

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF ARTHUR A. JUTTON ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2007

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today with great pride, to honor someone who is very close to me and for whom I have the greatest respect; Mr. Arthur A. Jutton. Known as Art or Mr. Jutton to his colleagues, Art served as my Chief of Staff since my first day in office until his recent retirement this month. As one of the longest serving staff members here in the House of Representatives, there are very few Hill staffers and Washington professionals who did not know or have the utmost respect for him. I cannot begin to describe all the contributions that Art has made throughout what seems like an endless tenure here on Capitol Hill.

Art began his career working for former Congressman John Terry back in 1970. He served as Mr. Terry's District Representative until 1972. Art then worked for former Congressman Bill Walsh, my father, as his Field Representative from 1972 to 1978. In 1978, Art moved down to Washington D.C. to serve as the Administrative Assistant to former Congressman Gary Lee until 1982. In 1983, Art became the Administrative Assistant to former Congressman Gerry Solomon and served in that post until 1988 when he became my Chief of Staff. For the most part, all of the Members of Congress that Art has served have represented the Central New York region. As a Central Yorker himself, Art has helped all of us work diligently on behalf of the people of that region and also for the greater good of the country.

During his time in government, Art became a pillar of strength among those with whom he worked with. From his first days until his last minute, Art carried a work ethic second to none and was an everlasting source of knowledge. In the late 1970s, he started the New York State Republican Administrative Assistant Association. This group would meet once a month for a breakfast to discuss the issues that were not only on the political forefront, but primarily issues that affected the citizens of New York State. These meetings have since turned into the New York Republican Chiefs of Staff breakfasts that continue to this day. Over the years, Art became a mentor to all staff that was lucky enough to have worked with him. Though sticking true to his beliefs, he had an uncanny ability to maintain an open mind and adjust with the times as they changed.

Art not only created close relationships with staffers, but with all the employees of the House of Representatives. Every morning, bright and early, you could find Art in the Rayburn cafeteria sharing a cup of coffee with the Superintendent's staff. It was these early morning talks that Art credited as the source for the most useful information and inside tips.

Madam Speaker, I am happy for Art on his retirement and extremely proud of the 37

years of service he has given the people of Central New York. I know that although not here in Washington, Art will find a way to stay involved. The work he accomplished was done with the highest level of professionalism, a vigorous work ethic, and most importantly a loving heart. On behalf of my constituents, the constituents of the aforementioned former members and all of the wonderful staff with whom he worked with, I personally thank Art Jutton for all he has done. We will miss him.

RECOGNIZING THE 92ND BIRTHDAY OF DANNY QUILL

HON. PATRICK J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2007

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise before you today to recognize the 92nd birthday of Danny Quill, decorated World War II veteran and Sergeant of Arms for the Yardley VFW Post 6393. Mr. Quill is the oldest and longest standing member of the Yardley VFW Post and the Knowles-Doyle American Legion Post 317. His service to this country began in 1942, and ever since he has inspired generations of men and women who have had the privilege of knowing him.

Mr. Quill was originally assigned to Washington, D.C. with the 176th Infantry Division responsible for protecting President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Following this assignment, Private First Class Quill was transferred to Fort Benning, Georgia, where he served as a machine gun instructor. Mr. Quill began his tour overseas with the 91st Infantry Division in Africa, but was quickly transported to Italy.

Alongside Polish and English Army regiments, Mr. Quill, a member of the 5th Army, saw his first combat near Naples under the command of General Mark Clark. From there, Madam Speaker, PFC Quill engaged in heavy combat as a machine gunner during campaigns through Appennino Mountains and Po Valley. Madame Speaker, so extreme and deadly was the fighting there, PFC Quill suffered the loss of 13 assistant ammunition loaders, along with many other men serving beside him.

His bravery and courageous service earned Mr. Quill a Combat Infantry Badge, Three Bronze Stars, a European Campaign Medal, a European-African Campaign Medal, a World War Two Victory Medal, and a Good Conduct Medal.

When Mr. Quill returned home, his sense of duty held strong, so with the same passion he began serving his community, a role he has played now for the better half of a century. For such enduring commitment to his family, friends and neighbors; to the men and women of his community and his country, Mr. Quill deserves the utmost respect and unconditional admiration. Madam Speaker, Mr. Quill stands as an ever-steady example of the American

ideal of integrity and character he fought for then and inspires today.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR COMMISSION ON UNFAIR TAX BREAKS AND SUBSIDIES

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker. I am today introducing another bill intended to help reduced waste and inequity in the Federal budget.

There has been much discussion of individual spending items—"earmarks"—requested by individual members. They are not all bad, but I agree that some need closer scrutiny. That's why I have introduced a bill, H.R. 595, the Stimulating Leadership in Cutting Expenditures, or "SLICE" Act, to give the President a constitutionally sound version of a line-item veto that can force Congress to reconsider individual spending items.

But we need to recognize that earmarks are not the whole story. Much waste and inequity in the budget results not from 1-year spending items, but from ongoing tax breaks and subsidies that are built into the budget and will persist unless and until there are changes in relevant law.

Like earmarks, not all tax breaks and subsidies are bad—in fact, I think many are good for our country and deserve to continue or even be expanded. One example would be the tax breaks and other provisions to promote renewable energy and to help Americans become more efficient in their use of energy. And there are other examples as well.

But there is also an array of direct subsidies, tax breaks and indirect assistance created for the special benefit of a relatively small number of beneficiaries, sometimes at the expense of others.

Too often, such provisions have persisted because of the phenomenon that once made it nearly impossible for Congress to close unneeded military bases—the cost of each one is relatively small in overall terms, but very important to a few States or Congressional Districts, with the result that the potential budgetary benefit of a reform is not great enough to overcome the strong opposition from its defenders.

So, the bill I am introducing today would resolve this dilemma in the same way that an earlier Congress resolved the similar problem of eliminating unneeded military bases. It would do that by establishing an independent, bipartisan, and expert commission to review special-interest tax breaks and subsidies to see which should be ended or revised.

But this would not be just another commission to produce another report fated only to gather dust on congressional shelves. Instead, like the special commissions that have reviewed military bases, it would be key to a

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

process that would require Congress not just to read the report but to vote on whether to adopt its recommendations.

Here's how my bill would work:

BIPARTISAN CUTS COMMISSION

The Commission on Unfair Tax Breaks and Subsidies, or "CUTS Commission", would consist of five members. Its chair would be a person named jointly by the Speaker and the Senate majority leader. The Speaker and the majority leader of the Senate would each pick one other member, and so would the minority leaders in each Chamber. Members would be chosen on the basis of their expertise and to represent a fair balance of views.

The Commission's job would be to identify and evaluate payments, benefits, services, or tax breaks to see if they meet the test of a reasonable expectation that they will bring a return to the public at least equal to the value of the cost to the taxpayers.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

The scope of this review would not include payments made to or tax breaks benefiting individuals, to state or local government or Indian tribes, or Native corporations organized under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, or to nonprofit, tax-exempt organizations.

It also would not cover support for research and development based on peer-reviewed or other open, competitive and merit-based procedures where the subject is in the public interest and the work is not likely to be done, or done with equal benefit to the public, by the private sector.

Similarly, the review would not include payments or tax breaks primarily benefiting public health, safety or protection of the environment; the development and use of renewable energy; improved energy efficiency; or education.

Finally, the Commission would not review matters of national security, including homeland security, compliance with trade agreements or treaties, or procurement contracts—and could not propose new programs or taxes or the termination of federal agencies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission would have a year to complete its work. Within that time, it would first prepare a preliminary report for review by the Government Accountability Office, GAO, and then a final report to Congress.

The Commission's report would specify which changes in subsidies the commission is recommending—and any recommendation supported by at least four of the five members of the Commission would be assured of prompt consideration by Congress.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS

Under the bill, recommendations with that high degree of bipartisan support on the commission would have to be introduced as bills, and each committee to which they were referred would have a 20-day deadline to reporting them.

A committee could consider only amendments that would terminate or reduce an inequitable subsidy, except that the tax-writing committees could offset revenue increases with broad-based tax cuts, they could not use limited tax breaks of the kind that would have been subject to a line-item veto under the Line-Item Veto Act of 1996. If a committee failed to meet the deadline for reporting, it would be discharged.

Bills reported from committees would go to the Rules Committees of each Chamber. If

more than one bill is reported, Rules would consolidate them into one measure which would go to the floor. After 5 days, excepting weekends and holidays, a motion to proceed to its consideration would be privileged and not debatable and, if adopted, the bill would be considered under procedures limiting the time for debate. Similar procedures would apply to conference reports after each Chamber had acted.

In short, Congress could not ignore consensus recommendations by the Commission. It would have to debate them and then vote on whether to adopt them.

POTENTIAL FOR SAVINGS

It is not possible to say exactly how much this bill will save the taxpayers—that depends on what the Commission might recommend and how many of their recommendations Congress would approve. I have seen estimates that the kinds of subsidies and tax breaks covered by this bill could be costing tens of billions of dollars annually just in terms of special-interest spending programs, not to mention special tax breaks—such as provisions to suspend the tariffs on certain items—many of which are of particular benefit to just one or a few companies. So, I think the potential is considerable.

EQUITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

And as important as the savings that could come from enactment of my bill is the increased budget equity and congressional accountability that it would promote. Special-interest subsidies, whether through spending or tax breaks, are great for the beneficiaries but they aren't always great for the taxpayers and they often are harmful to competing companies or other entities that don't get the benefit of the subsidies.

So, trimming or eliminating that kind of subsidies could save money and would remove inequities—and requiring those of us in Congress to stand up and be counted on whether to trim or eliminate some of them would increase our accountability to the taxpayers, to those hurt by the subsidies, and to the American people.

For these reasons, Madam Speaker, I think this bill deserves the support of our colleagues. For their benefit, here is an outline of its major provisions.

OUTLINE OF COMMISSION ON UNFAIR TAX BREAKS AND SUBSIDIES ("CUTS") BILL

Commission—5 members: chair appointed jointly by House Speaker and Senate Majority Leader, plus one each appointed by House Speaker, Senate Majority Leader, and House and Senate Minority Leaders. Members to be chosen on basis of expertise and to reflect diverse views. No Federal employees on the commission, but agencies can detail people to provide technical expertise.

Duration—Commission would have one year to complete its review and report to Congress.

Scope of Review—Commission would review payments, benefits, services, and tax breaks provided to companies, joint ventures, associations, etc. but not to individuals, state or local governments, Indian tribes and Alaska Native Corporations, or tax-exempt nonprofits. Review would not cover support for research and development based on open, merit-based competition if it is consistent with public interest and federal agency purposes and private sector cannot reasonably be expected to do it as well. Also outside scope of review: matters involving public health or safety or the environment;

development or use of renewable energy; greater energy efficiency; national security (including homeland security); or education. Review also would not involve matters needed to comply with international trade or treaty obligations or federal procurement contracts.

Report—Commission's preliminary report would be reviewed by GAO; final report would go to Congress with recommendations for changing or eliminating subsidies covered by commission's review. Any recommendation backed by at least 4 commission members would have to be introduced as legislation.

Action by Congress—Committees would be limited in amending bills to adopt recommendations by at least 4 of the 5 commission members and would have to report them for floor action with time limits on debate. So, Congress would have to act on those recommendations.

IN TRIBUTE TO FATHER ROBERT F. DRINAN: MAN OF GOD, POLITICAL LEADER, AND EDUCATOR

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Father Robert F. Drinan, his enduring faith, and lifelong commitment to human rights. Father Drinan passed on January 28, 2007, at his residence in the Georgetown University Jesuit community in Washington, DC. He was 86 years old and had recently been ill with pneumonia and congestive heart failure.

Father Drinan was an unwavering defender of the civil and human rights of all Americans. His commitment to these principles was anchored by his religious conviction and a fundamental belief in the rights of all people to be respected and protected by their governments and elected leaders. It was this conviction that led Father Drinan to politics in 1970 when he sought a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. During his tenure in Congress, Father Drinan was an outspoken opponent of the Vietnam war and was the first person to call for the impeachment of President Nixon. Father Drinan was re-elected four times, serving from 1971 until 1981. He stepped down in accordance with a directive from Pope John Paul II, barring priests from holding public office.

Father Drinan was the first Roman Catholic priest to serve as a voting member of the U.S. Congress. I had the honor of serving with him on the Judiciary Committee during the Watergate proceedings. He was a man of deep convictions, a passionate leader and a good friend. Long after he left Congress, Father Drinan continued to be a vocal supporter of human rights. Through his words and his actions he demanded morality in our political leadership. Ever committed to his work, Father Drinan spent the past 21 years as a professor at the Georgetown Law Center where he focused on legal ethics and international human rights.

We all mourn the loss of Father Robert F. Drinan, a man who committed his life to standing up for what he believed. He will be greatly missed.