and personal network to assist staff and students achieve their goals.

Mike's interests are varied and far flung as evidenced by his many board memberships and chairmanships. His main interest centers around his beloved family, his Roman Catholic faith, educational matters at all levels, medical issues, and alcoholism prevention and abuse. From his hard work he built a successful family business, renown throughout the region.

If there is a task force or committee seeking to improve life in Santa Clara Valley, Mike Fox, Sr. is sure to be a valued member, using all his resources to bring about change. Mike served as Chair of United Way Silicon Valley's

Board of Directors in 1997 and 1998. His guidance and expertise were instrumental in seeing United Way successfully through a period of financial difficulty and organizational restructuring. He served as Chairman of the Regional Healthcare Consortium where he worked with hospital administrators, colleges, and healthcare providers to protect the quality of healthcare in Santa Clara County. Mike participated in the Silicon Valley Blue Ribbon Task Force on Aviation Security.

Mike is a man who cares about others. I know this first hand, because in the 1970's my father, who was a beer truck driver, found 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.