

the "Quality of Life" award from the Long Island Division of the American Society of Civil Engineers. May also spearheaded the initiative to reclaim the Morewood Property, an environmentally damaged area, turning it into the Harbor Links municipal golf course. This prescient, breathtaking project is one of America's most environmentally friendly championship level golf courses, winning the "Environmental Stewardship Award" as well as the prestigious "Audubon Signature Distinction." Supervisor Newburger also successfully lobbied the Environmental Protection Agency for \$200,000 to designate New Cassel as a Brownfields Pilot Community.

Throughout her career in public service, May Newburger has served on many state and national committees and has received innumerable awards and honors. In 1981, she served as a New York State Delegate to the White House Conference on Families; from 1987 to 1989 she chaired the American Jewish Congress' National Commission on Women's Equality. She was also a member of the State Judicial Committee on Women in the Courts, the Governor's Commission of Domestic Violence and the State Commission on Child Care.

Mr. Speaker, the good citizens of North Hempstead and Nassau County are truly blessed to have had the great benefit of May Newburger's vision, leadership, dedication and drive for these many years. Her commitment to her constituents has never flagged; she has been indefatigable in the cause of improving the lives of others. I am awed by her accomplishments, humbled to have known her, and very proud to call her my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to please rise and join me now in honoring May W. Newburger, in celebrating her outstanding career in public service, and in extending our best wishes to her as she goes on to meet new challenges.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE
MARINETTE JAYCEES' 50TH AN-
NIVERSARY

HON. MARK GREEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 2003

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today before this house I'd like to recognize and honor the Marinette Jaycees as they celebrate fifty years of dedicated service to the Marinette community.

Since their establishment in 1920, the United States Jaycees have helped thousands of young men and women develop personal and leadership skills through community service. Their positive presence across the country has touched millions of lives, and furthered the causes of some of our nation's most noble organizations.

For fifty years the Marinette Jaycees have carried on that tradition of service and leadership in northeast Wisconsin. They've organized countless volunteer activities, given young folks an opportunity to learn more about business and government, and fostered a greater sense of pride in their community. There's no question, Marinette is a better place because of their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and pleasure to recognize today the Marinette Jaycees on

their 50th anniversary. On behalf of my constituents, we say thank you, and we wish them another fifty years of overwhelming success.

A DEMON FOR OUR TIMES

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 2003

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that an issue as important as homeland security is written with such cogency and realism as the following column by Dorothy Rabinowitz, a member of the Wall Street Journal editorial board. I recommend it to all of my colleagues.

[From the OPINION, Sept. 22, 2003]

A DEMON FOR OUR TIMES

(By Dorothy Rabinowitz)

Frenzy mounts uncontrolled over John Ashcroft, now considered—in those quarters touched by the delirium—enemy number one of the Bill of Rights, the Constitution and all that Americans hold dear. What is the cause of these fevers? Is there a doctor in the house?

We may exclude Dr. Howard Dean, running for the Democratic presidential nomination, who has already offered his findings, to wit: "John Ashcroft is not a patriot. John Ashcroft is a descendant of Joseph McCarthy." Sen. John Kerry, once properly—and eloquently—infuriated over the campaign of cretinous slanders mounted against John McCain in the last Republican presidential primary, has in turn offered his views on the attorney general. During the Democrats' debate in Baltimore, Candidate Kerry said he saw before him "people of every creed, every color, every belief, every religion. This is indeed John Ashcroft's worst nightmare here." Richard Gephardt, eyes similarly on the prize, has let America know which of our great national concerns he considered most pressing—a good thing to know about a candidate. The national priority looming largest in his mind is, Mr. Gephardt has let it be known, to fire John Ashcroft in "my first five seconds as president."

On the subject of the attorney general, no candidate has waxed more passionate than John Edwards, who warned, "we cannot allow people like John Ashcroft to take away our rights, our freedoms, and our liberties." And further: John Ashcroft and this administration can "spin their wheels all they want about the Patriot Act . . . they, have rolled over our rights for the past two years," says Mr. Edwards, one of the most uncompromisingly staunch Senate supporters of the Patriot Bill when it was passed after September 11—a fact the candidate seems to have found little or no occasion to mention in the course of his current crusade. Also among those voting for the bill were Rep. Gephardt, and Sens. Kerry, Lieberman and Graham.

It's hardly necessary by now to list all the charges and the alarms being raised about Mr. Ashcroft, by those portraying the attorney general as the menace to civil liberties that should haunt the dreams of all Americans who want to preserve our way of life. This is no exaggeration; the fever has spread wide, fed largely by the American Civil Liberties Union and allied sentinels of freedom, its signs clear in the ads calling on citizens to "Save Our Constitution," in emergency rallies led by the ACLU, and such groups as "Families for a Peaceful Tomorrow," and "The New York Bill of Rights Defense Committee."

The attorney general has declared the New York Civil Liberties Union, "led a massive assault on our most basic rights." Indeed, to hear the aforementioned groups, John Ashcroft is a greater threat to our national life and our freedoms than that posed by terrorists—a view that itself speaks volumes about the character and disposition of the Constitution-protectors up in arms over Mr. Ashcroft.

Then there is the issue of the facts—a scarce commodity in the oceans of oratory now spilling forth about our threatened Bill of Rights, and about agents spying on Americans' reading habits. In none of the descriptions of the out-of-control attorney general, and accompanying suggestions of incipient Fascism on the march, is there to be found any mention of the truth that the attorney general did not, of course, arrogate to himself the power to extend security measures: he went to the courts for permission. They were put in place only after scrutiny by judges.

Likewise, current hair-tearing about secret investigations and library spies notwithstanding, it remains a fact that for decades now, in its pursuit of crimes like money-laundering, the government has been free to prohibit banks from informing clients they were under investigation—and has done so without any outcry from the ACLU about civil rights violations. The Patriot Act could be said to be imperfect in some areas, a dissident member of the ACLU recently informed me—but so dishonest was his organization's portrayal of it as a threat to our basic freedoms, he could hardly bring himself to join any argument against it.

That ACLU dissidents harbor feelings of disgust at their leadership and its policies shouldn't come as news. For some 20 years now, control of the organization has rested securely in the hands of activists devoted to issues dear to the hearts of the left. No one was surprised when the ACLU of Southern California—home to the organization's most far-out activists—undertook the lawsuit to delay the state's recall vote.

The ACLU was the first to charge, after Sept. 11, that the government's anti-terrorist measures and detention of terror suspects threatened civil liberties. Even as workers struggled to pull bodies from the mountain of rubble in downtown Manhattan, the ACLU and like-minded allies had begun issuing warnings that government efforts to prevent more terrorist assaults posed greater dangers to the nation—would destroy our Constitution and the America we have always known—than the terrorists could possibly do.

The arguments found instant acceptance, not surprisingly, among faculty ideologues on the campuses. Who can forget the instantly organized teach-ins, where speakers argued, even as the nation mourned nearly 3,000 dead, that the United States had received just deserts for its policies? Efforts to protect ourselves with rational means of defense—investigations and apprehension of likely suspects, increased security measures, profiling—all connected with the spirit of these arguments: We—not the terrorists so avid for our destruction—were the enemy that would cause the demise of our democracy.

This was, and remains, claptrap of the rankest kind, which the great mass of sane Americans would never buy—and still, it cannot be ignored. It cannot be ignored, that is, that we are in a time never before seen in this country—a time produced in part by what remains of the politics and values of the 1960s, but only in part. For even in the '60s, we did not see what we do today—namely significant quarters of the culture, elite and popular, sympathetic to the views of

those home and abroad most hostile to this nation. A time when talk of American "swagger" and "bullying" comes tripping from the tongue.

For such times John Ashcroft was a target made to order. Devoutly religious, appointee of George Bush, he could scarcely have been a better fit for the bogeyman figure advanced as the greatest threat to our civil liberties—the perfect model to fire up the crowds at marches, and breast-beating festivals. Not for nothing do the Democratic presidential candidates out-do themselves denouncing the attorney general: they know, the candidates do, what has filtered down to their base, their main audience, after all. They all know, as John Kerry does, that he can say whatever he wants about John Ashcroft—that he views, as a nightmare, members of other races, creeds and religions; or anything else the Democratic candidate finds convenient—and it will all be understood, a mark of political virtue.

Mr. Ashcroft's detractors were at no time more infuriated—at least recently—than when he undertook his journey to various states, to speak up in defense of the USA Patriot Act. Indeed, Janet Reno, former attorney general, was sufficiently exercised by Mr. Ashcroft's journeys to come forward to join the denunciations of his policies. Ms. Reno, whose devotion to civil liberties was best exemplified in 1993, when she ordered tanks in to assault the Branch Davidian compound in Waco—which exercise resulted in the deaths of 19 children and 57 adults—has not been heard from for a while. But it is worth remembering that attorney general's notions of due process in a time of emergency. A dangerous situation was becoming more dangerous, Ms. Reno would later explain—there had been word that children had been sexually abused. In went the tanks and the flammable gas canisters. As far as one can tell, the ACLU launched no protests. The 19 children, were, it could be argued, certainly saved from molestation.

Mr. Ashcroft's efforts as attorney general have, as far as anyone knows, resulted in no such mass casualties. Still the hot-eyed demonstrators keep rolling out to shout their denunciations and wave placards saying "R.I.P. Civil Rights" and "Here Lies Your Freedom." Much has been invested in the demagoguery portraying John Ashcroft as the most serious threat to our liberties in memory: an investment that has enriched the ACLU's funding coffers, and delivered priceless publicity. No one should expect it to end any time soon.

MILLWRIGHT LOCAL 1043

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 2003

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and respect that I offer congratulations to some of Northwest Indiana's most dedicated and talented workers. On Friday, September 26, 2003, the Millwright Local 1043 of Burns Harbor, Indiana will honor special members at their Annual Retirement and Awards Banquet at the Avalon Manor in Hobart, Indiana. Devoted to their hard work and dedication, these individuals will be recognized for their many years of service to their union. Members who have served for 20 years or more will be honored, as well as the 2003 retirees. Millwright Apprentice Graduates will also be recognized at this gala event. Finally, the ceremony will include special recognition of members who have passed away in 2003.

Local 1043, led by President Bruce Wright, will celebrate tenures ranging from 20 years to 55 years of service. Those members being honored for 55 years of service include: Nick Christoff, Joseph Drasich, and Steve Kicho. Millwrights who will be honored for 50 years of service include: Whitney Duhon, Robert Erickson, and Alfred N. Salvesen. Members of Local 1043 who will be honored for 45 years of service include: John Cisarik, Archie Fisher, Joe Williams, and Paul D. Maness. Those who will be honored for 40 years of service include: James L. Geer, John Pegg, and Herbert E. Sprinkle. Millwrights honored for 35 years of service include: Dona Banks and Carl Dean Robinson. Those who will be honored for 30 years of service include: Randy Ames, Jerome Bielak, Gary Talcott, Dionisio Trinidad, Louis A. Vendramin, John Vintila, David B. Whitaker, and John Zavalydriga. Local 1043 members who will be honored for 25 years of service include: Michael Adams, Greg Allen, Terrill Crase, Steven J. Kime, Mark Liston, Monie Parker, John R. Smith, Houston L. Stevens, and John Wardell. Finally, those Millwrights being honored for 20 years of service include: Jay Beere, Jay Childress, Jeffery Ludvigson, John E. Naccarato, Paul Pasley, and John Williams.

Local 1043 will also be recognizing and honoring dedicated members who are 2003 retirees. These members include: Jerry Forcht, Fred Miller, Rick Pierce, Gerald Purevich, Sr., and Kenneth Rippe. The Apprentice Graduates of Millwright Local 1043 will be acknowledged for their hard work and dedication. These individuals are Ryan M. Davis, Frank A. Hines, Thomas J. Hoekelberg, Rodney L. Hyatt, Jon P. St. Myer, Gary E. Torbeson, Jr., Mark A. Tuszyński, and Vanessa Vlach. There will also be special recognition in memory of members who have passed away in 2003. These members include: Frank Kark, Lawrence Ray, Donald Janisch, William Kollada, James Dowdy, Thomas Stewart, and Tony Vrbancic.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating these dedicated, hard-working, and honorable members of Millwrights Local 1043 in Burns Harbor, Indiana. They, along with all the other men and women of the Northwest Indian unions, represent the true backbone of our economic community. Their commitment and loyalty to the First Congressional District is worthy of the highest commendation and respect.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 2003

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes due to personal family reasons, Rollcall vote No. 506 (To H.R. 7, Charitable Giving Act of 2003)—Had I been present I would have voted "no." Rollcall vote No. 507 (To H.R. 7)—Had I been present I would have voted "no." Rollcall vote No. 508 (H.R. 7)—Had I been present I would have voted "yes," and given the following statement which I now include in my extension of remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 7, and am glad to especially support the flat-

tening of the excise tax on the net investment income for private foundations from a two-tiered tax to a single tier of 1 percent. This could be one of the most effective steps Congress could take to spur charitable giving.

Currently, private foundations generally are subject to a 2 percent excise tax on their net investment income.

The tax was originally enacted in the Tax Reform Act of 1969 as a way to offset the cost of government audits of these organizations, in the wake of some unfortunate—and clearly wrong—mismanagement of foundation income. However, excise tax revenues have steadily climbed and IRS audits of private foundations have steadily dropped over the past decade. Specifically, in 1990, the excise tax raised \$204 million and the IRS conducted 1,200 audits of private foundations. In 1999, the last year for which figures are available, the excise tax raised \$499.6 million with the IRS conducting only 191 audits.

Congress reduced this tax in 1978 and 1984. In both instances it was noted that the adjustments were necessary because the revenues collected from the tax exceeded IRS auditing needs. Accordingly, the Joint Committee on Taxation recognized in its April 2001 recommendations the need to repeal this tax. Finally, the tax is inequitable, as other tax-exempt organizations are also audited, however, private foundations are the only tax-exempt organizations that have to fund their own policing.

Repeal of the excise tax would result in dollar for dollar increase in qualifying distributions of hundreds of millions of dollars every year, boosting the ability of charitable organizations to address national priorities across the range of fields that are the focus of some 58,000 private foundations. President Bush has proposed a reduction in this excise tax in his FY2004 budget to 1 percent, and for that I am quite appreciative. If we went further, though, the elimination of this tax would spur additional charitable giving. One of the most compelling arguments I've received comes from foundations pointing out that the money they would save from a repeal won't benefit the foundation officers, trustees, or even any employees. Who will benefit from a repeal of the excise tax? The causes for which each foundation was created. For example, the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund in Hamden, Connecticut writes me: "Congressman (Stearns), the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund would gain nothing from the flattening of this tax. The check we write to the United States Treasury we would instead write to our grantees. Our 2002 excise tax payment was \$22,176. We would prefer to put that money to work where we know it would help—the children and families in Connecticut." Signed, David M. Nee, Executive Director.

Foundations often spring from a corporate beginning. Take Robert W. Woodruff, the President of The Coca-Cola Company from 1923 until his death in 1985. He transformed the fledgling soft drink enterprise and its bottler franchise system into a corporate giant with the world's most widely known trademark. But this was not enough. Mr. Woodruff established a remarkable record as a businessman and philanthropist. Mr. Woodruff gave anonymously to many institutions, a number of which owe their very existence to his generosity. Prominent on Mr. Woodruff's desk was his personal creed: "There is no limit to what