

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES OF
THE HOUSE TO THE FAMILIES
OF THE CREW OF THE SPACE
SHUTTLE "COLUMBIA"

SPEECH OF

HON. ERIC CANTOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 2003

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, our Nation mourns the loss of the seven astronauts of Shuttle *Columbia*. We honor the lives of some of our finest men and women from America's space program and their desire and sacrifice to make this world a better place.

We in Virginia take a moment to remember one of those astronauts, Captain David M. Brown, Mission Specialist aboard Shuttle *Columbia*. I extend special condolences to the family of Capt. Brown, son of Dorothy and Paul Brown of Massies Corner, from the Seventh District of Virginia. Capt. Brown was a graduate of the College of William and Mary and also graduated from Eastern Virginia Medical School in Norfolk, VA. Virginians will long remember and honor the accomplishments and the life of Captain David Brown.

We recognize the crew of Shuttle *Columbia*'s courage and devotion to the expansion not only of our Nation's scientific knowledge, but our national security as well. Although this tragedy strikes a terrible blow, it is important to remember the words of our fellow Virginian, Capt. David Brown: "This program must go on."

I would like to express my deepest sympathy to the grieving families. My prayers are with the entire Shuttle *Columbia* crew's families and loved ones during this tragic time.

"LIBERATION" OF FRANCE IN VIO-
LATION OF COVENANT OF
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 11, 2003

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, among the many letters I have received on the subject of Iraq, one of the most provocative is the following, signed "Publius Secundus."

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HYDE: I am not an international lawyer, but as part of an effort to be helpful, I must note that I have come across disturbing and, I believe, persuasive evidence that D-Day and the subsequent "liberation" of France were in direct violation of the solemn obligations undertaken by Great Britain and France under the Covenant of the League of Nations. As Article 11 states: "Any war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations."

Whether one regards this easily avoided conflict as a dispute (1) between one League member, Britain, and another, France (then represented by the government of so-called "Vichy" France, which is believed to have never withdrawn from the League), or (2) between one League member and a non-member state (the United States vs. France, Brit-

ain vs. Germany), the League Covenant makes clear the course of action to be taken, in letter and certainly in spirit.

Under the first scenario, the conflict must be submitted to the League Council under Articles 12-16. The waiting period of at least three months after the award by the arbitrators, sadly, was not honored.

As for the second scenario, as addressed in Article 17, I do not recall Germany—an ex-member since 1933—being invited to accept the obligations of League membership, and certainly the leading role of the Council was never respected. In fact, I am forced to conclude that the Council was bypassed altogether. Certainly, no vote of the Council authorizing the attack was ever recorded.

I believe we can all agree that Chancellor Hitler was a brutal dictator whose replacement should be welcomed by all civilized people, but we must also admit that he was never given an opportunity to disarm.

Certainly no League Commission was ever allowed to perform its tasks, as set forth in the Covenant. I need hardly remind anyone that Britain's declaration of war against Germany in 1939—Germany had made no attack upon Britain—violated virtually all of the Articles of the League Covenant.

I find all of this very troubling.

I believe we have no option but to judge the June 6, 1944 Allied attack—jointly planned and conducted by the U.S. and Britain in a deliberate effort to impose their will by force on other countries without authorization by the League—upon Germany/France as an avoidable or easily postponed act of aggression that demonstrates a complete disregard for international law and the obligations of membership in the League. The international community cannot allow this violation to stand.

Sincerely,

PUBLIUS SECUNDUS.

For your convenience, I have attached the relevant sections of the Covenant. (The entire document can be obtained at <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/leagcov.htm>).

THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ARTICLE 5

Except where otherwise expressly provided in this Covenant or by the terms of the present Treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting . . .

ARTICLE 11

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary General shall on the request of any Member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

ARTICLE 12

The Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture they will submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to enquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision, or the report by the Council. In any case under this Article the award of the arbitrators or the judicial decision shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

ARTICLE 13

The Members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between

them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration or judicial settlement.

ARTICLE 16

Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League.

ARTICLE 17

In the event of a dispute between a Member of the League and a State which is not a Member of the League, or between States not Members of the League, the State or States not Members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles 12 to 16 inclusive shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

Upon such invitation being given the Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances. . . .

(The entire Covenant can be obtained at <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/leagcov.htm>)

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 4, THE
PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY,
WORK AND FAMILY PROMOTION
ACT OF 2003

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 11, 2003

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to join with several of my colleagues in sponsoring H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act of 2003, which would reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant and the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

Last year, the House Education and the Workforce Committee considered and passed H.R. 4092, the Working Toward Independence Act, to reauthorize the work-related provisions of TANF. The legislation built upon the historic welfare reform law passed in 1996—a law that made a fundamental shift in policy by encouraging personal responsibility and promoting work. For the first time in the history of social welfare policy, benefits were tied to work. Because of the principle of "work first" and a purpose to help people better themselves, a whole new culture of personal responsibility was created within the program.

After merging the remaining sections of TANF into a comprehensive package, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4737, the Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act of 2002, which was substantially the same as the bill that has been introduced today. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on a welfare reauthorization bill.

As such, Congress must again pass a reauthorization bill that builds on the success of the 1996 law that has been nothing short of remarkable.