

bill addresses a great injustice being perpetrated by the Federal Government on those youngsters who participate in programs such as 4-H or the Future Farmers of America. Under current tax law, children are forced to pay federal income tax when they sell livestock they have raised as part of an agricultural education program.

Think about this for a moment. These kids are trying to better themselves, earn some money, save some money and what does Congress do? We pick on these kids by taxing them: It is truly amazing that with all the hand-wringing in Congress over the alleged need to further restrict liberty and grow the size of government "for the children" we would continue to tax young people who are trying to lead responsible lives and prepare for the future. Even if the serious social problems today's youth face could be solved by new federal bureaucracies and programs, it is still unfair to pick on those kids who are trying to do the right thing.

These children are not even old enough to vote, yet we are forcing them to pay taxes! What ever happened to no taxation without representation? No wonder young people are so cynical about government!

It is time we stopped taxing youngsters who are trying to earn money to go to college by selling livestock they have raised through their participation in programs such as 4-H or Future Farmers of America. Therefore, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting the Agriculture Education Freedom Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GREATER
NEW YORK CHAPTER, THE
LINKS, INCORPORATED—2011
WOMEN OF DISTINCTION SPIRIT
AWARD LUNCHEON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Greater New York Chapter, The Links, Incorporated—2011 Women of Distinction Spirit Award Luncheon which takes place on Saturday, April 23, 2011 at the elegant and scenic Pier Sixty at Chelsea Piers in New York City.

Established in 1946, The Links, Incorporated, is one of the Nation's oldest and largest volunteer service organizations of women who, linked in friendship, are committed to enriching, sustaining and ensuring the culture and economic survival of African-Americans and persons of African descent. The Links, Incorporated is a not-for-profit organization, which consists of nearly 12,000 professional women of color in 272 chapters located in 42 states, the District of Columbia and the Bahamas.

On May 21, 1949, the Greater New York Chapter was chartered in response to an invitation extended by Margaret Roselle Hawkins and Sarah Strickland Scott, co-founders of The Links, Incorporated. Co-founder Sarah Strickland Scott attended the installation of the new charter members at Harlem's famous Hotel Theresa, which included Dorothy Reed, Bernia Austin, Myrtle Howard, Estelle Jarrott, Ethel Lowry, Emilie Pickins, Mable Trent, and Marie Vidal. The Links National Emblem was

designed by Ethel Lowry, who served as the National Corresponding Secretary.

The Greater New York Chapter was the first chapter in New York and comprises members from all five boroughs in New York City and Long Island. Today, under the leadership of President Gerri Warren Merrick, the Greater New York Chapter is committed to fostering community outreach throughout the New York metropolitan area by developing quality programs with a long-term impact on the well-being and enrichment of African-Americans.

The Greater New York Chapter honors two women of distinction and spirit—Ms. Debra L. Lee, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of BET Networks and Ms. Rhonda Mims, President of the ING Foundation and Senior Vice President of the Office of Corporate Responsibility and Multicultural Affairs.

Award recipient Debra L. Lee is responsible for helping guide BET's reinvigorated approach in producing programming that supports, embraces and encourages African American families in a very positive light, focusing on the issues that are important to the Black family, while presenting the freshest talent and entertainment to American Television and beyond.

Award recipient Rhonda Mims is responsible for creating an enterprise-wide community relations platform, focusing on financial literacy, children's education and diversity, including advancing the company's workforce diversity and inclusion strategy.

Please join me in recognizing the Greater New York Chapter, The Links, Incorporated and the Women of Distinction Spirit Award honorees.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EDWARD
A. BURDICK, FORMER CHIEF
CLERK OF THE MINNESOTA
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 2011

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise in tribute to a leader, a parliamentary expert, a mentor and a friend to many, Mr. Edward Burdick, former Chief Clerk of the Minnesota House of Representatives. On March 9, 2011 he died at the age of 89 years old, and he is remembered fondly by his family and many friends and colleagues.

In 1941 at the age of 19, Ed as he was known, began a job in the Minnesota House of Representatives as a Page, earning \$5 a day. He held many jobs in the Legislature and other public service jobs, including U.S. Department of Commerce and the Minnesota Department of Military Affairs. He also proudly served our Nation in the U.S. Army. In 1967, Ed was elected Chief Clerk of the Minnesota House of Representatives, a job he maintained until his retirement 38 years later. In all, Ed provided 62 years of public service to the people of Minnesota and our Nation.

Ed was not only Chief Clerk but also House Parliamentarian, understanding every little twist of parliamentary procedure. His mastery of legislative process made him a nationally renowned expert in the field. Within the House Chamber, his booming and authoritative voice was a familiar presence as he kept decorum

in a legislative body not always known for that quality. During the decades that Ed served as Chief Clerk, he mentored a dozen Speakers of the House and many others in leadership, including myself. He took his role teaching the House rules and parliamentary procedure very seriously.

In November of 1992, I was elected to the Minnesota State House of Representatives. Prior to my swearing-in he informed me that he would meet with each new representative and explain the workings of the House and his office, ending with "if there is anything you need or anything I can do for you, do not hesitate to ask me or my office"—and he truly meant it. That was who Ed Burdick was. A gentleman, a kind and thoughtful person, a hard worker, a person willing to serve everyone who needed assistance of any kind.

Ed will be missed by many, many Legislators and State Government officials for his guidance, dignity and hard work.

I know that I am not alone in saying, that I will miss Ed's kindness, his genuine nature, his loyalty to Minnesota and his absolute and total fairness to all. Ed Burdick will always serve a Minnesotan icon to public service. May you rest in peace, my friend.

AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS
RESOLUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2011

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the return home of our U.S. military in the absence of a declaration of war by this Congress is long overdue. Members of this House must support H. Con. Res. 28, and help reverse the course of the unconstitutional Afghan war.

First, the war in Afghanistan is unconstitutional.

Article 1, Section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution grants Congress—not the President—the power to declare war. Once that declaration is made by the Congress, the President can conduct war.

The Constitution is clear and there is no debate over the fact that the Constitution never intended any shared decision making in declaring a state of war. Such a shared decision making was rejected originally by the Framers. Thus, without a declaration of war, the President's continued use of force to continue a war in Afghanistan is unconstitutional.

James Madison, one of the key architects of the Constitution on separation of powers, said that "this requirement for Congress to be able to declare war is one of the most important provisions of the Constitution." However, ten years after the conflict began in Afghanistan, we still have no such declaration. This significant authority granted to Congress is why I rise today in support of the gentleman from Ohio's resolution.

Congress cannot hand over to the President our exclusive power to declare war. Without a declaration of war, the President's use of military force in Afghanistan is unconstitutional.

The seminal case of *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer* rejected the President's claim that he had authority as Commander-in-

Chief to unilaterally seize steel production plants. Justice Douglas' concurring opinion contained an important recognition of the importance of separation of powers during war:

"All executive powers—from the reign of ancient kings to the rule of modern dictators—has the outward appearance of efficiency. Legislative power, by contrast, is slower to exercise . . . We therefore cannot decide this case by determining which branch of government can deal most expeditiously with the present crisis. The answer must depend on the allocation of powers under the Constitution."

No one in this Congress argues that the military must diminish their role in fighting against attacks on the United States. However, if the armed conflict is not defensive, the federal constitution has, unmistakably provided that the Congress shall have power to declare war.

This war has continued for almost 10 years and it is time to call it to a stop until Congress declares a clear objective to engage the nation in war. The Framers granted Congress the authority to make the decision to go to war because Congress could best assess whether the country was behind a war, which is a key element to any victory.

Therefore, we must remember our constitutional duty to represent the voice of the American people. The cost of war comes at the expense of their lives, their sons, and their daughters.

Second, the war in Afghanistan exceeds the scope of the authorization of the AUFMA resolution.

The authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF), is not a general anti-terrorism bill. The resolution never gave the President perpetual authority to use military force after 9/11 to any acts or plans of terrorism. Instead, the AUMF resolution reads:

"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 attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future act of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons."

The AUMF cannot be used as a cover for a full-blown war, which is what has occurred in Afghanistan. We are now almost 10 years into a full-blown war under the claim that the AUMF continues to authorize this war cannot be upheld. For this claim to be upheld, Congress must then declare war.

The United States cannot engage in national building type activities that are not connected to the scope of the authorization under the AUMF. Should Congress determine that the military needs more or less authority than it has been given under the AUMF, we will act accordingly.

Thirdly, the armed unmanned drones in Pakistan are unlawful.

Another concern is that the Afghanistan action has paved the way for unauthorized military actions in neighboring Pakistan, including the use of military drones.

The military continues to use armed unmanned drones operated by the CIA and conducts exercises on the ground in order to tar-

get Al Qaeda and the Taliban and additional terrorist groups. How can the administration pursue the use of drones without abandoning America's hallmark commitment to civil liberties?

The use of drones has placed the United States military in a bad light internationally for the killings of innocent people from the use of drones. The New America Foundation, reportedly, estimates that between 867 and 1,281 deaths from drone strikes, with 277 to 435 being noncombatants that have died since 2004.

The use of drones by the United States has been called "one of Washington's worst-kept secrets." American drones may well have attacked jihadist groups not connected to the supporters and members Al Qaeda or the Taliban. This combat can not be justified under the AUMF authorization because the attacks exceed the scope the authorization.

Our actions may well be increasing the rush of Pakistan jihadist gaining greater influence in combat in Pakistan. Increased military presence in Afghanistan has inflamed anti-American resentment in the region. Pakistan, reportedly, also has hundreds of nuclear weapons. Our troops may be in more danger because of the effects of compromised U.S. efforts in the region and the greater Middle East.

Expansion of executive war power beyond the AUMF is precisely the kind of momentous decision making the Framers conferred upon the Congress. We must put a stop to this war in Afghanistan or else it will send a message to the world that our Executive Branch may pick and choose wherever they want to send troops or to start a war.

The United States military is in a dozen different locations all over the world engaged in combat. Even now, our military is fighting in Libya, yet there has been no authorization or declaration from this Congress nor has there been any meaningful consultation with Congress.

The burden caused by the decision to expand military activities into Pakistan exceeds the scope of the AUMF. Congress must support H. Con. Res. 28 in order keep this Country dedicated to the way the Framers of the Constitution structured our nation on how to commit to armed conflict.

Finally, the military action appears to violate international legal norms.

H. Con. Res. 28 will place the United States in a better position in light of our international obligations under the U.N. Charter. None of the mandates from the two resolutions passed in the wake of the tragedy on 9/11 decided that any state should engage in war.

Instead, for example, Resolution 1373 directs member states to root out terrorism through means that affect the financing, harboring, investigating, and collaborating of terrorist groups while Resolution 1268 strongly condemned the attacks on 9/11 and called for international cooperation to find the perpetrators of 9/11.

Without a clear objective or credibility that the United States is acting in self defense, our country may be violating our obligation as a member state in the U.N. to refrain from acts of aggression that are unauthorized by the Charter.

The use of drones and military operations by the CIA also conflicts with both article 51

and article 2. Combat for the purposes of article 51 only authorizes the right of the use of military force if the force is in self-defense in the event an armed attack occurs. Article 2 of the Charter also prohibits the use or threatened use of force against another state.

Article 51 does not grant the right of bombing, unmanned armed drones, nor does it describe armed force as self-defense. Unfortunately we have engaged in such force and accepted the risks associated with the use of such force. The U.S. must comply with our obligations under these Articles.

The attacks on the United States on 9/11 were horrific. However, the horror we experienced on that tragic day does not provide any legal justification to use deadly force against people believed to be hiding in regions throughout Afghanistan. There is no justification for the Afghan war to be transformed into an authorization to use force anywhere we think terrorism exists.

HONORING MAYOR PETE DAMES

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 2011

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pete Dames as he celebrates 17 years of dedication to the people of La Mirada, California. Pete began his service to La Mirada as a member of the La Mirada Parks and Recreation Commission in 1980 and has been involved in numerous civic, service, and educational organizations and programs ever since.

Throughout his time on the City Council, Pete has focused on keeping La Mirada a safe, family-friendly, and thriving community. Pete was instrumental in maintaining a low crime rate and keeping La Mirada business-friendly.

Pete's involvement in public service reaches far beyond the confines of the City Council's Chamber. His broad community service includes serving as President of the La Mirada Athletic Council, as an active, lifetime member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 9148 and Knights of Columbus, and as a Board member of the La Mirada Youth Foundation and the Beatitudes of Our Lord School. He has received many prestigious awards including the Kiwanis Administrator of the Year, and the Kiwanis Governor's Award for Distinguished Service. He also received the Parent Teacher Association Honorary Service and Continuing Service Award, which honors those who have made significant contributions to the welfare of children and youth in the community.

Today, Pete continues his dedication as a Delegate to the Southern California Joint Powers Insurance Authority and to the Southern California Association of Governments. He also serves as the City's liaison to the La Mirada Chamber of Commerce.

From one public servant to another, please join me in honoring Mayor Pete Dames for his service and dedication to the City of La Mirada and the community.