his encouraging and supportive approach.

On January 26, 2020, Central Baptist Church will say good-bye to Pastor Chris and to his wife, Peggy, as they begin the next chapter of their lives in Fort Worth, Texas, where Chris will continue to spread the Word of God as a professor at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

As members of the Central Baptist Church congregation, my wife, Gina, and I have both grown in Christ because of the impact of the church under the leadership and friendship of Chris and Peggy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and thank both Chris and Peggy for their down-to-earth and positive leadership of this congregation and for their impact of spreading the good news of Jesus Christ.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the lives and legacies of Chris and Peggy Osborne.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our military men and women who protect us, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

RECOGNIZING THE 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF FORMER STUDENTS OF TEXAS
A&M UNIVERSITY

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recent 140th anniversary of The Association of Former Students of Texas A&M University.

The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, now known as Texas A&M University, was founded as a land-grant college by the State of Texas in 1871, pursuant to the Morrill Act. The college was the first public institution of higher education in Texas and started classes on October 4, 1876.

On June 26, 1879, with the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas still in its infancy, 11 former cadets hosted a reception in Houston, initiating the first formal organization of A&M former students. The persons at that meeting included:

William Sleeper, class of 1879;
William Trenckmann, class of 1878;
Pinckey Downs, class of 1879;
Edward Fitzhugh, class of 1879;
Edward Cushing, class of 1880;
George Hardy, class of 1879;
David Alexander, class of 1879;
William Small, class of 1882;
Robert Chatham, class of 1877;
William Brown, class of 1882; and
Thomas Fuller, class of 1881.

It was decided at that first meeting to endeavor to keep a record of all

former cadets who attended the A&M College of Texas, thus promoting and maintaining fellowship. The Ex-Cadets Association was reorganized to form the Alumni Association in 1888.

Developing throughout the years in tandem with the Alpha Phi Fraternity, which was founded in the 1890s and included former students who had not graduated, a coalition was formed in 1919 to formally reorganize and adopt the name The Association of Former Students.

This name was written into the charter granted by the State of Texas in 1925. In this charter, the association committed to “support of benevolent, charitable, and educational undertakings by extending financial and other aid to students at Texas A&M; by promoting social, literary, and scientific pursuits; by perpetuating and strengthening the ties of affection and esteem formed in university or college days; by promoting the interests and welfare of Texas A&M University and education generally in the State of Texas.”

Since its first day of class over 143 years ago, with six professors and 40 students, the university has grown to become one of the largest Tier 1 research and education institutions in the United States, with almost 70,000 students, thousands of faculty and staff, and close to a billion dollars of annual research activity.

□ 1245

Through its existence, the Association of Former Students has continued to grow rapidly. Today it serves more than 508,000 former students of Texas A&M University and generates an impact of almost \$14 million annually for university support through scholarships, student activities, and long-revered traditions, such as the Aggie Ring Program.

As the university has grown and developed, the Aggie Network—as the organization is commonly referred to today—has evolved but has always maintained its core values and commitments to the university, its current students and its former students. Together, the association and the university collaborate to maintain six core values of: loyalty, integrity, excellence, leadership, selfless service, and respect. These are the core values that unite all Texas A&M students and by which all Aggies strive to live.

As former chairman of the board of the Association of Former Students during 2007, I am honored and humbled to be able to recognize the accomplishments of the organization over the past 140 years. The Aggie Network is truly the glue that unites our current students, former students, and our responsibilities to live our core values every day.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the recent 140th anniversary of the Association of Former Students of Texas A&M University, I applaud the organization's ongoing commitment to all

Texas Aggies and to the core values of our beloved institution.

I have requested that the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the 140 years of legacy and the impact of the worldwide Aggie Network.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women who keep us safe, and for our first responders who protect us at home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REFLECTIONS ON THE WAR POWERS DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate yesterday on the so-called War Powers Resolution, fundamental misunderstandings surfaced that I think need to be addressed.

The first misunderstanding is that the justification for the attack that killed Soleimani was that he was an evil terrorist responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans. Well, there are a lot of evil terrorists out there, and that does not give the President authority to launch attacks on foreign countries to kill them.

But what did give the President authority in this case, was the fact that Soleimani was acting as an armed combatant against U.S. forces in a war zone in which the Congress had authorized the President to take military action through the Authorization for the Use of Military Force in Iraq in 2002.

Now, I hate to shock my woke colleagues, but killing active enemy combatants is what war is all about, and it is a war that Congress started with that act.

That act of Congress provides: “The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.”

The very nature of this authority includes combating hostile militia and armed proxies acting within Iraq against American forces. That is exactly what the President did.

The authorization to use military force did not end with the defeat of Saddam Hussein any more than the President's military authority in Japan and Germany ended with the defeat of Hirohito and Hitler.

In those cases, the President's authority didn't terminate until 1952 and 1955, respectively, and the President's military authority in Iraq remains in effect until the President and Congress terminate it.

Now, the second misunderstanding is that the President's action was an at-

tack on Iran. It most certainly was not. It was carried out in the theater of war defined by Congress against a combatant who was commanding hostile forces against American troops.

Not only did the President act entirely within his legal authority as Commander in Chief, but within his moral responsibility to protect American military and diplomatic personnel and American citizens in Iraq.

The third misunderstanding is that the War Powers Act is applicable in this circumstance. The War Powers Act governs only those circumstances when the President responds without congressional authority to an attack upon the United States, its territory or possessions, or its Armed Forces. In this case, the President already had congressional authority.

The fourth misunderstanding is that the attack on Soleimani was equivalent to President Obama's attack on Libya. The two are entirely different matters. The attack on Libya had no congressional authorization and the War Powers Act did not apply because Mr. Obama's military attack was not in response to an attack on the United States, its territory or possessions, or its Armed Forces.

It was an entirely unprovoked attack, entirely unauthorized and, accordingly, it was entirely illegal.

I think as we go forward, we need to get back to some basic, fundamental understandings about the constitutional parameters of war powers.

The American Founders made a sharp distinction between starting a war and waging a war for some very good reasons. They understood that this most solemn and lethal decision should not be entrusted to one individual whose authority would be greatly augmented by it.

The decision to start a war was given exclusively to Congress to assure that every voice in the country was heard, and that Congress, once having taken that stand, would be obligated to put the resources of the country behind that war and those fighting it.

But once the war has begun, the Founders wanted a single Commander in Chief directing it with clear and unambiguous authority. There is no surer path to military disaster than having 535 squabbling prima donnas second-guessing every decision being made.

Thus, the President can wage war but cannot declare it, and the Congress can declare war but cannot wage it.

The Founders debated these principles thoroughly during the Constitutional Convention. They recognized that the President did need certain residual military power to repel an attack when Congress couldn't act. And I believe the War Powers Act faithfully defines these circumstances and establishes a framework to contain them.

But the War Powers Act does not give the President the authority to