

Since 1972, Coach Geesman has led the Kingsmen to five state championships and has never suffered a losing season.

Mr. Speaker, that's remarkable.

He retires in second place on the All-Time Football Coaching Leaders in Indiana with 339 victories. Only one coach in Indiana high school football history had more wins, but that coach also had more losses.

In 1996, he was inducted into the Indiana Football Hall of Fame.

Coach Geesman's impressive resume includes five state championships (1983, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 2000), three state runner-up finishes (1989, 1991, and 1999), eight semi-state crowns (1983, 1989, 1991, 1995–1997, and 1999–2000), and 13 sectional trophies (1979, 1983, 1987, 1989, 1991, and 1995–2000).

Penn High School football was also a force to be reckoned with under Coach Geesman's guidance in the Northern Indiana Conference by winning 22 NIC titles, including 17 in a row from 1986 through 2002.

Since a loss back in 1985, the Kingsmen have won an astonishing 117 straight NIC games.

The Kingsmen also established a state record with 89 consecutive regular-season victories running from 1985 to 1996 and own a state-record 22 straight playoff victories.

Coach Geesman's Kingsmen were ranked Number 1 in all or parts of a record 13 seasons for a record total of 87 weeks since 1977.

Coach Geesman has also had many players move on to play at the collegiate level and even a couple have advanced to play in the National Football League.

Mr. Speaker, I know the fans of Penn High School football and the Mishawaka community will certainly miss Coach Geesman, but I wish him well in his future endeavors.

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MR. AND MRS. JOHN PAGE

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, whereas, Mr. and Mrs. John Page began selling homemade fudge and then founded the Pillars Club to assist those in need; and

Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. John Page's involvement in the annual Pillars Club banquets have benefitted many in the community including students, the unemployed, and disaster victims; and

Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. John Page are examples of love and devotion having been married for over fifty years; and

Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. John Page should be recognized for their extraordinary outreach and selflessness;

Therefore, I join with the residents of the entire 18th Congressional District of Ohio in honoring and congratulating Mr. and Mrs. John Page for their accomplishments and contributions to the community.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MISSOURI HIGHWAY PATROL TROOPER ER MICHAEL L. NEWTON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the life of Missouri Highway Patrol Trooper Michael L. Newton. His life, though tragically cut short, was enriched by numerous accomplishments in his career, and a loving, caring family.

Mike served the Missouri Highway Patrol with dignity and passion. He set career goals that established himself as a competitive officer. He was ardent about making as many driving-while-intoxicated and traffic arrests as he could and it was this determination that made him a standout among his fellow officers. His eagerness and drive established him as an officer that was well-liked by many of his peers.

Mike is survived by his loving wife Shonnie and two sons, Tyler and Devon. Many of the Missouri Highway Patrol have pledged to help the family through these trying times. It is my hopes that his young boys will always remember how passionate their father was about his job and how diligently he served the people of Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you help me in recognizing and remembering Missouri Highway Patrol Trooper Michael L. Newton, his accomplished career, and the remarkable family he leaves behind. God Bless them.

PRO-LIFE ACTION MUST ORIGINATE FROM PRINCIPLE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as an obstetrician who has delivered over 4000 children, I have long been concerned with the rights of unborn people. I believe this is the greatest moral issue of our time. The very best of the western intellectual tradition has understood the critical link between moral and political action. Each of these disciplines should strongly inform and support the other.

I have become increasingly concerned over the years that the pro-life movement I so strongly support is getting further off track, both politically and morally. I sponsored the original pro-life amendment, which used a constitutional approach to solve the crisis of federalization of abortion law by the courts. The pro-life movement was with me and had my full support and admiration.

Those who cherish unborn life have become frustrated by our inability to overturn or significantly curtail *Roe v. Wade*. Because of this, attempts were made to fight against abortion using political convenience rather than principle. There is nothing wrong *per se* with fighting winnable battles, but a danger exists when political pragmatism requires the pro-life movement to surrender important moral and political principles.

When we surrender constitutional principles, we do untold damage to the moral underpinnings on which our Constitution and entire system of government rest. Those underpinnings are the inalienable right to life, liberty, and property. Commenting upon the link between our most important rights, Thomas Jefferson said "The God which gave us life gave us at the same time liberty. The hands of force may destroy but can never divide these."

M. Stanton Evans further explained the link between our form of government and the rights it protects when he wrote, "The genius of the Constitution is its division of powers—summed up in that clause reserving to the several states, or the people, all powers not expressly granted to the federal government."

Pro-lifers should be fiercely loyal to this system of federalism, because the very same Constitution that created the federal system also asserts the inalienable right to life. In this way, our constitutional system closely links federalism to the fundamental moral rights to life, liberty, and property. For our Founders it was no exaggeration to say federalism is the means by which life, as well as liberty and property, are protected in this nation. This is why the recent direction of the pro-life cause is so disturbing.

Pro-life forces have worked for the passage of bills that disregard the federal system, such as the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, the federal cloning ban, and the Child Custody Protection Act. Each of these bills rested on specious constitutional grounds and undermined the federalism our Founders recognized and intended as the greatest protection of our most precious rights.

Each of these bills transfers to the federal government powers constitutionally retained by the states, thus upsetting the separation and balance of powers that federalism was designed to guarantee. To undermine federalism is to indirectly surrender the very principle upon which the protection of our inalienable right to life depends.

The worst offender of federalism is the so-called Unborn Victims of Violence Act, which not only indirectly surrenders the pro-life principle but actually directly undercuts the right to life by granting a specific exemption to abortionists! This exemption essentially allows some to take life with the sanction of federal law. By supporting this legislation, pro-lifers are expressly condoning a legal exemption for abortionists—showing just how far astray some in the pro-life community have gone.

Even the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act, which is an integral part of the current pro-life agenda, present a dilemma. While I have always supported this Act and plan to do so in the future, I realize that it raises questions of federalism because authority over criminal law is constitutionally retained by the states. The only reason a federal law has any legitimacy in this area is that the Supreme Court took it upon itself to federalize abortion via *Roe v. Wade*. Accordingly, wrestling the abortion issue from the federal courts and putting it back in the hands of the elected legislature comports with the Founder's view of the separation of powers that protects our rights to life, liberty, and property.

Given these dilemmas, what should those of us in the pro-life community do? First, we must return to constitutional principles and proclaim them proudly. We must take a principled approach that recognizes both moral and political principles, and accepts the close relationship between them. Legislatively, we should focus our efforts on building support to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. Ideally this would be done in a fashion that allows states to again ban or regulate abortion. State legislatures have always had proper jurisdiction over issues like abortion and cloning; the pro-life movement should recognize that jurisdiction and not encroach upon it. The alternative is an outright federal ban on abortion, done properly via a constitutional amendment that does no violence to our way of government.

If the next version of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act reads like past versions in the House, I will likely support it despite the dilemmas outlined here. I cannot support, however, a bill like the proposed Senate version of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban that reaffirms *Roe v. Wade*.

For the pro-life cause to truly succeed without undermining the very freedoms that protect life, it must return to principle and uphold our Founder's vision of federalism as an essential component of the American system. Undermining federalism ultimately can only undermine the very mechanism that protects the right to life.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the President has said in numerous speeches that his policies are designed to "leave no child behind." He has said recently that, "My jobs and growth plan would reduce tax rates for everyone who pays income tax." White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer stated on May 29 about the new tax-cut law (which includes all of the provisions of the President's plan in full or in part), "This certainly does deliver tax relief to people who pay income taxes." Now that the bill has been signed, all of these statements have been shown to be false.

Back then, during the debate on this bill, the Republicans assured the press that the final conference bill retained a Senate provision that, while it did not extend any tax relief to millions of low-income working families with children, did at least accelerate the 15 percent partial refundability. The Republicans also claimed that the marriage penalty relief was accelerated for couples. These claims have been proven false as well.

The American people were sold a false bill of goods by the Administration and the Congressional Republicans. In the middle of the night, the Republicans passed a bill that over and over again puts the interests of the wealthiest people in the country ahead of those of the ordinary American family.

You will hear all sorts of excuses from the Republicans as to why this occurred. The

spokeswoman for Chairman Bill Thomas of the House Committee on Ways and Means told *The New York Times* that the blame lay with the members of the other body of Congress "(W)hen we had to squeeze it all to \$350 billion, they weren't talking about the child credits." She concluded, "(W)hatever we do is not going to be enough for some segments of the population."

The "segments" of the population we are talking about are those people who the President and Congressional Republicans say that he wants to help. We are talking about 11.9 million children (in 6.5 million families) who would benefit from accelerating the increase in the refundability of the child tax credit. These are parents who work hard at low wages and pay high payroll taxes to the Federal government. Another "segment" we are talking about is working couples who qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit. These are working poor families who are often struggling to stay together given the financial pressures on them. A couple with two children where each parent earns about \$10,000 has about a \$1,000 marriage penalty next year. And yet, the Republicans decided that marriage penalty relief should not include them.

The Republicans also left out 8.1 million taxpayers who receive no benefits from the new tax law and yet pay income taxes. This group consists mainly of low-income single individuals and moderate-income single parents whose children are over 16.

Not only are these "segments" made up of men and women who work and pay Federal taxes, many of the people that are left out of tax relief are the same men and women who just fought for this country in Iraq. The society they sacrificed for has decided to raid the Social Security and Medicare trust fund to give billions of dollars in tax relief to wealthy investors, but has not seen fit to give a tax cut to our soldiers.

Make no mistake about it. Nobody forgot to put benefits in because they were sleepy in the middle of the night. This was not necessary because the bill had to cost only \$350 billion and it was simply impossible to do anything for these working Americans in the bill. The Republicans in Congress, with the tacit approval of the White House, deliberately skimmed and trimmed on the few provisions under consideration to help millions of middle- and low-income working families. Meanwhile, they enhanced provisions for the wealthy and for special interests. They made sure that the average millionaire would receive a \$93,500 tax break. They made sure that luxury SUV owners would get a generous tax break if they can figure out a way to make their vehicle a "business expense." They even made sure that the tax cuts for dividends, the so-called elimination of "double taxation," applied to dividends from companies that use sham headquarters in tax havens to get out of paying any tax. These companies that put profits over patriotism get benefits from the tax bill the President signed, but the parents of 12 million children do not.

The bill we introduce tonight is designed to serve those people with children that the Republicans talk about but somehow never do anything for. This includes many of our service men and women who are or have been stationed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Korea. These

men and women have risked their lives and done their duty at such low wages that the President's tax cut which he claims helps "working families" has left them out.

The bill would include an expansion of the refundable child credit that was included in the Democratic economic stimulus proposal. It would expand the refundable child credit for the families of military serving in Iraq and other combat zones. It also would include the provision of the Democratic stimulus plan that accelerated the marriage penalty relief in the earned income tax credit that was provided in the 2001 tax bill.

The President's bill gave big tax cuts to the wealthiest citizens and funded these tax cuts through borrowing. While we want every child in America to benefit from tax cuts, we do not want to pass the cost of what we do to our children and grandchildren in the form of more national debt. The cost of the bill would be offset by a combination of the corporate tax shelter and Enron-specific provisions that passed the Senate and Mr. NEAL's bill stopping corporate expatriation.

The legislation we propose has two key sections:

LIBERALIZATION OF REFUNDABLE FAMILY CREDIT

Under current law, the per-child tax credit is partially refundable (i.e., paid even if the family has no income tax liability). The amount of partial refundability is 10 percent of taxable wages above \$10,000. Under the 2001 tax act, the amount of refundability is increased to 15 percent of taxable wages over \$10,000 effective in 2005 and thereafter.

This legislation accelerates the 15 percent partial refundability and lowers the threshold for partial refundability from \$10,000 to \$7,500. It would increase the number of families eligible for partial refundability.

The military serving in combat zones receive an exclusion for their pay while serving in the zone. As a result, many in the military will not be eligible for the partial refundable family credit because they do not have taxable wages. The legislation solves this problem by disregarding the combat pay exclusion when computing the size of the partially refundable family credit.

MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF IN EARNED INCOME CREDIT

The 2001 tax act provided three types of marriage penalty relief, an increase in standard deduction, an expanded 15 percent rate bracket, and an increase in the dollar amount at which the earned income credit begins to be phased out. The recently enacted tax cut accelerates the first two types of marriage penalty relief, but does not accelerate the relief in the earned income tax credit.

This legislation will accelerate the marriage penalty relief in the earned income tax credit.

When the Republicans brought their final tax cut bill up in the House in the middle of the night, I argued on the House floor that the bill did almost nothing for working people while rewarding the wealthiest people in our society who have lots of unearned income. The Republicans accuse me of engaging in "class warfare" and expect me to back down. But I agree that it is class warfare. The Republicans have declared war against those who earn their living through work, even when those individuals are serving their nation in the armed service. This legislation shows that in this