

himself out of a job. My dad was recording secretary of Teamster's local 888. He was a hard worker and never missed a day's work. He was renowned for his honesty. But he was having trouble finding employment for two reasons: first, the reluctance of some employers to hire a driver in his 50's and also, he believed, his history of union activism.

Mike Fox gave my dad a job and it made all the difference for our family. So while the public knows of Mike's philanthropy and generosity, I know him from the perspective of the families of those he employed. He was and is a fair man willing to give others a chance to succeed.

My parents have both passed away, but my brother and I will never forget Mike Fox's lasting impact on our lives as have been others in our community who were not so personally connected to the Fox family.

His generosity of spirit afforded opportunities to so very many in our community. We hold a debt of gratitude to Mike and an obligation to continue his work by following his personal philosophy which states, "You can change the world".

INTRODUCTION OF EXPEDITED RESCISSIONS ACT OF 2005—AN EFFECTIVE AND CONSTITUTIONAL TOOL TO COMBAT WASTEFUL SPENDING

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to give the President and Congress new and effective—and, more importantly, constitutional—powers to weed out wasteful Government spending.

Over the last four years, there has been a dramatic change in the federal budget—and it has been a change for the worse. It has gone from annual surpluses to annual deficits, meaning we have gone from debt reduction to increasing the "debt tax" that our children will have to pay.

In part, this was the result of recession. In part, it was caused by the need to increase spending for national defense, homeland security, and fighting terrorism.

And in large part it was the result of the excessive and unbalanced tax cuts that Congress passed in those same years.

This bill does not directly address those major causes of our budgetary problems. Responding to them will require long-term work on several fronts, including tax policy. But I think this bill can provide one useful tool that will help in the larger effort.

It deals with the increasing number of individual, earmarked items included in appropriations bills.

Some people are opposed to all earmarks. I am not one of them. I think Members of Congress know the needs of their communities, and that Congress as a whole can and should exercise its judgment on how tax dollars are to be spent. So, I have sought earmarks for various items that have benefited Colorado and I will continue to do so.

At the same time, I know—everyone knows—that sometimes a large appropriations bill includes some earmarked items that might not be approved if they were considered separately, because they would be seen as unnecessary, inappropriate, or excessive.

That's why presidents have long sought the kind of "line-item veto" that is available to the governors of several states—and why Congress passed a law attempting to give that authority to President Clinton.

The supporters of that legislation argued that making it possible to cut unnecessary individual items out of a spending bill could help make the government more prudent in the way we spend taxpayer money.

But while the diagnosis was right, the proposed remedy of a line-item veto went too far—further than the Constitution permits. That's why it was struck down in court.

My bill is a better prescription—one that will work and that will pass constitutional muster.

Under this legislation, whenever the President wants to cut a particular spending item in an appropriations bill he would be able to require Congress to reconsider and vote separately on rescinding that item, under tight deadlines and without amendment.

That would be an important change, because while current law authorizes the president to propose rescissions—that is, deletions—from appropriations that Congress has approved, there is no requirement that Congress take any action on those proposals.

My bill would change that by requiring Congress to consider and vote on whether the president's proposed rescissions should be approved.

So, like the line-item veto act, this bill would let the President throw a bright spotlight onto spending items and have Congress vote on them separately, up or down, without changes and in full public view.

The bill is entitled the "Expedited Rescissions Act of 2005." It is based on one introduced by my predecessor, Representative David Skaggs which in turn was patterned after, but stronger than, legislation passed by the House in 1993.

Unlike the bill that the House passed in 1993, my bill would not let the Appropriations Committee come up with its alternative way to rescind the same amount of money that would be cut by the President's proposed rescission. Instead, it would require that the actual rescission proposed by the President—that one, without any amendment, and with no alternative to it—be voted on by the Congress.

Unlike the line-item veto, this bill is constitutionally sound. It does not attempt to give to the President the basic law-making authority that the Constitution vests solely in the Congress. Constitutionally, the line-item veto act could not be effective—it wasn't real. This bill would give the President authority that could be used effectively—it is real.

The President and the Congress alike need to have an effective, constitutionally valid alternative to the line-item veto that can be used to revoke parts of a spending bill that could not withstand a separate up-or-down vote. This bill will meet that need.

For the information of our colleagues, here is an outline of the bill's provisions:

OUTLINE OF EXPEDITED RESCISSIONS ACT OF 2005

The bill would amend the Budget Act by adding a new section providing for expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions.

The new section would authorize the president to propose rescission of any budget authority provided in an appropriations Act through a special message that includes a draft bill to make that rescission. The new section would require the House's majority leader or minority leader to introduce that bill within two legislative days. If neither did so, any Member could then introduce the bill.

The House Appropriations Committee would be required to report a bill introduced pursuant to the new section of the Budget Act within seven days after introduction. The report could be made with or without recommendation regarding its passage. If the committee did not meet that deadline, it would be discharged and the bill would go to the House floor.

The House would debate and vote on the bill within 10 legislative days after the bill's introduction. Debate would be limited to no more than four hours and no amendment, motion to recommit, or motion to reconsider would be allowed. If passed by the House, the bill would go promptly to the Senate, which would have no more than 10 more days to consider and vote on it. Debate in the Senate would be limited to 10 hours and no amendment or motion to recommit would be allowed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed two votes on February 15th, 2005. One to recognize the contributions of Jibreel Khazan (Ezell Blair, Jr.), David Richmond, Joseph McNeil, and Franklin McCain, the "Greensboro Four", to the civil rights movement and another to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 Montgomery Road in Altamonte Springs, Florida, as the "Arthur Stacey Mastrapa Post Office Building." Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both rollcall 32 and rollcall 33.

CELEBRATING THE CITY OF TOLEDO'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the City of Toledo's 100th birthday. For a century this Oregon town has stood on the shores of Yaquina Bay at the foot of Oregon's Coast Range.

From the beginning Toledo grew and prospered because of the area's abundant natural resources, and timber has long provided the economic base for the community. In its early days, many small sawmills processed the surrounding lumber while the closely located waterways provided easy transport. World War I

brought the U.S. Army Signal Corps to Toledo to build a large sawmill and logging railroads into the woods, providing the small town the infrastructure to harvest the nearby stands of spruce and fir. Today, Georgia-Pacific's factory in Toledo remains one of the largest employers in Lincoln County, and Plum Creek Timber continues to manage timberlands in the Coast Range to ensure that timber will remain an abundant resource in Toledo's future.

Toledo has seen a lot in its 100 years. It has faced many changes, yet throughout it all, it is still thriving, ready to face another century. So, Mr. Speaker, I stand before you on this 17th day of February, 2005 to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Toledo and convey my warmest regards to its residents.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF STEPHEN LEITER

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the tragic and untimely passing of Stephen Leiter who was an outstanding attorney and business leader in the Long Island community. Most importantly, however, Steve Leiter was a close friend to me and countless other Long Island residents.

I had the privilege of knowing Steve Leiter and his wife Glenda for more than thirty years. During that time I always marveled how Steve could be so active in so many businesses, community, political and sports endeavors, be a loving husband and father, and still have so much time for his friends.

Steve Leiter was extraordinarily successful in his professional life, but even more so in his personal friendships. He was always there for those who needed him and he always had a ready smile and warm greeting for you.

I express my sincere condolences to Steve's widow Glenda, his son David, who worked for me several years ago, and his daughter Lindsay. As tragic as Steve's passing is, I hope that Glenda, David and Lindsay will find consolation in the knowledge that Steve Leiter's memory will be cherished by so many. May he rest in peace.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CITIZENS INVOLVEMENT IN CAMPAIGNS (CIVIC) ACT

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today, Rep. PAUL KANJORSKI and I are introducing bipartisan legislation to establish a program of limited tax credits and tax deductions to get average Americans more involved in the political process. This bill, the Citizens Involvement in Campaigns (CIVIC) Act, will broaden the base of political contributors and limit the influence of big money donors in federal elections.

We need to take a fresh look at innovative approaches to campaign finance reform, with

special attention paid to ideas that encourage, and not restrict, greater participation in our campaigns. Toward this end, I have been advocating tax credits and deductions for small political contributions for many years. An updated tax credit system would be a simple and effective means of balancing the influence of big money donors and bringing individual contributors back to our campaigns. The impact of this counterweight will reduce the burden of raising money, as well as the appearance of impropriety that accompanies the money chase.

Most would agree that the ideal way to finance political campaigns is through a broad base of donors. But, as we are all painfully aware, the economic realities of modern-day campaigning lead many candidates to focus most of their efforts on collecting funds from a few large donors. This reality alienates many Americans from the political process.

The concept of empowering small donors is not a new idea. For example, from 1972 to 1986, the federal government offered a tax credit for small political contributions. This provided an incentive for average Americans to contribute to campaigns in small amounts while simultaneously encouraging politicians to solicit donations from a larger pool of contributors. Currently, six geographically and politically diverse states (Oregon, Minnesota, Ohio, Virginia, Arkansas, and Arizona) offer their own tax credits for political contributions. These state-level credits vary in many respects, but all share the same goal of encouraging average Americans to become more involved.

The CIVIC Act can begin the process of building this counterweight for federal elections. This bill is designed to encourage Americans who ordinarily do not get involved in politics beyond casting a vote every two or four years (that is, if they bother to vote at all) to become more active participants in our political process.

The CIVIC Act will reestablish and update the discontinued federal tax credit. Taxpayers can choose between a 100% tax credit for political contributions to federal candidates or national political parties (limited to \$200 per taxable year), or a 100% tax deduction (limited to \$600 per taxable year). Both limits, of course, are doubled for joint returns. As long as political parties and candidates promote the existence of these credits, the program can have a real impact and aid in making elections more grassroots affairs than they are now.

A limited tax credit for political contributions can be a bipartisan, cost-efficient method for helping balance the influence of large money donors in the American electoral process. Instead of driving away most Americans from participation in political life, we can invite them in. It seems to me that this will be a fruitful way to clean up our system, while at the same time convincing Americans that they actually have a meaningful stake in elections.

HONORING NASHVILLE'S HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, I am honored today to pay tribute to Nashville's Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's) Fisk University, Meharry Medical College, and Tennessee State University. These institutes of higher learning are among the more than 115 HBCU's across the United States. While originally founded to teach freed slaves to read and write, today they welcome and educate students from a wide range of races and ethnic backgrounds.

Fisk University's founding can be traced back to the days following the abolishment of slavery in America. Six months after the Civil War ended and two years after the Emancipation Proclamation, the first classes at Fisk University began on January 9, 1866. On this date, former slaves from the young to the very old openly began their quest for learning. No longer having to hide books that were forbidden to them, they could express their passion and enthusiasm for learning and pursue the path to true freedom and dignity . . . education. Since its inception, Fisk's faculty and alumni have been among the most intelligent, creative and civic-minded individuals in America. Amid its many graduates have been W.E.B. DuBois—the great writer, social critic and co-founder of the NAACP, and Booker T. Washington—the great educator and founder of Tuskegee University. Thurgood Marshall, who later became the first African-American Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, participated in the famous Fisk Race Relations Institute. Today, 68 percent of Fisk's attendees are African American.

During the reconstruction period in the United States, the health of poor Americans received little attention and Nashville had the worst mortality rate in the country. The most dismal health conditions were among the blacks who suffered disproportionately from death and disease. In October 1876, the Meharry Medical College was founded and established as the Meharry Medical Department of Central Tennessee College by the Freedman's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This college was formed to educate freed slaves and bring health care to the community's poor and underserved. Meharry has continued in that custom, and now is home to the Lloyd C. Elam Community Mental Health Center and the United States' first Institute on Health Care for the Poor and Under-served. Meharry is the largest private, historically black institution that is dedicated to educating healthcare professionals and biomedical scientists in America. Over-one-third of the black physicians and dentists currently practicing in the United States graduated from Meharry Medical College. A significant number of these graduates practice medicine in under-served rural and inner-city communities. Meharry's student population is over 70 percent African American.