



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 99th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—June 11, 1986

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 10, 1986.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday, June 11, 1986.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the
House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We remember, O gracious God, those people whose lives experience pain or anxiety. Teach us to share with those who face difficulty that all of us may enjoy the fruits of Your bountiful creation. May we be good stewards of the gifts You have given, preserving the riches of life and supporting one another with deeds of love and concern. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 109, answered "present" 3, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—261

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnes
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Biaggi
Boland
Bonar (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Carper
Chapman
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett

Daniel
Darden
Daschle
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (TN)
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini

Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kluczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Livingston
Long
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain

McCloskey
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Montgomery
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelson
Nielsen
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price

Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Ritter
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Shumway
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snow
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain

NAYS—109

Army
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehrlert
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Carney
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Conte
Coughlin
Courtner
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeWine
Dickinson

Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gregg
Gunderson
Hansen
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hunter
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta

Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tausin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torrice
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (MO)

Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Lott
Lowry (WA)
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCandless
McGrath
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Molinar
Monson
Moorhead
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rowland (CT)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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

Schaefer	Smith, Robert	Vucanovich
Schroeder	(OR)	Walker
Schuette	Solomon	Weber
Sensenbrenner	Stangeland	Whitehurst
Shuster	Strang	Whittaker
Sikorski	Stump	Wolf
Skeen	Sundquist	Young (AK)
Slaughter	Swindall	Young (FL)
Smith, Denny	Tauke	
(OR)	Thomas (CA)	
Smith, Robert	Vander Jagt	
(NH)		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Hawkins	Loeffler	Staggers
---------	----------	----------

NOT VOTING—60

Aspin	Ford (MI)	Moody
Barnard	Fowler	Moore
Bevill	Grotberg	Neal
Boggs	Hartnett	Nichols
Breaux	Hefelt	O'Brien
Burton (IN)	Hillis	Oxley
Campbell	Jones (NC)	Rodino
Carr	Kaptur	Rose
Chandler	Kasich	Roukema
Chappell	Kolter	Saxton
Conyers	Leland	Sharp
Davis	Lipinski	Shaw
DeLay	Lowery (CA)	Shelby
Dicks	Martinez	Siljander
Dingell	Matsui	Snyder
DioGuardi	McCurdy	Tallon
Dixon	McKernan	Towns
Dowdy	Michel	Wilson
Downey	Mitchell	Yates
Foglietta	Mollohan	Zschau

□ 1010

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to designate October 8, 1986, as "National Fire Fighters Day."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 720) "An act to establish a permanent boundary for the Acadia National Park in the State of Maine, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 347), "Joint resolution to designate the week of May 19, 1986, through May 24, 1986, as 'National Homelessness Awareness Week'."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2211. An act to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to bankruptcy proceedings involving debtors who are family farmers, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2434. An act to authorize appropriations for the Patent and Trademark Office in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2211), "An act to

amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to bankruptcy proceedings involving debtors who are family farmers, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DeCONCINI, and Mr. HEFLIN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 426), "An act to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for more protection to electric consumers," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCURE, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. FORD, Mr. METZENBAUM, and Mr. MELCHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4420, MILITARY RETIREMENT REFORM ACT OF 1986

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4420) to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the retirement system for new members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GLICKMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. ASPIN, PRICE, BENNETT, MONTGOMERY, and DICKINSON, Mrs. HOLT, and Mr. HILLIS.

As additional conferees when differences concerning titles I, II, and III of the House bill and sections 1 through 12 of the Senate amendment are under consideration: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Messrs. SKELTON, SISISKY, ROBINSON, BUSTAMANTE, HUNTER, BATEMAN, and SWEENEY.

As additional conferees when differences concerning title IV of the House bill and sections 13 through 15 of the Senate amendment are under consideration: Messrs. STRATTON, NICHOLS, DANIEL, DELLUMS, MAVROULES, WHITEHURST, SPENCE, BADHAM, and STUMP.

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2591

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the cosponsor list on H.R. 2591.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2591

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 2591.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

A PROPOSAL TO SAVE IRA BY ESTABLISHING NATIONAL TAX AMNESTY

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a modest proposal to the other body during their consideration of the landmark tax reform bill.

I propose a trade—establish an NTA to save IRA's.

The NTA is a one-time national tax amnesty along the lines of H.R. 2085, a bill I authored earlier this year. Under NTA, those who have underpaid or failed to pay Federal taxes would have 6 months to pay full amount in exchange for forgiveness on all civil and criminal penalties and one-half interest penalties.

In terms of revenues raised, NTA would do as well as eliminating IRA deductions. The IRA revenues would be about \$24 billion. A 6-month national tax amnesty could raise at least that much considering the base which is a \$90 billion "tax gap"—the difference between what we get and what we are owed in taxes. All a national tax amnesty would have to do is recoup less than 30 percent of the base, and it would offset retaining the IRA deduction. This process has been enormously successful in many States.

Wiping out the IRA deduction is not tax reform; it is punitive policy against the middle class already victimized by tax laws. More than 77 percent of IRA deductions are claimed by those with incomes under \$50,000. To me, it is a simple choice. I choose forcing those who have not paid taxes to do so, over taking an important deduction away from those who have paid their fair share. I urge the other body to as well.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2591

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be deleted from the list of sponsors of H.R. 2591.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

TO RESUME IS TO RECOVER FROM ILLNESS

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the benefits from the resumption of a gold standard were well illustrated by our experience with resumption in 1879. Confidence in the currency was restored. Floating quotations for our dollar disappeared, Business and exports expanded. Gold flowed in from abroad. The Treasury was swamped with orders, from our people and from abroad, for Government securities. It was able to refinance its maturing or callable debt at lower interest rates than it had been compelled to pay under the irredeemable greenbacks.

The Secretary of the Treasury, John Sherman, one of our greatest students of monetary science, said in an address shortly after resumption:

I want to convince everybody that . . . the United States is not bound to have its notes hawked about at a discount, but that a note of the United States may travel around the world, everywhere received as equal to gold coin, and as good as any note ever issued by any nation, either in ancient or modern times."

A depreciated paper money cheats and robs every man who receives it of a portion of the rewards of his labor or production, and, in all times it has been treated by statesmen as one of the greatest evils that can befall a people."

To resume is to recover from illness, to escape danger, to stand sound and healthy in the financial world, with our currency based upon the intrinsic value of solid coin. (Recollections of Forty Years in the House, Senate, and Cabinet, Vol. I-II, by John Sherman, New York, 1895.)

RELEASE THE AMERICAN HOSTAGES

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, until an American flag flies at the apex of that beautiful Vietnam Memorial, I will not be able to vote for a gold medal for anything. I will not be able to support H.R. 2591.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues who have signed a letter to President Hafez Assad of Syria asking that he do everything within his power to secure the release of our five American hostages. There has never been a domestic kidnaping, and except for the horror in the kidnaping involved with our entire Embassy staff in Teheran in the nation of Iran, there has never been a circumstance like this in all of our history.

I ask not only President Assad but every single head of state in all of the Middle East to do all they can to put pressure on the Hezbollah segment of the Shiites to release our American hostages. I hope to take that message to President Assad soon.

VOTE "YES" ON GOLD MEDALS

(Mr. BONIOR of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the House will have the honor to follow the other body in granting congressional gold medals to the three individuals who built the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

A "dear colleague" circulated yesterday, however, insinuates, without providing any examples—not a single incident of any kind—that these three men engaged in "self promotion" and "commercialized" the memorial.

In fact, as the signers of the "dear colleague" know, past charges of commercialization were exhaustively investigated by the General Accounting Office, and found to be entirely untrue.

The "dear colleague" also insinuates that these three men were somehow improperly compensated, receiving "generous salaries." In fact, as the signers of this "dear colleague" know, salaries were below that received by a GS-13 Federal employee.

In fact, as the signers of the "dear colleague" know, most of the individuals who have ever received a gold medal from Congress were paid far, far more for the work honored by their gold medals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote "yes." It is time to honor those individuals whose great service to our Nation has too often been repaid with unfounded personal attacks.

CIVILIZATION UNDER SIEGE

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, a nation cannot exist in chaos. The worsening crisis of liability insurance is moving us toward the unwinding of the American economic system. The small structure business on which this country has flourished may well be wiped out. Yet here in the Congress there is no sense of urgency about getting hold of the problem. And because of the interstate nature of much of the problem for businesses, it is a situation crying out for congressional oversight.

Over the last few years the American court system has become skewed in some strange manner to represent not the common good of society in li-

ability suits, but to institutionalize the idea of collective social guilt and responsibility for the conduct of any person no matter how much he or she may be individually responsible for what happened.

The tort laws of this country are being interpreted by the Judiciary for Robin Hood. No matter how demeaning it is of our citizens—making them look like hapless innocents at the mercy of the every day world—everyone who walks away from the liability insurance lottery with his pockets filled is happy.

A civilization is judged by the manner in which it regulates the relations of its people—the stabilizing of conflicts. This situation is creating conflict and puts the whole country at risk. It must be urgently addressed.

VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL GOLD MEDALS

(Mr. KOSTMAYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today the House will be considering H.R. 2591, a bill to award congressional gold medals to Jan Scruggs, Robert Doubek, and John Wheeler, for their leadership in erecting the Vietnam Veterans Memorial for the Nation.

Since its dedication 3½ years ago, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial has captured the Nation's soul. Not only has awareness of the gratitude due to Vietnam veterans become part of the national consciousness, but it has been a catalyst for a long overdue national reconciliation. The memorial is now the most visited shrine in the Nation's Capital with about 25 million people having visited it so far. As the first major memorial established in Washington since before World War II, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is a major contribution to the Nation.

While it could not have been completed without the active support of hundreds of volunteers, it was Jan Scruggs, Robert Doubek, and John Wheeler who provided the indispensable leadership that made the Vietnam Veterans Memorial a reality. I believe that if ever the recognition offered by the congressional gold medal was deserved, it is deserved by Jan Scruggs, Robert Doubek, and John Wheeler for their leading role in giving the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to our country.

VOTE "NO" ON CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS

(Mr. RIDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House will consider under suspension the awarding of the congressional gold medal to three nominees. As a Vietnam combat veteran, I rise in reluctant and strong opposition to this measure.

I am mindful of the contributions that these three men made to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, particularly "The Wall." I am also aware of the efforts of several other veterans who worked without compensation and who prevailed over the objection of the nominees to include a pathway, a statue and the flag.

As a Vietnam veteran, I am grateful for all of their efforts, but I cannot support the awarding of this honor to any of them. Most Vietnam veterans, and probably all combat veterans, carry memories of the sacrifices and heroism of those men and women whose names appear upon the wall. They are aware of the circumstances involved in the 300,000 soldiers who were wounded in Vietnam as well. While the efforts of these nominees were commendable, they were also well compensated. Nothing they have done is comparable to the sacrifice of their slain and wounded comrades.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this measure.

FAULTY FRANKING COMMISSION REGULATIONS

(Mr. FRENZEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Franking Commission voted to dismiss a complaint against one of our colleagues who had mailed outside of his district within his State.

That particular colleague had signed, in February, a statement with the FEC indicating that he was a candidate for the Senate. He had announced to the press in his home State that he was a candidate for the Senate.

The Franking Commission dismissed the complaint, saying that he was not, in fact, a candidate because he had not qualified under State law to have his name on the ballot.

I think that is a distinction that our constituents will not understand. They think it's an abuse of the frank, and who can blame them.

We did the same thing with another of our colleagues who is now a candidate for the Senate a few weeks ago. The problem does not lie with our colleagues. The problem lies with the Franking Commission and our franking regulations, both of which make us look bad.

There is a body of thought within the Commission which holds that Members of this House are unwilling to accept accountability, and instead demand a blank check on use of the frank. I do not believe that.

I believe that our franking regulations need improvement, and they need it now. Our constituents need protection against the lack of accountability in the use of their money. Our

colleagues need reasonable, understandable regulations which protect their responsible use of the frank.

I will be discussing it with my colleagues over the coming weeks.

VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL GOLD MEDALS

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2591, as amended, a bill to award congressional gold medals to Jan Scruggs, Robert Doubek, and John Wheeler, for their leadership in erecting the Vietnam Veterans Memorial for the Nation.

The creation of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was an extraordinary achievement. It was dedicated just over 3½ years after the incorporation on April 27, 1979, of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc. [VVMF] as a nonprofit organization.

Starting with no funds of its own, the VVMF raised over \$9 million from trade unions, corporations, foundations, veterans' organizations, and individual American citizens. After intense political lobbying, Congress approved the VVMF's request for a 2-acre site on the Capitol Mall, near the Lincoln Memorial. The national competition through which the Memorial design was selected attracted 1,421 entries, making it the largest such competition ever held. An entirely new technology was created and used to inscribe the 58,000 names. A task originally estimated to require years was done in 3 months. Construction was completed on time and under budget.

While it could not have been completed without the active support of hundreds of volunteers, it was Jan Scruggs, Robert Doubek, and John Wheeler who provided the indispensable leadership that made the Vietnam Veterans Memorial a reality.

Jan Scruggs, a wounded and decorated Vietnam veteran, conceived of the idea of a memorial as a way of honoring those who had died in the Vietnam war, and of healing the great hurt inflicted on returning veterans by a country wanting to forget that war. He founded VVMF, and has served as its president since April 1979. From the beginning he worked tirelessly to promote the idea of the memorial. He wrote numerous articles for publication, enlisted the support of government, business and labor leaders, and secured many major financial contributions. Mr. Scrugg's conception of separating veterans from the divisive national debate over the war, and then honoring those veterans was the most important element of the memorial effort.

Robert Doubek was cofounder of the VVMF. As VVMF executive director, he secured the support of the major veterans organizations and coordinated passage of the site authorizing legislation. He initiated the direct-mail fundraising campaign and directed the design competition. As Memorial project director, he organized the design and construction team and oversaw the completion of the Memorial. He was responsible for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the names inscribed on the walls and originated the name locator directories and the National Park Service volunteer guide program. Finally, he orga-

nized and managed the Memorial's dedication ceremony and other public events.

John Wheeler, chairman of VVMF's board of directors, gave several thousand hours of volunteer time to the Memorial project. He recruited many of the volunteers who have served as directors and advisors. His adept political decisions were crucial in steering the project past those who felt the Memorial should dictate a particular interpretation of the Nation's involvement in Vietnam.

The Vietnam Veteran Memorial honors Vietnam veterans with more poignancy than more conventional memorials. Its design seems able to capture all of the ambiguity that the Vietnam war evoked in America.

For Vietnam veterans, the Memorial embodies their pride in having served their Nation—and their rage at a Nation slow to honor and help those who served. For all of us, the Memorial embodies our love for our country—and a tremendous sorrow for those men and women who died for our country.

But the design of the Memorial also provides for a reconciliation of those ambiguities. The names have a power all their own. They turn the Memorial into a quiet place for people to renew their faith in America and its people, and to better understand sacrifice and sorrow. And the black granite, chosen for its reflective quality, seems to draw visitors into a special union with the name. It ensures that we will never forget, never, Mr. Speaker, never.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS TO JAN SCRUGGS, ROBERT DOUBEK, AND JACK WHEELER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2591, as amended, on which further proceedings were postponed on Monday, June 9, 1986, and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2591, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 186, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—224

Ackerman	Bonior (MI)	Coughlin
Akaka	Borski	Crockett
Alexander	Bosco	Darden
Anderson	Boucher	Daschle
Andrews	Boxer	Dellums
Annunzio	Brooks	Dieks
Atkins	Brown (CA)	DioGuardi
AuCoin	Bruce	Donnelly
Barnes	Bryant	Dorgan (ND)
Bates	Burton (CA)	Durbin
Beilenson	Bustamante	Dwyer
Bennett	Carr	Dymally
Bentley	Chapman	Dyson
Berman	Clay	Early
Blaggi	Coelho	Eckart (OH)
Billrakis	Coleman (MO)	Edgar
Boggs	Collins	Edwards (CA)
Boland	Conte	English

Evans (IL)	Lehman (FL)	Rinaldo
Fascell	Leland	Roe
Fawell	Levin (MI)	Roemer
Fazio	Levine (CA)	Rose
Feighan	Lipinski	Rostenkowski
Fish	Lloyd	Rowland (CT)
Florio	Long	Roybal
Foglietta	Lott	Russo
Foley	Lowry (WA)	Sabo
Ford (MI)	Luken	Savage
Ford (TN)	Lundine	Saxton
Fowler	Mack	Scheuer
Frank	MacKay	Schroeder
Frost	Manton	Schumer
Garcia	Markey	Seiberling
Gaydos	Martinez	Sharp
Gejdenson	Matsui	Sikorski
Gephardt	Mavroules	Slattery
Gibbons	McCloskey	Smith (FL)
Gilman	McCollum	Snowe
Glickman	McCurdy	Spence
Gonzalez	McEwen	Spratt
Gordon	McHugh	Staggers
Gray (IL)	McKinney	Stallings
Gray (PA)	Meyers	Stark
Guarini	Mica	Stokes
Gunderson	Mikulski	Strang
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Studds
Hall, Ralph	Mineta	Synar
Hamilton	Mitchell	Thomas (GA)
Hawkins	Mollohan	Torres
Hayes	Morrison (CT)	Torricelli
Hefner	Murtha	Towns
Heftel	Natcher	Traficant
Henry	Neal	Traxler
Hertel	Nelson	Udall
Howard	Nielson	Vento
Hoyer	Nowak	Viscosky
Hughes	Oakar	Volkmer
Jacobs	Oberstar	Vucanovich
Jeffords	Obey	Walgren
Jenkins	Olin	Watkins
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Waxman
Jones (OK)	Owens	Weaver
Jones (TN)	Panetta	Weiss
Kanjorski	Pashayan	Wheat
Kaptur	Pease	Whitten
Kasich	Penny	Williams
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Wirth
Kennelly	Pickle	Wise
Kildee	Price	Wolpe
Klaczka	Pursell	Wright
Kolbe	Rahall	Wyden
Kolter	Rangel	Yates
Kostmayer	Regula	Yatron
Leach (IA)	Reid	Young (MO)
Lehman (CA)	Richardson	

Michel	Roth	Solarz
Miller (OH)	Roukema	Solomon
Miller (WA)	Rowland (GA)	St Germain
Moakley	Rudd	Stangeland
Molinari	Schaefer	Stenholm
Monson	Schneider	Stratton
Montgomery	Schuette	Stump
Moody	Schulze	Sundquist
Moorhead	Sensenbrenner	Sweeney
Morrison (WA)	Shaw	Swindall
Mrazek	Shelby	Tauke
Murphy	Shumway	Tauzin
Myers	Shuster	Taylor
Nichols	Siljander	Thomas (CA)
Oxley	Sisisky	Valentine
Packard	Skeen	Vander Jagt
Parris	Skelton	Walker
Pepper	Slaughter	Weber
Petri	Smith (IA)	Whitehurst
Porter	Smith (NE)	Whitley
Quillen	Smith (NJ)	Whittaker
Ray	Smith, Denny	Wolf
Ridge	(OR)	Wortley
Ritter	Smith, Robert	Wylie
Roberts	(NH)	Young (AK)
Robinson	Smith, Robert	Young (FL)
Rogers	(OR)	Zschau

Mr. HENDON. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman withhold the request temporarily until we check on this side?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I will be happy to.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] withdraws his request.

□ 1055

FOR THE "SWEET SIXTEENTH" TIME THE CELTICS ARE CHAMPIONS

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last year at about this time, the whispers of the many who dared think that maybe this wasn't the year of the "sweet sixteenth" were united in one loud voice. The Gallant Five from the Ancient Garden went down at the hands of the Wanton Knights of Hollywood.

This upset the citizens of the proud city on the Charles, but none were as upset as the Great Red One—and no one was more capable of doing something about it.

So with two subtle flicks of his magic cigar Red fixed his eyes on a distant star. He wished for a clipper, ancient but sturdy. And a mid-western sharp-shooter, a crack-shot from thirty.

Then he gathered his warriors on the old parkay plank.

He pointed to the rafters, musty and dank. Said "men gather 'round, listen up if you would"

The last banner up there's been there longer than it should

With that they moved in round The Chief and The Bird

They made a solemn pact, each gave it their word

On the socks of Bill Russell and the shorts of The Cooze

They swore they would die before The Naismith they'd lose

With K.C. at the helm, that no-nonsense chap

Our heroes took on every town on the map. In their wake they left carnage and broken desire

Each victory just added to the rage of the fire

'Til all that stood 'tween them and the magic gold ring

Were two towers from Texas who thought they should be King

But while Houston, just to be in the match, was excited

The Green shut them down as if fate had decided

See, the rockets had flash, some skill and some fans

But our boys had a destiny, with prearranged plans

Now the skeptics are believers, the critics beside 'em

As this year total victory was not be denied 'em

NOT VOTING—23

Barnard	Dixon	Moore
Breaux	Dowdy	O'Brien
Burton (IN)	Downey	Rodino
Campbell	Groberg	Snyder
Conyers	Hartnett	Swift
Craig	Hillis	Tallon
Davis	Lowery (CA)	Wilson
Dingell	McKernan	

□ 1045

Messrs. LUJAN, DUNCAN, and COYNE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. CONTE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in committee today and missed the vote on rollcall 154. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO SIT ON TODAY AND TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have permission to sit during the 5-minute rule on today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HENDON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared through the ranking member on this side?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I was assured that it was. I was advised that he has been notified. I cannot personally attest to it.

NAYS—186

Anthony	Coyne	Holt
Applegate	Crane	Hopkins
Archer	Daniel	Horton
Arney	Dannemeyer	Hubbard
Aspin	Daub	Huckaby
Badham	de la Garza	Hunter
Bartlett	DeLay	Hutto
Barton	Derrick	Hyde
Bateman	DeWine	Ireland
Bedell	Dickinson	Johnson
Bereuter	Dornan (CA)	Kemp
Bevill	Dreier	Kindness
Bliley	Duncan	Kramer
Boehlert	Eckert (NY)	LaFalce
Boner (TN)	Edwards (OK)	Lagomarsino
Bonker	Emerson	Lantos
Boulter	Erdreich	Latta
Broomfield	Evans (IA)	Leath (TX)
Brown (CO)	Fiedler	Lent
Broyhill	Fields	Lewis (CA)
Byron	Flippo	Lewis (FL)
Callahan	Franklin	Lightfoot
Carney	Frenzel	Livingston
Carper	Fuqua	Loeffler
Chandler	Gallo	Lujan
Chappell	Gekas	Lungren
Chapple	Gingrich	Madigan
Cheney	Goodling	Marlenee
Clinger	Gradison	Martin (IL)
Coats	Green	Martin (NY)
Cobey	Gregg	Mazzoli
Coble	Hammerschmidt	McCain
Coleman (TX)	Hansen	McCandless
Combest	Hatcher	McDade
Cooper	Cooper	McGrath
Courter	Hiler	McMillan

So Hail D.J.! Hail Birdman! Hail Danny and The Chieftian!
Hail Kevin, Bill Walton, K.C., Carlisle and Sighting!
Hail Vincent and Thirdkill! Hail Kite and Scott Wedman!
As for time number sixteen, the Celtics are champions!

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO SIT ON TODAY, AND TOMORROW, JUNE 12, 1986, DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may be allowed to sit during the 5-minute rule on today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEAD LETTER DAYS

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this second session, the distinguished majority whip, Mr. FOLEY, and I distributed little wallet-sized cards to our respective party members on which were noted the significant budget calendar dates for 1986, pursuant to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Deficit Control Act enacted last December.

Today I would like to call on my Democratic leadership colleagues to take those little cards out of their wallets—read them, and heed them. Those cards contain critical, red-letter dates for completing various actions under the budget process. And yet, we are letting these crucial deadlines slip by, unheeded and unmet. To quote the British essayist, Charles Lamb, "The red-letter days now become, to all intents and purposes, dead-letter days."

What happened to the April 15 statutory deadline for completing action on a budget resolution? It's a dead-letter; we still don't have a budget resolution some 2 months later. What about the June 10 statutory deadline for reporting all appropriations bills in the House? It too is a dead-letter; not one money bill had been reported as of yesterday's deadline. We're also likely to miss next Sunday's deadline for completing action on reconciliation, and the June 30 deadline for finishing all appropriations bills in the House.

When are we going to get serious around here and start complying with the very laws we have imposed on ourselves? Or is it the intent of the Democrats to make the Deficit Control Act a dead-letter, and turn those red letter days into more red ink days?

HOUSING ACT OF 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 450 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1100

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to amend and extend certain laws relating to housing, and for other purposes, with Mr. AuCOIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 5, 1986, title II of the text of the bill H.R. 4746, which is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, was open to amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title II?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a brief colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], concerning HUD's study on assessing the energy efficiency of log homes.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there has been an ongoing dispute over the energy efficiency of log homes between HUD and builders of these homes. The dispute has centered on whether log homes, for the purpose of determining FHA and related insurance eligibility, should meet existing energy standards approved by HUD, or whether the unique energy retention capability of logs makes those standards inappropriate as suggested by the log home industry.

It is also my understanding that in an effort to resolve these differences that the Congress directed HUD in 1977 to conduct a study to ascertain the energy efficiency of log homes from which appropriate energy standards could be promulgated. I wonder if the distinguished chairman could tell me the status of this research project previously approved by the Congress.

Mr. GONZALEZ. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman is correct, there has been an ongoing dispute as to the appropriateness of HUD-approved energy standards to log homes. In an effort to resolve the dispute, HUD was instructed by the 96th Congress to conduct a research project in tandem with the National Bureau of Standards [NBS] to determine the energy efficiency of log homes. Although the basic field research was completed in 1982, for some reason, a full analysis of the data

has not been conducted by either the National Bureau of Standards or HUD. As a result, there is no definitive data on which to formulate energy efficiency standards for log homes.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me that NBS and HUD need to complete their analysis of the test results and come up with some conclusions that will improve access to log homes. Given the potential energy savings for America and the possibilities for cost-effective housing build of logs, couldn't \$60,000 in HUD's research budget be used to complete the analysis and develop a standard for log homes?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Funding completion of this project from HUD's research budget would indeed be a wise use of funds, especially in view of the moneys that have already been spent to conduct the tests. It was the intention of Congress that the entire project be completed and supportable conclusions arrived at.

Once the results are tabulated, representatives from HUD, NBS, the Department of Energy, and the log home industry should develop an acceptable energy standard for log homes, or reach agreement on how the industry can meet the existing standards without trading away cost-effectiveness. It's especially important in this era of funding cutbacks that we help more Americans obtain energy-efficient, affordable housing.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAY OF ILLINOIS

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY of Illinois: Page 42, after line 11, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(a) REDUCTION OF RENTAL PAYMENTS FOR ELDERLY FAMILIES.—Section 3(a)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following "(25 percent in the case of an elderly family)".

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. The existing rental in senior citizens public housing is 30 percent of adjusted gross income. Mr. Chairman, this is forcing an undue hardship on many of our senior citizens who are going into the sunset of their lives. This amendment would merely roll that back to 25 percent, the amount that was prevailing up until 1981.

As an example, when you have a senior citizen drawing the minimum Social Security of under \$300 per month, that extra 5 percent takes away \$15 of that recipient's income which they need for food, clothing and other important items.

I think without a doubt we are forcing an undue burden on our senior citi-

zens. I know in my own congressional district we have a 15-percent vacancy rate in senior citizen housing because they are moving out of Government-supported housing back into substandard housing whence they came. The whole purpose of public housing for senior citizens is to get them out of that substandard housing, allow them to come and have friendship and fellowship with other senior citizens, have a decent nutritional diet in that public housing project, and now we are doing just the reverse with these exorbitant rents, forcing them back out of public housing, back into the squalor of substandard housing.

So I hope that the Committee will accept this amendment.

I want to commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] and the distinguished ranking member, Mr. MCKINNEY, for what they have done for not only senior citizens but all people living in public housing throughout this country. They have done a Trojan job over the years. I know of no one who has put in more time or more effort into helping our senior citizens and our low-income families. I urge the subcommittee to accept this amendment. If you feel that the 5-percent reduction is a little exorbitant, I hope you will at least take it to conference with the other body and come up with something that will give some relief to those people who are being forced out of the senior citizen housing in this country or who are real pressed in their budget to pay 30 percent of their income for rent.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the amendment. Thank you.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we just received a copy of the amendment, so I first want to try to understand it.

Is the gentleman's amendment applying to all types of housing programs, section 8 public housing?

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. This is senior citizens housing. Three categories.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will further yield, I am having trouble remembering; I don't believe there is a name of Federal housing called senior citizens housing, and I am trying to identify what housing this amendment includes.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. There are three sections of senior citizens housing affected by my amendment. First, public housing programs, Second, section 8, new construction and section 202. Third, section 8 existing, vouchers and moderate rehabilitation. Those three sections.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will further yield, this amendment affects all housing programs so long as that person is a senior citizen.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Precisely.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. It merely lowers rents from the 30 percent of gross income down to 25 percent;

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. This is somewhat of a surprise, I think, to the House floor. This is a decision that was made in prior years to move that up to 30 percent.

Does the gentleman have a cost estimate, either in terms of how many dollars it would cost to make this change or in terms of how many senior citizens would have to be cut off from the rolls if we had the same amount of dollars expended under the budget? Does the gentleman know how many senior citizens would not be able to be served if we added additional costs?

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. There are two answers to that question. In my case, in my congressional district, which is a 21-county district, we have 15 percent vacancies caused exactly for the reasons I have just alluded to. That is, people cannot afford the high rents in public housing, and they are moving back into substandard housing.

So if we lower the rate, we think we could recoup as much as we would lose by—it is similar to when I was in the automobile business, when you have a lot of cars on hand, you lower the price of the car and do a volume business.

This is what we would like to do here. The money that we would lose if we did not recoup any additional renters would be about \$400 million in all of the programs across the board. But as I say, if we fill those units up with people that are now moving out of the units, we think we could recoup the largest part of that.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman would yield further.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Yes, I would be glad to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. The cost of this amendment would be \$400 million of additional subsidy, but the gentleman believes that would be recouped by providing additional subsidies to people who are not living there now?

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. No, no. I am talking about filling the units back up with people who would be paying the 25 percent, and those units at least in my district are vacant. So we would be getting money back we are now losing.

I hope the Members will support this important amendment. Thank you.

□ 1110

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, nothing would please me more than to say that I would accept this amendment. It is one that I would have offered myself time and time again and, in fact, have done so.

The reason that we have 30 percent of income as rent in assisted housing, which means in our country the housing for the poorest of the poor, is that we had Gramm-Latta and then we had "Grimmer-Latta." And we were compelled into that. We were not actually ever allowed to have an out-and-out floor debate.

It is ironic that all of the Members of the Congress who stand for purity in the process were very eager to jump on that one, which I considered to be a diversion of the processes.

But, nevertheless, that is the history of it. That is how we got 30 percent. We were mandated. The committee never accepted that. We fought against it. We voted against it in the subcommittee.

We then attempted in 1982 and then in 1983 in the Authorization Act for 1983 to restore the traditional 25 percent, but we failed in that attempt.

At this point, though, I am restrained from accepting the gentleman's amendment. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his sensitivity as to just what is going on in the real world. But I have, together with the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of the subcommittee, after many, many months of effort, forged a compromise which, if I were to accept this, I would consider it to be a violation of the compromise, because it would put these very good-willed Members in an untenable position at this point.

So what we are trying to do is save the baby and the bath water. I am afraid that if I were to accept and then destroy the consensus that has enabled us to get this far, for the first time in the last 5½ years, on an authorization bill on its own feet, I therefore reluctantly must oppose the amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think many of us are concerned. It was 25 percent of income for a long time. The fact is that when it was raised without a debate on this floor in 1981, we since then have fought to reduce it back to 25 percent. So the gentleman's amendment is something that many of us share support for, but understanding that we have a long road to go in terms of the other body and the ad-

ministration in terms of getting this bill enacted.

But I think that the gentleman really reflects the sentiments of many of us in terms of the elderly.

The fact is that we won some battles in terms of this bill, in terms of that issue. Even though the percent is 30, the way that it was implemented was on a gradual basis. Not only that, but we retained the credits that are so important, the credits for those who have medical expenses, the credits for other types of expenses that residents, senior citizen residents, of assisted housing have.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the chairman to explain some of the credits that are present that do in fact lower the overall costs for senior citizens and for other residents that are in housing that have special dietary needs. I think this is the best bet.

Before the chairman does that, the point that I want to make is that I think that the promise here was that if we were to, for instance, increase the rent slightly under the 1981 law, somehow we would be able to provide more help, more assisted housing, for the poor in this country. The fact of the matter is that promise has been broken, that that is not what has occurred, but what rather has occurred is there has been a diminishing support for, of course, assisted housing and for public housing and for senior citizen housing. That, of course, has to be reversed. There are all these high-sounding promises about the fact that that 5 percent is going to go to help more, today we have a more serious problem in terms of housing, in terms of deficient housing, in terms of homelessness that we had before.

I would like the chairman to comment about some of the credits that exist that do offset the rent costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important issue. It goes to the heart of the matter. I realize that we may not be voting on this, and I hope we are not compelled to.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota, because the gentleman has very much fought against that increase. The gentleman has been in the forefront of the fight and has explained it well.

Mr. Chairman, I did want to point out to my equally distinguished colleague from Illinois, who has a tremendous record of service in this House, and who I highly honor, that there are minor victories that we were able to get. We might have lost the war, but we won a few skirmishes, and these are what I would like to point out to the gentleman that are avail-

able in the way of diminishing the harsh impact on the poorest of the poor of a 5-percent increase in the rents.

We had it done this way. We amended the basic 1937 Housing Act in that 1983 effort, and we had this definition: The term "adjusted income" means income that remains after excluding, first, \$480 for each member of the family residing in the household other than the head of the household or his spouse who is under 18 years of age or who is 18 years of age or older and is disabled or handicapped or a full-time student; second, \$400 for any elderly family—you have that exemption of a flat \$400 for any elderly family; third, the amount by which the aggregate of the following expenses of the family exceeds 3 percent of annual family income: one, medical expenses for any elderly family; two, reasonable attendant care and auxiliary apparatus expenses for each handicapped member of any family, to the extent necessary to enable any member of such family, including such handicapped member, to be employed; and fourth, child care to the extent necessary to enable another member of the family to be employed or to further his or her education.

So we do have those mitigating factors, but I still believe that it was an error to have raised the rents at a time when our housing starts continue to diminish, particularly to the poor and the poorest of the poor.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the motives of the sponsor, the author, of this amendment, but I think that we need to keep in mind a couple of points.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, there is already a credit that is applied against gross income when one calculates the amount that an elderly person or family is going to pay.

Let us just run through a very quick calculation. Let us assume that we have a couple that receives \$600 a month in their combined Social Security payments. That is not very much. They have against that a credit of \$400. So the amount that they are going to pay in terms of their rent in subsidized housing is going to be applied against only \$200. We are talking then about currently they would pay \$60 in rent out of \$600 of income. That is 10 percent of their income. We are talking about reducing that to \$50, which would be 8 percent, if you reduced it to 25 percent.

Now the national average currently, the national average for all Americans, and what they pay as a percent of their income, whether we are talking about rich, poor or middle income, is

28 to 29 percent of their gross income which is paid for their housing.

The example that I gave is obviously one which is significantly below that. Even if you were to leave out the credit that is applied there, then you are talking about reducing it from 30 to 25 percent below the national average.

I know that in my district there are many elderly people who are paying well over the amount even of that national average in terms of the income that they apply, and they are not in subsidized housing. It strikes me as incredible to imagine somehow how reducing the rent from \$60 to \$50 for that individual or for that family is going to get them into subsidized housing and fill up these units, that they are now in housing that somehow they can get at \$50 outside the subsidized housing market that they cannot get at \$60.

□ 1120

I just find it incredible to imagine how that is going to happen.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has put his finger on a very important point and that is that the average citizen in this country is only paying approximately 20 percent of his adjusted gross income for rent, and we are charging our senior citizens, going into the sunset of their lives, 30 percent of adjusted gross income, when the whole purpose of senior citizen housing is to give them a better break on housing in the last days of their lives. I think the gentleman has made a good argument for my amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. If I might reclaim my time, the figure I gave was 28 to 29 percent of gross income. When you talk about the \$400 credit, then you are only talking about 10 percent. Twenty-five percent of \$200 would be \$50. That is 10 percent of their gross income.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield further, even if they are on a similar basis, we are not doing much for the senior citizens. If we are equating rentals on the open private market with anybody in senior citizen housing—that is, even the same amount, 28-percent, what are we doing for them to get them out of substandard housing and into decent housing where they can get good nutrition, where they can prolong their lives by going down to the recreation room and visiting with other senior citizens? That is the whole purpose of senior citizen housing. So even if we only charge them 28 percent, we are

not giving them any real consideration.

Mr. KOLBE. The point was made by the gentleman from Illinois that we would somehow fill up these vacant units, at least in his district, if we would reduce the amount of income that is paid, adjusted income, from 30 percent to 25 percent. I suggested a little scenario that I ran through there that if you had a \$600 income, you are really talking about reducing it from \$60 to \$50. I cannot conceive of these people finding housing on the outside that they are getting for \$60, that somehow reducing it to \$50 is now going to get them into subsidized housing.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I just want to point out that I am glad the gentleman has got up and reaffirmed the support for the credits, because as far as the elderly, they are far more important than the percentage paid, and I think it is important that we have preserved that particular element.

The other aspect, though, is because of the nature of the eligibility standards in terms of public housing, we are increasingly addressing and providing housing for the poorest of the poor. In other words, instead of 80 percent of median income, there was a time when it was everyone below 50. And the fact is that when you have a very low income, whatever percentage you take is a much tougher standard for those with low income. But I think it is important here and I am pleased that the gentleman has pointed out the importance of these particular credits, because they do allow, I think, a more realistic way of approaching this.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GRAY of Illinois) there were—ayes 11, noes 10.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 277, noes 137, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

AYES—277

Ackerman	Bates	Bonior (MI)
Akaka	Beilenson	Bonker
Alexander	Bennett	Borski
Anderson	Bentley	Bosco
Andrews	Berman	Boxer
Annunzio	Bevill	Brooks
Anthony	Biaggi	Brown (CA)
Applegate	Billrakis	Bryant
Aspin	Boehmert	Burton (CA)
Atkins	Boggs	Bustamante
AuCoin	Boland	Byron
Barnes	Boner (TN)	Carr

Chapman	Hutto	Reid	Dickinson	Loeffler	Saxton
Chappell	Jacobs	Richardson	Dornan (CA)	Lott	Schaefer
Clay	Jeffords	Rinaldo	Dreier	Lowery (CA)	Schuette
Clinger	Jones (NC)	Robinson	Eckert (NY)	Lujan	Sensenbrenner
Coelho	Jones (OK)	Roe	Edwards (OK)	Lungren	Shumway
Coleman (TX)	Jones (TN)	Roe-mer	Evans (IA)	Marlenee	Shuster
Collins	Kanjorski	Rogers	Fawell	Martin (IL)	Siljander
Conte	Kaptur	Rose	Fields	McCain	Skeen
Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski	Franklin	McCandless	Skelton
Coyne	Kemp	Rowland (CT)	Frenzel	McKinney	Slatery
Crockett	Kennelly	Rowland (GA)	Gallo	McMillan	Slaughter
Daschle	Kildee	Roybal	Gingrich	Meyers	Smith, Denny
de la Garza	Klecza	Russo	Gradison	Michel	(OR)
Dellums	Kolter	Sabo	Green	Miller (OH)	Smith, Robert
Derrick	Kostmayer	Savage	Gregg	Miller (WA)	(NH)
Dicks	Lantos	Scheuer	Gunderson	Molinari	Smith, Robert
Dingell	Leath (TX)	Schneider	Hansen	Monson	(OR)
DioGuardi	Lehman (CA)	Schroeder	Hendon	Moorhead	Stenholm
Dixon	Lehman (FL)	Schulze	Henry	Morrison (WA)	Strang
Donnelly	Leland	Schumer	Hill	Nichols	Stump
Dorgan (ND)	Lent	Seiberling	Hyde	Nielson	Sundquist
Downey	Levin (MI)	Sharp	Ireland	Oxley	Sweeney
Duncan	Levine (CA)	Shaw	Jenkins	Packard	Swindall
Durbin	Lewis (FL)	Shelby	Johnson	Penny	Tauke
Dwyer	Lipinski	Sikorski	Kasich	Petri	Taylor
Dymally	Lloyd	Sisisky	Kindness	Pickle	Thomas (CA)
Dyson	Long	Smith (FL)	Kolbe	Porter	Vander Jagt
Early	Lowry (WA)	Smith (IA)	Kramer	Pursell	Vucanovich
Eckart (OH)	Luken	Smith (NE)	LaFalce	Ray	Walker
Edgar	Lundine	Smith (NJ)	Lagomarsino	Ridge	Weber
Edwards (CA)	MacKay	Snowe	Latta	Ritter	Whitehurst
Emerson	Madigan	Solarz	Leach (IA)	Roberts	Whittaker
English	Manton	Solomon	Lewis (CA)	Roth	Wylie
Erdreich	Markey	Spence	Lightfoot	Roukema	Zschau
Evans (IL)	Martin (NY)	Spratt	Livingston	Rudd	
Fascell	Martinez	St Germain			
Fazio	Matsui	Staggers			
Feighan	Mavroules	Stallings			
Fiedler	Mazzoli	Stangeland			
Fish	McCloskey	Stark			
Filippo	McCollum	Stokes			
Florio	McCurdy	Stratton	Boucher	Dowdy	McKernan
Foglietta	McDade	Studds	Breaux	Foley	Moore
Ford (MI)	McEwen	Swift	Campbell	Groberg	O'Brien
Ford (TN)	McGrath	Synar	Cheney	Hartnett	Rodino
Fowler	McHugh	Tauzin	Conyers	Hillis	Snyder
Frank	Mica	Thomas (GA)	Davis	Mack	Tallon
Frost	Mikulski	Torres			
Fuqua	Miller (CA)	Torrice			
Garcia	Mineta	Towns			
Gaydos	Mitchell	Trafficant			
Gejdenson	Moakley	Traxler			
Gekas	Mollohan	Udall			
Gephardt	Montgomery	Valentine			
Gibbons	Moody	Vento			
Gilman	Morrison (CT)	Visclosky			
Glickman	Mrazek	Volkmer			
Goodling	Murphy	Walgren			
Gordon	Murtha	Watkins			
Gray (IL)	Myers	Waxman			
Gray (PA)	Natcher	Weaver			
Guarini	Neal	Weiss			
Hall (OH)	Nelson	Wheat			
Hall, Ralph	Nowak	Whitley			
Hamilton	Oakar	Whitten			
Hammerschmidt	Oberstar	Williams			
Hatcher	Obey	Wilson			
Hawkins	Olin	Wirth			
Hayes	Ortiz	Wise			
Hefner	Owens	Wolf			
Heftel	Panetta	Wolpe			
Hertel	Parris	Wortley			
Holt	Pashayan	Wright			
Hopkins	Pease	Wyden			
Horton	Pepper	Yates			
Howard	Perkins	Yatron			
Hoyer	Price	Young (AK)			
Hubbard	Quillen	Young (FL)			
Huckaby	Rahall	Young (MO)			
Hughes	Rangel				
Hunter	Regula				

NOES—137

Archer	Brown (CO)	Coleman (MO)
Army	Broyhill	Combest
Badham	Bruce	Cooper
Barnard	Burton (IN)	Courter
Bartlett	Callahan	Craig
Barton	Berman	Crane
Bateman	Bevill	Daniel
Bedell	Biaggi	Dannemeyer
Bereuter	Bryant	Darden
Bliley	Burton (CA)	Daub
Boulter	Bustamante	DeLay
Broomfield	Byron	DeWine
	Carr	
	Coble	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—18

Boucher	Dowdy	McKernan
Breaux	Foley	Moore
Campbell	Groberg	O'Brien
Cheney	Hartnett	Rodino
Conyers	Hillis	Snyder
Davis	Mack	Tallon

□ 1135

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Breaux for, with Mr. Hartnett against.

Mr. CARPER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CHAPPELL and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1145

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROYBAL: Page 90, after line 4, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 245. MODIFICATION OF RESTRICTION ON USE OF ASSISTED HOUSING BY ALIENS.

(a) LIMITATION OF RESTRICTION TO NEW APPLICATIONS.—Section 214(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

"(2) The restriction established in this subsection shall not apply to—

"(A) the continued provision of any financial assistance commenced before the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1986;

"(B) the provision of any financial assistance pursuant to a conversion from any other financial assistance; or

"(C) the provision of any financial assistance to an individual displaced from a dwelling as a result of an activity of the Federal Government or an activity approved or assisted by the Federal Government."

(b) RETENTION OF RESTRICTION ON NONIMMIGRANT STUDENT-ALIENS.—Section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not make financial assistance available for the benefit of—

"(1) any alien who—

"(A) has a residence in a foreign country that such alien has no intention of abandoning;

"(B) is a bona fide student qualified to pursue a full course of study; and

"(C) is admitted to the United States temporarily and solely for purposes of pursuing such a course of study at an established institution of learning or other recognized place of study in the United States, particularly designated by such alien and approved by the Attorney General after consultation with the Department of Education of the United States, which institution or place of study shall have agreed to report to the Attorney General the termination of attendance of each nonimmigrant student (and if any such institution of learning or place of study fails to make such reports promptly the approval shall be withdrawn); and

"(2) the alien spouse and minor children of any alien described in paragraph (1), if accompanying such alien or following to join such alien."

(c) CERTIFICATION AND DOCUMENTATION PROCEDURES.—Section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (as amended by subsection (b) of this section) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall require, as a condition of providing financial assistance for the benefit of any individual, that such individual—

"(1) declare in writing, under penalty of perjury, whether or not such individual is a citizen or national of the United States; and

"(2) if not a citizen or national, provide such documentation regarding the immigration status of such individual as the Secretary may require by regulation."

Mr. ROYBAL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that there are over 13 million individuals in public assisted housing in the United States and that each and everyone of them were placed in public housing because they met HUD

regulations in effect at the time of application, interview, and placement.

Today we are offering an amendment seeking to avoid the harsh effects of new and most recent HUD regulations that impose, retroactively, strict documentary requirements proving eligibility, on all present tenants of public housing. We do this not because eligibility requirements should not be met, but because they will be applied retroactively on people already given housing under previous HUD regulations.

This will affect all those aged 18 or older who will be required to provide documentary proof of their eligible immigration status. This massive paperwork burden, scheduled for implementation beginning July 31, will present a very costly bureaucratic nightmare to public housing authorities whose operating expenses are already severely limited.

My amendment prevents retroactive provisions from being applied by exempting from the verification process only those persons currently receiving subsidized housing assistance. It retains the HUD restrictions on Federal assistance to prospective tenants. It permits those families who are displaced by Federal action to receive relocation assistance.

The latest HUD regulations threaten all families in federally assisted housing with eviction or the breakup of the family unit unless they can meet new strict documentation requirements proving eligible immigration status. Approximately 45 percent of HUD residents are elderly and most are presumed to be legal residents. But these senior citizens and others may have been born at home and not in the hospital and have no birth certificate. Honorable discharge from the U.S. Army does not make a person a citizen and if he is unable to find any other documentation, he and his family will be evicted, simply because HUD wishes to impose retroactively a requirement they should have had in effect before all of these people were placed in public housing in the first place.

Further, HUD regulations do not require landlords to provide sufficient time to secure or find required documentation.

The retroactive enactment of the HUD regulations would have a severe impact on citizen members of tenant families. For instance, I know of a family with several children who are citizens, a mother who is a permanent resident alien, and a father who has not yet been able to adjust his residency status. Under the new regulations, all would be evicted unless the father abandoned the family. There are thousands of similar cases throughout the country. A retroactive regulation is unfair, unjust, and cruel and in this instance very expensive.

I am not addressing questions regarding the validity of the regulations as they affect prospective tenants. I know that challenges will be made in the courts on such grounds as the right of privacy of families. However, we cannot wait for the courts to resolve the fairness questions for those persons now living in public housing.

Mr. Chairman, there is no denying the severe hardship that the retroactive HUD regulations would impose on families living in assisted housing and the problems it would create for their communities. I believe that this amendment is a realistic and fair approach. It would grandfather in those placed in housing under HUD regulations which they complied with when they were admitted. It would prevent the expenditure or millions of dollars to reprocess more than 13 million residents and at the same time apply fairness and maintain the family unit.

This humane approach is supported by many national organizations that are aware of the havoc the HUD regulations would cause. These include the National Council of Churches, the National Association of Counties, the National Low-Income Housing Coalition—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] has expired.

(On request of Mr. GONZALEZ, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROYBAL was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas for having the time extended because I would like to include the rest of the organizations that are supporting this amendment. I had already stated that they include the National Council of Churches and the National Low-Income Housing Coalition. They include also the National Rural Housing Coalition, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. I urge all my colleagues to join us in supporting this amendment and, on grounds of equity and fairness, to prevent these new HUD regulations from being applied retroactively.

Mr. Chairman, we are not asking for anything new. We are asking simply that a HUD regulation that is now being imposed retroactively be permitted to exempt those already in public housing.

A retroactive law, particularly of this nature, is definitely not fair. Why did HUD not do that to begin with, before these people were placed in public housing? Why did HUD permit these people to be in public housing, with their children, with all their belongings, and then all of a sudden come to the conclusion that they made a mistake then that they want this

House of Representatives now to correct?

□ 1155

I think that while it was a mistake, that we should at least not go along with the retroactive provisions of that order. Let us start now. If they want to impose the law the way it is, the way it should be, then let them do so, but not to do it retroactively, for it will result in the suffering of too many people. I do not think that we in this body want to be a part of that particular situation.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL]. I do not believe that anyone in this Chamber is in favor of illegal immigrants receiving scarce public housing assistance. I too am opposed to such a policy. Drastic cuts in Federal housing have left thousands of eligible families without assistance.

But the issue here is not whether to deny illegal immigrants public housing assistance. The issue is whether this body approves of a policy that will result in the eviction of thousands of innocent families from their homes. If we allow the final HUD regulation to be implemented as published thousands of American children would be forced into the streets, simply because their parents are here illegally.

As Mr. ROYBAL pointed out, senior citizens who are legal residents would be forced to find shelter simply because they cannot locate the proper documentation to prove their legal status.

The amendment offered by Mr. ROYBAL would alleviate these problems by grandfathering those families already receiving subsidized housing. It retains the existing restrictions on assistance to prospective tenants and requires that all prospective tenants certify their citizenship or legal status.

Mr. Chairman, given the hardship to existing subsidized tenants that the HUD regulation would pose, I ask for speedy passage of this amendment. I believe that the amendment represents a realistic and pragmatic approach to dealing with innocent families who may not be able to prove their status and have no where else to turn.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our 1980 Housing Act, as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, set forth in law a prohibition against providing assistance under federally assisted housing programs to any alien who is not a lawful resident of the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

Our 1983 housing bill had a provision which put on hold HUD's ability

to publish final regulations. That hold period was for 1 year.

HUD has since published a regulation which becomes final in early July.

The amendment before us today would grandfather those illegal aliens already housed in units assisted under our Federal housing programs. It seems to me that to grandfather these illegal aliens in these times of tight budgetary resources is grossly unfair to American citizens.

The impetus of the original statutory provisions in 1980 was that we saw ourselves housing non-Americans whose own country was housing American citizens against their will.

If my colleagues will recall, this was the so-called Vento amendment. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] offered the amendment when he found that we were housing Iranian students in public housing projects and thus he offered the amendment to make it illegal to house these illegal aliens, who were Iranian students.

Mr. Chairman, to house illegal aliens and deny occupancy to bona fide American citizens in these times when everyone is taking their across-the-board cuts it seems to me is just unfair.

I understand current law on this subject is not perfect. I understand the law is burdensome on public housing authorities and on HUD. On this point, I hope we can clarify exactly how burdensome this provision might be during the conference which is imminent on this housing legislation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly must suggest that I oppose the amendment at the present time.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when HUD announced this regulation, there were many people who said that it is about time that we should do this, to have America for Americans, and similar comments. But did they really consider the consequences of this regulation in human terms, I mean?

There is not any clear-cut picture. It is not a question of one family, one person being a citizen or noncitizen of these United States. It is not a question of just taking one family and putting them in the streets.

I can tell you that in the city of New York that if you take them out of public housing, they go into the streets. There is not any other place for them to live. People have to wait 18 years currently under the current housing situation in the city of New York in order to get into the city housing authority under this provision.

It is all right to respond in a Rambo fashion, and I am sympathetic oftentimes to some of that sentiment; but one has to look beyond this regulation.

I understand why, because there are so many people who are citizens, who

are without residences, and I appreciate that; but the wrong here, if it is a wrong, was committed at the outset, where there was not any requirement of citizenship when the initial applicants were accepted.

You have 35 to 40 percent of the people in public housing in the city of New York who would be evicted if the HUD regulation were to be enforced and would be maintained. Contemplate, if you will, the maelstrom, the chaos, the time consumed, the cost, the agonies which will be untold just in the stress and strain of the process of litigation.

In the end, how would you like to see the sidewalks of the city of New York speckled with families sitting out there with their furniture in the hot sun and the cold winters? That happened once before in New York town. That happened in my youth. I saw it time and time again, but I would like to believe that we have come a long way. We are in the so-called enlightened state of mind in our Nation with more regard given to human considerations.

I would strongly suggest to those who would support this regulation that they think more carefully of the consequences.

The amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], which agrees that prospectively he has no objection, nor would I, but implement or permit the HUD regulations to be implemented henceforth is unkind. It is cruel, unproductive, and would be a blight on our American way of life.

I strongly urge that we vote and pass the Ed Roybal amendment.

I plead to my friends who might think in terms of America for Americans, as I oftentimes do, but make this the exception.

I do not know how many housing projects you have in your respective districts. I have many in mine. We have many in the city of New York. The vacancy rate in New York as far as apartments is concerned is virtually zero. If they are evicted, they will be in the streets.

Can you imagine or envision 35 percent of the population of the public housing in our city being evicted and put into the streets? Would you like to be a party to any such movement? I know you do not. I know that Members and my colleagues here are too kind and concerned with housing, and I am sure they are, as I am; but I am not so sure they have really thought this all the way out or thought the whole process out and what the consequences would be.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does make a good point and I

can understand the position he is coming from, but the members of the delegation from New York do say that there are no vacancy rates in the city of New York, and I guess that is the point I want to make, that there is a dearth of housing and that housing is not available to American citizens in the city of New York. I think that is the point I would want to make.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CARR). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BIAGGI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, just to respond, I made the point and the gentleman affirmed it clearly. There is not enough housing for the citizens, clearly; but of those hundreds of thousands that have applied, they are not all citizens. We just have a tough, tough almost impossible critical housing situation in the city of New York; but we do not resolve the problem by transposing, by taking people out and putting them in the streets and then taking those who are currently housed in other quarters into public housing, because what will happen to the quarters that are being vacated, that are not public housing, is the rents will skyrocket. Because of rent control they are still able to maintain their ability to stay in those places. The new folks will be evicted and seek admission to those houses and simply will not be able to afford it.

I know how the gentleman feels about housing and at no time have I inferred in any way that he is not sympathetic to the housing problem, but this is a special aspect of it that I would like to address because it is one that is real. It is real.

We are not talking about logistics. We are not talking about a fantasy or imagined scenarios. We are talking about the real consequences. I have seen it once in my life. I would rather not see it again. I would certainly not like to see it again as sponsored by these United States of America.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from California's amendment. In my own congressional district, I have several housing units which receive Federal assistance from HUD that would be adversely affected by the current HUD regulations preventing undocumented aliens from residing in federally assisted housing.

This regulation is likely to cause hardships in a number of cases. First, the minority elderly, because they may not have been born in hospitals or due to other factors, may find it difficult to establish their citizenship or immigration status without proper documentation. Second, many families in public housing or section 8 housing units have some members who are citizens or permanent residents; in many cases these family members are children. Yet, under the present regulations, the entire family would be forced out of their home. In New York City, because of our hous-

ing shortage, it is clear that these families would have no place to go. They would be forced to join the ranks of the homeless who are already underserved.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment which will go a long way toward easing the burden of enforcement on local housing authorities and protecting families from being forced to join the ranks of the homeless.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN of California to the amendment offered by Mr. ROYBAL: Page 1, line 11, strike "The" and insert the following:

In the case of any family in which any member is a citizen of the United States, a national of the United States, or an alien resident of the United States described in any of the subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1), the

Page 3, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 4, line 1, and insert the following:

"(2) if not a citizen or national—

"(A) declare in writing, under penalty of perjury, the immigration status of such individual, if such individual is not less than 62 years of age; or

"(B) provide such documentation regarding the immigration status of such individual as the Secretary may require by regulation."

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, there have been some eloquent words spoken on the House floor this morning on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], many of them by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] himself, that this great Chamber does not want to perform an enormous injustice against innocent people, families, children, people with a tremendous work ethic, who want to participate in the American dream; however, this body did express its will to our Department of Housing and Urban Development and HUD is trying under very difficult circumstances to effectuate what this Chamber desires. This Chamber's desire is that American taxpayers not give American hard-earned tax dollars to people who are not Americans, and yet there is not a Member of this Chamber or any American citizen that I know of who wants to hurt innocent children, who wants to hurt good families; so I think that if we establish as a body a guidance for HUD that wherever there is an American citizen in the family, irrespective of that citizen's age, that is a full citizen of the United States of America and that is not a citizen or a family of that citizen that we want HUD—to put it into the eloquent words of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI]—to see turned into the streets.

□ 1210

All of our great religions in this country are interested in this. Most of our States that have problems with substandard housing or that are trying to build new housing are interested in this. All of them have expressed to Mr. ROYBAL and to me that they have no desire whatsoever to turn out into the streets, particularly in those cases as in my own hometown of Garden Grove, where we are trying to rebuild a decayed area that has become crime infested, and in that area are innocent—and I underline that word "innocent"—several times—innocent families who, if they are not able to go into Government housing are simply going to have to be put in the street, or the programs of rebuilding are shut down on this catch 22, that you cannot turn out a family, put them in the street, is not the choice you want, and you cannot put them into any Government-supported housing.

As far as the aspect here of people 62 years of age or over having to affirm their citizenship, we should take the word of honor of senior citizens, many of them who go back 50 years to that period when Mr. BIAGGI spoke of seeing horrors in this country where children were born in camps across this country because everyone was struggling for a job during the Great Depression, and they have no records of birth, civil servants were being laid off in many of our States, and these people who were 12 or younger who came out of that period should, under penalty of perjury, be afforded the honor of affirming their citizenship. This is what the Immigration and Naturalization Service works under, and I think it is unfortunate that HUD is struggling under a tougher standard than INS because we did not clarify in our legislative intent the will of the House. So I hope that my amendment will be accepted.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN of California. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to take the floor to congratulate the gentleman because I think his amendment makes a great deal of sense, but let me go a step beyond.

I think one of the biggest problems that we have had in America, especially among poor people, is to try and keep them together. Our welfare system sometimes is such that we have families living apart so they can continue to maintain themselves.

I congratulate the gentleman and I congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] because I think that essentially what we are trying to do is to keep families together. The American dream is keep the family to-

gether. Strong families make for good citizens.

It is also important that people understand that many of these people the gentleman and I are now talking about are taxpayers. They toil. They work every day, and they pay their taxes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. GARCIA and by unanimous consent, Mr. DORNAN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GARCIA. If the gentleman will yield further, based on what my colleague from California said, I really think that he is right on target. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman and to thank him personally. I think the amendment makes sense.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman from California for his very thoughtful amendment. Obviously he has given this a considerable amount of time and interest.

The nexus of the gentleman's amendment would provide that if an American citizen is living in the public housing unit, then the other persons living in the unit would be allowed to continue to live there in the public housing unit.

It seems to me that that makes the amendment offered by the gentleman from California much more agreeable to this Member. As I indicated, I think the gentleman is to be complimented and commended for his approach to this very difficult problem.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN of California. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYBAL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know a little bit more about the amendment that the gentleman has proposed. It is my understanding that the amendment will protect those now in public housing who have in the family unit either a citizen or a legal resident. Is that correct?

Mr. DORNAN of California. Yes.

Mr. ROYBAL. It would also protect those individuals who are dispossessed by housing by some Federal action, whether they be legal citizens or not. Is that correct?

Mr. DORNAN of California. Will the gentleman please rephrase that?

Mr. ROYBAL. In the event of some Federal action taking place anywhere in the country that affects individuals, all those individuals would be protected by the use of Federal funds.

Mr. DORNAN of California. What the State of California tells me is that 85 percent or more of these families the gentleman is talking about, when we are trying to rebuild a decaying area, have an American citizen in the family.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DORNAN of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. The Senate and the churches—a particular hero in this area is our new archbishop in Los Angeles, Roger Mahoney—have said that the churches and the State can easily take up this tiny area of people where it is a totally illegal alien family without any citizens in the family. It also protects those people that the gentleman has spoken out so eloquently in defense of, those who are 62 years of age and over who have no proof of their citizenship. The INS has said they rarely, if ever, find anybody who does not tell the truth; that when they affirm to their citizenship under oath, they are citizens.

So it takes care of everything but a small percentage.

Mr. ROYBAL. If the gentleman will yield further, these people, whether or not they can prove their citizenship by the use of documents, would be protected and Federal moneys can be used for that purpose.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Yes.

Mr. ROYBAL. If the gentleman will yield further, there is another point that I am kind of leery about, and that is the fact that under the gentleman's particular amendment it would be necessary for the housing authority to reprocess all 13 million in Federal housing.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. ROYBAL and by unanimous consent, Mr. DORNAN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Department of Housing and Urban Development is duplicating all the work that has been done by INS. This is already available by INS and they are not only adhering to a harder standard than the Immigration Service itself, but they are duplicating all of this work.

Mr. ROYBAL. I understand.

Mr. DORNAN of California. So we just need these 2 agencies to work to-

gether, and it does not have to be done all over again.

Mr. ROYBAL. If the gentleman will yield further, in order for them to make a determination, they have to ask questions. In order to ask questions, they have to talk to people. They have to interview these 11 million people to find out whether or not, No. 1, they are legal residents or American citizens. In other words, it will not prevent the reprocessing of the 13-million people in public housing.

Mr. DORNAN of California. No. I am told no. And also, when we take each individual project over the next few years, we are not dealing with the enormous figure of 11 to 13 million. For example, in Garden Grove, we are dealing with a very small area called Buena Clinton, and we know already how many families are in there and it is a matter of a few hours, particularly if they use the INS research that is already available.

Mr. ROYBAL. If the gentleman will yield further, I have one hypothetical question.

What will happen to the individual like myself, for example. Suppose I were 60 years of age. I must admit I am a little older than that.

Mr. DORNAN of California. We could never tell.

Mr. ROYBAL. Let us say I was 60 years of age, I served in the armed services. When I was born, I was not born in a hospital. I was born at home. I have no birth certificate.

Suppose I had no documentation, only my discharge papers. HUD or any housing authority would not accept my discharge papers as being an American citizen; therefore, I would be evicted under those circumstances, together with all my family.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Under this perfecting amendment to the gentleman's amendment, he would not even need his discharge papers. He would merely affirm that he is a U.S. citizen and his word of honor would be sufficient.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Will the gentleman from California engage in a colloquy with me on this amendment?

Mr. DORNAN of California. Yes; gladly.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me say first I commend the gentleman, because I believe he is making a positive contribution in this important debate, but I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions so I can clarify what the issue is that we are addressing.

It is my understanding that a person applying for public housing has to fill out some type of application or questionnaire, and among the things asked of that person would be their citizen-

ship status, their source of income, and the like. Usually this is taken under oath, or ascribed to by the person as being truthful and accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Is that the gentleman's understanding as well?

Mr. DORNAN of California. Yes.

□ 1410

Mr. DURBIN. If we have a situation where an individual, for instance, has falsified information concerning their source of income and becomes a resident of public housing as a result of that falsification, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] would not question the fact that that person is undeserving of public housing and should be evicted.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Absolutely not.

Mr. DURBIN. In this situation, what if we are dealing with a hypothetical where, in fact, two parents, or two would-be parents would make that same application and falsify information as to their citizen status, claiming to be U.S. citizens? They are then admitted to public housing as eligible and shortly thereafter a child is born to them, who, by virtue of the fact of being born in the United States, is an American citizen.

Does the gentleman's amendment suggest, then, that because there is an American citizen within their household, that the falsification of information on their application status regarding citizenship could not or should not be used against them?

Mr. DORNAN of California. That is an excellent question. However, coming back to what the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] was trying to do with his amendment, and what the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] spoke to, and what the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI] spoke to, I do not believe there is a Member of this Chamber that would want to evict into the streets an American citizen, that child, because of the transgressions of his parents.

There is the line from Scripture that pops into my head: "No room at the inn." I think that this would be a case where the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the INS would have to wrestle with that word "justice" in addressing this problem. It is a good question and I am glad the gentleman brought it up in the colloquy because the people in the bureaucracy on the western side of the city, just down the hill from us, are always trying to read our legislative debate, glean out of it what exactly we meant, but justice to that child, that American citizen, would indicate that it might have to go to the courts.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me say that despite the legal exchange here of hy-

potheticals, the gentleman from California—

Mr. DORNAN of California. The gentleman has a harder one than that one?

Mr. DURBIN. No; I am going to stop at this point, but I would like to commend both gentlemen from California. I know how difficult this subject matter is and this particular question came to mind during the debate.

I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for engaging in this colloquy.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, in closing with the few seconds I have left, I just want to ask my fellow colleagues to underscore throughout this debate three words: justice, fairness, and the work ethic and vote your conscience.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roybal amendment and what I consider to be the perfecting amendment offered by his colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Let me address some things that are actually facts out in that real world where we come from. The question of illegal residents of assisted or public housing has been grossly exaggerated in some instances.

The last thing an illegal individual wants to do, when you really go around and see where they live and all, is to go anywhere near officialdom because they know that the moment they are near any kind of an official governmental activity, they are going to be picked up and deported by INS. So they stay away.

Let me assure my colleagues that in my area, the individuals that are illegal today are in greater number from the Central American countries, particularly El Salvador, than they are from Mexico, for example, where everybody assumes we get the bulk of the illegal flow.

Where they are living is in some of the original, what we call tourist courts built in the 1920's, in San Antonio, which, as late as the 1950's, were being advertised as \$1 a day tourist courts. They consist of one room and one small bathroom.

What you have there now is families of these beleaguered human beings, and let me tell you, they are beleaguered. They live in fear every day. They are families that consist of four, five children living in those one-room ancient tourist courts that have been condemned in many instances, but are being rented for as much as \$300 a month.

They are not being reported, but they live in fear that they will. They are not going to apply for public housing.

The administrators of our public housing projects in our part of Southwest United States will be the first to tell you that they do not have any

kind of a sizable problem with respect to illegal aliens residing in those projects. I think we ought to get that focused.

I think that would answer this question about the hypothetical question about two illegals fraudulently presenting an application and then subsequently to being admitted, giving birth to a child.

I want to compliment the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], and his colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], for having struck off a compromise that will go a long way in avoiding the injustices that will manifestly happen if HUD insists on enforcing their announced regulations as of August 1.

The reason for that is that the HUD regulations would impose a mandate on every occupant of public housing, alien, citizen, anybody, and it would bring about real hardship because in our part of the country, for example, and I give that as an example, probably true in other areas, we have many citizens, and I think the gentleman from California pointed out, who have lived in our country for 60, 65, 70 years. Most of them, if not all, are legalized residents of our country.

When they were either brought as infants or came over as children, there were hardly any real immigration restrictions. The reality of life along our borders with Mexico are that you have had an almost indistinguishable line of demarcation there. You have daily to and fro hundreds, thousands of people from one city on the other side, on the Mexican side, coming into the Texas side and Texas citizens going to Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe that any really serious reservation we might have should be dispelled about the Roybal amendment.

The gentleman from California's [Mr. DORNAN] amendment does not strike the pertinent parts of the Roybal amendment that ought to be kept; rather, it perfects. I want to congratulate him on his perfecting language and I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of the Roybal amendment as amended by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINNEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYBAL.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for a technical change because of an error on my amendment. Where it says page 3, "strike line 24," it should say "strike line 25."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. CARR]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], and with my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], and my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. I think that this has been a legitimate step toward trying to solve a very basic problem in the United States.

□ 1230

It is a problem that is not just limited to immigrants; it is a problem with public housing which is taking on a monstrous proportion that we do not seem to know what to do with, and I call its real root cause very bad administration by public housing authorities.

If you have been reading your Washington papers, you will probably note that the public housing authority of the city of Washington is going to try and sweep the projects. Well, what does this mean? This means put out illegal people who are there.

They are disruptive; they are usually the cause of drug sales; and they usually do not qualify for public housing. Yet throughout the length and breadth of the United States we have this problem of double tenancy and in some cases even triple tenancy.

This is poor administration.

In fact a European, a Mexican, Peruvian, anybody, is in public housing illegally they are there because the public housing authority has not done its job.

It seems to me that to punish people because bureaucrats do not do their job is just the wrong way to go; and so I strongly support the amendment as modified by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and hope that the body will vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY] to title II regarding tenant management be in order at any time prior to the conclusion of consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to title II? The Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—RURAL HOUSING

SEC. 301. PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) INSURANCE AND GUARANTEE AUTHORITY.—Section 513(a)(1) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The Secretary may, to the extent approved in appropriation Acts, insure and guarantee loans under this title during each of the fiscal years 1986 and 1987 in an aggregate amount not to exceed such sums as may be approved in appropriation Acts."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 513(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and to remain available until expended—

"(1) for grants under section 504, such sums as may be provided in appropriation Acts;

"(2) for purposes of section 509(c), such sums as may be provided in appropriation Acts;

"(3) such sums as may be provided in appropriation Acts to meet payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary under section 511 equal to—

"(A) the aggregate of the contributions made by the Secretary in the form of credits on principal due on loans made pursuant to section 503; and

"(B) the interest due on a similar sum represented by notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary;

"(4) for financial assistance under section 516, such sums as may be provided in appropriation Acts;

"(5) for grants under section 523(f), such sums as may be provided in appropriation Acts;

"(6) for grants under section 533, such sums as may be provided in appropriation Acts; and

"(7) such sums as may be provided in appropriations Acts for the Secretary to administer the provisions of sections 235 and 236 of the National Housing Act and section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937."

(c) RENTAL ASSISTANCE PAYMENT CONTRACTS.—Section 513(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Secretary, to the extent approved in appropriation Acts for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, may enter into rental assistance payment contracts under section 521(a)(2)(A) aggregating such sums as may be approved in appropriation Acts. Such authority as is approved in appropriation Acts shall be used by the Secretary to renew rental assistance payment contracts that expire during such fiscal year and to make additional rental assistance payment con-

tracts for existing or newly constructed dwelling units.

SEC. 302. INCOME LEVELS FOR FAMILY ELIGIBILITY

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 501(b)(4) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the maximum income levels established for purposes of this title for such families and persons in the Virgin Islands shall not be less than the highest such levels established for purposes of this title for such families and persons in American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to any determination of eligibility for assistance under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. RURAL AREA CLASSIFICATION.

Section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking "April 30, 1986" in the last sentence and inserting "September 30, 1987".

SEC. 304. RURAL HOUSING ESCROW ACCOUNTS.

Section 501(e) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "The Secretary shall, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1986, establish procedures under which any borrower under this title may, at the option of the borrower, make periodic payments for the purpose of taxes, insurance, and such other necessary expenses as the Secretary determines to be appropriate."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER: Page 93, after line 9, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 305. STUDY OF MORTGAGE CREDIT IN RURAL AREAS.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall conduct a study of the availability and use of funds for the purchase and improvement of residential real property in rural areas, particularly in communities that have populations of not more than 2,500 individuals. Not later than April 1, 1987, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a detailed report setting forth the findings of the Secretary as a result of the study.

Mr. BEREUTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to title III requiring the Department of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a study on the availability and use of commercial mortgage funds in rural areas.

My amendment is motivated by constituent contact, personal observations in my home State of Nebraska, and also by testimony the Housing Subcommittee received last year. Basically what it comes down to is a question as to whether, in the renaissance now underway for home ownership, all equally qualified potential homebuyers are able to participate in the dream of owning one's own home.

In small communities and rural areas I am not sure the answer to that question is "yes." If it isn't, I want to know why they are subject to inequitable or discriminatory treatment. I want to know why they are neglected or discriminated against by commercial lending institutions and by Federal mortgage guarantee agencies.

Probably most of the Members of this House are aware that some of the agricultural regions of the country are experiencing economic difficulties. There is no question that parts of rural America have fallen upon hard times. At the same time I fear we overlook the fact that there are thousands of rural residents fully capable of meeting the obligations of home ownership mortgage responsibility who are denied this opportunity for homeownership—not because of their relative net worth, but only because they wish to buy or build a home in a small community.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I am not tying this amendment to the recent economic decline of our rural areas. It has exacerbated the problem no doubt, but I believe a bias—or programmatic or institutional deficiency has existed, against home mortgage lending in small communities and rural areas for many years. The study should enable us to learn if there is indeed inequitable or discriminatory treatment against prospective homeowners in small communities, and to learn what we might do to rectify that condition.

In conducting the study I would expect HUD to look not only at the amount of mortgage credit available in a particular area, but also to examine the extent to which these funds have actually been utilized by middle-income families. Middle income should be construed as family income in the range of 80 to 125 percent of area median income and the area surveyed should specifically be small communities and the surrounding area outside metropolitan statistical areas. I would hope that data would be available on a county-by-county basis, but certainly it could be based on a combination of economically related counties in non-metropolitan areas. In addition, this study should concentrate on small communities; Therefore my amendment suggests that the Department exclusively examine those communities with less than 2,500 population and rural areas. Finally my amend-

ment requires the Secretary of HUD to submit to Congress a detailed report setting forth his findings not later than April 1, 1987.

I would be pleased to answer any questions or comments that the chairman or the ranking member of the subcommittee might have.

I am pleased to yield to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank my very distinguished and hard-working colleague, a member of the subcommittee, and I want to tell him that I rise in strong support of his amendment.

I should say, Mr. Chairman, that we have shared his concern over a period of years, and the inability of the rural area to receive the allocation of credit that should not have ever been withheld.

It has been a tough uphill fight. As the gentleman knows, our compromise legislation would preserve even the basic rural housing policies and programs that the President would have us eliminate as of last year and this year, in his budget presentation.

We need, of course, at all times the information, but there is no reason why the Farmers Home Administration could not have on their own corrected this. I think the gentleman well knows that the administration, in its testimony through its spokesmen to our committee, denied the need for any substantial allocation of credit to the rural and the low income in the rural areas.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BEREUTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. The gentleman is quite right. The amendment he is offering would provide the study. I cannot see anyone objecting to it. It would verify officially the need for rural credit, even among the moderate-income population; whether it be due to an outright shortage of credit, the unwillingness to make low-cost-housing loans, or simply because the Federal Housing Administration section 203 insurance program does not reach these areas.

The fact is the need is there. We know; we have gone out in to the field; the subcommittee has gone in to rural areas, as I have said repeatedly, from the Eastern Shore clear to California and in between from North to South, even near his area, and the fact is the need is there.

Under the gentleman's amendment, the study would help us very much, and I wish to compliment him for offering this amendment. I think I speak

for the majority on this side when I say we accept the amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I do know that the chairman knows my concern is the availability of commercial credit; and I am not talking about a subsidized credit problem. I thank the chairman for his comments.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I understand.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

(On request of Mr. McKINNEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. BEREUTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McKINNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY].

□ 1240

Mr. McKINNEY. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Nebraska on his amendment. I agree with it. I agree with it more during this particular economic climate we are in in the smaller communities of this country, particularly farm communities and oil communities in the West and Southwest. I think it is an excellent idea that we get to this. There is a certain amount of greed within the financial institutions, sometimes, of our Nation that says, "let's not take a mortgage where the price does not go up to where no one can afford to live in the house." It is interesting in my congressional district housing costs are rising at about 10 percent per annum. That is a tremendous amount of money. But there are housing investments that are severely needed, very good investments; it is just that they do not appreciate at this ridiculous rate.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I would be pleased to yield to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I come from the second most agricultural district in the Nation. We have 317 small communities and larger communities in my district, and I know that what the gentleman says the difficulties of getting funding for housing in areas like this particularly at a time when the agricultural economy is so distressed, I think the amendment is important and I support it strongly.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Nebraska.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BERUTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SMITH OF NEBRASKA

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska: Page 93, after line 9, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 305. DEFINITION OF VERY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES.

Section 501(b)(4) of the Housing Act of 1949 (as amended by section 302 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end of the following new sentence: "For purposes of assistance under section 502, the term 'very low-income families or persons' means families and persons whose incomes do not exceed the applicable level established pursuant to the preceding sentences, or 50 percent of the statewide nonmetropolitan median income (as determined and adjusted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture), whichever amount is higher."

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which will appear as section 305 in title III of the bill before the committee affecting rural housing programs—programs funded through my Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and Rural Development.

Mr. Chairman, our legal definitions of income eligibility for rural housing assistance are out of whack.

On the one hand, we cannot find enough families with sufficient credit to technically qualify for a significant portion of the funds already appropriated in one category of assistance, while demand in another category of assistance is so high that many otherwise deserving families will be denied help because of this year's budget cuts.

My amendment addresses this problem by revising the income eligibility requirements so that Nebraska and all other States may make full use of the funds appropriated for rural housing assistance.

What is more, my amendment would not add families or eliminate families from the program. And as the money we are discussing has already been appropriated, it would not add to the budget deficit.

What it would do would be to allow our Nebraska administrators to use money prudently for the intended purpose of providing needed rural housing assistance to deserving families—money that would otherwise be returned to the Treasury and spent for who-know-what purpose. Foreign aid to Israel or Egypt perhaps? Wasteful urban-oriented welfare programs? The Washington, DC, subway system?

I have pledged to the people of the Third Congressional District that I would always fight for a fair share of Federal money appropriated and allo-

cated to help Nebraskans. Regardless of whether the programs were wisely conceived and established, once the money is appropriated, Nebraska should receive and fully use its fair share.

Mr. Chairman, I want to let you know of my appreciation of the Nebraska Association of Home Builders who were instrumental in bringing this situation to my attention, and of the National Rural Housing Coalition which has worked closely with me on this. Both groups fully support my amendment.

My amendment addresses the definitions of two categories of income eligibility. The first one is called very low income, and the second one is called just plain low income.

It has come to my attention that we cannot find enough very low-income families, not only in Nebraska but also in the other States, who are able to meet all the requirements for receiving assistance under this program. In fact, in fiscal year 1985, FmHA was unable to obligate some \$500 million in section 502 funds—54.3 percent of funds available.

On the other hand, demand from eligible families qualifying for help in the second category of low-income families should outstrip the supply of funds this year by \$840 million if past loan activity is any indication.

In 1985, my home State of Nebraska was only able to obligate 29 percent of the section 502 very low-income category money allotted to it out of the total allotment of \$7.7 million for this purpose.

At the same time, this year Nebraska's demand for low-income funds will exceed the supply available by close to 200 percent.

In fiscal year, 1985 Nebraska turned back \$8.4 million in section 502 funds. A tragic paradox at a time when our State's agricultural economic condition is quite possibly at its lowest ebb and when, therefore, all Federal dollars spent within our borders are needed as never before.

The Farmer's Home Administration section 502 Single Family Housing Program offers home mortgage financing directly to rural families whose incomes place them in low and very low categories. The Housing Act of 1983 built a targeting provision into the program specifying that 40 percent of section 502 moneys should be set aside for the specific use of households falling into the very low-income category.

Very low-income is currently defined as less than 50 percent of area median income, while a family with less than 80 percent of area median income will qualify as low-income. For the purposes of rural housing, an area is usually defined as a county.

My proposed amendment perfects the basis for the definition of very "low-income" families as used by the

Farmers Home Administration to include the use of statewide nonmetropolitan median income as a measure along with area median income. The FmHA will be asked to incorporate use of these figures, which HUD already compiles, in order to define "very low-income" households.

The definition of a "very low-income" household will be set at either 50 percent of area median income or 50 percent of State nonmetropolitan median income, whichever is higher. Counties with area median income higher than State nonmetropolitan median income will not be affected by this amendment.

Under the Housing Act of 1937, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to adjust definitions of low and very low-income households to reflect the special needs of certain areas. As the Secretary has not acted to include this standard additional HUD measure in order to determine FmHA very low-income households, this amendment seeks to include that measure.

After cuts in FmHA housing funds, many States will run out of section 502 low-income money this year. However, States will continue to show surpluses in their 502 very low-income account. This amendment will shift some of the demand for 502 low-income funds by recognizing that certain applicants who have been applying as low-income applicants, rightfully should be able to apply for very low-income funds.

In other words, the amendment simply and logically seeks to bring the program guidelines in line with the actual demand for services.

I point out to my colleagues that after discussions of this irregularity, language similar to my amendment has been inserted in the housing bill the other body will soon be considering.

My amendment offers only a technical change increasing the effectiveness of the FmHA Section 502 Single Family Housing Program. It does so without expanding or restricting the number of families covered by the program. The amendment has the full support of both industry and consumer groups. I urge its adoption.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nebraska. The subcommittee recognized the problem that her amendment addresses. It gave more flexibility to the FmHA in administering the targeting provision requiring 40 percent of section 502 funds to be used for families of 50 percent or below the applicable area median income in 1983. However, even this does not appear to work. So long as the basis for determining the percentage ceiling is the same as is used for purposes of establishing ceilings for

deep subsidy programs such as section 8, the section 502 eligibility limits will always be too low to realistically expect a substantial number of families at those income levels to afford homeownership with subsidies that merely cover the cost of interest.

Using the State nonmetropolitan income data as the basis for determining the very-low-income eligibility ceiling for section 502 assistance would not result in qualifying any families that were not intended to be qualified. It would merely include them in the very-low-income definition. This would permit the very-low-income percentage target to be better achieved by the States. Being able to so achieve the very-low-income target would free up the funds available and permit loans to be made to low-income families with incomes above 50 but not more than 80 percent of the median. The result, as I see it, would be to permit the section 502 funds approved by the Congress to be used as intended. I therefore urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the minority side of the aisle has looked at the amendment and agrees with the gentlewoman. I agree also with the comments of the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my colleague from Nebraska's [Mrs. SMITH] amendment to title III of the committee bill, H.R. 4746.

It is extremely important. At the present time only 29 percent of the 502 money for low income is able to be used in our State. This definition change is very important. It will help many families not only in Nebraska but in many other States across this country. The gentlewoman is to be commended for her initiative in pursuing this matter.

As a member of the Housing and Community Development Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking, I have participated in hearings analyzing the impact of this type of amendment on rural housing needs. I can only concur with my colleague's amendment which will help provide section 502 single family housing moneys to some additional American and Nebraskan families in the very low income category.

This has been a problem in many States in that the definition of very low income has prevented making use of available section 502 moneys, the gentlewoman's amendment seeks to correct this problem by widening the definition of very low income in the State.

In committee I had been concerned with reaching the median income families, those in the 80-115 percent category of income as well, and to provide loan guarantee moneys without subsidy to this group. I am disappointed the bill does not contain my amendment which indeed was adopted by the full committee, but I shall take up the matter again if a study shows it to be the best alternative.

In my home State of Nebraska only 29 percent of the section 502 very-low-income money allotted to it in 1985 was obligated. This amendment seeks to remedy that situation. Without this chance in the definition proposed by my colleague's amendment there is little chance Nebraska can make use of the 502 moneys allocated to this category.

I urge the support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: Page 93, after line 9, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 305. REQUIREMENT OF LOCAL CONSULTATION FOR DOMESTIC FARM LABOR HOUSING.

(a) INSURED LOAN PROGRAM.—Section 514 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) The Secretary may not insure a loan under this section (regardless of the number of units proposed to be included in the housing and related facilities involved) unless the application for the loan includes a certification that the applicant has consulted with the unit of general local government in which the housing and related facilities are to be located."

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) The Secretary may not provide financial assistance under this section (regardless of the number of units proposed to be included in the housing and related facilities involved) unless the application for the financial assistance includes a certification that the applicant has consulted with the unit of general local government in which the housing and related facilities are to be located."

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply only to applications submitted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered and read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment pertains to the section 514 and section 516 loan and grant programs of the Farmers Home Adminis-

tration, and will serve to improve the application and review process.

I understand that the distinguished managers of the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY] support this amendment. I thank my colleagues for their concern and interest in this matter, and for their efforts to reauthorize, improve, and establish many housing and community development programs so vital to our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, among the many rural housing programs reauthorized in this bill are the section 514 loan and section 516 grant programs of the Farmers Home Administration. These two small programs are funded annually in our appropriations bills at combined levels of about \$30 million, but they provide critically-needed assistance to farmowners, nonprofit farmworker organizations, States and local governments for the construction and rehabilitation of housing and related facilities for our farmworkers.

My amendment is designed to strengthen and improve the application and review process by ensuring local community involvement in project proposals submitted to Farmers Home for insured loan or grant awards.

Under current Farmers Home regulations, an intergovernmental review of sections 514 and 516 applications is required for projects of 25 units in size or greater. I believe that this requirement is an important one, for it enables State and local regional planning agencies to offer a wide range of comment on issues related to the project and its development, issues which include environmental impact, historic preservation, consistency with overall building, zoning, and development plans and a host of others.

However, in this review process, the body of government able to offer the most direct, relevant, and valuable comment is not always involved. I refer to the body of local, elected officials serving our rural towns and urban cities, as our mayors, our boards of selectmen, our aldermen, town managers, city and town councils.

My amendment to H.R. 4746 will ensure that those elected officials have an opportunity to review and comment upon project proposals that are submitted to Farmers Home for Federal loan or grant commitments. It will amend the 1949 Housing Act to require certification of consultation with the unit of general government in the community in which the housing and related facilities are to be located.

Under the terms of my amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture may not insure a section 514 loan or provide section 516 assistance unless such cer-

tification is provided by the applicant in those cases where the applicant is not the unit of local government. These terms are to apply to each application submitted after the date of enactment of this act, and are not intended to apply to projects which have already received Federal commitment.

As the author of this amendment, I would like to make clear my intent that such consultations with units of local government take place during the most preliminary phases of the application process so that adequate time may be provided for the submission of any appropriate or desired information or comment to Farmers Home for agency review.

I believe that this new requirement is consistent with those already imposed for the vast majority of our Federal housing and community development programs. Certification of local consultation will insure the very minimum—that units of local government have a voice in proposals for Federal investments in their communities. At a time when our staggering Federal deficits require us to place increasing responsibilities on States and localities, the need for intergovernmental reviews take on new importance.

Finally, I believe that expanding the existing requirements to apply to all 514 and 516 projects, regardless of size, will effectively create a better loan and grant program—one that continues our Federal commitments to the construction and rehabilitation of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for our domestic farm laborers and their families in those areas where a critical need exists; one that serves the urgent needs of our farmworkers and the communities of which they are a part.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts. It would extend the existing provisions in the Farmers Home Administration regulations to all farm labor projects rather than to only those having 25 or more units. It is a good amendment and I urge that the House adopt it.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. McKINNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the minority accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAPPELL

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHAPPELL: Page 93, after line 9, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 305. PROCEDURES FOR REDUCTION OF INTEREST CREDITS.

Section 521(a)(1)(B) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "In the case of assistance provided under this subparagraph with respect to a loan under section 502, the Secretary may not reduce, cancel, or refuse to renew the assistance due to an increase in the adjusted income of the borrower if the reduction, cancellation, or nonrenewal will cause the borrower to be unable to reasonably afford the resulting payments required under the loan."

Mr. CHAPPELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am offering today would clarify the intent of the Congress to assure that under the section 502 Rural Homeowner Assistance Program existing borrowers whose incomes increase above the income ceiling for interest credit assistance be permitted to continue to receive such credits if they would not be able to reasonably afford the loan payment without interest credits. It has been brought to my attention that some borrowers are being required to make monthly payments beyond their ability simply because their incomes have increased to levels above the applicable income ceiling limits used to determine initial eligibility for interest credits. In most instances this happens to borrowers whose Farmers Home Administration loans were written when interest rates were very high generally and the corresponding FmHA rate was proportionately high. In such instances the payment required at that high note rate might be more than the borrower can afford and can lead to the borrower defaulting and ultimately FmHA foreclosing on these loans.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is a good solution to the problem which does not require incurring scarce, newly approved loan authority as would be the case if a new loan at current interest rates were made by FmHA to alleviate the problem for these particular borrowers. It is supported by Farmers Home Administration technical staff as a desirable alternative to the problem and will have no impact on the cost of this bill. I

urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPPELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for offering this amendment. It would clarify the congressional intent to assure that under the section 502 Rural Homeowners Assistance Program, existing borrowers whose income increases above the income ceiling for interest credit assistance be continued to receive such credits if they would not be able to reasonably afford the loan payment without interest credits.

The gentleman offers a good amendment and a good solution to the problem which does not require incurring scarce newly approved loan authority, as would be the case if a new loan at current interest rates were made by FmHA. We accept the amendment.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPPELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. McKINNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the minority accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. It is a good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CHAPPELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] who could not be here, be allowed to put in his amendment, should he arrive from wherever he is, for title II, at any given time, just as we told the gentleman from the District of Columbia that he could put his amendment in.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—SHELTER ASSISTANCE FOR THE HOMELESS AND DISPLACED
SEC. 101. NATIONAL EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There hereby is established in the Department of Housing and Urban Development a board to be known as the National Emergency Food and Shelter Board. It shall be the function of the Board to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall be composed of 7 members as follows:

(1) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or the designee of the Secretary, who shall be the chairperson of the Board; and

(2) 6 members appointed by the Secretary from individuals who—

(A) have expertise in the provision of shelter and related services to the homeless; and

(B) are recommended by the organizations that are members of the national board of charities constituted under the emergency food and shelter program established in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1986 (Pub. L. 99-160).

(c) TERM OF MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Board described in subsection (b)(2) shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

(2) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Board occurring before the expiration of a term shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made. Any member appointed to fill such a vacancy shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(d) MEMBERS NOT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—The members of the Board shall not, by reason of their membership on the Board, be considered to be officers or employees of the Federal Government.

(e) PAY AND EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Board shall serve without pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of such service.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Board shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties relating to such meetings or in other activities of the Board under this title, be allowed (except in the case of members of the Board who are officers or employees of the Federal Government) travel expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(f) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet not less than 3 times during each fiscal year, at the call of its chairperson or a majority of its members.

(g) STAFF AND OFFICES.—The Secretary shall provide the Board with such staff and office facilities as are necessary to ensure that the Board carries out its functions under this title in an efficient and expeditious manner.

(h) TRANSFERS FROM NATIONAL BOARD OF CHARITIES.—Upon the appointment of members to the Board under subsection (b)—

(1) the national board of charities constituted under the emergency food and shelter program established in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1986 (Pub. L. 99-160) shall cease to exist; and

(2) the personnel, property, records, and undistributed program funds of the national board of charities shall be transferred to the Board.

SEC. 402. CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL BOARD OF CHARITIES PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall continue the emergency food and shelter program established in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1986 (Pub. L. 99-160). Activities under such program may include repairs necessary to make emergency shelter facilities safe and sanitary and ensure compliance with local building and related codes.

(b) FUNDING.—Any amount transferred to the Board under section 401(h)(2) shall be utilized by the Board to carry out this section.

(c) COORDINATION WITH TASK FORCE.—In carrying out this section, the Board shall coordinate activities with the Federal Interagency Task Force on Food and Shelter chaired by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or any successor Federal task force established to deal with the problems of the homeless, to identify vacant and surplus Federal facilities that could be renovated or converted for use as emergency shelter facilities for the homeless.

SEC. 403. SECOND STAGE HOUSING FOR THE HOMELESS AND DISPLACED.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall carry out a demonstration program in accordance with the provisions of this section to determine the effectiveness of assisting nonprofit organizations in providing housing and supportive services for homeless persons.

(2) PURPOSES.—Such demonstration program shall be designed to determine—

(A) the cost of acquisition, rehabilitation, or acquisition and rehabilitation of existing structures for the provision of housing for homeless persons;

(B) the cost of operating such housing and providing supportive services to the residents of such housing;

(C) the social, financial, and other advantages of such housing and supportive services as an alternative to continued institutionalization of handicapped persons; and

(D) the social, financial, and other advantages of such housing and supportive services as a means of assisting homeless persons.

(b) ASSISTANCE TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board may provide the following assistance to any eligible nonprofit organization under the demonstration program established in this section:

(A) a non-interest-bearing advance equal to the aggregate cost of acquisition, rehabilitation, acquisition and rehabilitation, or leasing of an existing structure for use in the provision of housing and supportive services for homeless persons;

(B) annual payments for operating expenses of such housing, not to exceed 80 percent of the annual operating expenses of such housing; and

(C) technical assistance in establishing and operating such housing and providing supportive services to the residents of such housing.

(2) NONREPAYMENT OF ADVANCES.—Any advance provided under paragraph (1)(A) shall not be required to be repaid if the nonprofit organization involved utilizes the structure for which such advance is made, for not less than the 10-year period following initial occupancy of such housing—

(A) as housing for homeless persons in accordance with the provisions of this section; or

(B) as housing for lower income persons, if the Board determines that the structure is no longer required for use as housing for homeless persons.

(3) ASSISTANCE CONTRACTS.—The Board shall, to the extent approved in appropriation Acts, enter into a contract with each nonprofit organization receiving annual payments under paragraph (1)(B) to provide for the making of such payments for not more than a 2-year period.

(c) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for assistance under this section shall be made in such form and in accordance with such procedures as the Board shall establish.

(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting nonprofit organizations for assistance under this section, the Board shall consider—

(A) the ability of such nonprofit organization to develop and operate housing for homeless persons and to provide or coordinate supportive services for the residents of such housing;

(B) the extent to which such nonprofit organization will utilize innovative methods in providing housing and supportive services for homeless persons;

(C) the need for such housing and supportive services in the area to be served; and

(D) such other factors as the Board determines to be appropriate for purposes of carrying out the demonstration program established in this section in an effective and efficient manner.

(3) REQUIRED AGREEMENTS.—Each nonprofit organization receiving assistance under this section shall agree, with respect to each structure for which such assistance is provided—

(A) to conduct an assessment of the supportive services required by the residents of such structure;

(B) to employ a full-time residential supervisor with sufficient expertise to provide, or supervise the provision of, supportive services to the residents of such structure; and

(C) to comply with such other terms and conditions as the Board may establish for purposes of carrying out the demonstration program established in this section in an effective and efficient manner.

(4) OCCUPANT RENT.—Each homeless person residing in housing assisted under this section shall pay as rent an amount determined in accordance with the provisions of section 3(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

(d) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the expiration of the 120-day period following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(2) ADVANCE CONSULTATION.—Before issuing regulations under this section, the Secretary shall consult with persons and entities having expertise with respect to the problems and needs of homeless persons or experience in providing housing or supportive services for such persons.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) LIMITATION ON BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The aggregate amount of non-interest bearing advances and annual payments for operating expenses made by the Board under this section may not exceed such sums as are approved in appropriation Acts for each of the fiscal years 1986 and 1987. Such amount shall remain available until expended.

(2) DISBURSEMENT.—Any amount approved in an appropriation Act for this section shall be disbursed not later than the expiration of the 120-day period following the date of enactment of such Act.

SEC. 404. EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS.

(a) GRANT ASSISTANCE.—The Board shall, to the extent of amounts approved in appropriation Acts, make grants to States and units of local government (and to private nonprofit organizations providing assistance to the homeless, in the case of grants made with reallocated amounts) in order to carry out activities described in subsection (c).

(b) ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall allocate assistance under this section to metropolitan cities, urban counties, and States (for distribution to units of general local government in the States) in a manner that ensures that the percentage of the total amount available under this section for any fiscal year that is allocated to any State, metropolitan city, or urban county is equal to the percentage of the total amount available for section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 for the prior fiscal year that is allocated to such State, metropolitan city, or urban county.

(2) **MINIMUM ALLOCATION REQUIREMENT.**—If, under the allocation provisions applicable under this section, any metropolitan city or urban county will receive a grant of less than \$30,000 for any fiscal year, such amount shall instead be allocated to the State in which such city or county is located and shall be included in the amount available for distribution to units of general local government in the State.

(3) **DISTRIBUTIONS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.**—Any unit of general local government receiving assistance under this section may distribute all or a portion of such assistance to private nonprofit organizations providing assistance to the homeless.

(4) **REALLOCATION FUNDS.**—

(A) The Board shall, not less than twice during each fiscal year, reallocate any assistance provided under this section that is unused or returned to the Board under subsection (e)(3).

(B) The Board shall provide such reallocation funds—

(i) to units of general local government demonstrating extraordinary need or large numbers of homeless individuals;

(ii) to private nonprofit organizations providing assistance to the homeless; and

(iii) to meet such other needs consistent with the purposes of this section.

(c) **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.**—Assistance provided under this section may be used for—

(1) the following activities relating to emergency shelter for the homeless:

(A) renovation of buildings to be used as emergency shelters;

(B) provision of essential services, including services concerned with employment, health, drug abuse, or education, if—

(i) such services have not been provided by the unit of general local government during any section of the immediately preceding 12-month period; and

(ii) not more than 15 percent of the amount of any assistance to a unit of general local government under this section is used for activities under this paragraph; and

(C) maintenance, insurance, operation (other than staff), utilities, and furnishings; and

(2) the activities described in paragraph (1) for any second stage housing project replicating a second stage housing project operating effectively under section 403 for a period of not less than 2 years.

(d) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF GRANTEEES.**—

(1) **SUBMISSION OF HOMELESS ASSISTANCE PLAN.**—Following notification by the Board of eligibility for assistance under this section, each State, metropolitan city, and urban county shall submit to the Board a plan describing the proposed use of such assistance. The Board shall provide the appropriate amount of assistance to such State, metropolitan city, or urban county before the expiration of the 60-day period following the date of the submission of such plan, unless the Board determines before the expiration of such period that such plan is not in compliance with this section.

(2) **MATCHING AMOUNTS.**—

(A) Each grantee under this section shall be required to supplement the assistance provided under this section with an equal amount of funds from sources other than this title. Each grantee shall certify to the Board its compliance with this paragraph, and shall include with such certification a description of the sources and amounts of such supplemental funds.

(B) In calculating the amount of supplemental funds provided by a grantee under this section, a grantee may include the value of any donated material or building, the value of any lease on a building, any salary paid to staff to carry out the program of the grantee, the value of the time contributed by volunteers to carry out the program of the grantee, and the value of services provided for the program.

(3) **ADMINISTRATION OF ASSISTANCE.**—Each grantee shall act as the fiscal agent of the Board with respect to assistance provided to such grantee.

(4) **CERTIFICATIONS ON USE OF ASSISTANCE.**—Each grantee shall certify to the Board that—

(A) it will maintain as a shelter for the homeless for not less than a 3-year period any building for which assistance is used under this section, or for not less than a 7-year period if such assistance is used for the substantial rehabilitation of such building;

(B) any renovation carried out with assistance under this section shall be sufficient to ensure that the building involved is safe and sanitary; and

(C) it will assist homeless individuals in obtaining—

(i) appropriate supportive services, including permanent housing, medical and mental health treatment, counseling, supervision, and other services essential for achieving independent living; and

(ii) other Federal, State, local, and private assistance available for such individuals.

(5) **USE OF INTEREST ON ASSISTANCE.**—Any interest received by any grantee under this section on assistance provided under this section shall be used in accordance with this section or returned to the Board for reallocation.

(e) **ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than the expiration of the 30-day period following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall by notice establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Such requirements shall not be subject to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, or section 7(o) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act. The Secretary shall issue regulations based on the initial notice before the expiration of the 12-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **INITIAL ALLOCATION OF ASSISTANCE.**—Not later than the expiration of the 30-day period following the date of the enactment of a law providing appropriations to carry out this section, the Board shall notify each State, metropolitan city, and urban county of its allocation of assistance under this section. Such assistance shall be allocated and may be used notwithstanding any failure of the Secretary to issue regulations under paragraph (1).

(3) **RECAPTURE OF UNUSED ASSISTANCE.**—The Board shall deobligate or recapture any assistance provided under this section that is not used by the grantee within a reasonable period of time.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to

carry out the provisions of this section such sums as may be provided in appropriation Acts for each of the fiscal years 1986 and 1987. Any amount appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 405. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

The Board shall submit to the Congress—

(1) not later than 3 months after the end of fiscal year 1986, an interim report summarizing the activities carried out under this title during such fiscal year and setting forth any preliminary findings or conclusions of the Board as a result of such activities; and

(2) not later than 6 months after the end of fiscal year 1987, a final report summarizing all activities carried out under this title and setting forth any findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Board as a result of such activities.

SEC. 406. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) The term "Board" means the National Emergency Food and Shelter Board established in section 401(a).

(2) The term "elderly person" means an individual who is not less than 62 years of age.

(3) The term "handicapped person" means an individual having a physical, psychological, or other impairment that substantially impedes the ability of such individual to live independently without supportive services.

(4) The term "homeless person" means an individual who—

(A) is a lower income person, elderly person, or handicapped person;

(B) lacks permanent housing; and

(C) in the case of assistance under section 403, cannot live independently without supportive services.

(5) The term "housing for homeless persons" means a single- or multifamily structure suitable in design and size for the provision of housing and supportive services designed to encourage independence for homeless persons.

(6) The term "lower income person" means an individual whose income does not exceed 80 percent of the median income of the area involved.

(7) The term "nonprofit organization" means any governmental or private nonprofit entity that is approved by the Board as to financial responsibility.

(8) The term "operating expenses" means expenses incurred by a nonprofit organization for any program operating housing for homeless persons under section 403 with respect to—

(A) the administration, maintenance, repair, and security of such housing;

(B) utilities, fuel, furnishings, and equipment for such housing;

(C) the conducting of the assessment required in section 403(c)(3)(A); and

(D) the provision of supportive services to the residents of such housing.

(9) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(10) The term "supportive services" means assistance in obtaining permanent housing, medical and psychological counseling and supervision, employment counseling, nutritional counseling, and such other services essential for maintaining independent living as the Board determines to be appropriate. Such term includes the provision of assistance to residents of housing for homeless persons in obtaining other Federal, State, and local assistance available for such persons, including mental health benefits, em-

ployment counseling, and medical assistance.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to title IV of the bill?

The Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—NEHEMIAH HOUSING OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

SEC. 501. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this title—

(1) to encourage homeownership by families in the United States who are not otherwise able to afford homeownership;

(2) to undertake a concentrated effort to rebuild the depressed areas of the cities of the United States and to create sound and attractive neighborhoods; and

(3) to increase the employment of neighborhood residents.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) The term "Fund" means the Nehemiah Housing Opportunity Fund established in section 509(a).

(2) The term "home" means any 1- to 4-family dwelling. Such term includes any dwelling unit in a condominium project or cooperative project consisting of not more than 4 dwelling units, any town house, and any manufactured home.

(3) The term "lower income families" has the meaning given such term in section 3(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

(4) The term "metropolitan statistical area" means a metropolitan statistical area as established by the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) The term "nonprofit organization" means a private nonprofit corporation, or other private nonprofit legal entity, that is approved by the Secretary as to financial responsibility.

(6) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(7) The term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(8) The term "substantial rehabilitation" means—

(A) rehabilitation involving costs in excess of 60 percent of the maximum sale price of a home assisted under this title in the market area in which it is located; or

(B) the rehabilitation of a vacant, uninhabitable structure.

(9) The term "unit of general local government" means any borough, city, county, parish, town, township, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.

SEC. 503. ASSISTANCE TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may provide assistance to nonprofit organizations to carry out Nehemiah housing opportunity programs in accordance with the provisions of this title. Such assistance shall be made in the form of grants.

(b) **APPLICATIONS.**—Applications for assistance under this title shall be made in such form, and in accordance with such procedures, as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 504. USE OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any nonprofit organization receiving assistance under this title shall use such assistance to provide loans to

families purchasing homes constructed or substantially rehabilitated in accordance with a Nehemiah housing opportunity program approved under this title.

(b) **SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.**—Each loan made to a family under this section shall—

(1) be secured by a second mortgage held by the Secretary on the property involved;

(2) be in an amount not exceeding \$15,000;

(3) bear no interest; and

(4) be repayable to the Secretary upon the sale or other transfer of such property.

SEC. 505. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Assistance provided under this title may be used only in connection with a Nehemiah housing opportunity program of construction or substantial rehabilitation of homes.

(b) **FAMILY NEED.**—Each family purchasing a home under this title shall—

(1) have a family income on the date of such purchase that is not more than whichever of the following is higher:

(A) 115 percent of the median income for a family of 4 persons in the metropolitan statistical area involved; or

(B) the national median income for a family of 4 persons; and

(2) not have owned a home during the 3-year period preceding such purchase.

(c) **DOWNPAYMENT.**—

(1) Each family purchasing a home under this title shall make a downpayment of not less than 10 percent of the sale price of such home, or of such greater amount determined by the nonprofit organization involved to be appropriate.

(2) Any downpayment made under this subsection shall accrue interest from the date on which such downpayment is made through the date of settlement, at a rate not less than the passbook rate. Such interest shall be paid by the nonprofit organization involved to the family purchasing the home for which such downpayment was made.

(d) **LEASING PROHIBITION.**—No family purchasing a home under this title may lease such home.

SEC. 506. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) **LOCAL CONSULTATION.**—No proposed Nehemiah housing opportunity program may be approved by the Secretary under this title unless the nonprofit organization involved demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

(1) it has consulted with and received the support of residents of the neighborhood in which such program is to be located; and

(2) it has the approval of each unit of general local government in which such program is to be located.

(b) **PROGRAM SCHEDULE.**—Each nonprofit organization applying for assistance under this title shall submit to the Secretary an estimated schedule for completion of its proposed Nehemiah housing opportunity program, which schedule shall have been agreed to by each unit of general local government in which such program is to be located.

(c) **MINIMUM PARTICIPATION.**—No nonprofit organization receiving assistance under this title may commence any construction or substantial rehabilitation (except with respect to homes to be constructed or substantially rehabilitated for the purpose of display) until not less than 25 percent of the homes to be constructed or substantially rehabilitated are contracted for sale to purchasers who intend to live in such homes and the required downpayments are made.

(d) **FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY.**—The Secretary may not provide any assistance under this

title to any nonprofit organization unless such nonprofit organization demonstrates the financial feasibility of its proposed Nehemiah housing opportunity program, including the availability of non-Federal public and private funds.

(e) **HOME QUALITY AND LOCATION.**—A Nehemiah housing opportunity program may be approved under this title only if it provides that—

(1) the number of homes to be constructed or substantially rehabilitated under such program will not be less than whichever of the following is less:

(A) the greater of (i) 50 homes; or (ii) 0.25 percent of the number of existing dwelling units in the unit of general local government that provides the most assistance to such program; or

(B) 250 homes;

(2) each home constructed or substantially rehabilitated under such program will comply with—

(A)(i) applicable local building code standards; or

(ii) in any case in which there is not an applicable local building code, a nationally recognized model building code mutually agreed upon by the sponsoring nonprofit organization and the Secretary; and

(B) the energy performance requirements established under section 526 of the National Housing Act;

(3) all homes constructed or substantially rehabilitated under such program will be located in census tracts, or identifiable neighborhoods within census tracts, in which the median family income is not more than 80 percent of the median family income of the area in which such program is to be located, as such median family income and area are determined for purposes of assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(4) all homes constructed or substantially rehabilitated under such program will be concentrated in a single neighborhood and located on contiguous parcels of land, except that if the unit of general local government in which the project is located certifies that such land cannot be made available for a program of the size required by paragraph (1), homes may be constructed in a single identifiable neighborhood if the program provides for construction or substantial rehabilitation of homes on not less than 20 percent of the lots in such neighborhood; and

(5) sales contracts entered into under such program will contain provisions requiring repayment of any loan made under this title upon the sale or other transfer of the home involved, unless the Secretary approves a transfer of such home without repayment (in which case the second mortgage held by the Secretary on such home shall remain in force until such loan is fully repaid).

SEC. 507. PROGRAM SELECTION CRITERIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In selecting Nehemiah housing opportunity programs for assistance under this title from among eligible programs, the Secretary shall make such selection on the basis of the extent to which—

(1) non-Federal public or private entities will contribute land necessary to make each program feasible;

(2) non-Federal public and private financial or other contributions (including tax abatements, waivers of fees related to development, waivers of construction, development, or zoning requirements, and direct financial contributions) will reduce the cost

of homes constructed or substantially rehabilitated under each program;

(3) each program will produce the greatest number of units for the least amount of assistance provided under this title, taking into consideration the cost differences among different market areas;

(4) each program is located in a neighborhood of severe physical and economic blight (and, in determining the degree of physical blight, the Secretary shall consider the condition (but not age) of the housing, other buildings, and infrastructure, in the neighborhood of the proposed program);

(5) each program uses construction methods that will reduce the cost per square foot below the average construction cost in the market area involved; and

(6) each program provides for the involvement of local residents in the planning, and construction or substantial rehabilitation, of homes.

(b) EXCEPTION.—To the extent that non-Federal public entities are prohibited by the law of any State from making any form of contribution described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall not consider such form of contribution in evaluating such program.

SEC. 508. DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE TO NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) RESERVATION OF AMOUNTS.—Following the selection of any Nehemiah housing opportunity program for assistance under this title, the Secretary shall reserve sufficient amounts in the Nehemiah Housing Opportunity Fund for such assistance.

(b) DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE.—Following the sale of any home constructed or substantially rehabilitated under a Nehemiah housing opportunity program selected for assistance under this title, the Secretary shall provide to the sponsoring nonprofit organization an amount equal to the amount of the loan made to the family purchasing such home. Such amount shall be provided not more than 30 days after the sale of such home.

(c) MAXIMUM ASSISTANCE.—The assistance provided to any nonprofit organization under this title may not exceed \$15,000 per home.

SEC. 509. NEHEMIAH HOUSING OPPORTUNITY FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There hereby is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund, to be known as the Nehemiah Housing Opportunity Fund. The Fund shall be available to the Secretary, to the extent approved in appropriation Acts, for purposes of providing assistance under section 503.

(b) ASSETS.—The Fund shall consist of—

(1) any amount appropriated under section 512;

(2) any amount received by the Secretary under section 504(b)(4); and

(3) any amount received by the Secretary under subsection (c).

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Any amount in the Fund determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the amount currently required to carry out the provisions of this title shall be invested by the Secretary in obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by, the United States or any agency of the United States.

SEC. 510. ANNUAL REPORT.

The Secretary shall annually prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report setting forth the activities carried out under this title. Such report shall include—

(1) an analysis of the characteristics of the families assisted under this title during

the preceding year, including family size, number of children, family income, sources of family income, race, age, and sex;

(2) an analysis of the market value of homes purchased under this title during the preceding year;

(3) an analysis of the non-Federal public and private financial or other contributions made during the preceding year to reduce the cost of homes constructed or substantially rehabilitated under each program;

(4) an analysis of the sales prices of homes under this title during the preceding year;

(5) an analysis of the amounts of the grants made to programs under this title during the preceding year; and

(6) any recommendations of the Secretary for modifications in the program established by this title in order to ensure the effective implementation of such program.

SEC. 511. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Any such regulations shall be issued in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(2) of such section.

SEC. 512. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title such sums as may be provided in appropriation Acts for fiscal years 1986 and 1987. Any amount appropriated under this section shall be deposited in the Nehemiah Housing Opportunity Fund, and shall remain available until expended.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] is scheduled for an amendment on this section of the bill which has been called. He is not here, but I would ask unanimous consent that he be able to submit his amendment upon his arrival.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman, which amendment is this?

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is an amendment to which I am totally opposed. It strikes the title. As one of the coauthors of the bill, I hope it is defeated. But I think this is the democratic process.

Mr. SCHUMER. I just wanted to pin it down.

Mr. MCKINNEY. In fact, if the gentleman really wants to know where I stand on the McCollum amendment, he will hear it ad nauseam should we debate it.

Mr. SCHUMER. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut, and I waive my right to object for that specific amendment.

□ 1255

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCKINNEY] at this time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word while, as I understand it, a number of colleagues are preparing the final touches on some amendments that will be very critical to this House. I think that both sides of the aisle are, in fact, working together to prepare an amendment that will end up with good public housing policy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, though, to discuss a section of the bill that has already been discussed, and I think does not need amendment, but to seek clarification for the rest of the country that is awaiting our action on FHA. This bill does seek to extend FHA's permanent authority, as I understand it. Yet, that authority expired some time last week.

I know that every Member of this House has considerable concern for the on again-off again approach that we have, through a series of circumstances, in the past several months taken to FHA.

I suppose I would just use this opportunity to inquire of the bill's sponsors and others on behalf of the large number of individuals and mortgage borrowers in the country who are seeking FHA loans as to what the Congress' plans are on the extension of FHA. It seems to me to be likely that FHA will not be extended today or tomorrow or any time in the next several weeks, because the bill still has to go to the other body and would still likely result in some kind of a conference.

So I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee or if the bill's sponsor could enlighten us as to the gentleman's plans on the extension of FHA through some other vehicle. I think mortgage borrowers are legitimately concerned about this.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman well knows, our authorization bill was designed to extend not only the expired authority of FHA mortgage insurance programs, but all of the assisted housing programs. And the legislation involving them actually technically expired last October 1. This is the reason we have a reauthorization bill, so that the best way to prevent the stop-and-gasp-and-start proceedings here and having these 30-day, 15-day, 3-month extensions that we have been proceeding on since last October 1 would be to pass an authorization bill. This is the reason we have been so insistent on having an authorization.

In the meantime, though, the fact is that that lending authority has expired, and the Senate is trying to bring us something in a sort of an indirect fashion by trying to amend the supple-

mental appropriation, which we do not know when it will get here.

As of today, with the joinder of both the minority ranking member of the full committee and the minority ranking member of the subcommittee, I have introduced an extending resolution which has been designated as House Joint Resolution 652. So we are very much aware of it. It has an extension to July 25.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would further yield to the gentleman if the gentleman could tell us when the gentleman planned to bring up that extension. It does need to be brought up.

I would say that, from my perspective, I would hope perhaps we could have it extended further so that we could give some assurance to the marketplace and to the home buyers that FHA is permanently in place.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman will recall, just last month we had on an emergency basis an extension on FHA and an increase in Ginnie Mae. The administration was opposed to it until the crisis in the market became so acute. The President was in Tokyo. The administration changed its mind so suddenly that, as soon as we passed it, they took it in a military airplane and sent it all the way to Tokyo so he could sign it. He was against it when he left.

So this is what we have been fighting.

But I want to assure the gentleman that as soon as we complete action on our authorization bill, we are going to move for the adoption of the extending resolution.

Mr. BARTLETT. Today, if we finish today?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCOLLUM: Page 111, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 123, line 17 (and conform the table of contents accordingly).

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike from this bill what is known as the Nehemiah Program. It is a new provision that has not been there before, that would become law. It is one that is based on a very successful New York project that my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], modeled this provision after and has sponsored this provision in committee.

I think that the problem with any kind of a new program at this time should be apparent to any of the Members. If we are going to spend scarce resources on housing, and we only have limited resources with all of the constraints on our budget now, it should be obvious to all of us that we ought to spend that money in the

areas where we already have existing programs and for the low-income Americans who have indeed the problems and real suffering for the shortage of housing in this country.

I think that the Nehemiah Program and all of its success in New York can be repeated in some of the other parts of the country. It can be repeated just as it was in New York without Federal involvement. It is a very successful program that the city and the State and the local and private agencies and independent nonprofit organizations put together, and it has worked rather well.

But let us talk about it in the context of why we do not need it, and we do not need it in this bill.

First of all, it would establish a fund to be funded by such sums as may be appropriated to provide grants to nonprofit organizations to use for \$15,000 second mortgages for large-scale housing developments in distressed neighborhoods.

The purpose of the program, modeled after the one in New York, is to expand home ownership opportunities for families in revitalized depressed areas of cities.

The proposed program would heavily subsidize moderate home buyers who could afford to purchase privately financed housing. I think that is a key point in this. We are not subsidizing the low end of the scale here. We are subsidizing moderate-income Americans who could afford in the circumstances presented to go through the private mortgage system. The program would not be available to lower income families.

Participants in New York's Nehemiah Program had incomes ranging from \$20,000 to \$40,000, with an estimated median income of \$23,000 to \$24,000 a year. A family earning \$22,500 could have qualified for a privately financed mortgage at a 10-percent interest rate.

The proposed legislation provides that a family's personal income may not exceed the higher of 115 percent of the area median income, or the national median income of \$27,500. One hundred and fifteen percent of the area median income is \$39,790 in Chicago, \$37,375 in Detroit, \$36,110 in Baltimore, \$34,730 in Louisiana, and so on.

The proposed legislation also contains provisions that would make the program unavailable for low-income families. There is a requirement of a 10-percent down payment, which most low-income families cannot afford.

Construction is not allowed to begin until 25 percent of the homes have sales contracts, plus the required down payment. Families would have to tie up a significant amount of funds for a year or more before the homes would be ready for occupancy. What low-income family could afford to do that?

One selection factor relates to the production of the greatest number of units for the least amount of assistance. This would encourage sales to families near the upper level of the maximum income that is permitted under the legislation.

□ 1305

Furthermore, it is unlikely that the proposed Nehemiah program on a Federal level could duplicate the factors in the New York project to revitalize neighborhoods and make homes affordable to moderate-income home buyers.

In New York, a politically strong nonprofit organization was able to put together a complex development package and obtain the cooperation and financial support of the city and State governments. A combination of many factors reduced a family's average monthly carrying costs under the New York project from \$926 to \$462. These factors included but were not limited to:

Free land: 95 percent of the land was donated by the city, was city-owned through in rem or condemnation. It significantly reduced acquisition, relocation and demolition costs and provided for faster startups.

The construction loan fund: East Brooklyn Churches, the developer, created a 5-year interest-free revolving construction loan. This reduced development costs by 10 percent.

Existing infrastructure: The land was already equipped with utilities, water, sewer lines and roads, and the city waived its city code to allow for a single hookup for each block of homes. This reduced development costs by 10 percent.

Second mortgage: The city provided a \$10,000 capital grant in the form of an interest-free second mortgage.

Mortgage revenue bonds: The State of New York Mortgage Agency provided 30-year mortgage financing through mortgage revenue bonds.

Tax abatement: The city provided a 20-year tax abatement.

The New York project was based on the availability of several hundred contiguous acres of land which insulated the revitalized neighborhood, 1,250 row houses in the current phase, from the surrounding decay.

The proposed legislation scales back the minimum number of homes to 50 to 250, depending on the size of the jurisdiction. It also permits only 20 percent of the lots to be in a single neighborhood, opening the door for scattered development and infill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. The further the proposed legislation moves away from the New York experience in terms of scale and concentrated development, the less likely it will create neighborhoods and rebuild depressed areas of other cities and the more likely it will become just another subsidized home ownership program.

I might add that I am not at all convinced that when you move away from the situation New York created, where you could insulate people from the decay around them, that you are going to have very many moderate-income people willing to go into the depressed area, which is the idea, in the first place, since low incomes are not going to be able to afford to go into these projects.

The New York project benefited from a high pent-up demand for home ownership in a tight housing market. The proposed program would probably not work in soft housing markets.

I think this last point is a very telling one on the entire process. This is unlikely to be of much use to anybody in a rural area. We are talking about a city area now, where anybody is going to try a Nehemiah project. New York did its thing. Taking the bill and the proposal that is before us for Federal support, HUD went out and surveyed 10 major cities in this country to find out if any of those cities had the land, had the resources, had the tax incentive possibilities available to make use of the Nehemiah program if we passed some support for it in this legislation. And the survey of the field economists for HUD in the 10 cities reported back that the market conditions and available land would probably not be adequate to implement the proposed Nehemiah program in more than one of those cities, even with minimum size requirements, which are less than one-fourth of the program size in New York.

The bottom line of all of this is that Nehemiah is a good project, it is an excellent project. We need to have more Nehemiah programs. But Nehemiah has some unique qualities that allowed it to operate without Federal subsidy, without Federal involvement in New York. If a city—and there are very few of them, I would submit, based on the HUD survey—in this country wants to duplicate what Nehemiah did for New York, it certainly can. The model is there, the nonprofit organizations surely can be found, the tax breaks with the city and the State can be given, the land can be donated, whatever it takes, Nehemiah can be done. We do not need to federalize another new housing program in this fashion. We can promote it, we can put general language in the bill saying Nehemiah is great, you ought to look at it, but we do not have any business putting any kind of Federal subsidy into a new moderate-income housing program,

with the scarce resources we have today, for housing for low-income and for those moderate-income programs that already exist. We need to put our resources where they do the most good, in modernization, in rehabilitation, in those few new start programs that already exist. A great idea, but it has no business being in this bill at this time. I would urge my colleagues to support my amendment to strike this new program out of the bill and let us get on with providing housing in those tried and true programs we already have in the legislation.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the gentleman has made an excellent statement, an excellent exposition on the subject of Nehemiah. I think for our colleagues who are listening, there are a couple of numbers that bear repeating and maybe a further explanation.

The gentleman pointed out that the 115 percent of median income that is permitted for a \$15,000 Federal subsidy under this proposal is the equivalent, for example, in a city like Chicago, of an income of \$39,700, almost \$40,000. People with incomes of \$40,000 are going to qualify under this provision for a \$15,000 Federal subsidy.

I think the point that has to be made at this point is that that translates into a person whose income would qualify him for private financing of a home worth \$102,000 in that same Chicago market.

Mr. McCOLLUM. That is exactly right. And that person probably can afford, with 10 percent, or whatever, to get that private financing, without any problem.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. And yet we are suggesting that we federally subsidize such a purchase rather than private financing.

Mr. McCOLLUM. That is right. The low-income person cannot afford to do this program because he has to put 10 percent down, which is ridiculous.

I thank the gentlewoman and I appreciate her pointing out that fact. It is just not a workable program for other places, as good as it is for New York. It certainly does not merit Federal support.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for being such an excellent leader of Nehemiah, as well as the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut, and, of course, the gentleman from Texas, who has been supportive of this program.

Let me, Mr. Chairman, first give a little history about housing legislation, which the good gentleman from Florida I think leaves out. For years and years and years, we have heard arguments that the present housing programs do not work, they are too expensive. We have heard about over \$100,000 a unit for subsidizing certain kinds of units for very poor people. And then we look at those units, and they do not last. And so many of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle have come to us and said, "Come up with new programs because the old programs don't work, the old programs are cost inefficient, they are too expensive, the old programs don't last, they are poorly managed, the old programs don't develop a political constituency to support them."

And guess what. We have thought about it in this bill, and we said, "You are right, you have a point." We are trying to change the way housing is done in America. We have a housing crisis out there. We have literally millions of people who do not have adequate shelter. There is no doubt about it. But in this day and age, Congress will not appropriate \$100,000 per unit. We cannot afford it.

And that is the lesson that we have walked through. Now, we feel whip-sawed because the minute we come up with a new program that meets the criticisms, that is cost efficient, that does indeed provide flexibility so different localities can use them, that encourages the private sector and individuals to get involved and care about their homes and their housing, we are then told, "No new programs."

That is not fair. That is not right. You cannot have it both ways unless you are for the Federal Government getting totally out of housing all together. And that has not been the consensus in either this body or the other body.

Nehemiah was a program that was designed to work, to work cost efficiently. Instead of \$100,000 or \$80,000 a unit, it only cost \$15,000 a unit, to work flexibly. Along with the good gentleman from Texas, we have made this program flexible so that many, many cities can adapt it. As for the HUD study, HUD has been opposed to all new programs. To have HUD be judging whether Nehemiah should exist, this HUD, by calling up 10 economists in 10 cities, which was not a professional study, is hardly a way to judge the merits of a program.

Furthermore, we tried to be mindful of budget constraints.

So Nehemiah is not a \$1 billion or \$5 billion new program. We are asking a real pittance. One-hundred fifty million dollars, to see if this program can work in other communities.

What are the benefits of Nehemiah? First, it opens up tight markets for

very poor people. True enough, it is not the very poorest of the poor who will move into Nehemiah, but if the New York project is any indication, they will move out of many other units and open the way for poor people to come in cost efficiently and cheaply. The average person who benefited from a Nehemiah grant had an income of \$24,000. The average person who moved into the public housing unit or section 8 unit or private unit that that person from Nehemiah vacated had an income of \$6,000. So if you want to look at it that way, you can say that we are indeed helping the very poorest of the poor find adequate housing, and we are doing it in a different and novel way.

The other thing about Nehemiah is that it brings some life. I have seen Nehemiah work in New York. You had an area that looked like Dresden or Hiroshima after World War II, totally burnt out, totally abandoned, and because of the lure of homeownership for poorer people, working class people who could not find a home another way, these folks were willing to save their nickels and dimes and invest it in a downpayment and get their dream, a home.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHUMER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHUMER. We sat at the hearings that we had. At the hearings there was not a dry eye in the house, when substantial working people told that they could not find homes that they could afford, that they would be accepted into, because we, unfortunately, have a great deal of racial discrimination in terms of housing, and they found their dream home. Their children are living in a home, and they are bringing back the whole neighborhood. The schools are being revitalized, the shopping streets are being revitalized, the city is paying attention to them.

Can Nehemiah work in the rest of the country? Well, let me tell you something—and I would tell this to the gentleman from Florida—it is worth a shot. We have met the budget in this housing bill. The \$150 million that is going into Nehemiah came out of somewhere else. So the only effect of the gentleman's amendment would be very simple. It would say: Go back to the old programs which do not have the political constituency, which are much more expensive, which have not really worked to anyone's satisfaction, because we are not allowing you to come in with anything new, no matter how modest, no matter how experimental. It is catching everyone between a whipsaw.

Now, let me say of Nehemiah is some crazy idea, it has garnered more sup-

port in this body and in the other body than any other new housing program to come along in a long time. The chairman of our subcommittee has been a strong advocate of Nehemiah. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCKINNEY] has been a strong advocate of Nehemiah. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] has been a strong advocate of Nehemiah. In the other body, the Senate Banking Committee passed a Nehemiah bill with the support of the chairman, the Senator from Utah. This is no crazy, way-out idea. This is hope. That is what Nehemiah is. Nehemiah was the prophet who rebuilt Jerusalem.

Do we want to turn our backs totally on our inner cities? Or do we want some hope? Do we want to try to rebuild them? Do we want Nehemias to spring up in every city tomorrow throughout the country? No. We are not sure it will work in every city. It will certainly work in a great many of them. But it may not work in every city. But let us together try it. Let us together find if there are ways that we can relieve the plight of homeless people by increasing the number of houses in the market. Let us see if inner city people can pull themselves up by their bootstraps with a minimal amount of help.

This is not a conservative program or a liberal program. It is not an eastern program or a western program. It is a program to which people throughout the entire country can point to as a beacon as some hope in the desolate sea of housing.

We had an amendment last week that said that this body is no longer—and I was opposed to that amendment—going to continue to build public housing, new public housing. Are we going to say we should have no new housing for people who need the help? Are we going to say, "Forget it, let's just let the number of homeless increase"? Or are we going to try something that has worked, that has garnered broad support, that is a program that is real, concrete and has so many external benefits?

□ 1320

I would urge, I would strongly urge my colleagues to reject the McCollum amendment and support the Nehemiah Program. On the housing scene, it represents hope, and hope is what we need.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Would the gentleman explain for the Members, many of our colleagues who do not have the background on housing how the financing in this would work from the Federal perspec-

tive and what the cities might have to contribute and so on?

Mr. SCHUMER. I would say to the gentleman there is no specific requirements as to what the cities could contribute, but it would be helpful if they would, in many cities, in many of the larger cities and even some of the smaller ones. There are tracts of land that have become useless and wasted and they could contribute that.

The Federal Government would only have to provide per unit \$15,000 which would help reduce the costs of the home and then, at the option of HUD, depending on the locality, that could be a second mortgage. So that when the house was sold, when the property values in the area increased, the Government would recoup the money.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. McCOLLUM and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHUMER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHUMER. It would always be a second mortgage. So the money would be recouped if the program works.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCOLLUM. If I am not mistaken, am I correct that under this proposal that you have, there would be Federal involvement at least to that extent, but in New York City, under Nehemiah, there was no Federal involvement. Is that not true?

Mr. SCHUMER. That is indeed correct.

What we are trying to do in this, it worked in New York City because of the great generosity, not only of city and State governments but, for instance, the Brooklyn East Churches, the Brooklyn Archdiocese put in millions of dollars to help Nehemiah become reality. They wanted to see if it would work.

I would say to the gentleman from Florida that, No. 1, it seems to me an appropriate Federal role to provide that incentive for that home. We have done it through FHA, we have done it through VA with millions of people in similar ways.

No. 2, if, in smaller communities, they do not have that kind of money available, if there is not an active and concerned church group, but there are people who want to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, localities, which, as we all know, this budget will eliminate revenue sharing which is going to put a crimp on all of our localities.

If the Federal Government is to have a role in housing, I could not think of a more appropriate role than this one.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me, and I would like to ask the gentleman about it, but if this program is as successful as I believe it is, and I think it is a great program. I am all for the Nehemiah concept. We ought to give it a chance to work in the other communities without the Federal role. We have not had time for this example to filter down for a lot of other nonprofits to come forward, to have the cities to plan to do it, and so on.

Am I not correct that while there is a restricted, open feeling on the part of the committee about how much money would be involved in this, once we authorize it, it is up to appropriations committees in the future to decide how much to fund? We have no idea in the end 5 years or 10 years down the road what we are opening up to and what else might be done by this volunteer community, as it is in New York City, if they are given a chance for the next couple of years to try this program without Federal support.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would remind the gentleman that this bill—when I said \$150 million, that was the amount we asked for in the bill—but what is appropriate, what is authorized here is such sums as may be appropriated. The Appropriations Committee would determine how much money they thought was worthy of Nehemiah.

Let me ask the gentleman: We have approximately a \$9 billion assisted housing budget. That has gone down from \$31 billion 5 years ago. Is it not worth allowing the Federal Government to give incentives to cities throughout the country for a small amount of money?

I talked to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee; I have talked to the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Subcommittee, and they do not envision a large amount of money; but they envision something else.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. McCOLLUM and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHUMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. If the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to make one, quick comment on that.

It seems to me that, yes, this is a small amount of money in the beginning, but it is like a lot of other things around here: This is like the camel getting his nose under the tent. Once we start the program.

I may very well be a strong supporter of this program 2 or 3 years down the road if we have some track record showing that other cities really will not follow New York's example. It seems to me that it is a perfect opportunity for other cities to come in and follow New York's example now. Getting nonprofits involved; getting tax breaks. Why do we want to mess it up with even any incentive program at the Federal level? Why do we not just put in the bill?

Look at Nehemiah; it is a good program; it works in New York. You all ought to go out and look at it; give a rah-rah this time and come back in a couple of years. It is a much better way to go. Why not do that?

Mr. SCHUMER. I respect the gentleman's integrity, but I would say his last remarks really are not in the full spirit of this.

Let me say this: The gentleman is first saying that if we start a new program we run the risk of it burgeoning into a big program.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHUMER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. SCHUMER. If this program works, I hope it will replace some of the existing programs. But the gentleman from the Banking Committee knows, as we all know in this House, this is no climate where we are going to increase the overall amount of money appropriated. We may switch it around from one to another, but let us try it, because the old programs have not worked.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to this amendment, and I think that we are all missing the point of why we are here sometimes.

It seems to me that we are here to, as the Ford Motor Car Co. would tell you, "Build a better idea." It is wonderful that I find myself sitting in dreadful disagreement when people say, "Oh, let us get rid of section 8," but it is not a very good program. Everybody says, "Let us get rid of this, it is not working." Then we suddenly come up with a new idea and we are all afraid of it.

What is the real problem in housing? In some sections there is not any. In some, of course, there is too much because of the economic condition of the area, but people are not going to certainly walk to those houses in an economically depressed area.

I see my good friend from New York sitting over there, and I will tell you that East Brooklyn, NY, was everyone's point of despair; what could ever be done with it. It was Hiroshima, as it

was stated earlier from my other friend from New York.

So a group of churches and everyone else got together and they got together to do one thing: To make it possible to own a home. Who bought these homes? People bought these homes who were in public housing. Why were they in public housing? They were too rich for public housing, but were they rich enough to own a home in New York City, even in East Brooklyn, NY? No.

Who are these people? Teachers, policemen, bus drivers, nurses, the very people who make a community run, that make a community function, that make a community a community. The very people who, unfortunately, if you read today's paper you would see, are being forced out of Washington, DC. Have been forced out of many towns in Connecticut. The very people that make a town run.

What do you want, a rent-a-cop in your town? You drive in from the poor section and you watch all us nice, rich people around here. No, thank you. You want homeownership for Americans. The people particularly who make enough money to look rich but not enough money to own.

I talked to people at Nehemiah who had taken 15 years for them to put \$5,000 in a savings account or a certificate of deposit or something of that sort.

□ 1330

This was going to be their first chance. That \$5,000 in the New York City real estate market would not get them three rooms on the top of a 12-story walkup.

All right. The Nehemiah situation as it exists perhaps could be done by charities, could perhaps be done as the last gasp, as it was in New York. What we are simply saying is, though, "Let's have some help." If we are going to cut revenue sharing, if we are going to cut community development block grant funds, our communities are not going to have any kind of money, in fact, to help people buy houses.

Now look what happens when you use this system. They buy a house. They own the house. They pay taxes. Ask Ed Koch what happens to the crime rate in that district. None of those hard-working people that own those houses with their front yards and their back yards are going to allow a drug seller in the neighborhood. None of them are going to allow kids to break windows.

I used to live in the city. I used to ride on the cowcatcher of a streetcar, if you can believe it. I would get home, having been the clever boy who was running down the sidewalk and jumping on the cowcatcher and disconnecting the trolley car from its electrical wire, and wonder why my mother

slapped me the minute that I walked in the door.

Well, she got a call from someone down the street saying, "Claire, your little boy is jumping on streetcar tracks." And she would get me good when I came home.

That was called a neighborhood. That is something else that Nehemiah makes. It makes a neighborhood.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McKINNEY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McKINNEY. We had a ball with Boston—we destroyed it. We had a ball in Bridgeport, CT—we went in where the housing was and tore it all down and put in a mall so that you cannot find 10 people in there after rush hour. We had a ball in the cities of America destroying the neighborhoods of people who lived there and owned there.

What we are saying is that this program has worked in New York, with great difficulty, with great personal sacrifice, and with building codes that I wish New York would take a long, hard look at. In Bridgeport, CT, where you do not need a poured concrete basement, where you do not have to have cast-iron sewer pipe, where you do not have to have a masonry fire-wall—you can have a double-thickness fire wall, where you can do a lot of things that you cannot do in the big city, we could put people into housing at reasonable cost.

We have a problem. The Federal Government has to do something to make it worthwhile for a city. But it is a one-timer. Section 8 goes on forever. The builders' relief bill. It is wonderful. It has inflation written in, and it has nice rents, and everybody makes money. We have to have it; it houses people. But how much nicer to help those who can get out of the housing they should not be in, which is subsidized totally, and into their own home, where their interest in the community goes up, their interest in stopping crime goes up, their interest in stopping drugs goes up, and believe it or not, eventually they will pay taxes. Is that not a nice thought?

You can bet your bottom dollar that New York City was not getting any taxes out of east Brooklyn, where Nehemiah is. I can show you large areas of almost any city in a district where cities are not collecting any income at all. In fact, those areas have become detriments and huge and gigantic costs to the cities.

All right, so you put a little Federal money in the form of an interest-free second mortgage. I would like to see HUD decide that if somebody stays there for 15 years that the mortgage just be forgiven, but you have the safety that if they leave, if the area

goes up, that you will get your money back, which is more than you can ever say for section 8, or anything else like that.

We need permanent neighborhoods. They are the lifebreath of this Nation, and we destroyed them. We told people, "You can't have mixed-use buildings, so you can't have apartments over stores." We told people all kinds of nonsense things so that we created a situation which is an abomination.

This is a very small step in a new direction, to give homeownership to the hard working, lower middle-class American, and they do not have a chance to do it now, because where there is a surplus of housing, it is always expensive housing, or it is substandard housing. If housing is being built in those areas that are short of housing, it is not being built for these people. There is no money in it. General Motors can make over \$5,000 at the factory on a Cadillac. On the cheapest Chevy Nova, they are lucky if they make about \$400. There is very little money in it. It is simply done to compete with the Japanese.

Let us give a chance to a program, starting out in a small way, taking no new money, leaving it to the Committee on Appropriations to try to show that homeownership is important to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman first off and tell him that while he and I disagree on this amendment, I really respect his ranking position on our side of the aisle on the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development. I know how sincere he is about this, and I think that our basic difference is not on what the quality of this program is, but it is basically over whether the Federal Government should step in at this point.

The gentleman stated his position very eloquently. I am still very much in favor of my amendment, because I do not think that we have to go through the Federal route to get Nehemiahs. I thought New York was a great example.

I do respect the gentleman a lot, I know that his heart is in it, and I want to thank him for all that he has done for the committee, but I urge at the same time a vote for my amendment.

Mr. McKINNEY. Well, Lord hope that we do not ever have as many destitute areas such as east Brooklyn, NY, which Congressmen and rabbis and priests and bishops and mayors and everyone have to get together on. That is what I am trying to say.

You know, I agree. There was a gentleman of the other party by the name of Mr. Lance who said, "If it ain't

broke, don't fix it." This is broke; let us try to fix it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Nehemiah section of the legislation and to oppose the amendment to delete that section out of the bill.

I do so out of great respect for the author and the sponsor of the amendment. We are generally, in almost every case, on the same side of issues before this House.

I have examined and worked with this section of the bill over the past year since it was introduced, and I would share with my colleagues that it is not only a much-improved section and much-improved title, but it is a program that goes in the right direction, and that is to go in the direction of providing the opportunity for homeownership for low-income families which ultimately is a vast improvement over the status quo of current housing programs.

The fact of the matter is, and the reason that I oppose the amendment to strike the Nehemiah section, is that the status quo in Federal assisted housing today is not worth supporting for either liberals or moderates or conservatives. What we should be trying to do is to improve the status quo of those Federal housing programs and not to freeze ourselves into existing programs that were developed during the 1960's.

Let me address for just a second the comments on targeting of the Nehemiah to low-income families. I do think that this amendment could be better targeted, and I think an amendment will be offered later that will more directly target this section toward even lower income, in the 90-percent range, and I think that it could be and will be better targeted.

The fact is that the average income for a family of four in the program as it is used now in New York is \$23,000. The Federal funds that would be spent on Nehemiah are not spent, per se—that is, they are not lost, they are funds that would be repaid back into the pool to be able to be re-lent on second mortgages to other low-income families.

As the gentleman from New York so eloquently said, the Nehemiah also opens up other units of assisted housing for even lower income families.

As to the question of whether Nehemiah in its present form can be used in other cities, as originally introduced, no, it could not. I do not think that that was the intention of the gentleman from New York, but he introduced legislation which has worked in his city as a model, to see if it could work elsewhere.

I worked with the gentleman and with officials from a number of cities,

large and small, throughout the country, and we came up with language that does not duplicate the exact parameters of Nehemiah in New York, but duplicates the results, and the results are what count.

The fact is that the program in New York as it is now and in the Nehemiah title of the bill contains the ingredients of the use of vacant lots, of the use of flexibility of local regulations, of the use of primarily local funding, plus city funding and charitable funding and private-sector groups, as well as loans that would be made by private financial institutions.

I recall when I was on the city council in my home city, it was about the same year, I recall, that the President, then Jimmy Carter, in 1978, walked through the south Bronx and he made his "bombed out Berlin" statement about the south Bronx.

□ 1340

Over the period of years then, over about 5 years, several billions of dollars of government money, of government housing were poured into that area, with little if any perceptible difference.

At about the same time in a city in Texas, I recall another section of that city that looked close to the South Bronx, a group of lenders and homeowners and city officials and Federal officials walked through and said, "Let's see if we can give the people of this area, that looks like the South Bronx, a chance to own their own homes and we will lend them money and we will provide some flexibility in the codes. We will repair the sidewalks and we will provide for those same people."

Today within a matter of years with the expenditure of a very small amount of Federal funds and small amounts of city funds, primarily sweat, equity, and work of the residents themselves and the loans by financial institutions, that area was upgraded and the people who live there, low-income families, have discovered ways to live in decent, safe, and sanitary housing and homes that they own themselves.

Nehemiah is not unique. It is not the only homeownership program around the country. We have a program in Dallas called Common Ground. Neighborhood Housing Services has been in the business for some 10 or 15 years. Savings and loans themselves have blocked out areas.

The point is that this Congress ought to be at this reauthorization of the housing program, as I said last week, not simply rubber stamping and reauthorizing a status quo that no one likes, not the low-income families, not Congress, not liberals, not conservatives. We ought to be trying to improve it.

Now, this is not offered as an add-on program. I would suggest that the gentleman has offered his bill, and I wish that he had actually offered it in a way that it would directly remove other Federal programs, but he does not, and perhaps he cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTLETT was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman offers it in a way in which the funding for Nehemiah would have to come out of other existing housing programs. If we had Nehemiah, this title as a Federal housing program today, no one would be trying to eliminate it. In fact, it would be considered to be in the upper third or the upper 10 percent of successful opportunity programs, housing programs for low-income families.

There is a reason to replace or eliminate housing programs that do not work. One of the ways that we can accomplish that is to put into place housing programs and home ownership programs that do work.

I recall a hearing where one of the witnesses was asked by one of the members of the committee, "Do you think that we ought to be providing more public housing?"

And she was angry and she said, "Mr. Chairman, we don't want more public housing. We want to own our homes."

I have heard that again and again and again from existing tenants and proposed tenants of public housing from low-income families all over this country.

This program is one which could well become one of the home ownership programs that begins to move Federal housing programs out of the status quo of the present and into a future in which we can have more bang for the buck and more people with a lower per-unit cost and help them in a much, much better way.

The old days of Government-built housing just did not work. The new days of home ownership opportunities and freedom of choice opportunities for low-income families will work a lot better.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Well, my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, and I usually see eye to eye on these programs and he knows that I am very much in favor of the home ownership concept and trying to get us away from a lot of the public housing programs of the past; but what concerns me is the gentleman supporting this program and yet the evidence I have seen indicates that the restrictions in

here make it nigh on to impossible for low-income Americans to be able to participate, to be able to afford it. The incentives in our proposal in this bill skew it to the middle income and the upper end of that middle-income scale in many of our cities.

Does the gentleman believe that this program now as it is structured in this bill is really going to be available and can work for that lower-income group that HUD seems to say it is not?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's question. In fact, the reverse is true. This is skewed toward lower income working people, people who will be able to afford to repay their mortgage. The average median income as it was used in New York, and I think it can be lower than this, was \$23,000.

The fact is that low-income families all have one thing in common and that is they do not want to be low income anymore. What we ought to be doing with housing programs is to give them a chance and an incentive and an opportunity to increase their employment and their home ownership opportunities.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I certainly agree completely with the gentleman. We ought to be giving them that opportunity, but I disagree that this bill does that. It seems to me what this bill does is it takes Federal subsidies one step further and it is not necessary to do that. We do not need a new federally subsidized program for moderate-income Americans.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee has gone into the New York area four times in a matter of 11 months with the exception of one hearing we had in central Manhattan at the Federal building, the rest we spent at such places as the Nehemiah project in Brooklyn and the southeast Bronx.

At this point I would like to correct my colleague, the gentleman from Texas. The Government did not pour millions of dollars into the southeast Bronx after Jimmy Carter nor after Mr. Reagan appearance there during the campaign, and Secretary Sam Pierce soon after he was appointed Secretary. They went and pointed to the same bombed out area; however, when we went there last year, we went to the Southeast Bronx where they did not have a Nehemiah project, because they had an entirely different situation confronting them. They had the church leadership, but they also had the availability of some section 8 new construction which they very, very definitely proved that Federal money could be used in an innovative manner.

What has happened in Nehemiah is that you had the happy acceptance of

a responsibility on the part of the State government of New York like no other State in the country. New York heads the States in their State level support of housing, and as well the city of New York, both Mayor Koch and Governor Cuomo must be recognized for their leadership in this respect. They realized that in the absence and the reduction of the Federal moneys, the State of New York would have to supplant somehow, and so would the city of New York; so the State of New York has one of the most efficient, if not the most efficient State housing finance and mortgage agency, State housing agency, and so does the city of New York.

Then with the help of the seed money from the churches, the Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn for instance contributed \$6 million. The Episcopal Diocese contributed \$2 million and Lutheran Church \$1 million and because of the very happy use through the inspired leadership of a home builder of the native talent living in those neighborhoods, Mr. I.D. Robbins.

In the Southeast Bronx, Father Gigganti, a great leader, was the one that put that housing development in. They have constructed 3,000 housing units to be owned by those residents.

You walk through that project, as we did, and then you walk just three blocks farther on the other side of the perimeter of that housing project and you will see the still remaining bombed out sections.

Of course, we need what this minimal authorization provides as seed money for those areas even within the same city of New York that does not have the community forces that Nehemiah areas in the Southeast Brooklyn does have.

So that this is a very creative piece of legislation. It is in the tradition of what the United States, the Congress, the executive branch, have given the Nation in the sense of a commitment of the American people that the dream of home ownership shall last and endure at a time when it has been ordered to cease and desist from being a dream.

I realize that my distinguished colleague from Florida has a strong ideological bend toward Federal participation, but you cannot have everything on a negative basis and then oppose a program merely because it involves some Federal level involvement, though it is creative, though it is tacitly admitted that it is.

I must say that the gentleman reminds me of Dorothy Parker's little ditty:

Higgledy-piggledy my little white hen.
She lays eggs only for gentlemen.
I can't persuade her with pistol or lariat,
To come across for the proletariat.

I have seen no vote, no vote, no vote from the gentleman from Florida, as a

member of the subcommittee which I happen to be chairing temporarily.

So I say, let us not yield to that argument and let us defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(At the request of Mr. McCOLLUM, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Certainly.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but agree with the gentleman that this is a very excellent project and program. I think the gentleman hit the point of this debate right on the head when he said that he and I differ as to whether Federal involvement ought to be here. That is really the whole debate, because there are problems I think in implementing the program with the low-income people not getting it, and that is a side issue, it is an important one, whether it will work under the legislation here; but the gut reason that this gentleman really is opposed to this being in the bill is because, as opposed to the gentleman from Texas, my good chairman, I think that we ought to give the free, open, State, local example of New York, a chance to work without Federal involvement for a little while. It did a marvelous job in New York and it is a great example to the rest of America of what can be done without any Federal encouragement or assistance. Let us allow that example to be sold across this country. It is a perfect example to be followed, to be modified as the local communities need it, but we cannot dictate how they modify it. Mr. Chairman, we cannot tell them how.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the constituents of the 12th Congressional District, who are in a district where all of the Nehemiah houses that have been constructed thus far are located, and on behalf of those in the 11th Congressional District who will be the beneficiaries of another 800 Nehemiah houses being planned, I would like to thank the members of the committee. I would particularly like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], and my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCKINNEY], for the very special interest that they have shown in this housing experiment which brings great benefits to those who are in greatest need of housing.

I would like also to point out that the 11th and 12th Congressional Districts are among the 10 poorest congressional districts in the country. Of the 435 congressional districts in the

country, the 12th and the 11th Districts are among the 10 poorest and New York has four of the 10 poorest.

This project, this program, has not only provided housing for those who need it the most, it has also begun to revitalize an entire community. Brownsville was an area which was often referred to as looking worse than Berlin looked shortly after the allies took it over after much bombing had taken place in Berlin.

Hiroshima has also been an analogy that has been used in connection with the condition of housing in Brownsville. There are numerous sociology books, books on urban planning and housing, which have cited Brownsville as an example perhaps of the ultimate in urban decay.

The area where the first Nehemiah houses were constructed is an area that had for 25 years been designated as an urban renewal area, and yet the city had not been able to do anything about it.

What has happened here is a coming together of forces from the private nonprofit sector, from the private sector, and from the Government sector to produce a miracle, almost. It is a model that should be viewed as a model that can be used somewhere else in the country.

The situation is urgent with respect to housing. The homeless problem will not go away, not only for New York, but for the rest of the country. We cannot afford to allow an experiment like this, a model like this, to lie fallow and not try to duplicate it and replicate it somewhere else in the country. It is a model that can meet a need without costing the taxpayer anything of great substance.

In fact, what has happened in Brownsville has been that the tax coffers have been replenished. The tax coffers will be receiving a benefit from this vacant land that has been fallow for so long for the first time.

Not only that, the private developers have come in. As a result of the Nehemiah houses, of what the Nehemiah houses have done, the private developers have moved in to take over any other existing vacant land.

The commercial sector has moved in. They are looking for areas to build new stores.

The Nehemiah houses in Brownsville are located within a center of public housing, about 20,000 public housing units within a 10-block radius of the Nehemiah houses. These public housing units have been the primary places from which the people who occupy the Nehemiah houses have come. They are people in many cases who are Government workers, civil servants who work for the city of the State and they are hospital workers, some of the lowest paid workers in the city. Nevertheless, they do have a job.

They are able to meet the credit requirements and for the first time they can go forward to own a home which they can purchase with a down payment of \$5,000; \$5,000 for a \$45,000 home, a simple row house, but as far as the people are concerned who want to buy these homes, they are palaces.

The waiting list for Nehemiah homes is so long that they have decided not to accept any other names. They refuse to allow people to put their names on a waiting list any longer because there are so many people lined up for the Nehemiah homes.

The entire community is being revitalized. The schools tell us that they have a new kind of leadership from parents in the schools.

The businessmen for the first time are ready to invest in the retail Main Street establishments.

□ 1355

For the first time there is talk of this community taking full advantage of the fact that it is in the middle of a transportation hub. There are all kinds of new things that are happening as a result of the successful partnership between the private sector and the Government sector in the Nehemiah plan.

The rest of the country would benefit in like manner. We should not allow this experiment to just be laid aside while nothing is done about it. We should try to replicate it in the rest of the country. The Nation has a housing emergency and we must act now.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM].

Mr. Chairman, I was sitting in my office minding my own business and trying to take care of some local problems. The magnificence of having a television set in our offices is that we can monitor the things that are being said on the floor, so we can follow debate closely.

I think one of the biggest problems that we have when we talk about housing is that very few of us take the opportunity to go and visit districts where housing is needed, visit districts where housing, in fact, is a very important part in building that community.

To talk about billions of dollars coming into the Borough of the Bronx, which is where my district falls, and say that it was money wasted, those seem to me to be words that were measured carefully. I would say to my colleague from Texas on the other side of the aisle that what I would like to do, maybe too late because we have gutted most of the housing bill already, he should come up and visit and see for himself before

words are said on this floor that money was wasted.

There are literally thousands of people living today in the Bronx because of the housing programs. We will no longer be the beneficiaries of these programs, thanks to the gutting amendments that have taken place on this floor over the last 5 years.

I say that to the gentleman because it seems to me that to have balance in this legislative process we have to be able to see both sides, not just one side. I would hope that those Members who have voted against housing would come and see first hand, at my personal invitation, the thousands of people who are today living in housing that is standard, living and raising families, just like any other person, whether they come from Texas or Florida or California. The dream is the same. The color of our skin may be different, our income levels may be different, but the dream is the same.

I say that to my colleagues because when I am accused, or my district or my borough is accused of wasting billions of dollars, I really think those words are unfair.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if I offended the gentleman, I did not mean to and I sincerely apologize. I did not say nor intend to imply that the funds were wasted.

What I did say and do believe to be true is that we can do better with the housing funds that we have spent and we can do better with programs like Nehemiah in which we get a large measure of home ownership.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague would permit me to reclaim my time, I think the words were that "billions of dollars have been poured." Is that a fair assessment? I yield to my colleague for a response.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, without looking at the record, that is a fair assessment of what I intended to say, that the money was spent, and it seems to me that Federal funds could be spent better with a different approach. That does not mean that all funds that have been spent have been wasted. I do not believe they have been. Nor does it mean that all funds that have been spent have not helped someone. Many have.

What I would suggest is that by using local flexibility, by using large amounts of leveraged private money, of loans, and by using that equity that low-income families feel when they are given the chance to own something, we can do better. I would think that the gentleman would agree with that.

I do not know. We are both in this business together and we represent in many ways many of the people who live in other parts of the country similar to the people who live in the gentleman's district.

I just would contend that we can do better than we have done over the past several years.

Mr. GARCIA. I would say to my colleague the magnificence of discussing these subjects with the gentleman on the floor is that he is always so soothing and he makes me feel better about what we are debating.

I would like to here, publicly invite the gentleman to come to my district, because he has been one of those persons who has been so concerned about housing in his years in Congress, and I would be delighted to invite him, to have him come up to meet with the people who are receiving these billions of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GARCIA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GARCIA. I would say to my colleague that it may be an education for him. I will tell the gentleman what I will do. If he will come and visit with me I will go and talk to his folks in Texas and it will let me have an opportunity to visit with them. We can do it here publicly, because I think America has to meet itself someplace in between.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague from the South Bronx yield?

Mr. GARCIA. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have visited the gentleman's district several times with the good Congressman from the South Bronx, and I just want to remind my friend from the South Bronx, with whom I agree in this colloquy, that the gentleman from Texas is a strong supporter of the very concept that the gentleman from the South Bronx has been talking about. I do not know if the gentleman has heard everything the gentleman from Texas has said today, but he is a very strong supporter of this whole idea of homesteading and getting more folks into their own property. He strongly supports the Nehemiah Housing Program.

So I just hope at the end of this colloquy we all recognize that here we have a gentleman from Texas and a gentleman from the South Bronx essentially on the same side of the same issue, and I hope he does not miss that very important point as he continues this fascinating colloquy.

Mr. GARCIA. Let me say to my colleague from New York that my own personal feeling about this is that it is

not so much what we say in words but what the deeds are. It is like looking at past performances and we do not listen to the words but look at the past performances and base our judgment not on what people say but what they do.

I think in the final analysis my colleague from New York, who is the co-sponsor with me on monumental legislation, such as the Enterprise Zone, that we can both appreciate that it is deemed not just words.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first, I accept the gentleman's invitation to visit his district, and I issue the gentleman an invitation, which I believe he just accepted, to visit other areas in other parts of the country, and we will share what works.

Second, as the gentleman knows, I introduced and offered to this bill in committee Enterprise Zone legislation, and I am glad to see that the gentleman is going to offer it as an amendment.

Mr. GARCIA. That is not part of this debate. The debate has to do with Nehemiah.

Mr. BARTLETT. The debate was turned on deeds. Third, in terms of deeds, I will be offering, as I did in committee, later on today some amendments that will allow low-income families to live where they want to through portability of section 8 certificates, that will allow them to increase their income when they get a job, and a number of other freedom of choice, employment opportunities, and living conditions amendments. I do hope the gentleman will support those in terms of allowing people to make choices affecting their own lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GARCIA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

□ 1405

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] and I can, in fact, do a lot of good together. We do agree on some things; we disagree on some things. I have made my deeds match my words, as I know the gentleman has also.

Mr. GARCIA. I would just like to say that when we finish the debate on my colleague's amendment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] or the gentleman from Florida's [Mr. McCOLLUM] amendment, which I just want to make it very clear that I do not support, I will get into the next discussion which has to do, I guess,

with the livability amendment that the gentleman is proposing.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McCollum amendment to strike from H.R. 4746 provisions to create the new housing opportunity grant program, known as Nehemiah. This program is patterned after a similar successful local program in New York City. However, Mr. Chairman, that's where the similarities end.

Unlike the New York City program, Nehemiah is too costly, and would funnel already scarce Federal resources away from those who are truly in need of federally subsidized housing. The program is designed to promote homeownership among middle-income households, not low-income households. In fact, most families that would qualify under this program could qualify for private mortgages. If anything, the New York project proves conclusively that the Federal Government's nonparticipation is one of the keys to its success.

We're talking about spending \$150 billion a year on a program that, according to HUD, would not be workable in the majority of the cities outside of New York. But more important than the funding, H.R. 4746 proposes Federal intervention into an area that can be much better managed by local communities. If my colleagues are really concerned about improving economically depressed areas in our Nation's cities, enterprise zone legislation would have been enacted years ago.

Federal handouts are not the answer to the serious problem of intercity decay, and I urge my colleagues to support the McCollum amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 300, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—123

Archer	Dornan (CA)	Latta
Badham	Dreier	Leach (IA)
Barton	Duncan	Lewis (CA)
Bateman	Edwards (OK)	Lewis (FL)
Bevill	Emerson	Lightfoot
Billirakis	Evans (IA)	Livingston
Boulter	Fawell	Lloyd
Broomfield	Fiedler	Loeffler
Brown (CO)	Fields	Lott
Broyhill	Flippo	Lujan
Burton (IN)	Franklin	Marlenee
Byron	Frenzel	McCain
Callahan	Goodling	McCandless
Carney	Gunderson	McCollum
Carr	Hall (OH)	Meyers
Chappie	Hammerschmidt	Mica
Cheney	Hansen	Michel
Clinger	Henry	Miller (OH)
Coble	Hiler	Miller (WA)
Coleman (MO)	Holt	Monson
Combust	Hopkins	Montgomery
Crane	Hyde	Moorhead
Daniel	Ireland	Morrison (WA)
Dannemeyer	Jones (TN)	Murtha
Daub	Kasich	Myers
DeLay	Kolbe	Nichols
DeWine	Kramer	Nielson
Dickinson	Lagomarsino	Oxley

Packard	Shaw	Stenholm
Penny	Shumway	Strang
Petri	Shuster	Stump
Quillen	Siljander	Sundquist
Regula	Skeen	Swindall
Roberts	Slaughter	Taylor
Robinson	Smith (NE)	Thomas (CA)
Rogers	Smith, Denny	Vander Jagt
Roth	(OR)	Whitehurst
Rudd	Smith, Robert	Whittaker
Schaefer	(OR)	Wylie
Schuetter	Snyder	Young (AK)
Schulze	Spence	Young (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Stangeland	

NOES—300

Ackerman	Erdreich	Lowry (WA)
Akaka	Evans (IL)	Luken
Alexander	Fascell	Lundine
Anderson	Fazio	Lungren
Andrews	Feighan	Mack
Annunzio	Fish	MacKay
Anthony	Florio	Madigan
Applegate	Foglietta	Manton
Army	Foley	Markey
Aspin	Ford (MI)	Martin (IL)
Atkins	Ford (TN)	Martin (NY)
AuCoin	Fowler	Martinez
Barnard	Frank	Matsui
Barnes	Frost	Mavroules
Bartlett	Fuqua	Mazzoli
Bates	Gallo	McCloskey
Bedell	Garcia	McCurdy
Beilenson	Gaydos	McDade
Bennett	Gejdenson	McEwen
Bentley	Gekas	McGrath
Bereuter	Gephardt	McHugh
Berman	Gibbons	McKernan
Biaggi	Gilman	McKinney
Bliley	Gingrich	McMillan
Boehlert	Glickman	Mikulski
Boggs	Gonzalez	Miller (CA)
Boland	Gordon	Mineta
Boner (TN)	Gradison	Mitchell
Bonior (MI)	Gray (IL)	Moakley
Bonker	Gray (PA)	Molinaro
Borski	Green	Mollohan
Bosco	Gregg	Moody
Boxer	Guarini	Morrison (CT)
Brooks	Hall, Ralph	Mrazek
Brown (CA)	Hamilton	Murphy
Bruce	Hatcher	Natcher
Bryant	Hawkins	Neal
Burton (CA)	Hayes	Nelson
Bustamante	Hefner	Nowak
Carper	Hefel	Oakar
Chapman	Hendon	Oberstar
Chappell	Hertel	Obey
Clay	Hillis	Olin
Coats	Horton	Ortiz
Cobey	Howard	Owens
Coelho	Hoyer	Panetta
Coleman (TX)	Hubbard	Parris
Collins	Huckaby	Pashayan
Conte	Hughes	Pease
Conyers	Hunter	Pepper
Cooper	Hutto	Perkins
Coughlin	Jacobs	Pickle
Courter	Jeffords	Porter
Coyne	Jenkins	Price
Craig	Johnson	Pursell
Crockett	Jones (NC)	Rahall
Darden	Jones (OK)	Rangel
Daschle	Kanjorski	Ray
de la Garza	Kaptur	Reid
Dellums	Kastenmeier	Richardson
Derrick	Kemp	Ridge
Dicks	Kennelly	Rinaldo
Dingell	Kildee	Ritter
DioGuardi	Kindness	Roe
Dixon	Klecicka	Roemer
Donnelly	Kolter	Rose
Dorgan (ND)	Kostmayer	Rostenkowski
Dowdy	LaFalce	Roukema
Downey	Lantos	Rowland (CT)
Durbin	Leath (TX)	Rowland (GA)
Dwyer	Lehman (CA)	Roybal
Dymally	Lehman (FL)	Russo
Dyson	Leland	Sabo
Early	Lent	Savage
Eckart (OH)	Levin (MI)	Saxton
Eckert (NY)	Levine (CA)	Scheuer
Edgar	Lipinski	Schneider
Edwards (CA)	Long	Schroeder
English	Lowery (CA)	Schumer

Seiberling	Studds	Waxman
Sharp	Sweeney	Weaver
Shelby	Swift	Weber
Sikorski	Synar	Weiss
Sisisky	Tallon	Wheat
Skelton	Tauke	Whitley
Slattery	Tauzin	Whitten
Smith (FL)	Thomas (GA)	Williams
Smith (IA)	Torres	Wilson
Smith (NJ)	Torricelli	Wirth
Smith, Robert	Towns	Wise
(NH)	Trafficant	Wolf
Snowe	Traxler	Wolpe
Solarz	Udall	Wortley
Solomon	Valentine	Wright
Spratt	Vento	Wyden
St Germain	Viscosky	Yates
Staggers	Volkmer	Yatron
Stallings	Vucanovich	Young (MO)
Stark	Walgren	Zschau
Stokes	Walker	
Stratton	Watkins	

NOT VOTING—10

Boucher	Davis	O'Brien
Breaux	Grotberg	Rodino
Campbell	Hartnett	
Chandler	Moore	

□ 1425

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Hartnett for, with Mr. Breaux against,

Messrs. FEIGHAN, DURBIN, KANJORSKI, SMITH of New Hampshire, DONNELLY, LUNGREN, WEBER, and COBEY changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAUNTROY

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAUNTROY:

Page 73, after line 7, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 213. PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENT MANAGEMENT.

The United States Housing Act of 1937 (as amended by section 212 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENT MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 21. (a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to encourage increased resident management of public housing projects, as 1 means of improving existing living conditions in public housing projects, by providing increased flexibility for public housing projects that are managed by residents by—

"(1) waiving certain statutory and regulatory requirements;

"(2) permitting the retention, and use for certain purposes, of any revenues exceeding operating and project costs; and

"(3) providing funding, from amounts otherwise available, for technical assistance to promote formation and development of resident management entities.

"(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) RESIDENT COUNCIL.—As a condition of entering into a resident management program, the elected resident council of a public housing project shall approve the establishment of a resident management corporation. The resident management corporation and the resident council may be the same organization, if the organization com-

plies with the requirements applicable to both the corporation and council. If there is no elected resident council, a majority of the households of the public housing project shall approve the establishment of a resident council to determine the feasibility of establishing a resident management corporation to manage the project.

"(2) PUBLIC HOUSING MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST.—The resident council of a public housing project, in cooperation with the public housing agency, shall select a qualified public housing management specialist to assist in determining the feasibility of, and to help establish, a resident management corporation and to provide training and other duties agreed to in the daily operations of the project.

"(3) BONDING AND INSURANCE.—Before assuming any management responsibility for a public housing project, the resident management corporation shall provide fidelity bonding and insurance, or equivalent protection, in accordance with regulations and requirements of the Secretary and the public housing agency. Such bonding and insurance, or its equivalent, shall be adequate to protect the Secretary and the public housing agency against loss, theft, embezzlement, or fraudulent acts on the part of the resident management corporation or its employees.

"(4) MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES.—A resident management corporation that qualifies under this section, and that supplies insurance and bonding or equivalent protection sufficient to the Secretary and the public housing agency, shall enter into a contract with the public housing agency establishing the respective management rights and responsibilities of the corporation and the public housing agency. Such contract may include specific terms governing management personnel and compensation, access to public housing project records, submission of and adherence to budgets, rent collection procedures, tenant selection and screening, tenant income verification, tenant eligibility determinations, tenant eviction, the acquisition of supplies and materials, and such other matters as may be appropriate.

"(5) ANNUAL AUDIT.—The books and records of a resident management corporation operating a public housing project shall be audited annually by a certified public accountant. A written report of each audit shall be forwarded to the public housing agency and the Secretary.

"(c) COMPREHENSIVE IMPROVEMENT ASSISTANCE.—Public housing projects managed by resident management corporations may be provided with comprehensive improvement assistance under section 14 or 20 for purposes of renovating such projects in accordance with such section. The Secretary shall issue regulations that provide public housing projects managed by resident management corporations with additional consideration in the allocation of comprehensive improvement assistance under section 14 or 20. If such renovation activities (including the planning and architectural design of the rehabilitation) are administered by a resident management corporation, the public housing agency involved may not retain, for any administrative or other reason, any portion of the assistance provided pursuant to this subsection.

"(d) WAIVER OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENT.—

"(1) WAIVER OF REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.—Upon the request of any resident management corporation and public housing agency, and after notice and an opportu-

nity to comment is afforded to the affected tenants, the Secretary may waive any requirement established by the Secretary (and not specified in any statute) that the Secretary determines to unnecessarily increase the costs or restrict the income of a public housing project.

"(2) WAIVER TO PERMIT EMPLOYMENT.—Upon the request of any resident management corporation, the Secretary may, to the extent necessary to permit the employment of residents of the project, permit such residents to contribute a portion of their labor.

"(3) REPORT ON ADDITIONAL WAIVERS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1986, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth any additional waivers of Federal law that the Secretary determines are necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section. In preparing the report, the Secretary shall consult with resident management corporations and public housing agencies.

"(4) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may not waive under this subsection any requirement with respect to income eligibility for purposes of section 16 or rental payments under section 3(a).

"(e) OPERATING SUBSIDY AND PROJECT INCOME.—

"(1) CALCULATION OF OPERATING SUBSIDY.—Notwithstanding any provision of section 9 or any regulation under such section, and subject to the exception provided in paragraph (3), the portion of the operating subsidy received by a public housing agency under section 9 that is allocated to a public housing project managed by a resident management corporation shall not be less than the public housing agency per unit monthly amount provided in the previous year as determined on an individual project basis.

"(2) CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.—Any contract for management of a public housing project entered into by a public housing agency and a resident management corporation shall specify the amount of income expected to be derived from the project itself (from sources such as rents and charges) and the amount of income funds to be provided to the project from the other sources of income of the public housing agency (such as operating subsidy under section 9, interest income, administrative fees, and rents).

"(3) CALCULATION OF TOTAL INCOME.—

"(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the amount of funds provided by a public housing agency to a public housing project managed by a resident management corporation may not be reduced during the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1986 (or on any later date on which a resident management corporation is first established for the project).

"(B) If the total income of a public housing agency (including the operating subsidy provided to the public housing agency under section 9) is reduced or increased, the income provided by the public housing agency to a public housing project managed by a resident management corporation shall be reduced or increased in proportion to the reduction or increase in the total income of the public housing agency, except that any reduction in operating subsidy that occurs as a result of fraud, waste, or mismanagement by the public housing agency shall not affect the funds provided to the resident management corporation.

"(4) RETENTION OF EXCESS REVENUES.—

"(A) Any income generated by a public housing agency (other than investment

income or rental income) that exceeds the income estimated for purposes of calculating operating subsidies according to the performance funding system established under section 9 shall be excluded in subsequent years in calculating operating subsidies.

"(B) Any income generated by a resident management corporation of a public housing project that exceeds the income estimated for purposes of this subsection shall be excluded in subsequent years in calculating (i) the operating subsidies provided to the public housing agency under section 9; and (ii) the funds provided by the public housing agency to the resident management corporation.

"(C) Any revenues retained by a public housing agency or resident management corporation under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be used for purposes of improving the maintenance and operation of the public housing project, for establishing business enterprises that employ residents of public housing, or for acquiring additional dwelling units for lower income families.

"(f) RESIDENT MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—

"(1) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—To the extent budget authority is available for section 14 or 20, the Secretary shall provide financial assistance to resident management corporations or resident councils that obtain, by contract or otherwise, technical assistance for the development of resident management entities, including the formation of such entities, the development of the management capability of newly formed or existing entities, the identification of the social support needs of residents of public housing projects, and the securing of such support.

"(2) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—The financial assistance provided under this subsection with respect to any public housing project may not exceed \$100,000.

"(3) FUNDING.—Of the amounts available for financial assistance under section 14 or 20 for fiscal year 1987, the Secretary may use not more than \$1,500,000 to carry out this subsection."

Mr. FAUNTROY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, one of the most commonly heard complaints about public housing residents is, "Why don't they take better care of the properties we provide them?" That is an understandable sentiment because most Americans espouse the virtues of tenants and homeowners alike taking care of the units in which they live.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of several public housing projects in our country have seriously embraced the virtue of pitching in to keep up the properties in which they live. They have said to their public housing authorities, "By golly, give us a chance and we will go to work managing and maintaining our own units, and we will do a better job than the bureaucrats."

And you know what, Mr. Chairman? They have done just that with remarkable results.

Let me give you this example of the unit right here in our Nation's Capital, Kenilworth-Parkside public housing project, which for nearly 25 years has been similar to many big city public housing projects, many of its residents had failed to pay their rent regularly, the property was run down, overflowing trash dumpsters housed rats, and vacant apartments became the play places of drug dealers and drug addicts.

But in 1979 Kimi Gray, an active tenant leader at the Kenilworth-Parkside public housing project, convinced the District of Columbia government to allow the tenants to take control.

In March 1982, after a 2-year training program, the residents formed a nonprofit corporation to assume management of their own units. The results, Mr. Chairman, have been nothing short of amazing after 4 years of operation.

Rent collections have increased by 179 percent; onsite administrative costs have gone down by 60 percent; routine maintenance costs have declined by 20 percent.

And with the savings that they have been able to put other public housing residents to work in a day care center services that have been made available free for other residents. They have been able to take 132 of their residents off of public assistance, making them taxpayers, each averaging \$300 per year in taxes for the District government alone. Beyond that, they have been able to save, on a projected basis over the 10-year period, \$4.5 million in public funds.

And Mr. Chairman, Kenilworth-Parkside is not unique. The B.W. Cooper tenant management corporation in New Orleans, LA, has reduced 3,000 outstanding service requests to zero, employing residents as repair persons. The Cochran tenant management corporation in St. Louis has cut vacancies by 500 percent and created 350 new jobs for tenants.

At the Bromley-Heath tenant management corporation in Boston they established a community security force with their savings, paying what we call in the vernacular the "baddest dudes" in the project to be security officers. As a result they were able to reduce crime by 77 percent.

So the amendment which Mr. KEMP joins me in offering now to provide three things that these pilot tenant management ventures have taught us are necessary to enable more public housing tenant groups to put their own residents to work taking care of their own units.

The first is that it provides for the training and preparation of tenants to manage their own units. You cannot expect tenants to take over without

the kind of training that this amendment provides.

Second, it allows tenant management corporations to utilize the savings they realize for approved self-help projects in their units. For example, with the savings they can then put their own residents to work at a free a day care center, establish a tenant-run security force, all of which improve the quality of life. Third, it permits the residents who are employed by a resident management corporation to contribute a portion of their labor in performance of their jobs.

It is on this question that I am sure all of you have been visited with letters and representations that this amendment ought to be opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the District of Columbia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FAUNTROY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. FAUNTROY. All of my colleagues have received correspondence to the effect that you ought to oppose the Fauntroy amendment for the reasons that it forces existing employees out of work. The fact is that that is not the intent; it never was the intent. Indeed, Government workers did leave Kenilworth-Parkside, but they went to work at other project areas where they were desperately needed. There is no public housing authority in this country that could not use additional workers. And these additional workers were made available.

Indeed in the District of Columbia we have such a shortage of staff to maintain units that we lost millions of dollars a few years ago because we could not service them with the limited staff available.

This measure in fact allows those present employees to be assigned to other projects run by the public housing authority. I am sure that those of you who will follow this debate and hear the amendment which my colleague from Connecticut, Mr. MORRISON, is about to make to our amendment, will understand that this is clear by the language that I am prepared to support, after some colloquy to make sure that it tracks with my intent.

The issue here is not whether you support or oppose Davis-Bacon. The issue is whether you are for or against people in public housing being able to manage and maintain their own units in a fashion that not only benefits and improves the quality of life for them but also saves money as this project has saved in Washington, some \$4.5 million for the District government in its effort to meet the needs of those who are on public assistance.

I hope you will vote for my amendment. I hope the next time you hear somebody say "Why don't they take

better care of their units?" that you won't have to reply "because I won't let them. I voted against the Fauntroy amendment. I hope you will be able to say "I made it possible because I voted for the Fauntroy amendment."

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I yield to my colleague from New York, the gentleman is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I not only appreciate the gentleman's leadership but also his courage in helping to try to change the status quo in public housing. This is not anti-public housing. It is simply the recognition that ultimately if public and private housing are to succeed, it is going to take the interests of people who are involved at the community level.

The gentleman and I had the opportunity along with other Members of Congress in a unique bipartisan coalition to go to Kenilworth-Parkside. Just last month the Delegate from the District of Columbia and I had the opportunity to visit Kenilworth-Parkside and be with Kimi Gray and Mayor Barry's representative from the public housing authority in the District of Columbia.

Let me say as a Member of Congress from upstate New York it was one of the most remarkable opportunities that this Member of Congress has ever had to watch people take not only an interest but a very active involvement in the repairs, the modernization, the expansion of jobs, job training and to take over those projects from daycare centers to the co-op store that Kimi Gray has successfully managed, and to watch that being done not only in the District of Columbia but in St. Louis; Newark, NJ; and other parts of this country. In all these areas, tenants of public housing projects are managing their own projects and improving the quality of life and ultimately, hopefully, as the gentleman pointed out, bringing down the cost of operating public housing.

I think it is one of the most positive signals going on in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the District of Columbia has again expired.

(On request of Mr. KEMP and by unanimous consent, Mr. FAUNTROY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I would be happy to yield further to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was particularly impressed on our visit, to hear firsthand how welfare dependency had been reduced, crime had been reduced, the

quality of life had been improved, jobs had been created.

As the gentleman pointed out, none of us are interested in replacing existing jobs. We want to give folks an opportunity to repair, to pick up, to clean up, to refurbish, to do what was done in the 19th century when we had a homesteading act. This is, in my view, fitting into this whole concept of urban homesteading. We can provide opportunity for folks to have and to manage their own properties, their own housing, to give them a stake in that dream that all of us share irrespective of our color, culture, creed, or political philosophy. The gentleman of the District of Columbia, in my view, is to be commended. It has been a pleasure to work with him on this.

□ 1440

I want to commend the gentleman for his leadership and, again, I am rising in strong support of this effort to turn around the thinking and the fear in the inner city that they cannot have the same quality of life, the same hope, the same opportunity, the same answer to their problems that is wanted by every single American, indeed every human being.

I look forward to supporting the Morrison amendment, which I think will make a constructive suggestion, a constructive approach to our amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the friendship and leadership of the Delegate from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I want to extend my appreciation to the gentleman from New York for his kind support, because, at heart, this issue is not one of Democrats versus Republicans or conservative versus liberal, but it is a question of whether or not we want to invest in the least of these God's little ones in the public housing units and recognize their right and their desire to participate in improving the quality of their own lives.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the Delegate from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY], and by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP], which I might add is similar to a provision in my substitute and similar to an amendment which I offered in the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and which was adopted.

Mr. Chairman, there is substantial room for improvement in the management of public housing, especially in some of our large cities. Maintenance is poor, vandalism is rampant, and vacancies are extensive. A variety of alternative approaches to traditional management have been explored, including management by private management companies under contract with the public housing agency. One

approach that has been undertaken with great success in some cities is management by project residents themselves. Under resident management, a public housing agency contracts with a corporation comprised of project residents or one more mutually agreed upon management responsibilities.

Resident management is not a new concept. Tenant groups in such diverse locations as Boston, St. Louis, New Orleans, Louisville, Jersey City, and Washington, DC, have demonstrated over the past 10 years that resident management can work if the residents and the public housing agency work together.

Other resident management groups report similar successes in improving social services, eliminating extensive vacancies, cutting maintenance backlogs, and reducing crime. Some of the existing groups have gone beyond management into such business ventures as day-care centers, catering services, and development of additional low-income housing. Certainly, Kimi Gray's Kenilworth Park facility clearly has demonstrated these enterprising developments.

Resident management offers other tangible and intangible benefits as well. Increased resident participation and involvement can lead to an enhanced sense of community and community pride, which in turn can result in improved living conditions and lower operating costs. The hands-on training experience that residents gain can lead to new job opportunities and economic self-sufficiency.

This amendment is intended to assist these existing groups as well as residents of other public housing developments who are interested in managing their own units. It would provide assistance in establishing a resident management corporation, waiver of certain administrative requirements that hinder the operations of the corporation by unnecessarily increasing project costs or restricting income, and financial assistance to resident groups to develop management capability. In addition, excess revenues could be used to improve the project, to establish business enterprises, or to acquire additional dwelling units for lower income families.

This amendment is needed to support recent resident-management initiatives by HUD, private organizations such as the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, public housing agencies, and public housing residents to facilitate resident management where there is local interest. It does not require resident management in all public housing or interfere with the current role of public housing agencies in managing public housing. What it does do is provide much-needed support to the ongoing initia-

tives in this area and encourage additional resident management ventures in other projects in the cities in which it is currently underway and in other cities as well.

Let's give these groups a chance. I urge my colleagues' support.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOWLER). The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. COURTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WYLIE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYLIE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my colleagues from New York and Washington, DC, is surely a radical breakthrough. It is radical the way the old homestead bill after the Civil War was radical. Back then we gave thousands of impoverished immigrants and Americans an opportunity they could hardly have imagined they would ever have, a chance to own their own piece of property on the frontier and to extend the boundaries of civilization westward. Like that breakthrough program, this amendment does much the same thing in America's inner cities.

The terms of this proposal are generous, allowing poor residents of public housing to buy a modest apartment or housing unit at a mere 25 percent of its value, no down payment and a guaranteed low-rate mortgage. The secret of this privatization idea is that it provides a major new incentive for the poor to take advantage of employment opportunities to make this lifetime chance at the American dream a real possibility.

I don't come from a district with a great deal of public housing, but New Jersey has any number of inner-city areas that desperately need an alternative to public tenement homes. Any Member of this body from an inner-city district knows perfectly well how much time and effort you and your staff are spending on problems of conflicting residency claims, nonpayment of rents, nonresponding bureaucrats, and on all the social problems associated with living in a residential area describable in one word: "despair."

What exactly is the problem? Some blame the public housing authorities, but the problem isn't really that. Like most public employees, the authorities staffs are conscientious but they are literally swamped by the flood of complaints and problems. Nor is it the residents who are the problem. They don't like living with broken windows, littered halls, elevators that don't work, and drugs everywhere you look any more than anyone else—and in

truth the residents want to get out as soon as possible. For them, public housing projects are not a home; they are more than a little like a jail.

I have just returned from a trip to the Soviet Union. Public housing there, of course, by definition is the rule, not the exception. One thing you notice about Moscow high rises is that they are all in conditions of terrible disrepair—broken windows, collapsing steps, shoddy maintenance—all of Moscow looks like an American inner-city public housing project. And it's not just poor Russians who live there—some have fairly good incomes. Poverty per se has little to do with the problems of upkeep.

The real problem is that public property is no one's property—it is what used to be called a common—where no one has any incentive to improve the situation. With this amendment we want, for the first time, to offer residents something new, a reason for having pride in their own homes, a reason to take hope instead of despair.

Let's be clear about a few things some of my colleagues might be legitimately concerned about. This proposal puts no one out of their home. Anyone who can't or doesn't wish to take advantage of the offer to buy will remain there as long as they want, just as before. This proposal is not an effort to eliminate public housing for the needy. It does nothing to prevent Congress from meeting the need for more public housing in the future.

All we are trying to do is provide an alternative for those who can take advantage of it, for the working poor. It may well be that this private home of their own will be the greatest asset the working poor will ever have in their lives, it will be the one thing they can really be proud of. Just think about the effect of private home ownership and the pride it represents on the children of the poor, what it means to them in self-respect and in building character, future-orientation, and the desire to save and invest. I believe this is one opportunity for blacks and minorities in our inner cities that Congress must not turn down.

This shouldn't be a partisan question—indeed the sponsors of this amendment are a conservative Republican and a Democrat. But let me say this frankly to my colleagues: If we vote this measure down, and the urban poor perceive that one party wanted them to own their homes and the other stopped them, there will be a lot of explaining to do in the inner cities come November. I think this is an idea whose time has come—it has worked tremendously in Britain, one of the few Thatcher measures, let me say, that has worked for the poor—and it is time we let it work for the poor of America.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement. The

gentleman has summed it up very well with an excellent statement.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are indebted, too, to Kimi Gray and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] for taking the leadership role that the gentleman did in the tour of the Kenilworth Park facility and in encouraging all members of our Subcommittee on Housing to incorporate this amendment in any bill on housing which came out of the House Banking Committee. So I would also, as I say, compliment Chairman GONZALEZ for his leadership role in this effort.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 4746, the housing authorization bill, offered by my colleagues WALTER FAUNTROY, and JACK KEMP to promote tenant management of public housing projects. Earlier this year I introduced a bill which was very similar to the Fauntroy-Kemp amendment and I believe the concept not only makes sense from an economic standpoint but from a humanitarian standpoint as well.

For too long the prevailing attitude in this Congress has been that low-income people are not capable of taking care of themselves. Therefore massive bureaucracies have been erected to run their lives for them, resulting in inefficiency and waste of the taxpayer's money. I believe this legislation will contribute to reversing these negative trends.

The Fauntroy-Kemp amendment would promote the transfer of the day to day management of a public housing project away from the local housing authorities and would place it with tenant management organizations that have agreed, and are capable of, taking on the responsibility.

It has been proven that tenant management of public housing is an effective way to address the traditional ills that plague these projects, which are a result of bureaucratic mismanagement and tenant apathy. In some projects rent collection increased by as much as 60 percent, the cost of ordinary maintenance dropped 25 percent and administrative costs decreased by as much as 60 percent. The savings in administrative costs are particularly significant in that these excess funds were then put back into the projects for improvements. In addition, it was proven that by allowing the tenants to control their own living arrangements, they adopted a sense of pride and responsibility for their surroundings. The results were dramatically improved living conditions, lower crime rates and less Government dependency by the tenants themselves.

In addition to the social benefits of tenant management programs in public housing, the economic realities of today make this a very worthwhile idea to pursue. I believe that in the face of the present budget restraints, we have an obligation to both the taxpayers and the recipients of public funds in this country to make sure that their resources are used in as an effective and efficient way as possible. This amendment would be an important step to make sure that these goals are met and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. Chairman, public housing grants are often poorly managed investments.

Federal money is quickly rushed to the hot spots, the embarrassments.

Time and time again Federal money is sent to a housing project which attracted notoriety or negative attention because of violent crime, major drug busts or some other unfortunate incident. The current system rewards losers, those housing projects with major problems that no amount of tax dollars can solve.

This amendment is designed to spur internal development, to help people help themselves. We hope to encourage people to take control of their own homes, their own communities and their own lives.

We have all heard distressing statistics like this one from the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise: despite the 25-fold increase in Government spending on welfare and poverty programs; one third of the black community is in grave danger of becoming a permanent underclass. This amendment is a bold attempt to free the innercity resident from Government dependence while simultaneously freeing the taxpayers from an expensive, unproductive burden.

Last year, I hosted a briefing along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] on the concept of resident management for public housing. We were honored to have as our guest Kimi Gray of the Kenilworth-Parkside complex here in Washington. At that time my suspicions regarding the huge problems of public housing were confirmed. We need to allow people to manage their own lives, instead of forcing them to be dependent upon massive Federal giveaways.

The concepts of local control and self determination are often the subject of heated debate here on the floor of the House, yet they are more often ignored. The most effective way to help the poor and disadvantaged is through locally based efforts encouraging individual initiative, rooted in the free enterprise system.

I would like to repeat some of the points raised by the Council for a Black Economic Agenda: Those most affected by problems must be active participants in the solutions to those problems: strategies should be solution, as opposed to problem oriented; development should replace maintenance; strategies should represent positive sum, as opposed to zero sum solutions; strategies should be based on the strengths of self-help resources in the local community; and cost effective strategies should replace massive infusions of Federal funds.

This amendment embodies all of these concepts.

Finally, this amendment will lead to greater control over one's life, a break from continued dependence upon the Federal Government or any other institution. Successful resident management programs lead to eventual home ownership, the so-called American dream. This amendment will make the dream a reality for thousands of Americans. We cannot, in good conscience, oppose this very basic concept.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure. It sets up a far more equitable distribution of Federal funds. We will be investing taxpayers' dollars, not using them to cover up mistakes or disasters in public housing. We need

to encourage success and innovation rather than dependence and despair.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORRISON OF CONNECTICUT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAUNTROY

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut to the amendment offered by Mr. FAUNTROY: Page 1, line 7, delete the words "encourage increased" and insert "establish a pilot program" in lieu thereof.

Page 1, strike lines 12 and 13 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"(1) permitting tenants to volunteer labor subject to existing statutory and contractual obligations of the public housing agency;

Page 2, line 12, after the period, insert the following sentence: "The corporation shall be a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the state in which the project is located, and the tenants of the project shall be the sole voting members of the corporation."

Page 4, line 1 after the period, insert the following sentence: "The contract shall be treated as a "contracting out" of services and shall be subject to any provision of a collective bargaining agreement regarding "contracting out" to which the public housing agency is subject."

Page 5, strike lines 8 through 10, and insert the following in lieu thereof: "may, subject to applicable collective bargaining agreements, permit residents of such project to volunteer a portion of their labor."

Page 5, line 22, strike the word "or" and insert a comma in lieu thereof.

Page 5, line 23, strike the period and insert the following in lieu thereof: "tenant or applicant protections, employee organizing rights, or rights of employees under collective bargaining agreements."

Page 8, line 20, insert the words "up to fifteen" after the word "to".

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to say that I want to commend the Delegate from the District of Columbia for pressing his initiative in the area of tenant management. I think this is an initiative that has broad support here in the House and broad support in this country. It is a direction in which we ought to move to the extent that we can do so responsibly. I think it has been the gentleman's intention to do so in an orderly and responsible way, with full respect to the rights of tenants and to the rights of workers who are employed in current public housing facilities.

The gentleman and I have had discussions over the last several days about ways of making more explicit in the gentleman's amendment these

concerns with respect to tenant and worker protections.

I offer this amendment and, as I said earlier, I hope to have the gentleman's support with respect to this amendment, to clarify exactly what will and what will not be done with respect to this amendment.

□ 1450

First of all, it is the gentleman's expressed intention that this should start as a pilot project in terms of the funding. It is limited to \$1.5 million. It is allocated to no more than 15 housing authorities, at \$100,000 apiece. And my amendment merely makes this pilot project explicit that it is limited to up to 15 projects.

Beyond that, there are a number of waivers that are authorized in this legislation. My amendment narrows the scope of these waivers because there is a concern with the language in the original amendment that it is too broad and subject to misinterpretation. It narrows it in a number of ways. First of all, it makes clear that the volunteer labor is what is permitted from residents. This does not amend or remove existing legislation with respect to wages or other worker protections, but workers in residence in these facilities are able to volunteer additional time to lower the cost of operation of the project.

Second of all, with respect to any waivers, the tenants affected, notice and an opportunity to comment will be granted to the affected tenants when waivers are being sought, so if the tenants in a project have a problem, it can be brought to the Secretary's attention. That tenant and applicant protection that exists under current HUD regulations will be preserved, and the rights of workers to organize and the rights under existing collective-bargaining agreements will be preserved.

Finally, this amendment makes clear that with respect to entering into a contract between the public housing agency and the tenant management corporation, that existing applicable collective-bargaining agreements regarding contracting out of services will apply with respect to any of these contracts that may be negotiated.

I do not believe that any of this amendment changes the thrust which is intended by the gentleman from the District of Columbia. In fact, I think the project to which he refers, which has been operated so successfully here in the District of Columbia, can be operated well within these guidelines. But these guidelines will protect against any overreaching in the spreading of this idea to other areas.

So I think that this is a perfecting amendment. I think it is one that is consistent with the spirit of tenant management and with the spirit of the

gentleman's amendment, and I hope that it can be accepted by the body.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to make clear one point. As I visited Kenilworth and as I have read the history and the story of other communities where this has been tried and tried successfully, one of the things that always seems to come through very clearly is the amount of time and work and maintenance that people put into their own homes, fixing windows, fixing the plumbing, the same thing you and I do when we go home on weekends, and a good deal of the impact of that on the human spirit and the pride and the satisfaction, just as I do when I get a leaky faucet to quit leaking. Your amendment protects the right to put this what we call sweat equity back into our own homes.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I am not sure I would call it sweat equity, since the folks involved really do not have equity, but sweat it certainly is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. What is involved here is volunteer time is permitted, it does not undercut other statutory protections, but it does explicitly recognize the right to volunteer one's time in one's own apartment or in another's apartment.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate this explanation.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman on several issues, to make sure that gentleman's amendment is consistent with our intent.

Obviously, we agree that with \$1.5 million appropriated for this purpose it is really a pilot, so I have no objection to calling it a pilot. Second, in your second item, you note that permitting tenants to volunteer labor subject to existing statutory and contractual obligations of the public housing agency. This does not preclude a tenant volunteering a portion as a part of his labor on his tenant job, does it?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. The key is volunteer. The key is it has got to be voluntary, and the required work hours are so protected by the statutory protections.

Mr. FAUNTROY. So that if a person works 6 hours and volunteered 2, he could do that, under this.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Second, the nonprofit corporation could in fact engage in for-profit activities, such as is done in Kenilworth and in other such demonstrations around the country, so long as the profits are then reinvested in services and programs within the project and do not go to individuals.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Yes; what we are talking about is a nonprofit corporation. It can accumulate income which would not be, legally speaking, profits, since it would not be distributed as dividends to shareholders, but rather retained by the corporation and reinvested in its activities, as most nonprofit and charitable organizations do, so that there is no prohibition on running activities. Of course, they would be subject to the Internal Revenue Code.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. With respect to the Internal Revenue Code, it has rules about which income is taxable and which income is not, and this does not purport to make any decisions about that, but as far as the corporate structure, they can earn income. Whether it is outside income or project income depends on the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I think I like the next part of your amendment because a misconception has been that tenant management throws existing public housing authority workers out of work. The fact is that no public housing agency in this county would suffer from two or three or more workers going to other projects. So I want to make sure that your language on contracting out allows for the existing public housing authority workers to be protected in their right to work, if not in that project, in another project run by the authority.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. That is very much the intention—the gentleman is correct—to see that people are not displaced, and also to see to it that whatever agreements the public housing agency has made under a collective bargaining agreement regarding contracting out will be followed when it contracts with the tenants management corporation.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I want to be very clear, because when you say "not displaced," there were public housing authority people who were collecting rents, who were repairing units at the Kenilworth and in all these others who, when the tenants took over, were replaced, that is, they were replaced

by tenant workers, and the authority then moved those people to other housing units under its direction and management. They honored their collective-bargaining agreements with them. That is the intent of this?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. That is the intent. It is the retention of the jobs, not necessarily the location of the jobs.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut.

I was prepared to speak earlier strongly supporting the amendment of the gentleman from the District of Columbia and the gentleman from New York, because I strongly support the resident management concept. I think what we are really talking about here is the flexibility of the resident management corporation to do one of the things that Kimi Gray and Kenilworth have demonstrated so successfully, and that is to creatively and constructively involve the residents of the public housing project itself directly in the management and performing many of the skilled functions that it takes to make that function.

If we encumber this legislation with baggage, with rules, with contractual rights that preexist, then I think we run the risk of perhaps defeating what it is we are really trying to achieve, which is not only the protection and enhancement of existing public housing, but the effect that it has upon the residents and involving them in overcoming the problems that exist in that public housing unit and participating in the solution to those problems. That involves not just volunteer activities, it involves jobs. And it involves granting the authority to the public housing, to the resident management corporation, to redirect the activities under a contract with the public housing authority.

If we encumber this process with preexisting contractual arrangements, then I think we are going to create obstacles in the way of the kind of initiative it is going to take to get these resident management corporations off the ground.

Rather than try to tinker with the legislation that has been proposed, in terms of this or that bargaining agreement, or what have you, could we not consider the fact that the creation of a resident management corporation is in and of itself a contracting out, under any existing labor agreement? It would have to be dealt with, if we let this bill go through clean, unamended. Then the complexities of working that out, if there is an existing agreement and a given public housing authority could be worked out in detail if in fact they have a candidate resident management corporation and can then

enter into an agreement that lets the process open up so that the residents can participate in that process rather than encumbering it at the outset with a set of prenegotiated rules that I think are going to be self-defeating.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed amendment to permit resident management programs whereby residents of public housing projects not only can have an increased say in the management of the facilities but may actually have the authority to run day-to-day operations. This amendment strikes at the heart of the challenge to enable people to regain self-reliance, avoid dependence and take control of their own lives.

This is an idea whose time has returned. It is not a radical proposal or even new. It is really a very longstanding fundamental principle. If provided the chance, people can solve their own problems. In these times of cost-consciousness and budget restraint, it does not require the creation of a massive new subsidy program. Both so-called liberals and conservatives can come together in their common purpose of providing adequate affordable housing and to do it in a way that potentially reduces the need by building self-reliance.

In recent decades, the American people have allocated billions of dollars in the construction of public housing. While we have been partly successful in alleviating the shortage of shelter for those in need, many residents of these projects, sadly, are trapped in conditions that destroy the incentive and capacity to shape their own living conditions. Our tax dollars have bought shelter, but they have not always provided low-income families with the environment to build pride and independence. Too often, our programs are based on the assumption that people can't help themselves. That assumption breeds dependency. This proposal is based on the assumption that people can help themselves. A key is participation with authority. Where leadership exists, residents can be afforded the authority to work to improve their living conditions and neighborhoods, we have to take that risk.

We have seen examples where this concept of resident management has succeeded such as the Kenilworth-Parkside project under the leadership of Kimi Gray. It has made a dramatic difference in the quality of life for the people and produced dramatic and positive results on project rent revenue, employment, crime rates and teenage pregnancies, to name a few. It has shown promise in diverse geographic settings from Massachusetts to Louisiana. While it is not a panacea, it can work elsewhere. I think it is vital today to provide the legislative mechanism to permit and encourage, but not require, resident management pro-

grams so that the housing program will not only provide housing, but enable people to develop themselves.

This amendment provides a limited program to encourage housing authorities to explore options that have succeeded elsewhere. Success can breed success and we owe it to our neighbors to try.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. First, I think that the gentleman may misunderstand the amendment that I have offered. The amendment in no way prevents the various things that tenants will be able to participate in as a result of tenant management. But it does recognize certain rights of other interested parties, workers and tenants.

Now, the fact that we elect the Congress of the United States does not mean that we ignore the rights of individuals who are governed by our actions. The fact that residents are going to elect a board to rule their corporation that is going to run the project does not mean that individual tenants do not have rights that have to be respected with respect to their living in that project. And this is really what is being recognized here. It is not baggage. It is precision with respect to these rights.

Mr. McMILLAN. Suppose that an unemployed resident in the unit that has some plumbing skill, for example, and the public housing authority has a union contract with the plumbers' union that governs that operation, would the resident management corporation be free to hire that individual?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. The resident management corporation would not be subject to a bargaining agreement with the public housing agency except as governed by rules relating to contracting out. There might be any number of agreements that are struck, depending on the local circumstance. Whether or not such a person could be hired will be determined by that set of local rules. This does not seek to resolve that local question. It merely says that whatever preexisting rules there are, because of existing collective bargaining agreements, will be respected, that this is a contracting out, which is really what the gentleman suggested in his earlier comments ought to be the case. That is what this amendment seeks to do, to make it clear that by passing this statute we are not overriding existing law and existing agreements.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not think we could override existing law, even if we chose to. I think those agreements are probably a matter of constitutional contractual right. But I do think we are talking about the flexibility of a

resident management corporation being able to employ the residents in that housing project, whether it is on a maintenance project or a new construction project or running the day-care center or operating a laundromat, or you name it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McMILLAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. McMILLAN. I think to the degree that we encumber that in a comprehensive jurisdictionwide negotiation, without having to enter in itself to a broad comprehensive agreement that may cover a hundred or thousand public workers in public housing across the whole district, I would rather see us be able to negotiate that out as a part of the contracting out provision, with high flexibility for the resident management corporation.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. If the gentleman will yield, I think if you will look carefully at the amendment, you will see that what you are asking for is exactly what the amendment does. It says that this is a contracting out, and then it leaves the details to the negotiations between the tenant management council of the tenant management corporation and the public housing agency, and the public housing agency may need to negotiate with its union that has a collective bargaining agreement in order to provide certain things that are being asked for by the tenant management corporation.

□ 1505

We are not deciding how any of those things come out; we are just assigning them to their logical and proper role under our system which is, if they are subject to bargaining, they will be bargained. If they are not subject to bargaining, people can go ahead and do whatever they please.

This says this is a contracting out, which I think is what the gentleman is suggesting. It is really not very complicated; it is quite straight-forward. I think if the gentleman would look closely at it he would not have an objection to the amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have been looking closely at it for the last 30 minutes, since I first saw it. You will forgive me if I am not quite sure on that point.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I understand.

Mr. McMILLAN. It should be, I would probably not have objection if I felt that that was absolutely certain; that we had that negotiating capability within a contracting out provision. Granted, it would have to be agreed to.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. If the gentleman would yield further, I think that really is the nature of the process. That is what contracting out involves. It involves negotiation, and it depends on what the local collective bargaining agreement is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McMILLAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McMILLAN. But would it be the gentleman's understanding that the contracting out would include an agreement between a public housing authority and a resident management corporation?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. That is the action which is the contracting out of certain services and gives rise to certain rights under collective bargaining agreements, and that is what this amendment says.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate both Mr. MORRISON and my friend from Washington, Mr. FAUNTROY, because I think what both of them are trying to do is to have a workable compromise on what, the spirit of which is a pretty forthright issue, and that is: Should we experimentally have some projects that are tenant managed, and Mr. FAUNTROY has had a very good experience in the city of Washington, DC.

In the city of Cleveland, my own hometown, we have had a good experience in that area. Frankly, in my hometown, it is one of the rays of hope as far as in the area of management, period. So there is something certainly very positive to be said about what happens when people take over the management and really are able to deal with the problems.

In other parts of the country, I have heard that they have not had the same good experiences but the larger issue beyond the fundamental issue that Mr. FAUNTROY was dealing with is indeed if there is any intention to usurp the existing contracts with some of the workers in the areas.

I think Mr. MORRISON's amendment is very thoughtful. I am pleased that the original author accepts the amendment. Let us not lose the spirit of what has happened here. We see a very wise compromise, and I think that we ought to go along with what the authors, I understand my friend from New York also accepts the compromise, are willing to do.

So if you vote down the Morrison amendment in effect you really are harming the original amendment that was offered by Mr. FAUNTROY from Washington along with his colleague from New York.

I hope that we can vote for the Morrison amendment and then pass the Fauntroy amendment and deal with the issue in that manner. I think it is a good signal that we can work on a compromise to get something done around here. I hope that we will not isolate each amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentlewoman has had a chance to study this and discuss this with the writers of both amendments. I am left with only one concern. My concern is the clarity of your language, and I might direct the question to the gentlewoman, but I am hoping that you have both checked and you have thought this through. I would hate to have us leave any language sufficiently unclear that we could precipitate any unnecessary litigation in the future.

I am sure that if that is anticipated, we could work on that.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that any piece of legislation is, of course, subject to being litigated. I think that, if anything, the amendment that I have offered seeks to avoid litigation by making clear what the intention of the sponsor of the original amendment was with respect to certain important tenant and worker rights.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, one of the purposes of my getting clarity on the record here was to assure that the intent of my amendment is carried out by this. I am satisfied that it is. I think the record is clear that our intention is to allow tenants to volunteer their labor and to protect the rights of existing employees who will be working not any longer at the project, but will be honored in terms of their collective bargaining agreements in other areas where the public housing authority is carrying out the contracts.

Ms. OAKAR. I would say that if you are for the Fauntroy-Kemp approach that allows for tenant management in a pilot project manifestation, then you will obviously not want to see that defeated. One way to ensure that that has a resounding vote is to support the Morrison amendment that indeed enhances and clarifies, as the distin-

guished author said, his original intent.

I hope that anyone who supports the concept of tenant management and at least allowing for a pilot project will support Morrison and then support the Fauntroy-Kemp approach, and then we can all say that we have succeeded in compromising and reaching an understanding.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the two gentlemen for their assurance; I thank the gentlewoman for her assurance. I appreciate your statement. I think you are exactly right, I would like to, if you would allow me, to join you in that hope for the passage of both amendments and associate myself with your remarks.

Ms. OAKAR. I appreciate that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a landmark occasion in housing. We are now bringing the tenants into a position of management control, and upkeep of their own property, and I think that is an exceedingly important development.

It took a long time to get here; we went through the usual misunderstandings, but all is well that ends well. I commend the floor manager, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MORRISON, and all those who see the wisdom of this important breakthrough, particularly the author, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY].

The one subject that still needs careful scrutiny is the contracting out concept. Now, to me, the strongest way that we can build up good public housing, well-kept and well-managed is to limit the amount of sticky fingers that middlemen and their companies can get into the pie.

I personally, have a grassroots concept of this amendment, and would like to see maximized the ability of the tenant managers to control and conduct the business of regulating and maintaining the housing they live in to the greatest extent possible. Obviously legal services cannot come from the tenants themselves, and there will be technical work and accounting that clearly the tenants themselves could not provide.

But the management decisions, the actual work, and sometimes the training that goes to learn the work, it seems to me, is what this clarifying amendment is all about; it is a new and major emphasis on the tenants' participation, control, and management. I would like the authors of the amendments to speak to my understanding of the proposals before us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield first to the author, Delegate FAUNTROY.

□ 1515

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons that I accepted the language offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] is that what the gentleman from Michigan references is what is precisely what is going on. Public housing authorities in Boston, in New Orleans, in Washington, DC, have contracted the responsibility for managing and maintaining the public housing units to tenant management corporations.

In discharging those responsibilities in each instance they have proved that they can do it more cost-efficiently. So I think that the gentleman's concern that there be no middle people here, that the tenants take over direct responsibilities is satisfied by my amendment. Of course, there may be the necessity from time to time to bring in expertise which is not available among the tenants, and that will be done in order to carry out the kind of cost-efficient operations that we are confident are going to result from the passage of this amendment, as amended.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the thing that I am trying to minimize is a company coming in, contracting with the tenants to take over the whole shebang, and that puts us back into the soup, because then you could end up in all kinds of misemployment and misdirection, and, of course, you could have aggrieved tenants as well. So those assurances are very good. We are on the same wavelength.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his support on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that is included in my amendment is clarity about the tenant management corporation being a nonprofit entity and having the tenants as the members, thereby exerting majority control over the conduct of the affairs of the corporation. I think that that adds to the concern that the gentleman has.

Mr. CONYERS. It certainly does, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY], which provides for tenant management.

I have three points to make about this main amendment that he has brought to the floor today. The first is, what this amendment seeks to do at its heart is to improve the status quo

of public housing, and to improve that status quo by allowing and encouraging and permitting the tenants, the residents themselves, to have a role in their own lives, to allow them to make choices, to allow them to have an opportunity to improve their own living conditions.

Tenant management works. Oh, I do not think that the gentleman offers tenant management as a panacea; it is not. It may not work in every case at every time in every circumstance. But it does work, and it can work, and it has worked in public housing authorities throughout this country. I have seen it work. The Delegate from Washington has seen it work. We have seen it work in the District of Columbia, in St. Louis, on the west coast, in the Sun Belt, and in the Northeast. We have seen it work in limited ways, and in very substantial ways, such as in Kenilworth, or in St. Louis.

In the long run tenant management is less costly to the Government itself, and provides better living conditions for the residents who live there. The fundamental decision is this: to achieve that understanding within Congress that tenants of public housing are not the problem. Tenants can be a part of the solution that the provision of livable public housing is the goal that tenants have, and if they are given an opportunity to be part of the solution, they will be a part of the solution.

I also want to say a word, Mr. Chairman, about the sponsor of this amendment, the Delegate from Washington, DC, Mr. FAUNTROY, because as many of us have watched this, as he has worked on this with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP], with Mr. KEMP's vision, and with the vision and the courage of the gentleman from Washington, DC, as many of us have watched this develop, it seems to me that Mr. FAUNTROY in many ways has written a new chapter in "Profiles in Courage."

He has been pushed on, pulled at, pressured by every interest group imaginable. It would have been easy for the gentleman to have backed down on key issues, but I want to tell this House that he stood firm, he would not budge, he represented his constituents well, and he brought this vision created by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] early on, he worked with Members on both sides of the aisle, and he represented his constituents to bring this vision of improved living conditions for public housing tenants to become a reality. I think that we all owe him a debt.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that I was going to be in the position where I would rise in support of this amendment, but I am glad to,

and I must commend the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP], for having gotten together and proposing to us two amendments that I think cleared up some of the problems that existed in my mind.

I may be in a position different from most of my colleagues who are Members of this House of Representatives, having been one who lived and reared a family at least for awhile in the public housing developments in Chicago, and having been one who represented people as a leader of a labor union where contracts and conditions under which they work are so awfully important.

I must say that there is one thing about these amendments that sort of leads to the tenor of discussion as I hear it that disturbs me a little bit. Tenant management, while it is a new approach, is by no means a cure-all for the problems as they exist today in the whole area of public housing.

I happen to represent a district that has some 70,000 residents who live in public housing. Unemployment among them ranks somewhere in the area of at least 40 percent, and it is greater than that among the youth who live there. Many of the people who are residents are single parents and exist as people on public assistance.

I do not want us as representatives of the Federal Government or Members of this House to draw any public conclusions, any conclusions at all, which even indicate that the responsibility of the Federal Government to help in the maintenance of these housing developments is any less than it has been in the past. As a matter of fact, we need more help from the Federal Government.

I have more vacant apartments in some of the housing developments in my area, I guess, than in any other section of the city where funds are needed in order to rehabilitate them and fix them so that people can live in them.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. As one of the cosponsors of the bill and as someone who has visited several of these projects, I just want to say on behalf of the minority that I totally agree with the gentleman's comments that the Federal Government must strengthen its obligation to maintain and keep up public housing. I want the gentleman to know that from my standpoint I strongly support the statement that he is making from the well of the Chamber, and I think all of us, left and right, agree with the state-

ment that he has made here so eloquently.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his position in this matter, because this helps to clear up some of the reservations that were in my mind.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman for the work that he has done, not just with his constituency, but across the Nation, for the poor, the working poor, and those who are left out in our society.

This is the first housing bill, I have been informed, that we have been able to get through in 5 years. Unfortunately there is probably no money for new low-cost housing, probably a reduction in maintenance funds, and so we are up against the wall. This pilot project becomes incredibly important under those circumstances, and I am sure that everyone appreciates the gentleman who has represented labor for so many years for coming on board in support of this amendment.

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his statement.

□ 1524

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am not going to take my full amount of time, Mr. Chairman, except to say that this is I think an important day. There is a very significant and dramatic coalition building up. I do not want to overdramatize it, but nevertheless, I do not want to allow it to be diminished in the eyes of those who may be listening, watching or reading, what it is that is happening. A number of Members on both sides of the aisle, folks who share perhaps a liberal or more liberal philosophy or conservative philosophy, are beginning to come together on a concept. Labor and capital, the public and private sector, inner city and suburb, Republican and Democrat, and liberal and conservative—all want to find a way to help advance the interest that we all have in creating in the lives of the poor and the less fortunate and perhaps the left out in many instances that shared dream so eloquently testified to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] early today and, of course, the Delegate from the District of Columbia, and by many Members of both sides of the aisle.

I do not want to lose sight of the Morrison amendment contribution and I compliment the gentleman from Connecticut for working out that compromise so important to what I hope and believe will be an overwhelming vote in favor of the Fauntroy-Kemp amendment.

I do not want to leave out the fact that one of the most important provisions in this whole process is that mentioned by Delegate FAUNTROY earlier that this will allow the resident management team to keep the savings that are made and have that reinvested in the type of project management so successful in Washington, DC, and Cleveland, as the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] mentioned, and St. Louis, Boston, and other parts of the country.

This is an important step. In my view, it is a precondition for another step that we ought to take. The gentleman from Texas earlier on was talking about urban homesteading, or in the case of the Nehemiah program, helping to convert to home ownership those people or folks who heretofore did not really have perhaps the opportunity without some help from the Federal Government.

I would like to suggest that we take this a step further when this is passed and take the Kemp-Fauntroy idea, and allow public housing residents the opportunity to become property owners by having the Federal Government allow those projects to be sold to the resident at some significant reduction in the market price, 75 percent in the case of the Fauntroy-Kemp bill and with one-third reduction in the cost of the mortgage interest rate, as an attempt to take some of that public housing stock and convert it into private housing.

I want to remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I really appreciate what has happened here today and hope that someday soon we can find a way to take the concept and develop more opportunity for people to buy into the property base of this country.

There is no doubt in my mind that each and every one of us in this body have a big stake in helping to create the pride, the dignity, the hope and the opportunity that goes along, not just with managing your own piece of property, but ultimately the American dream. The more the Federal Government can do to enhance the opportunity for people to buy or to purchase or to own their land, their home, their dwelling unit, their apartment, I think the better off we all are going to be and the more pride of ownership will manifest itself in the type of thing that Kimi Gray and the Kenilworth Parkside project have been able to reflect here in the District of Columbia.

So I hope my colleagues will overwhelmingly support the Morrison amendment. I congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut and thank my colleague from the District of Columbia. Let us make this the opening step in a project that can turn the American dream into reality in the inner city.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I do not want to be redundant, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to congratulate the sponsors of the amendment and say that I represent a district where there are probably more than 25,000 units of public housing, nearly 100,000 families who live in public housing, all shapes and forms, usually very large public housing projects, much larger than Kenilworth-Parkside, and with many more complex problems.

Whereas I congratulate the effort being put forth today, I would also like to enter a word of caution, and that is that this is a pilot and I hope we are not back here in 5 years condemning resident management because the pilot project becomes a project where we dump responsibilities on residents and expect them to perform miracles. The pilot project and all subsequent projects must have the support they need, the kind of resources they need. They must be able to hire as many accountants per unit as the parent housing authority. They must have the continued cooperation and support of the municipal authorities and public officials. Just as they are able to keep their profits and do what they wish with them, I hope they are not forced to keep their losses and be stuck with their losses. If there is some kind of catastrophic event, I assume and I hope that the parent authority and the local government will be ready to stand by them and help with that catastrophic event, like the massive repair of roofs necessary or water mains breaking or some kind of unusual occurrence that would put them in the red for a long time and wipe out their ability to manage the project.

I hope we will also understand there is no magic in management because it happens to be done by residents. There will be log rolling. There will be cronyism. There will be nepotism. All those things have to be taken into consideration, too. There has to be some kind of mechanism where disputes are negotiated.

I do not think any project in New York City has ever gone as far as this pilot project has gone, but there have been varying degrees of independence given to residents and I have seen many of the kinds of problems that result from that varied degrees of independence to manage some part of the program or the community center. There are many problems and I hope that the euphoria of the moment does not blind us to the fact that these projects require ongoing support.

Kenilworth-Parkside had 2 years of training. I recommend that the resident manager projects have that kind

of training always involved in the future and that we not dump these problems on them. I think the biggest problem with public housing throughout the country is that there has been hostility on the part of local officials toward public housing. They have not given them the kind of support they needed. They have been sabotaged in many places. I do not think that is true in the case of New York City. That is why you do not have in New York City any vacancies. You have a housing authority that has been very committed and they have done many of these kinds of things that the resident management groups will be expected to do.

I think we should go forward and have more experiments with resident management and do that with a full commitment to give them the support that they need to make it work.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. OWENS. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from New York, because this is probably the most appropriate observation made thus far in consideration of this issue.

I would also like to inform the gentleman that Kenilworth did receive a \$10 million modernization grant before anything could be done by the tenants. Before anything could be done to try to sell property to tenants, you first have to make sure that they will be assured the resources to enable them to keep them up if they acquire title; so these are most appropriate remarks. I really compliment the gentleman from New York for his insightful grasp of the dimensions of this issue and wish to say that we on our side accept the Fauntroy amendment, as amended by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his observations.

I would like to conclude by saying that I am all for this experiment. Let us go forward with it.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment being offered as a bipartisan effort to improve both the quality of many of our standard public housing projects and the quality of life of the residents of these projects.

Last year, as chairman of the Republican Study Committee, I chaired a hearing on tenant management at the Kenilworth-Parkside project here in Washington. All of the Members who attended that hearing were most impressed with the results that have been achieved at Kenilworth by a few dedicated people with pride and gumption and belief in themselves.

America has become the greatest Nation on Earth because it is the land of opportunity. Our citizens pride themselves on the fact that in America, you have the freedom to make your own way. The rewards are great if you succeed and the humanity and morality of our people is there to help if you fail. But, for many years now, people living in public housing projects in many parts of the country have not had the freedom to try, the freedom to succeed, and the freedom to control their own lives and their own dwellings.

Rat-infested, crime-ridden, school dropout inhabited housing projects across the land have become rundown and poorly maintained. Vacancy rates are high and climbing. Maintenance is poor and declining. In many cases, the rent is not even collected in housing projects. That is exactly what had happened at Kenilworth-Parkside until Kimi Gray and the tenant management program got control. Their example can show the rest of us what public housing should be.

Rent collections have more than doubled, crime has been cut in half, and the dropout rate has been reduced substantially. The housing units are now repaired on time and by quality workmanship. In fact, that repair work and many other jobs in the project are now done by tenants who are proud of these jobs and proud of the fact that they are now off the welfare rolls. They are succeeding in the best tradition of America. I am proud of them and I am glad that we have found the way to help people to help themselves.

The problem that Kenilworth faces and that the other public housing tenants across the country face is that this is now only a demonstration project. There is no provision in law that allows tenant management. Another problem is that all those thousands of extra dollars being collected in rent by Kimi Gray and the Kenilworth management automatically go straight to the local housing authority. Think about that for a minute and you will realize that this is nothing less than a travesty. It is a travesty because it amounts to a reward or a subsidy to the housing authority that failed these people. What kind of an incentive to succeed is there when part of your success rewards the Government agency that failed in its duty to you?

I believe that the tenant management authorities should be allowed to keep at least a percentage of the increase in rent collections that they achieve. That is what this amendment does and that is one of the most important reasons that I believe that it is a good and necessary amendment to the housing bill that we are considering today.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Fauntroy-Kemp amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is at all necessary to give the speech that I was prepared to give, nor is it necessary for me to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, already after the short time I have been here I have learned that there are times on the floor of the House when you can sense the mood of accord in the House.

I want to take just a moment to tell you about my personal experience with this issue. In 1978, I was not a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. I was driving through Oklahoma City and as I drove through the city, I saw what we called the projects, the public housing units. As I observed these units, I recognized that too many were in states of disrepair. Too many were not occupied.

I thought to myself, there ought to be a better way to do a better job to see to it that people have housing units that are in a good state of repair, well-occupied, and doing the job they were intended to do to house the American people.

I knew that somehow we were failing to do the best we could do with the resources we had already put in place. Intellectually, I have dealt with this issue. I have sought the answer in my mind to this issue and I found the answer almost a year ago today, on June 6, 1985, when I visited Kenilworth along with 14 of my colleagues. I found the answer in the words of Kimi Gray.

□ 1540

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this moment to congratulate the Delegate from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] for their work and their leadership. I know how much they have listened to Kimi Gray and to others around the Nation. I know how much they care. I know how much they have worked with others to work out the kinds of compromises that are necessary. I know how much they have invested both their hearts and their minds in this project, and it is because they listened to a better idea.

The wonderful thing about what we are doing today is that we are letting the people who live with the laws passed in this Chamber teach us how to do a better job for this Nation and for them.

I would just like to close, Mr. Chairman, by saying thank you, Kimi Gray, and all the residents of Kenilworth who showed us that doing it yourself, your own way, is the way to make

yourself happy and the Nation prosperous. Thank you, gentlemen, for listening.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement, and also remind the gentleman that a young man by the name of Bob Woodson had something to do with this, from the Center for Neighborhood Enterprise. Bob is one of those who has championed this idea for a long time. A lot of other folks from community-based action groups have had something to do with this bringing together the various coalitions on both sides of this aisle, and Bob is among those who were looking for new ideas and new ways of doing things to revitalize our inner cities.

I know the gentleman would not want this moment to pass without giving Bob, as well as Kimi, their due.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just close my remarks by saying I think it is time we ought to vote and we ought to enjoy seeing what, for me, is going to be the most exciting vote I will see as we vote "yes" to those people who have shown that if we give them a chance they will do it better for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The CHAIRMAN (during the quorum call). A regular quorum will now commence.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2, rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if or-

dered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 157]

Ackerman	Daub	Hillis
Akaka	de la Garza	Holt
Alexander	DeLay	Hopkins
Anderson	Dellums	Horton
Andrews	Derrick	Howard
Annunzio	DeWine	Hoyer
Anthony	Dickinson	Hubbard
Applegate	Dicks	Huckaby
Archer	DiGuardi	Hughes
Armev	Dixon	Hunter
Aspin	Donnelly	Hutto
Atkins	Dorgan (ND)	Hyde
AuCoin	Dornan (CA)	Ireland
Badham	Dowdy	Jacobs
Barnard	Downey	Jeffords
Barnes	Dreier	Jenkins
Bartlett	Duncan	Johnson
Barton	Durbin	Jones (NC)
Bateman	Dwyer	Jones (OK)
Bates	Dymally	Jones (TN)
Bedell	Dyson	Kanjorski
Bellenson	Early	Kaptur
Bennett	Eckart (OH)	Kasich
Bentley	Eckert (NY)	Kastenmeier
Bereuter	Edgar	Kemp
Berman	Edwards (CA)	Kennelly
Bevill	Edwards (OK)	Kildee
Biaggi	Emerson	Kindness
Bilirakis	English	Kleczka
Billey	Erdreich	Kolbe
Boehlert	Evans (IA)	Kolter
Boggs	Evans (IL)	Kostmayer
Boland	Fascell	Kramer
Boner (TN)	Fawell	LaFalce
Bonior (MI)	Fazio	Lagomarsino
Bonker	Feighan	Lantos
Borski	Fiedler	Latta
Bosco	FIELDS	Leach (IA)
Boucher	Fish	Leath (TX)
Boulter	Flippo	Lehman (CA)
Boxer	Florio	Lehman (FL)
Brooks	Foglietta	Leland
Broomfield	Foley	Lent
Brown (CA)	Ford (MI)	Levin (MI)
Brown (CO)	Ford (TN)	Levine (CA)
Broyhill	Fowler	Lewis (CA)
Bruce	Frank	Lewis (FL)
Bryant	Franklin	Lightfoot
Burton (CA)	Frenzel	Lipinski
Burton (IN)	Frost	Livingston
Bustamante	Puqua	Lloyd
Byron	Gallo	Loeffler
Callahan	Garcia	Long
Carney	Gaydos	Lott
Carper	Gejdenson	Lowery (CA)
Carr	Gekas	Lowry (WA)
Chapman	Gibbons	Lujan
Chappell	Gilman	Luken
Chappie	Gingrich	Lundine
Cheney	Glickman	Lungren
Clay	Gonzalez	Mack
Clinger	Goodling	MacKay
Coats	Gordon	Madigan
Coble	Gradison	Manton
Coble	Gray (IL)	Markey
Coelho	Green	Marlenee
Coleman (MO)	Gregg	Martin (NY)
Coleman (TX)	Guarini	Martinez
Collins	Gunderson	Matsui
Combust	Hall (OH)	Mavroules
Conte	Hall, Ralph	Mazzoli
Conyers	Hamilton	McCain
Cooper	Hammerschmidt	McCandless
Coughlin	Hansen	McCloskey
Courter	Hatcher	McCollum
Coyne	Hawkins	McCurdy
Craig	Hayes	McDade
Crane	Hefner	McEwen
Crockett	Hefter	McGrath
Daniel	Hendon	McHugh
Dannemeyer	Henry	McKernan
Darden	Hertel	McKinney
Daschle	Hiler	McMillan

Meyers	Ritter	Stark
Mica	Roberts	Stenholm
Michel	Robinson	Stokes
Mikulski	Roe	Strang
Miller (CA)	Roemer	Stratton
Miller (OH)	Rogers	Studds
Miller (WA)	Rose	Stump
Mineta	Rostenkowski	Sundquist
Mitchell	Roth	Sweeney
Moakley	Roukema	Swift
Molinari	Rowland (CT)	Swindall
Mollohan	Rowland (GA)	Synar
Monson	Roybal	Tallon
Montgomery	Rudd	Tauke
Moody	Sabo	Tauzin
Moorhead	Savage	Taylor
Morrison (CT)	Saxton	Thomas (CA)
Morrison (WA)	Schaefer	Thomas (GA)
Mrazek	Scheuer	Torres
Murphy	Schneider	Torricelli
Murtha	Schroeder	Towns
Myers	Schuetter	Trafficant
Natcher	Schulze	Traxler
Neal	Schumer	Udall
Nelson	Seiberling	Valentine
Nichols	Sensenbrenner	Vander Jagt
Nielson	Sharp	Visclosky
Nowak	Shaw	Volkmmer
Oakar	Shumway	Vucanovich
Oberstar	Shuster	Walgren
Obeys	Sikorski	Walker
Olin	Siljander	Watkins
Ortiz	Sisisky	Weaver
Owens	Skeen	Weber
Oxley	Skelton	Weiss
Packard	Slattery	Wheat
Panetta	Slaughter	Whitehurst
Parris	Smith (FL)	Whitley
Pashayan	Smith (IA)	Whittaker
Pease	Smith (NE)	Whitten
Penny	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Pepper	Smith, Denny	Wilson
Perkins	(OR)	Wirth
Petri	Smith, Robert	Wise
Pickle	(NH)	Wolf
Porter	Smith, Robert	Wolpe
Price	(OR)	Wortley
Pursell	Snowe	Wright
Quillen	Snyder	Wyden
Rahall	Solarz	Wylie
Rangel	Solomon	Yates
Ray	Spence	Yatron
Regula	Spratt	Young (FL)
Reid	St. Germain	Young (MO)
Richardson	Staggers	Zschau
Ridge	Stallings	
Rinaldo	Stangeland	

□ 1600

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred fifteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] for a recorded vote.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] insist upon his request?

Mr. KEMP. I demand a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—419

Ackerman	Applegate	Barnard
Akaka	Archer	McEwen
Alexander	Armev	Bartlett
Anderson	Aspin	Barton
Andrews	Atkins	Bateman
Annunzio	AuCoin	Bates
Anthony	Badham	Bedell

Bellenson Feighan
 Bennett Fiedler
 Bentley Fields
 Bereuter Fish
 Berman Flippo
 Bevill Florio
 Biaggi Foglietta
 Billirakis Foley
 Bliley Ford (MI)
 Boehlert Ford (TN)
 Boggs Fowler
 Boland Frank
 Boner (TN) Franklin
 Bonior (MI) Frenzel
 Bonker Frost
 Borski Fuqua
 Bosco Gallo
 Boucher Garcia
 Boulter Gaydos
 Boxer Gejdenson
 Brooks Gekas
 Brookfield Gibbons
 Brown (CA) Gilman
 Brown (CO) Gingrich
 Broyhill Glickman
 Bruce Gonzalez
 Bryant Goodling
 Burton (CA) Gordon
 Burton (IN) Gradison
 Bustamante Gray (IL)
 Byron Gray (PA)
 Callahan Green
 Carney Gregg
 Carper Guarini
 Carr Gunderson
 Chapman Hall (OH)
 Chappell Hall, Ralph
 Chappie Hamilton
 Cheney Hammerschmidt
 Clay Hansen
 Clinger Hatcher
 Coats Hawkins
 Cobey Hayes
 Coble Hefner
 Coelho Heftel
 Coleman (MO) Hendon
 Coleman (TX) Henry
 Collins Hertel
 Combest Hiler
 Conte Hillis
 Conyers Holt
 Cooper Hopkins
 Coughlin Horton
 Courter Howard
 Coyne Hoyer
 Craig Hubbard
 Crane Huckaby
 Crockett Hughes
 Daniel Hunter
 Dannemeyer Hutto
 Darden Hyde
 Daschle Ireland
 Daub Jacobs
 de la Garza Jeffords
 DeLay Jenkins
 Dellums Johnson
 Derrick Jones (NC)
 DeWine Jones (OK)
 Dicks Jones (TN)
 Dingell Kanjorski
 DioGuardi Kaptur
 Dixon Kasich
 Donnelly Kastenmeier
 Dorgan (ND) Kemp
 Dornan (CA) Kennelly
 Dowdy Kildee
 Downey Kindness
 Dreier Kleczka
 Duncan Kolbe
 Durbin Kolter
 Dwyer Kostmayer
 Dymally Kramer
 Dyson LaFalce
 Early Lagomarsino
 Eckart (OH) Lantos
 Eckert (NY) Latta
 Edgar Leach (IA)
 Edwards (CA) Leath (TX)
 Edwards (OK) Lehman (CA)
 Emerson Lehman (FL)
 English Leland
 Erdreich Lent
 Evans (IA) Levin (MI)
 Evans (IL) Levine (CA)
 Fawell Lewis (CA)
 Fazio Lewis (FL)

Lightfoot
 Lipinski
 Livingston
 Lloyd
 Loeffler
 Long
 Lott
 Lowery (CA)
 Lowry (WA)
 Lujan
 Luken
 Lundine
 Lungren
 Mack
 Madigan
 Manton
 Markey
 Marlenee
 Martin (IL)
 Martin (NY)
 Martinez
 Matsui
 Mavroules
 Mazzoli
 McCain
 McCandless
 McCloskey
 McCollum
 McCurdy
 McDade
 McEwen
 McGrath
 McHugh
 McKernan
 McKinney
 McMillan
 Meyers
 Mica
 Michel
 Mikulski
 Miller (CA)
 Miller (OH)
 Miller (WA)
 Mineta
 Mitchell
 Moakley
 Molinari
 Mollohan
 Monson
 Montgomery
 Moody
 Moorhead
 Morrison (CT)
 Morrison (WA)
 Mrazek
 Murphy
 Murtha
 Myers
 Natcher
 Neal
 Nelson
 Nichols
 Nielson
 Nowak
 Oakar
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olin
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Oxley
 Packard
 Panetta
 Parris
 Pashayan
 Pease
 Penny
 Pepper
 Perkins
 Petri
 Pickle
 Porter
 Price
 Pursell
 Quillen
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Ray
 Regula
 Reid
 Richardson
 Ridge
 Rinaldo
 Ritter
 Roberts
 Robinson
 Roe
 Roemer
 Rogers
 Rose
 Rostenkowski
 Roth
 Roukema
 Rowland (CT)
 Rowland (GA)
 Roybal
 Rudd
 Russo
 Solomon
 Spence
 Savage
 Saxton
 Schaefer
 Scheuer
 Schneider
 Schroeder
 Stenholm
 Schulze
 Schumer
 Seiberling
 Sensenbrenner
 Sharp
 Shaw
 Shelby
 Shumway
 Shuster
 Sikorski
 Siljander
 Sisisky
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Slattery
 Slaughter
 Smith (FL)
 Smith (IA)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith, Denny
 (OR)
 Smith, Robert
 (NH)
 Smith, Robert
 (OR)
 Snowe
 Snyder
 Solarz
 Soloman
 Spence
 Spratt
 St Germain
 Staggers
 Stallings
 Stangeland
 Stark
 Stenholm
 Stokes
 Strang
 Stratton
 Studds
 Stump
 Sundquist
 Sweeney
 Swift
 Swindall
 Synar
 Tallon
 Tauke
 Taulin
 Taylor
 Thomas (CA)
 Thomas (GA)
 Torres
 Torricelli
 Towns
 Traficant
 Traxler
 Udall
 Valentine
 Vander Jagt
 Vislosky
 Volkmer
 Vucanovich
 Waigren
 Walker
 Watkins
 Waxman
 Weaver
 Weber
 Weiss
 Wheat
 Whitehurst
 Whitley
 Whittaker
 Whitten
 Williams
 Wilson
 Wirth
 Wise
 Wolf
 Wolpe
 Wortley
 Wright
 Wyden
 Wylie
 Yates
 Yatron
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (MO)
 Zschau

NOES—1

MacKay

NOT VOTING—13

Breaux Fascell O'Brien
 Campbell Gephardt Rodino
 Chandler Grotberg Vento
 Davis Hartnett
 Dickinson Moore

□ 1610

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ROUKEMA

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROUKEMA: Page 114, line 23, strike out "whichever", and all that follows through line 24;

Page 115, line 1, strike "115 percent" and insert "90 percent";

Page 115, line 3, after "involved", add "except that in areas where such amount (90 percent of the area median income) is below 115 percent of the national median income, then 115 percent of the national median income will apply.".

Page 115, line 3, strike "or" and all that follows through "persons" on line 5.

Page 120, after line 17, insert the following new subsection:

(c) The Secretary shall require that a majority of the funds made available under this title for use within any metropolitan statistical area shall be available only for assistance to families whose incomes do not exceed 95 percent of the higher of are a median income or national median income.

Mrs. ROUKEMA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, we have just had a vote on whether or not to authorize the Nehemiah program. We have heard discussed several of the controversial issues within this proposal, and I now have at the desk an amendment which, I believe, will put the Nehemiah program under an economically viable targeting formula.

My amendment is very simple. What it would do is lower the income ceiling for eligibility for the Nehemiah Homeownership program from 115 percent of median income to 90 percent for all except those of median income. The effect of this change would be to target the Nehemiah program to those families that we should really be trying to help with our scarce housing resources: The lower to lower middle income families.

Now, at the start, I want to be very clear about this one thing. By authorizing Nehemiah for "such sums as may be necessary" and leaving the funding decisions to the Appropriations Committee, we are insuring that the money to fund Nehemiah will come out of other housing programs. In other words, don't think that you are getting something for nothing here. During committee markup of the original H.R. 1, the number that was discussed for Nehemiah was \$150 million. You know, and I know, that when the Appropriations Committee starts working on housing legislation, that \$150 million is going to have to come out of low-income housing programs, vouchers, section 8.

Mr. Chairman, it just does not make sense to create a new housing program that is going to subsidize homeownership for middle-income families—families that can afford to own their own homes without any Federal subsidy.

Let me run through a few statistics here that are quite revealing. As currently drafted, the Nehemiah eligibility ceiling of 115 percent of median income or national median income, whichever is higher, would permit families in Boston earning almost \$40,000 per year to receive a \$15,000 Federal subsidy. Can you imagine? Subsidizing a family whose income is \$40,000 per year?

On top of this, the State of Massachusetts already offers below-market interest rate mortgages to first-time homebuyers.

There are similar State- or city-run programs in Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Baltimore, and Cleveland. The list goes on and on.

Another interesting dilemma. A HUD field economist from Baltimore estimated that the 115-percent median income ceiling covers 60 percent of Baltimore's population. How are we to

determine who is to receive this subsidy and who is not? This same field economist suggested that the program could be targeted to lower income households without reducing its marketability.

Now, let me say that I think the Nehemiah program in New York has worked wonderfully. It's a project whose time has come—it combines private expertise and planning with public development support. Now the House has just demonstrated through the last vote that there is support for the Nehemiah program—but since it appears that we are going to start this new program, let's target it for those individuals who need our help.

Let me cite some more examples of what type of families the current draft with 115 percent of median income ceiling would allow to participate in this program. In Chicago, a family earning \$39,790 would qualify. In Detroit, a family earning \$37,375 would qualify. In Baltimore, a family earning \$36,110 would qualify for the Nehemiah program. In Los Angeles, the figure is \$34,730, and in Boston, families would qualify who are earning \$39,100. In fact, these families could qualify for the privately financed purchase of an \$80,000 to \$90,000 home. Now tell me, why should we be giving these people a \$15,000 subsidy?

One of the arguments I am sure we will hear against this amendment is that the Nehemiah proposal will rebuild inner cities by encouraging middle-income families to return to live there. But, Mr. Chairman, we already have other programs for inner-city development—UDAG, CDBG, HoDAG, are but a few examples of programs that serve to correct urban blight.

In conclusion, let me just say that although I have misgivings about starting any new subsidy program during this period of mandatory budget austerity, I will admit that this program, or some form of it, may have some promise. We all realize what a long journey it is for families hoping to realize the American dream of owning their first homes, hoping to break their dependency on the social services rolls, to break their dependency on being a renter in a blighted area. The purposes of this program are indeed noble: To rebuild blighted inner cities, and to encourage such rehabilitation by instilling in a lower income family the pride of homeownership, and thereby encouraging family stability and job security. But the point of this program must be to target to those who most need the help and still have an economically feasible project.

I ask my colleague from New York, the author of the Nehemiah program, if he will agree to this targeting formula?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Nehemiah program was drafted, I believe, quite carefully. It tried to deal with problems in certain city areas where housing costs were very high but median income was considerably lower. Therefore, while it was true that if you read the letter of the law and would find amounts of a certain few individuals could have actually incomes at quite a high level, it seemed to me it was worth doing to bring a few of those people into the projects. But the gentlewoman from New Jersey has pointed out that that number could actually cause Nehemiah to lose support in many various places, and therefore reluctantly I will go along with her amendment. I do not think it damages the program. The program will go forward.

It will mean that certain people in certain cities who were slightly above the median income will not be available to Nehemiah, and they will have to find housing elsewhere. But Nehemiah, while they might have been the icing on the cake in a Nehemiah type project, it might have been the local drug store owner or the local school teacher who, I feel, would be quite important to live in that project, the viability of the project, since the project will start out in an experiment mode, let us go with this as the gentlewoman from New Jersey has suggested, and if it does not work, we can always come back later and change it.

□ 1625

So I thank the gentlewoman for her kind words and her support of the basic program and, most importantly, for her efforts to improve the program.

I know that the hour is running late, and I will not speak any longer on this issue.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York and the gentlewoman from New Jersey in offering this amendment. I think the gentlewoman's amendment does in fact strengthen the Nehemiah program by targeting the program much more closely to lower-income families, and I think both of the Members of the body are to be commended.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKE-MAL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARPER

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARPER: Page 123, after line 17, add the following new title (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VI—PREVENTING FRAUD AND ABUSE IN DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 601. DISCLOSURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBER.

As a condition of initial or continuing eligibility for participation in any program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development involving loans, grants, interest or rental assistance of any kind, or mortgage or loan insurance, and to ensure that the level of benefits provided under such programs is proper, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may require that an applicant or participant (including members of the household of an applicant or participant) disclose his or her social security account number or employer identification number to the Secretary.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title, the terms "applicant" and "participant" shall have such meanings as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by regulation shall prescribe. Such terms shall not include persons whose involvement is only in their official capacity, such as State or local government officials or officers of lending institutions.

Mr. CARPER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer has to do with a procedure by which we may further reduce waste, fraud, and abuse in the programs covered by this bill.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development subsidizes over 2 million families under the section 8 program. The estimates are that at least 15 percent of these families are either totally ineligible or are receiving more assistance than is allowable because they simply do not disclose all their income.

It obvious to me, then, that we need a better approach on the part of HUD to detect these individuals, such as computer matching programs used by the States to identify food stamp fraud. The provisions of this proposal will help public housing agencies and HUD to better use housing resources for truly needy families.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply has the following effect: It would require applicants for housing and current tenants to provide their Social Security number as a condition for occupancy.

Unlike the Food Stamp Program, Social Security numbers cannot be re-

quired by HUD to check those who participate in housing programs. These are essential for public housing authorities to obtain information from State unemployment agencies on unreported income from wages. Authorizations are needed to allow for the verifications and auditing of the information they supply about their eligibility. Data on wages would not include any Federal income tax return information.

Mr. Chairman, I would also note that a companion piece of legislation which is under the jurisdiction of the House Ways and Means Committee, would require State unemployment agencies to cooperate with the PHA's and HUD in computer matching, on a reimbursable basis, which would be extremely important and very helpful. This provision, which is identical with the authority provided in the Food Stamp Program, would provide the major information source for identifying unreported income.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier that estimates are that at least 15 percent of subsidized families are either totally ineligible or are receiving more assistance than they are entitled to receive. According to a 1982 projection by the Office of the Inspector General, \$200 million is being spent for tenants who are totally ineligible for assistance or who are receiving subsidies in excess of what they are entitled to receive.

Two current examples of this widespread abuse of underreporting income are:

Pleasant Homes, Seat Pleasant, MD: Twenty tenants were convicted of making false statements or conspiring to defraud HUD in the rental assistance program. Sixteen of the tenants, including six Federal employees, were sentenced for submitting false statements about their family composition or income to obtain \$93,873 of assistance they were not entitled to receive.

Damen Courts Apartments, Chicago, IL: Eighteen tenants of the Damen Courts Apartments, a modern and well-maintained Chicago, IL, complex, pled guilty or were convicted on 48 counts of submitting false statements to HUD. The tenants, 12 of whom were public employees, including a former special assistant to the Chicago Regional Administrator for HUD, falsified information relating to their incomes and employment between 1981 and 1985 in order to obtain \$172,000 of section 8 rental assistance moneys they were not entitled to receive. In some instances, the individuals had annual incomes of as much as \$43,000 which, if declared would not have made them eligible for participation in the section 8 program.

In essence, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to provide HUD and the PHA's an opportunity to better identify fraud, waste,

and abuse in eligibility, and in the reporting of income. It provides assistance to those who need it and stops others from abusing it. I urge adoption.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is essential for programs to prevent fraud and waste be made part of every program and that they be put forward with the enthusiastic support of those of us who believe in the program. Providing decent public housing for low-income people is in no way antithetical to good antifraud and antiwaste provisions. In fact, they go to the same goal.

So I congratulate the gentleman for proposing an amendment, the merits of which are self-evident.

I hope I will set a good example by not talking anymore.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is nice to find an amendment that those of us on both sides of the aisle and all sides of the political spectrum can agree on. I certainly commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. It is an important one that could, as the gentleman pointed out, save as much as \$200 million a year, not off the backs of the people who are poor and off of those who we want targeted for these programs, but \$200 million from people who are not supposed to be eligible for these programs, to make sure that the money is available to those who ought to be receiving these programs.

As the gentleman has pointed out, that is what these programs are designed for, for those who have a need for publicly assisted housing. And to the extent that somebody who is not eligible is using that housing, then we are denying somebody who has a real need for that housing in achieving it.

So I commend the gentleman from Delaware for offering this. I think this is an amendment that every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle can support, and I certainly do enthusiastically.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware has expired.

(On request of Mr. WYLIE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CARPER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Delaware's [Mr. CARPER] amendment which provides for disclosure of Social Security numbers from participants in HUD programs as a condition of initial or continuing eligibility.

This issue was brought to our attention by our colleague from Florida, Mr. CHAPPELL, back in 1983. The Housing Subcommittee also conducted a hearing on this matter in November of 1983.

Although the amendment before us today is not the full loaf it is a step in the right direction and Mr. CARPER should be commended for the leadership he has shown on this issue in working with Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. I am sure Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI will also work in a cooperative manner to resolve any outstanding issues so as to provide for full income verification through use of computer matching programs which are presently in place in several States.

Mr. Chairman, the inspector general of HUD estimates that with the complete implementation of this amendment it will save \$200 million per year. I want to emphasize Mr. Chairman that this is not \$200 million which will be returned to the Treasury. It is not cruel and heartless deficit reduction on the backs of the poor. Rather, it is a way to help those who most need our help. The \$200 million is going to be taken away from some people who are not being truthful about the amount of their income and are therefore getting Federal assistance to which they are not entitled; and then that \$200 million will go to the people who we think we are helping when we pass Federal assistance programs.

Every Member of this House should be in favor of this provision because it stops cheaters and it helps people who need our help.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when the Federal deficit is of paramount concern and when the resources to help the needy of this country are feeling a pinch, we have an obligation to take steps to ensure that those who need it most receive our assistance.

That is precisely what this proposal does and I urge its adoption.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is really an excellent amendment. It is a breath of fresh air to find a proposal like this which is direct, fair, precise, and effective. This amendment actually will do something to prevent waste, fraud and abuse. Abuses which have resulted in millions of lost dollars.

This amendment authorizes HUD to require applicants and participants in HUD programs to provide their Social Security numbers as a condition of initial or continuing eligibility for participation.

Some of my colleagues may recall the recent Baltimore Federal grand jury indictment of 21 tenants of an assisted housing project in Seat Pleasant, MD. The tenants were indicated for falsifying income information in order to qualify for Federal rent subsidies. It was reported that overpayments made by HUD to the tenants exceeded \$200,000.

Unfortunately, this is not an isolated incident. Such overpayments have been documented in reports by the GAO and the HUD inspector general. A GAO review of six HUD programs estimated that overpayment of assistance in 1979 totaled \$867 million, including \$42 million in HUD's section 8 program. The HUD inspector general has estimated that at least 12 percent of the tenants in the section 8 program fail to report their full income, and currently, overpayment for all subsidy programs may be as high as \$200 million annually.

I find these statistics mindboggling. We here stories all the time about defense contractors gouging us for millions. This may be smaller in scale, but it's not peanuts. HUD has asked to be given this authority to verify income levels, and I think it is time that we do so.

At the same time, I might add, this amendment protects the rights of the individual under the Privacy Act of 1974, and furthermore, gives the applicant ample opportunity to examine and refute any information which may lead to the termination of the individual's participation in the program involved.

I do not believe there should be any controversy over the need to halt this waste, fraud, and abuse in HUD programs. I urge the adoption of the Carper amendment.

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I also want to add my support.

Mr. Chairman, one of the speakers, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], knows full well that in Connecticut and Massachusetts we have used a concept of cross-checking Social Security numbers with various programs like food stamps and welfare recipients, and we have saved millions and millions of dollars on the State level.

I think it is important to point out that in this day of tough budgetary times, this program will accomplish a number of purposes. It will maintain

the integrity of the program, it will give adequate protection for the tenants, and it will take care of the truly needy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman and I look forward to working with the gentleman as we straighten out some of the other problems with the Committee on Ways and Means. I commend the gentleman for a creative new approach. I know that it is going to find a great reception from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments and also for his work and his willingness to work with us as we crafted this approach.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CARPER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware, and to thank him for his cooperation in working out a compromise on this issue to take account of the concerns of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Delaware and others in the Congress have worked diligently to improve both the availability and proper usage of publicly assisted housing. I share their concern. However, there is an equally important concern regarding protection of information given by the public to the U.S. Government for specific administrative purposes.

The gentleman's amendment allows the Department of Housing and Urban Development to require all persons participating in HUD programs to give their Social Security numbers on the application for assistance. In the past, we have allowed the Social Security number to be required by other Federal or State agencies only in specific and narrow instances, after careful consideration by the committee. Such a specific amendment is necessary to override the strong general presumption that no one may be compelled to give his or her Social Security number except for Social Security purposes required by law. I will not at this time oppose this specific part of the amendment, recognizing the public policy goals that will be served by allowing HUD to require applicants to give their Social Security numbers.

This should in no way be interpreted as a break with the Committee on Ways and Means longstanding and strong concern about breaching the privacy of workers and beneficiaries in

the Social Security system. This action also should not be viewed as a precedent of waiving the committee's jurisdiction over Social Security number issues and requirements relating to the use of the Social Security number as an identifier.

I plan to schedule a public hearing at the first available opportunity for the Committee on Ways and Means to review whether efficient and effective mechanisms exist for HUD to receive appropriate and up-to-date income information, to allow better administration of public housing eligibility requirements. I wish to commend the gentleman for his efforts to make our Nation's housing programs work more effectively, so that assistance will be available for the truly needy within our society. I hope that we can work together toward that end.

□ 1635

Mr. CARPER. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Let me just say in conclusion that I look forward to the opportunity to begin step 2 of this two-step process. I thank the gentleman and the members of his staff for the cooperative approach we have taken on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have a demonstration here of how the system is supposed to work. We are working across party lines in a cooperative way to stretch the dollars that are available for needy people and working across committee lines. I thank each of you who have been involved in this process.

I would ask for support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEMP

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEMP: Page 73, after line 7, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 213. PUBLIC HOUSING HOMEOWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Housing Act of 1937 (as amended by section 212 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"PUBLIC HOUSING HOMEOWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

"SEC. 21. (a) HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES.—The families residing in each public housing project shall be provided with the opportunity to purchase the dwelling units in the project as follows:

"(1) FORMATION OF RESIDENT MANAGEMENT CORPORATION.—As a condition for public housing homeownership—

"(A) the adult residents of a public housing project shall have formed a resident management corporation in accordance with regulations and requirements of the Secretary; and

"(B) the resident management corporation shall have entered into a contract with the public housing agency establishing the respective management rights and responsibilities of the resident management corporation and the public housing agency.

"(2) HOMEOWNERSHIP ASSISTANCE.—

"(A) The Secretary shall provide comprehensive improvement assistance under section 14 or 20 to public housing projects in which homeownership activities under this section are conducted in order to ensure that the physical condition, management, and operation of the projects are sufficient to permit and encourage homeownership by the families residing in the projects.

"(B) The Secretary, and the public housing agency owning and operating each public housing project, shall provide such training, technical assistance, and educational assistance as the Secretary determines to be necessary to prepare the families residing in the project, and any resident management corporation established under paragraph (1), for homeownership.

"(3) CONDITIONS OF PURCHASE.—

"(A) A resident management corporation may purchase all or part of a public housing project following a determination by the Secretary that—

"(i) the resident management corporation has been established in accordance with paragraph (1); and

"(ii) the resident management corporation is prepared to undertake the ownership, management, and maintenance of the project with continued assistance from the Secretary.

"(B) A family may purchase its dwelling unit directly from the public housing agency, if the Secretary determines that the purchase will not interfere with the rights of other families residing in the public housing project or harm the efficient operation of the project.

"(4) ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Notwithstanding the purchase of all or part of a public housing project under this section, the Secretary shall continue to pay annual contributions with respect to the project. Such contributions may not exceed the maximum contributions authorized in section 5(a).

"(5) PURCHASE PRICE LIMITATION.—The price for any purchase under paragraph (3) shall be 25 percent of the fair market value of the property involved, as determined by the Secretary.

"(6) PURCHASE ARRANGEMENTS.—

"(A) A purchase under this section may be made under any of the following arrangements, at the option of the family or resident management corporation making the purchase:

"(i) Lease-purchase.

"(ii) Shared appreciation, except that not less than 50 percent of the future appreciation in the value of the property involved shall be reserved to the family or resident management corporation making the purchase.

"(iii) Cooperative ownership.

"(iv) Condominium ownership.

"(v) Purchase with amounts borrowed on the security of the property involved.

"(vi) Any other arrangement determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.

"(B) For purposes of assisting any purchase by a family or resident management corporation under this section, the public housing agency involved shall make a loan on the security of the property involved to the family or resident management corporation at a rate of interest equal to 70 percent

of the market interest rate for conventional mortgages on the date on which the loan is made.

"(7) RECAPTURE AT TIME OF SALE.—If any purchaser of property under this section sells the property before the expiration of the 5-year period following the date of the purchase, the purchaser shall pay the following percentage of the sale price to the Secretary:

"(A) 75 percent, if the sale occurs during the 1st 1-year period following such date.

"(B) 60 percent, if the sale occurs during the 2d 1-year period following such date.

"(C) 45 percent, if the sale occurs during the 3d 1-year period following such date.

"(D) 30 percent, if the sale occurs during the 4th 1-year period following such date.

"(E) 15 percent, if the sale occurs during the 5th 1-year period following such date.

"(b) RESIDENT MANAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The families residing in each public housing project shall be provided with the opportunity to undertake the management, maintenance, educational, and cultural functions of the project.

"(2) MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, and the public housing agency owning and operating the public housing project, shall provide such training, technical assistance, and educational assistance as may be necessary to prepare the resident management corporation established under subsection (a)(1) to undertake the management, maintenance, educational, and cultural functions of the project.

"(3) CONDITIONS OF RESIDENT MANAGEMENT.—A resident management corporation may undertake all or part of the management, maintenance, educational, and cultural functions of a public housing project following a determination by the Secretary that the resident management corporation is capable of undertaking such functions.

"(c) PROTECTION OF NONPURCHASING FAMILIES.—

"(1) EVICTION PROHIBITION.—No family residing in a dwelling unit in a public housing project may be evicted by reason of the sale of the project to a resident management corporation under this section.

"(2) RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—If any family resides in a dwelling unit in a public housing project purchased by a resident management corporation, and the family decides not to purchase the dwelling unit, the Secretary may offer to provide to the family a housing voucher determined by the Secretary to be appropriate to permit the family to continue to reside in the dwelling unit.

"(3) RELOCATION ASSISTANCE.—If any family resides in a dwelling unit in a public housing project in which other dwelling units are purchased under this section, and the family decides not to purchase the dwelling unit, the Secretary may offer—

"(A) to assist the family in relocating to a dwelling unit in another public housing project; or

"(B) to provide to the family a housing voucher determined by the Secretary to be appropriate to permit the family to obtain comparable alternative housing.

"(d) FINANCING ASSISTANCE.—

"(1) ASSISTANCE FOR PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.—The Secretary shall provide to public housing agencies such financial assistance as the Secretary determines is necessary to permit such agencies to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(2) OPERATING SUBSIDY.—The operating subsidy for a project managed by a resident management corporation shall not be less

than the public housing agency per unit monthly amount provided in the previous year. Such subsidy may not be reduced during the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the resident managed housing is transferred to resident ownership, except that if the total income of the public housing agency is reduced the income provided by the public housing agency to the resident owned project may be reduced in proportion to the total revenue reduction of the public housing agency.

"(e) ADDITIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this section may be construed to preclude the Secretary or any public housing agency from providing additional homeownership or resident management opportunities under section 5(h), section 6(c)(4)(D), or any other provision of this Act.

"(2) PURCHASE OF UNOCCUPIED UNITS.—Any qualified public housing resident or qualified applicant for public housing residence may purchase any unoccupied dwelling unit in a public housing project, subject to the conditions of this section.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Such regulations may establish any additional terms and conditions for homeownership or resident management under this section that are determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.

"(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Congress a report setting forth—

"(1) any need for the development of additional public housing dwelling units as a result of the sale of public housing dwelling units under this section;

"(2) recommendations of the Secretary for additional budget authority to carry out such development; and

"(3) recommendations of the Secretary to ensure decent homes and decent neighborhoods for lower income families.

"(h) LIMITATION.—Any authority of the Secretary under this section to provide financial assistance, or to enter into contracts to provide financial assistance, shall be effective only to such extent or in such amounts as are or have been provided in advance in appropriation Acts."

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1986, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later.

Mr. KEMP (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, in the spirit of the House that was achieved on the recent amendment of the gentleman from Delaware, as well as that on the amendment of the gentleman from the District of Columbia and myself, and a broad range of Republicans, Democrats, Liberals, and Conservatives, we passed what I consider to be one of the most important principles in housing in the United States of America, the idea that we could begin the process of helping restore to the public

housing projects in America the idea of residents managing their own projects.

There is another step in that process. The opportunity for people to own their own apartment, their own property, their own home, which all of us on either side of the aisle talk a lot about as part of the American dream.

The Delegate from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY] and I have offered a second amendment beyond tenant management, which is to allow all public housing tenants the option of buying their apartment or their home at 75 percent discount from prevailing market value, with a low-interest rate loan, from the public housing authority. If even one-quarter of the current public housing residents took advantage of home ownership opportunities offered by our amendment, property worth roughly \$14 billion would be immediately transferred to low-income tenants in America. There would be an enormous benefit to the poor, a giant leap forward toward enhancing access to income property, and opportunities for wealth for low-income Americans.

A few days ago, Yelena Bonner, the wife of Andrei Sakharov, wrote in a New York Times article something that should remind all of us of what the gentleman from the south Bronx said a little earlier very eloquently on the floor of this House. Yelena Bonner said in the New York Times, "What the American people most want is a house, a home." She said what she most wants for herself and Andrei Sakharov, her husband, was a home. She said a home is the symbol of independence. It is not a material one, she said, but it is sort of a combined spiritual and physical independence. She went on to say it is an open, kind, caring attitude both toward the house and toward everything that it stands for, the soil in the flower box, the lovingly tended lawn, even if it is just 3 or 4 square yards. She went on to say this shows what America is about in general.

Home ownership is especially a dream for those who live in public housing who, up until now, have had virtually no chance of owning an apartment or their own home.

We talked a lot on the floor recently about Kimi Gray, the outstanding organizer of the tenants at Kenilworth Courts here in Washington, DC, who received so much praise for her transformation of Kenilworth-Parkside public housing project. She said her brightest vision of her life, for herself and her family is home ownership. This is a fight, she said, not about race or poverty, it is about owning land, owning your property. She went on to say, "The way I see it, despite all of the accolades, this is just another project until we figure out a way to buy this place."

I want to say, on behalf of tenant management of Kenilworth-Parkside, and those inner-city residents of St. Louis or Cleveland or Trenton, NJ, or Buffalo, NY, or any part of this country, what this Congress is attempting to say today, or at least lay the predicate foundation for in the future, is the ability of the inner-city residents in public housing to be able to purchase that piece of property, whether it is a single-family dwelling or an apartment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KEMP was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, Congressman FAUNTROY and I and many cosponsors of this bill believe that we can turn many poor and low-income residents into homeowners if only we have the determination and the imagination to make that goal a reality.

The premise and the detail of the amendment that we are offering is a beginning step, but it would proceed along three very important conditions. First, the public housing residents could form a resident management association, like that at Kenilworth-Parkside; second, they would be trained and educated to help take over the management and operation of that project. That is the amendment that was just recently passed by 419 to 1. Third, the resident council would help organize the residents to buy the housing at a discount from the market value after demonstrating that they would bear the cost and responsibility of ownership and project management. To give you some idea as to the desire to do this, in New York City recently I think the city of New York and its public housing authority put some houses on the market at low discount rates, and there were perhaps 10,000 people from the inner city of New York who lined up to purchase those homes that were offered by the city of New York.

What we are suggesting is that it is more important to sell that project at a large discount, with subsidized mortgage rates, to convert some, not all, of the public housing stock into private ownership. Under our amendment, only a resident management association would initiate and direct a conversion to private ownership. Thereby, it would avoid chaotic individual sales or home ownership efforts which have previously failed.

To prevent premature or hasty transfer of ownership, title would be transferred to the residents only after HUD certifies that the tenants can afford the cost and the responsibilities of home ownership.

And, finally, under our bill, the Department of Housing and Urban De-

velopment must bring the housing up to decent standards before it is sold.

Would it reduce the housing stock for the poor? No; renters will simply be turned into homeowners. Would this amendment skim the best units from public housing authorities? Not if Kenilworth-Parkside and other resident management projects are any precedent. These projects, once among the poorest, have become outstanding candidates for home ownership.

What is the overall cost to the amendment? Nothing; the amendment would not add a penny to public spending, and it would not violate the Budget Act.

Government receipts, in my view, would actually be increased as housing is sold, thus converting public into private ownership.

Are not most public housing projects high-rise ghettos that no one would want to buy? Well, some housing projects are problematic indeed, but that underscores the importance of encouraging home ownership and resident management which has been established already here today.

According to a recent HUD survey, in 1982, 43 percent of the public housing stock was in good to excellent condition, 29 percent was in fair condition, and less than 28 percent was in poor condition. But that creates an incentive to begin "sweat equity," a euphemism for encouraging people to take greater interest in their apartment or their public housing project. And that again is what has been established here today by strong bipartisan vote.

Would it be difficult to convert? I do not think it would. According to HUD, only about 27 percent of the projects are high-rise buildings, 32 percent of all of public housing are garden apartments, 16 percent are low-rise walk-up apartments and 25 percent of our projects in America, which contain about 10 percent of the units, are single-family detached or townhouse units. Even high-rise units, if organized carefully, can be converted in part or in whole to cooperative or condominium home ownership.

Has it ever been tried before? They have done it in Great Britain. It has been very successful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KEMP was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. In Cuba, Castro converted all of the private housing on the Island of Cuba to socialized collective housing. It did not work. The housing stock became dilapidated. And whether it is in Cuba or the Soviet Union or in socialized countries, clearly socialist countries, Communist countries are trying to find a way to convert it back

to some form of private ownership. Whether it is in Great Britain or in Cuba—and I do not mean to suggest that Cuba is moving toward capitalism—they have begun to convert their public housing stock back to private ownership to get people to take care of it. That is the principle we are trying to establish. This does not speak down to anybody. It simply allows them the incentive to build up the chances in their own lifetime, if not for themselves, at least for their children, of converting that public housing project into home ownership.

I wish more Members were here to address the issue. I do not suggest this is a panacea. But on behalf of myself and other Members of the House, I offer this amendment as an attempt to regain the initiative on behalf of the innercity poor to help convert some of the public housing stocks to the pride and the dignity of home ownership.

□ 1650

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, ownership that is quite the secret, is it not? That is what it is all about. Ownership is what makes a house really your home, your part of the action, your space in affairs.

I tried, in 1977, to co-op Marina Village, a complex of 440 two-floor townhouses in Bridgeport, CT. Do you know what I found my worst enemy was? This is fascinating, nothing happened, nothing happened. We got the money out of HUD; that was a major occurrence; \$4.2 million.

Nothing happened. Guess what? The commissioners did not want to lose turf, they did not want to lose 440 units which means x number of secretaries, x number of papers and so on and so forth.

The people wanted to own these apartments. People that own maintain. People that own take care. People that own cut grass. People that own have a real, real percentage in not allowing the crime to rise. The same thing we were talking about with Nehemiah.

Bureaucrats should not stand in their way. In fact, this whole movement should be encouraged. The very basic replacement of parts and kitchens and furnaces and everything else is cut dramatically by ownership.

Mr. Chairman, it always amazes me when someone says, "Oh, those rotten tenants in public housing, they do not care for their buildings." What tenant does care for his building?

I used to rent a house on the beach for the most extraordinary amount of money that I thought people could possibly pay in a month, and I come in and have to replace the stove and have to replace the washing machine and have to replace the carpets because ev-

erybody had torn the place to pieces; they did not own it.

So I am simply saying anything we can do to give people a piece of the action, that is all they are asking for, that is all you are doing, and anything we can do to keep the bureaucrats out of the process is a good bill. I like it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic to the intention of this piece of legislation, and I am curious, though, as to how the inhabitants of public housing could come by the money. I think a 75-percent discounted rate is a very important one and very critical. But 25 percent of the sale price might be beyond the means of a person who qualifies for public assistance.

Mr. McKINNEY. I will tell my good friend how we had it and then I will let the author of the bill state what he has intended.

What we had was, very simply, that the, almost exactly the same amount of the rent, in most cases, about 3 to 5 percent more, would be paid by the tenants to own. There would not even have been a down payment on the marina project, and I hope that now we have a new mayor and new commissioners, new everything else. We certainly do not have the money any more, but I am hoping that we can start back on this project of letting these people have it.

The city social services department thought that their social service needs would be so much less in a well-controlled, home-owned park that they agreed to set up an office which would help people with problems that might be beyond them. They are not familiar with them; they are not dumb people, but they just have not ever had the opportunity to own.

There would be classes set up in the responsibility of ownership, et cetera, and maintenance and so on and so forth. I was very enthusiastic. It may have had some holes, but I did not think we would ever know unless we tried.

Mr. KEMP from New York probably has his own ideas on this.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the Library of Congress Congressional Research Service to give me an update on the study that they did 1 year ago on selling public housing to the tenants. I asked them for a capital cost, a financial investment, the annual and monthly charges and the required income to get some idea as to an

answer for the gentleman from Michigan because I had the same question: How can people afford it?

They took a typical capital cost of an apartment, say, in the District of Columbia. Say Kimi Gray wanted to buy her own apartment. They took the fair market value of \$50,000, the sale price of which would be 25 percent of market value, so that would cost her \$12,500. She would get a mortgage at, 100 percent of the price.

Under current market condition, she could finance 100 percent of the mortgage at a 7-percent, 30-year mortgage rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KEMP and by unanimous consent, Mr. McKINNEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman will continue to yield, here was the outcome of the cost. Her mortgage loan would be for \$12,500. Debt service would be \$80 a month. Maintenance and operations, anywhere from \$100 to \$125. Real estate taxes, \$21. Vacancy or turnover, I guess this is their figures now, \$70, for a total of about \$225 per month.

So she or any individual in that Kenilworth-Parkside project, could afford these homeownership costs if she earned roughly \$8,000 yearly.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

What I understand my colleague from New York to have said is that there is no down payment.

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct; no down payment.

Mr. CONYERS. The mortgage is amortized over a 30-year period. That it probably does not exceed the cost of the income or the public assistance that a person might be receiving inside their present public housing circumstances.

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman will yield, the Library of Congress suggested that an individual in that project would have to have \$8,000 of income in a year in order to afford that cost, amortized over 30 years, yes.

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman from Connecticut will continue to yield, I am not saying it is perfect; it seems to me that is something that would encourage people to begin the thought process toward homeownership. That is what we are interested in.

I again thank my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the notion of homeownership is a good one, and, in a somewhat different form, I would look forward to supporting this. But I think it has some problems as it now exists. I am perhaps somewhat able to talk about this because the subcommittee I chair of Government Operations has had several hearings.

There is a HUD demonstration program now going on, and I think we will have more information. I think the idea in general is a good one, but here are some of the issues that come up.

For instance, there is a 5-year recapture of the profits, but under this bill, and this is one of the things that came up from us, there are no restrictions on the disposition of the property. So what happens is suppose a resident of an elderly project, 68 years old, buys the apartment. Seven or eight years later, after the recapture period has expired, the person expires. That is then the property of the individual who was free to leave it in his or her will to his or her son who has \$200,000 who can then sell it at market rate.

In other words, what we have is a good program for the current poor residents of housing, but it could have the effect in its current form of taking that housing out of stock available for poor people.

The House decided last week not to build new public housing, so I think we have to be very careful, and I understand those considerations although I do not agree with them. We have to be careful about advantaging the current individuals, and I want to do that, but not in a way that would permanently withdraw this from the housing stock.

□ 1700

So I would hope that we might even withdraw this and come back and deal with this question of disposition.

It is not going to be the case that only the best units will be sold, but in fact the best units will be among those to be sold. We have areas of our cities which are becoming gentrified. What happens is, they used to be for the poor people, and now young rich people would like to live in what used to be bad neighborhoods. So the Government comes in with a UDAG and they have urban renewal and CDBG, and the Government spends a lot of money to fix the place up. Then the poor people cannot afford to live there anymore, and when we say that we want to help the poor people, they say no, the free market system—which apparently now is Adam Smith plus UDAG's—you cannot interfere with it.

So I would hope that we could deal with this concept, but in ways that would protect the right of subsequent poor people to keep it in.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the gentleman, who with his usual degree of clarity expresses a very sincere concern. I was thinking that there may be some way of perhaps limiting that resale, but of course the ability to own a piece of property means the ability then at some point—hopefully it will be protected 5 years which is in and of itself a limitation—but at some point you have got to say that if you own that piece of property you get title to it. For example, most of the land reform programs that have not worked in the world are where we give the campesino the right to work the farm, but he or she does not get the title, and thus it reduces the incentive to work the land.

With all due respect, I am not trying now to argue, except to try to find an answer to this problem. It seems to me that we are committed to housing the poor. The stock is not going to be diminished if we turn renters into homeowners.

Mr. FRANK. Let me just take my time back and ask the gentleman how he voted on the amendment last week offered by the gentleman from Texas which said that we should not build any more.

God does not build housing. He may smile on those who do, but no housing has been built by spontaneous generation in the memory of man.

Mr. KEMP. I understand.

Mr. FRANK. It voted not to. Congress voted not to build any more housing. Now if Congress voted not to build any more housing and you sell off the housing that you now have to the existing stock of poor people, you are not going to have more housing.

Mr. KEMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I just want to finish, and I will yield again to the gentleman, but he does not solve my problem. Yes, it would be good to help some existing poor people, I do not think that it restricts them to say yes, you can sell it, but with some resale restrictions. Again, let us take elderly people. There are elderly people who under this bill will be able to buy a piece of property, in some cases in some very desirable neighborhoods of the city, for 25 percent of its market value, pay a subsidized interest rate, and then 7 years later, even without dying, sell it off, or people will die and it goes, and there is nothing in here that says that it has to be anymore for the poor.

The House voted last week not to build any more housing for public housing. We have an amendment that is coming up which says that if you demolish housing, you do not even have to replace it. I hope that we will not go to that, but we are going to be asked to vote for an amendment offered by

the gentleman from Texas called the livability amendment. It is, it seems to me, a strange name, the "livability amendment," for one which demolishes a house. They would seem to me to be among the least livable, but people have a first-amendment right to call whatever they want whatever they want.

First we voted not to build any more public housing. Now we are going to be asked to vote to demolish it and not replace it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FRANK. Then we are going to be asked to sell it off with no way to keep that in the stream for low-income people. Of course, some of it will not be so good, but some of it will be the very best. I find as a general rule, when their own interest is involved, people are not stupid, and most people would rather buy a nice house than a rotten one. A lot of people will buy nice houses. They will buy it for 25 percent.

So I think it is a mistake to deal only with the existing stock of housing. As part of an overall program which says that we are going to build some more, OK, but to sell off systematically at subsidized prices the housing we have, when we then decide that we are not going to build any new stuff and we can demolish some other stuff, will mean fewer people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I completely agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. It means, without treading on the toes of another fresh idea coming into the housing picture, that we may have to reconsider the whole notion of not building any new public housing. I hope that that was not cast in concrete.

For example, there could be an amendment offered which I am considering which would do just that, and that would open the door for this, but the other defects that the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, the legal defects, I think need some considerable work on. But nonetheless, I think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] is on the right track.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman, and I will yield to the gentleman from New York in a minute, and I would point out that there is a home ownership demonstration program now being conducted. Some of us have been looking at it, we have had some differences of opinion, some agree-

ment; some housing authorities wanted to go in. I think that it would be best to let that proceed and then try to draft an amendment that would have some of the protections that we are talking about.

I think that you can give people many of the benefits of ownership—not say that they cannot sell, not say that they cannot profit from the extent to which they fix up the property. I am not even talking about that. I am saying that there has to be some method, I hope, of keeping a stock of low-income housing around.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I again appreciate the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

What bothers me about the whole problem is that there are, some estimate, 60,000 to 70,000 or 80,000 public units that are now vacant. They are just not even being utilized.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FRANK. I yield further to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. I was trying to find a way: First, to encourage people to fix up their apartment or their home; and second, to use up that vacant housing and to encourage private ownership.

It is the gentleman's time. I wonder if he would not acknowledge the fact that we have to find some way to utilize the 60,000 to 70,000 apartments and houses not now occupied.

Mr. FRANK. Two things on that. First of all, I am not trying, and I know of no one trying, to interfere with the home ownership demonstration program now going on. I would like to see it limited, and I would like to see that checked.

Second, we are trying to do modernization funds, and I voted, and I was an early supporter, as the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY] knows, of the amendment to do the tenant management. I was in the city of Boston when Bromley Heath, one of the first of these, was started in 1969. I think tenant management helps.

And that is the last point that I want to make. Home ownership is a good thing, but let me say a word in behalf of tenants. I am sorry that nasty people ruined that lovely beach house that my good friend from Connecticut has and never invited any of us to—I am sorry about that—but let us not overly denigrate tenants. I mean, I was a double tenant until they decided that I had to buy my condo-

minium, which I did not want to own because it was a pain in the neck. I have been a tenant all my life. I do not ruin property. Not only that, most people in public housing are going to continue to be tenants. Let us not overargue and suggest that tenants cannot have pride in where they live. Most people are decent people.

I understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] has not done that. But there is a danger in some people suggesting that only home ownership will work. We have tenant management. Most tenants are going to continue to be tenants. I do not think that it is inconsistent to say that we can instill pride there.

I would be glad to work with the gentleman at a future date, and I really do think in this case where HUD is doing a demonstration project that by the end of this year we will have some data, and next year will be an appropriate time.

I think that there are some common goals here, and I appreciate what the gentleman is doing. I do not think that this amendment does it.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my friend from Massachusetts, who makes a very important point about tenants having dignity and pride—and I want to acknowledge that as well—

Mr. FRANK. The only thing that tenants do not have that owners have is a good tax deduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the Members that this may not be the best thing for every public housing project. We acknowledge that. One of the conditions among others was to allow for a tenant-management project to go forward where democratically speaking the people would decide that they want to fix up their apartment and convert into private ownership. If somebody does not want to participate, he does not have to. So I do not think that it is quite as radical as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested.

I would urge that my colleagues give it greater consideration than just a little tiny pilot project in one part of the country or another.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I would just again point out that we have a problem here where people will buy this at 25 percent, and 6 and 7 years

later when they die or they sell it off, that housing then goes to wealthy people, people with no income restrictions. I do not think that that is the way to protect the interests of low-income people or the housing stock, and that will inevitably happen. Where people have this, within 6 or 7 years, particularly in some of the elderly projects, we will begin to lose it.

□ 1710

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] in introducing this measure and I am very pleased that he has taken the leadership to bring this to the attention of the Congress and the Nation.

I cosponsored it because my own experience in the Nation's Capital has demonstrated that tenant ownership of public housing can work. We in the Shoreham renewal area now some 20 years ago when we fashioned that renewal area included something called turnkey three public housing by which public housing funds were used to build structures and public housing tenants were allowed to move in, but with ownership of the units with the Federal Government paying the differences between what their public housing rents could afford them and what it actually cost for the units.

I believe that careful consideration of this bill with the kinds of concerns that have been raised here at a later time will enable us to fashion a home ownership program that on the one hand will provide ownership and pride for those now living in public housing, at the same time on the other hand that it continues our commitment to build more public housing stock, because none of those programs is going to be sufficient to meet the needs of the poor that I think we in many instances are abandoning because we are cutting back on public housing and new construction. New construction can be done in a fashion that home ownership is accorded the public housing residents, we have proved it in the District of Columbia, with turnkey three public housing. I hope that we will be able to examine this in a very significant manner around this bill as introduced.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his effort on behalf of the folks that he represents in the District of Columbia and also the comments of our friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

In response to the earlier comments of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] about what would happen if a senior citizen in a project were to buy it and then in 5 years leave it or sell it to his or her family or children or grandchildren, whatever the case may be. I want to make sure that at least I am on record as suggesting that one of the reasons that all parents are working and saving and investing in education and homes and apartments and housing is so that you can give your children a better future. I know the gentleman is not diminishing that incentive, but I want to make clear that at least I am on record as suggesting that I do not mind that part of the bill that will allow a family the opportunity over time to buy that apartment and at some point, after 5 years or 7 years or whatever the time frame is, to be able to transfer or sell, because that is what home ownership is. It is a choice and a chance to leave your children a little piece of an estate that is an incentive. I think that is what the American dream is all about and I did not want, as I said, not to have it answered.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I talked about a case of someone already elderly in a public housing project. If you are elderly, your children can be wealthy and you are still eligible for public housing. The parent working to make things better for us or her children is a nice concept, I am all in favor of it. A 75-year-old who happens to have one son who is a doctor and a daughter who is a lawyer who buys the nice public housing unit for 25 percent and is able to pay it off and then 6 years later leaves that in her will to the doctor and the lawyer, that is a version of the American dream that I would love to hear the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY] sing, but it has not evoked from my heart strings quite the twang that it seems to provoke from my colleague, the gentleman from New York. That is all I am talking about.

We are not talking about people working their way up. We are saying that someone who is already elderly and who has wealthy children, "Here, make your kids richer."

I think it is possible to devise a program that would not allow that, but the gentleman has not done that. I would be glad to work with the gentleman in the future, but the example I give I guarantee is one that would help under the amendment as offered.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate these hypothets from Boston. Now, in Detroit, most of the poor people in public housing do not have rich sons or daughters and a doctor somewhere. I am sorry to report that.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wants to remind guests in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and the Chair will not allow displays of any kind from the gallery.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, that is all I wanted to add, because the illustrations that my dear friend had been using up to now were within a realm that we in the Middle Western States can appreciate, but to suggest that we are worried now about rich sons and daughters inheriting the property, I want to make sure that this property does not go back to speculators, to real estate brokers and the like.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the District of Columbia has expired.

(At the request of Mr. FRANK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FAUNTROY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAUNTROY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I was not suggesting that in Detroit that was the situation. I guarantee to the gentleman from Michigan, I was talking about elderly housing.

There are people in this Chamber who have parents who live in elderly housing. In elderly housing and various parts of this country there are people who are themselves elderly who meet the eco limitation and have children who are by no means poor. That is a fact.

Now, that does not mean the whole idea is no good. What I am objecting to, and I do not think the gentleman denies that, there are people who live in New York City and other people who live in Boston and elsewhere, there are wealthy children who have parents in public housing. I do not think they should be able to get this gift.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time momentarily, I simply want to say that I am pleased that the gentleman from New York is not going to move this to a vote now, but this kind of discussion I think is worthy of being had in hearings leading up to a vote on a measure which I think we can pass that will provide the home ownership opportunities for those in public housing and those moving into new public housing.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I was rising to ask the author or one of the authors of this amendment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP], if he could consider something here.

It is obvious even from this brief discussion that there are very serious questions, given the language of the gentleman's amendment presently drafted.

Also, it is well established that the administration is conducting a study, as I understand it a rather extensive study, on a demonstration program on the sale of public housing.

In view of all this, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he would withhold his amendment so that those of us on the substantive committee could have a chance to hold hearings and go into this question and also have the benefits derived from the study that HUD probably will have terminated by the time to conduct our hearings.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Certainly.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I must admit that it is tempting and I do not want to diminish the sincerity with which the chairman raises the issue of working out some compromise.

I must say, I am in a little bit of a quandary because I think certainly the gentleman from Massachusetts did not mean to demean the attempt that we were making, but I never really got it established that I thought that for a rich doctor or lawyer to leave his or her mother or family in public housing, I think that was treating the problem with less than the dignity that it deserves.

I said earlier on that I was trying to establish a view of America in which the public housing residents had as much chance or had as much opportunity to provide home ownership and the pride of property as anybody else.

Is the chairman asking me to pull the amendment, is that it?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Well, if I may recall my time in order to answer and clarify my request, I am saying that at this time it is obvious that it is not the proper environment in which to enact this serious legislation.

I agree with the gentleman that it does not deserve levity. I for one certainly do not consider it anything but one of the most important issues confronting us.

The reason I am saying this is that we have been also very anxious to get the benefits of HUD demonstration program, because among other things the yet to be evaluated legal problems. For instance, in my State of Texas in order to convey title, you have to have a deed of trust and a warranty deed. We have been victimized in Texas in the past with contracts of sale which have victimized whom? Well, the poor-

est of the poor who wanted to buy that 25-foot lot and the little shack which today is substandard housing, but still a roof.

So all I am saying if the gentleman would consider my respectful and serious request to defer on his amendment for the time. No harm will come to his very noble endeavor to bring about a viable experiment and more than a demonstration program, a suitable and viable piece of legislation that will fulfill his desires and his hopes for this type of program. That is simply what I am asking.

Mr. KEMP. Well, I am not now saying anything with regard to the chairman's commitment, because I know it is sincere, or even that of the gentleman from Massachusetts, because he told me earlier that he was willing to work with me on this and I appreciate that, so let me make sure that I get that on the record.

My concern is that the bureaucracy, even though it is the bureaucracy of the current administration at HUD, will not want to move as swiftly toward the completion of that project that I think is important. It may be a good vote on the floor of the House, signaling our intent to encourage this type of right to buy by tenants and people who manage their own public housing projects, it might be a very demonstrable signal about what direction we want to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the gentleman from New York suggesting that I was not treating this with the proper dignity.

I think it is the amendment, frankly, that causes that problem. I do not say that the situations I cited were typical. I say that they exist and I object to an amendment, which though well intended, is not drafted tightly enough to deal with that.

I think the problem lies frankly in the amendment that will allow that to happen.

We do not have good, inhabitable public housing stock; it is a scarce resource and one that is likely to diminish than increase, so we are all going to work to try to deal with that. To allow it to be sold off with no safeguards and in this big country there will be situations like that, I think that is the problem. I did not create this.

I would favor a home ownership program that does not allow that; so I think the problem, I guess I object to being accused of creating a problem

when I simply am calling attention to one.

I think a properly drafted amendment with more time and effort could deal with that, but this is not it.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for his comment.

Then would not a vote on the floor at least on the concept be an important signal about the direction that Congress wants to go?

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Oh, certainly.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my friend, if he wants to send signals, he should join the Signal Corps or get a job on the railroad.

No, we do not sit on the legislative floor here to send signals. We are drafting legislation.

If the gentleman wanted to do some nonbinding resolution which says this would be a good idea, I think that is all right; but to put it into law is something else. The House of Representatives is not a student council. When we do things, we do them theoretically to have a binding effect.

I think it is a mistake to write into a statute a badly drafted amendment that would allow these things to happen.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, there goes the gentleman from Massachusetts again. He cannot resist a chance to turn the very friendly debate into a way of demeaning the attempt of the gentleman from New York and the Delegate from the District of Columbia and others who believe that tenants should not only have the right to manage their own property, but ultimately to buy it. There are 60,000 units that are vacant today that ought to be sold off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York will permit, I hope the gentleman will not let his judgment be clouded by perhaps a malinterpretation as to the thrust of the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts. None of us are exempt from the barbs of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We have learned to kind of set up an immune system to those, but I think in all seriousness, the reason I am suggesting this, and let me say this to the gentleman from New York if he will listen to

me, this is a request I have never made in the 25 years I have been in this House. I have never asked a colleague to withdraw. I, in turn, have been asked on many occasions and in most of them I have.

□ 1725

In this case, the reason I am saying, this is the most effective way, I believe, that the gentleman from New York can show his good faith in bringing about the enactment of effective, viable legislation is to give that opportunity to legislate with a background of experience and knowledge which can be derived once the HUD study and experiment is concluded.

So with that, I leave it up to the judgment of the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this legislation and so are most of the Members on the floor now, but I think that the chairman has made a rational appeal that we go back to the drafting board.

I, for one, will join in whatever decision the gentleman from New York chooses to make. I am hoping that it probably will not come to a vote today but that we can refine it, have hearings in the committee, and move forward from that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(On request of Mr. SCHUMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just concur with the comments of the gentleman from Michigan. There are other provisions in this title that I am not sure of.

What happens, for instance, after 3 years and the boiler explodes and you need a major repair and there are lots of poor people living in there?

I like the idea of home ownership. I think home ownership, all other things being equal, works better than anything else, but I think he has floated the concept, he has certainly pricked our imaginations and we ought to get down to trying to draft something together that will deal with the many contingencies that this new and interesting path would take us upon.

So I would urge at this point that we consider this a well taken debate in the best of spirit but not force people

to vote yes or no on this particular issue.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me say something very carefully to the chairman and to my friend, the gentleman from New York, and also to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan who has expressed an interest in asking me honestly and sincerely to withdraw at this point.

I am not interested in a victory legislatively. I would really like to see this project go forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. KEMP and by unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman will yield further, let me tell the gentleman why I am reluctant.

In 1979, ROBERT GARCIA from the South Bronx, JACK KEMP, and Congressman BILL GRAY introduced enterprise legislation. Twenty-seven States have enterprise zones. The U.S. Congress, at least the House, has not passed it. I have begged, pleaded, caajoled to get a vote on the floor of the House. But we cannot get enterprise zone bills.

This may be the only chance I ever get. It may never come back. I do not doubt the sincerity of the chairman of the committee, but how can one, as a minority Member of the Congress, ever get a chance to get a piece of legislation through if one does not at that propitious moment require a vote? I do not see why it is going to disrupt the United States of America to have a vote on the idea of allowing inner-city residents to buy their own piece of property, Mr. Chairman.

Will the chairman agree that he would hold hearings on this subject? Would he help me get a vote on enterprise zone legislation in 1986?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thought I had indicated that I would on the question of the amendment the gentleman presented on enterprise zones. We have sequential referral on some of the versions that have been introduced, including the one by the gentleman and Mr. GARCIA; that is, part of the gentleman's bill would go to the Committee on Ways and Means for approval. Part would be in two other committees, perhaps including ours, perhaps not, because the gentleman is talking about suspending some Federal legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. WATKINS and by unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was

allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. I will remind the gentleman that he said in the well that he was not intending to ask for a vote on his amendment.

Mr. KEMP. I was not until it became an issue that I was somehow selling off all of the public housing stock.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Do not misinterpret me. I believe in the processes we are undergoing now.

Mr. KEMP. So do I.

Mr. GONZALEZ. In fact, in markup the subcommittee had the longest, prolonged sessions in markup. We had over 130 amendments offered during the course of the markup. That has never happened before. So all I am saying is that for the purposes of perfecting acceptable legislation on this issue that I think the purposes would be better served if we withheld at this time.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate that. Mr. Chairman, may I say to you in all honesty and candor that I do not disagree necessarily with what the gentleman just said, but as a backbencher in the minority party, it seems to me it may be the only way I will ever, ever get a chance to get this bill to the floor of the House on enterprise zones and other legislation that we think is in the interest of fighting poverty in the inner cities of the United States of America.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise because of a concern I have. I might be in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and I support the position of the chairman of the committee on having hearings and looking into it, because I might be in support, just like the gentleman from Texas is, of the particular amendment of the gentleman from New York except when talking about public housing, in rural America we also have public housing and I would like to know how that is going to be affected and how it is going to be implemented.

I think if there is a vote right now, I would have to oppose the amendment, but in rural America there is some section 203 and section 207 housing, and section 515 and a number of others. What all will be included under public housing? How will it affect rural America? Are we talking about across the board?

I think it would be very worthwhile to accept a delay and have the hearings because right now I do not know how it is going to affect the rural areas and how it is going to affect the people. I kind of like the idea.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked with the Delegate from the District of Columbia, my friend with whom I worked on tenant management, and I have talked with my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and yourself, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, based upon the statements that the gentleman from Texas has made, for which I am grateful, to withdraw my amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas, but let me say one thing to the gentleman from New York.

I think we may have a worthy amendment there if we can get some answers, but I have also been very supportive of enterprise zones, trying to get that there.

Mr. KEMP. I know the gentleman has.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand where the gentleman is coming from there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to express my gratitude to the gentleman from New York because this is one of the myriad of questions that have arisen in our minds, the staff and mine, as we were listening to the discussion and the presentation of the gentleman's amendment. It is the only reason that would motivate me, because I do not fear the outcome of a vote.

Mr. KEMP. I know the gentleman does not.

Mr. GONZALEZ. This is the process. But I really was saying this in good faith.

Mr. KEMP. You have, Mr. Chairman, and in good faith I ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the willingness of the gentleman from New York to withdraw his amendment has taken a very honorable position and those who are basically in support of the gentleman from New York I would like to suggest go along with him on it because I think that is the only way we can get to a workable product and one that could actually be passed.

I would probably have to oppose it right now on the floor and encourage everyone from rural areas of this

country to oppose it because we do not know exactly how it will affect the various farm home programs, how it will affect the various public housing programs of HUD in the rural areas. I think the gentleman from New York has made a very honorable move there and I support his effort to withdraw it and have hearings. I would surely encourage the others because I would probably have to oppose it right now because I do not know how it is going to affect the rural America. I think the gentleman from New York took a very honorable position there and I would encourage the rest of the people to back him.

□ 1735

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues on my side of the aisle, the chairman of the committee has sincerely and honestly and very candidly suggested that he would move toward the types of hearings that I think would give us a chance to elevate the consciousness of the country and the Congress toward this issue of home ownership. There also is, I think, hopefully, a new-found interest in enterprise zones.

The gentleman from South Bronx [Mr. GARCIA], is going to introduce that amendment in this bill. Hopefully it will pass and in the spirit of comity and in the spirit of some progressive legislation for the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I am renewing my unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. KEMP. That is progress, let me say to my friend.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, having done so, let me first apologize to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for having expressed my earlier objection in such a startling and loud manner. I was caught a little off guard.

The reason I am reserving my right to object is that I have not yet been heard on this debate. I have been sitting on this floor now for 2 hours and I have yet been recognized.

I understand the protocol of the House and the rules with respect to recognizing committee members, but I have worked a great deal on this issue. I have invested a good deal of my own

heart and mind in this issue. I care about it a great deal. I see this as an opportunity for us to get this issue before the House and to vote on it, an opportunity that I fear we may not soon come by again.

I feel very concerned about letting this opportunity go by and I must say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] that I am at this point very certain that I will express my objection unless I have an opportunity to be heard on this bill, which I think is so important.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise to support the amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I have to concur that this is not only the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP], but also the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], in that the gentleman from Texas has been very actively supporting that bill. I sat in on a session this morning in which the gentleman encouraged everybody to support it and advocated its support.

Let me just say as one Member who has spent a little time at the Kenilworth project that I was extremely impressed with the tremendous progress which they have made. I understand the problem that the committee has with the so-called subsequent conveyance, the idea that somehow if we pass this thing without working on it further, the people will be able, when they once receive this property and take private ownership, to convey it to a third party. At some point, this property is going to be removed from the inventory of public housing.

I would say simply that that is something that is going to come about. Some people are going to be successful; some people are going to fail, but we cannot keep control of these people and of their property forever.

You cannot give a person the American dream; that is, the right to own a home, without also giving them the attendant rights of being able to convey that home, to encumber that home when trying to, for example, borrow money to educate their children or to do other things that are important.

Just in closing, I do not want to take up too much time, I know Kimi Gray was a very eloquent spokesman for the Kenilworth project and we asked her. She gave us some very impressive statistics because along with this self-de-

termination that those people have, they have reduced the teenage pregnancy rate substantially. They have reduced their welfare dependency substantially and we said, "How did you do that? How did you manage to do this with your kids?" She said very simple, "We lifted their vision."

I think that this Kemp, and I would like to call it the Kemp-Arme amendment, will do just that, will allow the people of the project and many other projects to lift their vision to the greatest dream in America, and that is owning your own home.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to 1964. In 1964, President Lyndon Johnson said our housing goal should be to put a decent roof over every American's head. Do you understand and do you recall the anger and the debate we had, remember the rhetoric that we heard in 1964 about the slum landlords, absentee owners, the state of disrepair, the awful living conditions that our American citizens lived under? And do you remember the promise that was made as we began to build these units that they would have decent housing?

That was a promise this Government made. By 1984, 220,000 of those units were standing substandard, in disrepair. You did not have to go look at them; you could see by the highways the awful living conditions and the impact that had on the spirit, the human spirit that gave us people that were dope addicts, alcoholics, battered and abused children, low literacy rates. We were right back in the slums.

We have 65,000 of those units that we built standing vacant because the promise was a false promise. We cannot do this for the people. The people found this out. They understand.

Kimi Gray, in 1979, went to the city and said, "Let us do it for ourselves," and they did it. They cleaned up the streets and they got them so clean they will not even let the city pick up their garbage because they cannot do it good enough. They ran out the drug dealers. They lowered the teenage pregnancy by 50 percent and they did that, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] said, by raising the vision.

The Government did not raise those youngsters' vision; the moms and the dads. Kimi Gray says, "One major result from tenant management was the return of fathers who had left their homes so their families could receive welfare payments. Those fathers came home," she says, "and we found in our midst plumbers, carpenters, painters and people with the skill to fix up for themselves." Those 220,000 units can be repaired, replaced, put back into service. Those mothers and fathers can reunite and take care of

their children. This amendment is a cautious amendment. I endorse it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make the point that this amendment is a cautious amendment. My problem with the amendment is it is built too much on reservation, too many safeguards, too many protections against what we fear might be the failure of these people to rise to that vision.

I think these people will rise to the vision. They have already done it. They need us to give them the chance to have the same thing we want for ourselves and our children.

I have a 70-year-old woman who says, "I am no longer on welfare. I love the independence." They sent their children to college in Kenilworth with the hope that they would come back. I hope that 70-year-old woman does have the right to buy her house and I hope when she is done, she sells it to her son, the doctor, and he comes back to Kenilworth and she lives with him and her grandchildren and they get what they are entitled to in America because we gave them that freedom.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] yields at this point because I do not think he wishes to be accused of inaccurate statements.

We were the first to go to Kenilworth, before anybody else did. When I say we, I mean the subcommittee. But I had been there as an individual at the beginning. I have been to every single public housing project in the District of Columbia, not in an official capacity. I have been into about nine in an official capacity; that is, in the name of the subcommittee.

Now, when the gentleman from Texas talks about Kimi Gray and Kenilworth, he is not talking about homeownership. Kimi Gray will be the first to tell you that they are not prepared to be homeowners. She will be the first; she told us in open committee hearings.

□ 1745

Mr. ARMEY. If the chairman will allow me to reclaim my time, Kimi Gray told the Washington Post last week: "The job is not done, we will not rest until we figure out a way to buy this place."

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is right.

Mr. ARMEY. I want to make one point, and I want to be very clear on this. This is a well-thought-out amendment; it is extremely well prepared to

cover all cases. If we do not do this now, then when? And if we do not do it, who will? These people deserve better than they have got; they do not deserve to have Uncle Sam be their slum landlord of the 1990's.

Mr. KEMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your participation in this debate, and just to clarify, that woman that you mentioned, Kimi Gray, who has become kind of a folk hero on the floor of the House today—in her letter to Delegate FAUNTROY and to JACK KEMP recently she said:

We labor in all of these pursuits with the ultimate dream of acquiring our homes through the process—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. KEMP and by unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP [continuing]. Of acquiring our homes through the process of cooperative ownership that you have outlined in your legislation. I join Mr. Kemp and Mr. Fauntroy in urging the Congress to give us the chance to empower ourselves by acquiring the ultimate equity state of ownership in our community."

One hour ago we turned down an amendment to eliminate the Nehemiah housing opportunity grant program. I voted with most of us on the floor not to diminish the chances for Nehemiah to move forward, and it provides \$15,000 of assistance from the Federal Government to incomes above \$22,000—which is nominal, low, moderate-income homes, to purchase homes, to purchase property.

We are doing more for middle-income homeowners than we are for Kimi Gray and the low-income residents of the District of Columbia. I think we should do at least as much for the poor as we are doing in the Nehemiah project, and I frankly think this is what Kimi Gray meant when she said to be empowered by owning her own piece of property.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I believe I am obliged to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. The gentleman says this is a well-thought-out amendment. I am sitting here trying to make sure I represent the people in rural America.

What does this amendment do to the sections of the Farmers Home Administration—sections 2, 3, section 223, housing; section 515, housing—what does it do to those?

Mr. KEMP. Will the gentleman yield so I may respond to that?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. This only affects properties under the Public Housing Authority. That is all.

Mr. WATKINS. What is the last statement?

Mr. KEMP. The 1937 act setting up the Public Housing Authority—this would only affect the properties under that legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

(On request of Mr. WATKINS and by unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ARMEY. I believe that it would not affect the housing units you are concerned about. If the gentleman would like to include them in this magnificent idea, I would be happy to join in drafting additional legislation to cover those areas.

Mr. WATKINS. If the gentleman will yield, I want to make sure that we carefully look at the situation and not include those, and I think under the 1937 Housing Act, it may take under section 223—what about the section 8 housing?

It does not take in section 8 housing? Mr. GONZALEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I must do two things for the sake of accuracy in the record. First, that of course it would have absolutely nothing to do with the Farmers Home Administration-administered housing for the poor.

Second, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP], and I want him to listen to me carefully, is actually confused as to the thrust of the Nehemiah financing. The \$15,000 is a loan. It is not a grant. It is not a grant.

Mr. KEMP. I did not say it was, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. But you did. You said—

Mr. KEMP. I said \$15,000—it is \$15,000 of credit; whether it is a loan or a grant, it is still \$15,000 of assistance.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Well, it makes a big difference if you are talking about selling to the poor that qualify for public housing tenancy.

Mr. KEMP. I voted with the chairman. All I am saying is, it is a program for low- and medium-income people. We ought to do as much for Kimi Gray as we are doing for people earning \$22,000.

Mr. GONZALEZ. In any event, I wanted to clarify that, and I wanted to reply to the gentleman from Oklahoma's [Mr. WATKINS] question that of course it would not embrace any kind of rural housing, the other assisted housing programs that have been set

up by the Congress for the poor and the moderate income.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the chairman. Again, I would like to encourage everybody with the few seconds I know I must have remaining, this is our chance in this House to fulfill the promise of 1964 and let the poor people of America put that roof over their head that they want.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we have in this debate lost sight a little bit in the details of the ultimate bottom line.

No. 1, this is one of the most creative pieces of legislative proposals that have come forward in a long time to the floor of this House. No. 2, this is an opportunity being provided; not any absolute giveaway or sale or anything else; it is an opportunity being provided under this amendment for the homeownership by low-income Americans, an innovative, truly creative concept that needs to be pursued.

I think that despite all the questions that have been raised here today about, well, would it do this; could somebody else who has got a little extra wealth on the side benefit or profit by a nuance here or there—the bottom line is that this proposal is as well-drafted, as well-crafted, as well-brought out here on the floor as almost anything could possibly be, or is brought out to the floor of the House.

Let us get a chance, if the gentleman from New York and others will allow, let us get a chance for us tonight to adopt it, put it into practice, let it get a running start, and we can come back as we always do down the road and correct things and make changes in them and so on. It is a very limited proposal; but is very creative, very innovative, and I opposed the Nehemiah earlier; all Members know I came down with the amendment to strike it, but I happen to think that this particular proposal of homeownership is a very, very important step forward as far as American public policy is concerned.

I very strongly urge my colleagues to not just let this go tonight; and for my colleague from New York [Mr. KEMP] to withdraw it, to consider it some other day, but let us go on and let us have a chance to vote and do it, produce it.

Mr. VENTO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I was absent from the floor and not able to participate fully in the debate, but I have some grave reservations about this particular approach.

I wonder—we comment about the amount of public housing that we

have, about 3½ million units. The fact is, we are focusing on public housing in the cities to in fact sell, but, once that is done, then the coming generations of low-income individuals that might otherwise qualify, that housing would be in fact in the hands of someone else that was fortunate enough to purchase it.

We have had homeownership programs: the 235 programs, the FHA, and the VA programs. Is it necessary now, once that is gone, that stock of housing would not be available for low-income individuals? I apologize for not being on the floor earlier, because some of this may have been discussed, but the fact of the matter is that this housing is necessary and needed.

There was some comment about the fact that much of this housing—still under contract as a matter of fact; it is not paid off; in other words, it is still running under its contracts—is in fact substandard.

Much of that housing, the senior citizen housing and much of the public housing, about 50 percent of which has the elderly in, incidentally, is very successful in our communities. We need that housing stock for these low-income individuals, and we need it today and we are going to need it in the nineties.

Is the gentleman willing to support public housing construction for sale? That would be an innovative approach; it is not anything that we have subsidized as deeply before.

Mr. McCOLLUM. First of all, reclaiming my time, there will always be provisions for public housing in this country; there is a need for it. The fact of the matter is we are not going to see everybody rush forward and buy all the public housing under this program tomorrow morning.

I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] who is partly the author of this proposal, to explain further what happens to the public housing stock under this proposal.

□ 1755

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to respond to that point. We have had VA, we have had FHA and if memory serves me correctly, we have always understood this is the basis to get that starter home, the dream of owning your own home and then of owning your dream home. That begins with that starter home. You finance it, you put in your sweat equity, and fix it up, you live in it, you build that equity and, yes, you move on after you sell out. And you sell out to somebody else who wants that starter home. They are not recycled. They are cycling the folks out of there after they have grown out of there and giving other folks their own opportunity.

Mr. McCOLLUM. If I may reclaim my time before I yield again, I think the point is this: Yes, some of the housing stock may be sold off, but a lot of Members like this one would be a lot more willing to see some Government input, in funding in the housing program of this country in the future to build housing stock that we know is going to go toward private homeownership and the pride that goes into it and the improvements that are made. If we adopt a proposal like this and get going down the road where we can see some light at the end of the tunnel, as the proverbial statement goes, I think that is the bottom line. We are not going to sell off all the housing stock so that there will not be any more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the question is, are we willing to construct public housing and then to basically provide it at a reduced cost to a very-low-income individual? I think you have some actuarial problems in terms of the soundness of a program, whether they will be able to maintain that down the road. I understand the initiative, the dream of homeownership. All of us do. But I am just suggesting to you do not take the housing that we have given up in terms of blood, sweat, and tears in terms of our communities that is successful for low-income people. You certainly would not want to provide housing, for instance, at Cabrini Greens or others that have the problems in terms of providing housing. Let me also point out, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we have some successful program that use a very, very shallow subsidy. For instance, tax-exempt bonds in my own community provide for homeownership, equity and a means of passing on that equity. The point here is, once you provide this first entry-level home, what happens in terms of the equity growth of it? In other words, it will grow out of and away from the availability and affordability of the very people you are talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from California, who has been seeking time.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has made a very good point. That is, we really subsidize with Government moneys most homeowners in this country. As an owner of a VA home, I know that.

The other point is that this Congress at some point has to be willing to let go and to acknowledge and to go ahead and surrender to the fact, let go and acknowledge that these homeowners at Kenilworth may very well sell their houses in the near future. That is part of the American dream, trading up, buying other homes is part of the American dream. This is not really Mr. KEMP's amendment, it is not really Mr. ARMEY's amendment, it is Kimi Gray's amendment. It belongs to her and a lot of other people like her.

I am absolutely dismayed at the adversity and the objections that this committee has raised to this thing.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Very briefly: Just all of the issues that have been raised by our friends, perhaps on both sides of the aisle but particularly on the Democratic side of the aisle, are equally applicable to the Nehemiah program. The Nehemiah program is a subsidy. I voted for it. But it is a homeownership program for low-income and moderate-income people. Every single thing that you have said against the Kemp-Fauntroy amendment has the same problem with Nehemiah, only this is allowing low-income people to get a stake in homeownership, not just upper-income people.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, as I was listening to the gentleman from Minnesota's remarks where he was saying we need to maintain this stock of low-income housing because we need it for those who are low-income people, subsidized housing.

It seems to me what we are saying is we need to maintain these people in this housing. It seems to me we have it backwards.

If we can recycle these people out of poverty and recycle subsidized housing projects out of poverty, having people own their own homes, that ought to be the goal of what we are trying to achieve here.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, that is exactly the point. That is the purpose of what this whole amendment is about, and I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman, Mr. KOLBE from Arizona, misstated my position. My position with regard to who is in low-income housing is not that we intend to keep folks there. The understanding is, and I guess the hope is, the hope of all of us, is that folks get help when they need it and then that help is available when someone else moves up in the mainstream of our society in the world of work. That is what we are shooting for. We know we have the tragedy of second- and third-generation individuals on welfare. But the truth of the matter is you cannot feed the cows the seed corn in order to continue a productive type of entity in terms of producing the crops down the line. That is basically what you are doing here. That is what is different fundamentally about this, what is different about Nehemiah. Nehemiah is a good program. I am glad we have bipartisan support.

I think we ought to have that for homeownership, low-income ownership, try to give people a stake in our society. I think homeownership is enormously important. What I am dismayed about with regard to what is going on here is we are taking public housing, some of which is very successful, some of which has endemic problems and utilizing that, that type of housing stock which should remain available in a successful mode for low-income individuals now and in the future; not to be utilized and given away, in other words throwing away the seed corn at that particular point.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 176, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—238

Anderson	Bilirakis	Byron
Andrews	Bliley	Callahan
Applegate	Boehlert	Carper
Archer	Boner (TN)	Carr
Armev	Borski	Chapman
Badham	Bosco	Chapple
Bartlett	Boulter	Cheney
Barton	Brooks	Clinger
Bateman	Broomfield	Coats
Bentley	Brown (CO)	Cobey
Bereuter	Broyhill	Coble
Bevill	Burton (IN)	Coleman (MO)

Combest	Kindness	Roemer
Coughlin	Kolbe	Rogers
Courter	Kostmayer	Roth
Craig	Kramer	Roukema
Crane	LaFalce	Rowland (CT)
Daniel	Lagomarsino	Rudd
Dannemeyer	Latta	Russo
Daschle	Leach (IA)	Saxton
Daub	Leath (TX)	Schaefer
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Schneider
DeWine	Lewis (FL)	Schuette
Dickinson	Lightfoot	Schulze
Dicks	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
DioGuardi	Livingston	Sharp
Dorgan (ND)	Loeffler	Shaw
Dornan (CA)	Lott	Shelby
Dreier	Lowery (CA)	Shumway
Duncan	Lujan	Shuster
Durbin	Luken	Siljander
Dyson	Lungren	Slusky
Eckert (NY)	Mack	Skeen
Edwards (OK)	Madigan	Slattery
Emerson	Marlenee	Slaughter
Erdreich	Martin (IL)	Smith (NE)
Evans (IA)	Martin (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Fawell	Mavroules	Smith, Denny
Fiedler	Mazzoli	(OR)
Fields	McCain	Smith, Robert
Fish	McCandless	(NH)
Flippo	McCloskey	Smith, Robert
Florio	McCollum	(OR)
Ford (TN)	McDade	Snowe
Franklin	McEwen	Snyder
Frost	McKernan	Solomon
Fuqua	McKinney	Spence
Gallo	McMillan	Stallings
Gaydos	Michel	Stangeland
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Stenholm
Gibbons	Miller (WA)	Strang
Gilman	Monson	Stratton
Gingrich	Montgomery	Stump
Glickman	Moorhead	Sundquist
Goodling	Morrison (WA)	Sweeney
Gordon	Murphy	Tauke
Gregg	Myers	Tauzin
Guarini	Natcher	Taylor
Gunderson	Nelson	Thomas (CA)
Hall, Ralph	Nichols	Valentine
Hamilton	Nielson	Vander Jagt
Hammerschmidt	Nowak	Volker
Hansen	Oxley	Vucanovich
Hefner	Packard	Walker
Hendon	Panetta	Weber
Henry	Parris	Whitehurst
Hiler	Pashayan	Whittaker
Hillis	Penny	Whitten
Holt	Petri	Wilson
Hopkins	Pickle	Wirth
Horton	Porter	Wolf
Hubbard	Pursell	Wortley
Hughes	Quillen	Wright
Hunter	Ray	Wylie
Hutto	Regula	Yatron
Hyde	Reid	Young (AK)
Ireland	Ridge	Young (FL)
Jeffords	Rinaldo	Young (MO)
Kasich	Ritter	Zschau
Kastenmeier	Roberts	
Kemp	Roe	

NOES—176

Ackerman	Burton (CA)	Edgar
Akaka	Bustamante	Edwards (CA)
Alexander	Chappell	English
Annunzio	Clay	Evans (IL)
Anthony	Coelho	Fascell
Aspin	Coleman (TX)	Fazio
Atkins	Collins	Feighan
AuCoin	Conte	Foglietta
Barnard	Conyers	Foley
Bates	Cooper	Ford (MI)
Bedell	Coyne	Frank
Bellenson	Crockett	Frenzel
Bennett	Darden	Garcia
Berman	de la Garza	Gejdenson
Biaggi	Dellums	Gonzalez
Boggs	Derrick	Gradison
Boland	Dingell	Gray (IL)
Bonior (MI)	Dixon	Gray (PA)
Bonker	Donnelly	Green
Boucher	Dowdy	Hall (OH)
Boxer	Dwyer	Hatcher
Brown (CA)	Dymally	Hawkins
Bruce	Early	Hayes
Bryant	Eckart (OH)	Hertel

Howard	Mikulski	Sikorski
Hoyer	Miller (CA)	Skelton
Huckaby	Mineta	Smith (FL)
Jacobs	Mitchell	Smith (IA)
Jenkins	Moakley	Solarz
Johnson	Mollinari	St Germain
Jones (NC)	Mollohan	Staggers
Jones (OK)	Moody	Stark
Jones (TN)	Morrison (CT)	Stokes
Kanjorski	Mrazek	Studds
Kaptur	Murtha	Swift
Kennelly	Neal	Synar
Kildee	Oakar	Tallon
Klecza	Oberstar	Thomas (GA)
Kolter	Obey	Torres
Lantos	Olin	Torricelli
Lehman (CA)	Ortiz	Towns
Lehman (FL)	Owens	Trafcant
Leland	Pease	Traxler
Lent	Pepper	Udall
Levin (MI)	Perkins	Vento
Levine (CA)	Price	Visclosky
Long	Rahall	Walgren
Lowry (WA)	Rangel	Watkins
Lundine	Richardson	Waxman
MacKay	Robinson	Weaver
Manton	Rostenkowski	Weiss
Markey	Rowland (GA)	Wheat
Martinez	Roybal	Whitley
Matsui	Sabo	Williams
McCurdy	Savage	Wise
McGrath	Scheuer	Wolpe
McHugh	Schroeder	Wyden
Meyers	Schumer	Yates
Mica	Seiberling	

NOT VOTING—19

Barnes	Fowler	O'Brien
Breaux	Gephardt	Rodino
Campbell	Grotberg	Rose
Carney	Hartnett	Spratt
Chandler	Heftel	Swindall
Davis	Lloyd	
Downey	Moore	

□ 1820

Mr. COELHO and Mr. BIAGGI changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CARPER, REID, and ERDREICH changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY] having assumed the chair, Mr. AUCOIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to amend and extend certain laws relating to housing, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATIONAL POW/MIA RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 220) to provide for the designation of September 19, 1986, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to once again cosponsor this important legislation establishing a POW/MIA remembrance day, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the chairman of our House task force on POW's and the MIA's the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for helping to bring this measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1970's, Mr. Speaker, a number of us were pleased to cosponsor this measure year after year because at that time we had a serious problem with nationwide apathy. Many well-meaning Americans, hurt and frustrated over our conflict in Southeast Asia, sought to put that period in our history behind them. They sought to do this by declaring the books closed on the 2,400 Americans who remained unaccounted for after the guns were stilled and after the bombs had stopped falling. They believed that the best way to put the Vietnam conflict behind us was by denying any evidence that it had ever happened. This was patently unfair to all those Americans who did not return home and whose families have never given up hope.

Today, in the second half of the 1980's, we have a new enemy, far different than the enemy of apathy but just as insidious—that is the enemy of oversimplification. Too many Americans, although well meaning, have not recognized the complexities of the situation in Southeast Asia. Fanned by sensationalist Hollywood fantasies, many believe that all we need to return our 2,400 missing American heroes is to pay a few brave men with adequate firepower. They forget that Southeast Asia is a mountainous, jungled terrain larger than the State of Texas. They seem to forget that, although we will not give up our quest for these brave Americans, we have never been presented with irrefutable proof of their whereabouts.

By establishing POW/MIA Remembrance Day for September 19, 1986, we are not only reminding our Nation that 2,400 Americans are still missing in Southeast Asia, we are also calling attention to the efforts made by our Government, day and night, to set them free and to fully account for them.

Accordingly, I urge all of our colleagues to adopt House Joint Resolution 451, establishing POW/MIA Remembrance Day on September 19, 1986.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, on which I serve, was unavoidably detained. He is the sponsor of this resolution, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and myself.

So speaking for both of us, let me just say that even though American military involvement in Indochina ended more than 13 years ago, the American people have never lost faith with the grieving families of those servicemen who remain yet unaccounted for.

We all look forward to the day when it will not be necessary to pass a resolution of this kind, but that day will not come until the leaders of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam decide to observe international law and the basic canons of human decency with respect to prisoners of war.

POW/MIA recognition day serves as a solemn reminder that the price of freedom is always high, but Americans have always paid it. Prisoners of war and those missing in action may be relatively small in number, but their sacrifice and suffering on our behalf are all out of proportion to their small numbers.

Mr. Speaker, none of us can truly comprehend the years of heartbreaking loneliness and uncertainty that some American families have experienced. This resolution is really the least we can do to stand with them in their suffering. I hope that the observance of POW/MIA Recognition Day this September 19 will cause us to take renewed dedication in our efforts to secure a full accounting of those Americans who never came home from Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman GARCIA for his cooperation in bringing this resolution to the floor. I would also like to thank the two other original cosponsors, Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. GILMAN, for their hard work on this issue. Finally, I am again gratified by the great number of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle and all points on the political spectrum who have joined in this important bipartisan effort.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the excellent remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]

and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague, Mr. GARCIA, for bringing this important legislation to the floor in an expeditious manner.

I also want to commend the gentleman who continues to demonstrate his own personal interest in efforts to account for Americans still missing in Southeast Asia, and has repeatedly lent his leadership to the issue.

For the past several years, National POW/MIA Recognition Day has been commemorated across the Nation with appropriate ceremonies and activities on the local, State, and National levels.

This year, veterans' groups and family organizations, including the National League of Families, have asked that Congress designate September 19 as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day."

This resolution, which is noncontroversial and has been supported on a bipartisan basis, underscores the United States' debt to American servicemen who fought for this country, yet who remain unaccounted for in Indochina.

This legislation supports the President's commitment to resolving this lingering issue as the highest national priority.

It honors not only those Americans who remain unaccounted for, but it recognizes the tremendous sacrifice of those who were imprisoned in Indochina as well.

By adopting this resolution, we also recognize and honor the families of missing Americans for their continued sacrifice and courage.

POW/MIA Recognition Day increases public awareness in the United States and throughout the world, that our Government is determined to receive the fullest possible accounting of our missing men and considers this issue a humanitarian issue of great concern.

By adopting this resolution, we also send a signal to the Governments of Laos and Vietnam that the Congress supports the priority placed on this issue and urges both Governments to continue and accelerate their cooperation with the United States so that we can all put this issue behind us.

Recently, we have witnessed considerable progress in our negotiations with the Governments of Vietnam and Laos.

Since July of last year, Hanoi has repatriated more remains to the United States than ever before: 26 last August, 8 in December, and 21 just this April.

The Laotians have returned the remains of 13 Americans excavated at a crash site near Pakse; and 14 from the Savannakhet.

United States officials jointly evacuated a crash site in Vietnam and another in Laos.

In January the highest ever ranking United States administration delegation met with Vietnamese officials in Hanoi and were told that Vietnam was committed to resolving this issue within a 2-year timeframe.

The Vietnamese told a congressional delegation, headed by my colleague from New York, Congressman JERRY SOLOMON, that there "may be Americans alive in Vietnam not under their control."

I am encouraged by this positive turn of events, and am certain that by adopting the legislation we are considering today, Congress will signal its support for these negotiations.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention and pay tribute to some of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who have worked extraordinarily hard and effectively on this issue.

I refer particularly to my good friend JERRY SOLOMON, who for the last year has chaired the task force on POW/MIA's and who continues to maintain an active and constructive role in this effort.

Just last February, the gentleman led a congressional delegation to Hanoi and Bangkok to review efforts to account for American MIA's.

Mr. SOLOMON has worked tirelessly on behalf of this issue and deserves the thanks not only of the families and of his colleagues in Congress, but of the American people for his efforts to focus attention on this problem and seek a solution for it.

Likewise, another gentleman from New York, and former task force chairman, Congressman BEN GILMAN continues to exercise his leadership on this issue.

I can think of no other Member who has dedicated more time and effort to resolving the mystery of our POW's than Mr. GILMAN.

Also, I must thank and commend Congressman BOB DORNAN and Congressman BOB LAGOMARSINO, both from California, who continue to contribute their wisdom and advise on this complicated and emotional issue.

Before yielding to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], I want to urge once again all Members to join me in support of this resolution.

By passing this resolution the Congress is paying tribute to all of the brave men who fought for our country in Vietnam and to their families who have suffered such enormous costs to preserve liberty and freedom in the world. None of us can afford to rest until the families of our POW-MIA's have received a full accounting of the fate of our POW-MIA's.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 220

Whereas the United States has fought in many wars;

Whereas thousands of Americans who served in such wars were captured by the enemy or are missing in action;

Whereas many American prisoners of war were subjected to brutal and inhuman treatment by their enemy captors in violation of international codes and customs for the treatment of prisoners of war and many such prisoners of war died from such treatment;

Whereas many Americans are still listed as missing and unaccounted for and the uncertainty surrounding their fate has caused their families to suffer acute hardship; and Whereas the sacrifices of American prisoners of war and Americans missing in action and their families are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That September 19, 1986, shall be designated as "National P.O.W./M.I.A. Recognition Day", and the President of the United States is authorized

and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate such day with appropriate activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 580) to designate the week beginning September 7, 1986, as "National Freedom of Information Act Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 580.

Mr. KLECZKA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 1986 marks the 20th anniversary of the Freedom of Information Act. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 580 to commemorate this occasion, and to focus attention on the principles of open government. I urge the House to support this bill.

The Freedom of Information Act has been important for many reasons. First and foremost, it has enabled journalists, scholars, and private citizens to learn more about how Federal decisions are made, and to participate in the political process.

The law has helped broaden our understanding of national crisis such as Watergate and the Vietnam war. The law has helped expose wasteful Federal contracts, and dangerous health risks to consumers. The law has also served as a deterrent to Federal officials who might otherwise skirt their responsibilities.

It is fitting that Congress commemorate the FOIA's anniversary because the original law owes its existence to this body. No executive agency testified on its behalf, and President Johnson sought to kill the proposal. It took strong, bipartisan cooperation to get the FOIA enacted, and to strengthen it, over President Ford's veto in 1974.

The Freedom of Information Act asserts a very basic principle in our de-

mocracy: That the people, not the bureaucrats, hold ultimate authority. Let's honor this principle by passing House Joint Resolution 580.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 580

Whereas a fundamental principle of the American system of government is that the people of the United States should participate in the governing process;

Whereas the people of the United States, in order to participate effectively in the governing process, require free access to information about the activities and decisions of Federal agencies;

Whereas section 552 of title 5, United States Code, commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act, helps provide the people of the United States with free access to such information;

Whereas the Freedom of Information Act became law in 1966, and 1986 is the 20th anniversary of the Act;

Whereas the commemoration of the Freedom of Information Act should include efforts to educate the people of the United States with respect to the substance and principles of the Act;

Whereas such efforts should be made by schools in the United States; and

Whereas the week beginning September 7 is the week in which many students begin the academic year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning September 7, 1986, is designated "National Freedom of Information Act Awareness Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon Federal, State, and local government officials and the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4510, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1986

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-633) on the resolution (H. Res. 472) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4510) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4175, MARITIME PROGRAMS' FISCAL YEAR 1987 AUTHORIZATION

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-634) on the resolution (H. Res. 473) to provide for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4175) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1987 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Maritime Commission, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4613, FUTURES TRADING ACT OF 1986

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-635) on the resolution (H. Res. 474) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4613) to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the Commodity Exchange Act, and to make technical improvements to that act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1835

SENIOR POWER DAY, 1986

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 1986, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the Honorable DON RIEGLE, was the keynote speaker at a Senior Power Day in Lansing, MI. Over 6,000 senior citizens were present to hear the stirring address of this able leader of the cause of the elderly.

He has charted a course for all of us to follow who are friends of the elderly of this country. Therefore, it is with particular pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I am including the speech of Senator RIEGLE for the RECORD:

SENIOR POWER DAY, 1986, LANSING, MI. "OUR SENIOR CITIZENS—A NATIONAL TREASURE"

Senator RIEGLE. It is an honor for me to be with you today as your keynote speaker.

My wife, Lori, and our 15-month-old daughter, Ashley, join me in expressing our love and affection for all of you—and active support for your agenda.

Senior Power Day here in Lansing is one of the most important events in our State each year. I thank each of you for coming, and for your personal contribution of effort to the great collective strength and purpose reflected by this mighty gathering.

Alone and separate our strength is small, but together we are a citizen army with strength enough to move mountains.

You are here to fight for your rights, and for a decent standard of living for every senior citizen in America. You deserve a decent life and I am determined to see that you get it.

Through long lifetimes of work in our factories, our homes, our shops and farms, you have built the magnificent nation we have today.

Through those life journeys, you have given your best efforts to build your families and to build America. You have done a magnificent job.

You have struggled through two World Wars, the Great Depression, and other difficult times. You have known joy and heartache, you have given life and strength to those of us in successor generations, and, yes, you have buried many loved ones along the way.

An ocean of tears have been shed for those we have loved and lost. Yet you have known the greatest joys as well—the birth of your children, your grandchildren, and great grandchildren. You have brought our nation safely through.

As seniors you have seen it all—lived it all. You are our national treasure of wisdom, and experience, and accomplishments. You are our role model for what can be done.

On behalf of the 9½ million people of Michigan, and the 240 million American citizens, I am here to express our pride and gratitude for all you have done for us—to thank you and to give your our pledge in return.

That pledge is that it should be America's highest goal to see that our seniors live out their retirement years in dignity and with the financial security and living standard that you deserve.

To those who say cut Social Security, we say you are wrong.

Social Security, including the annual cost of living adjustments, is the greatest social accomplishment of our government and citizens in this century.

Our seniors and retirees have worked and earned their Social Security income, and we will fight anyone who tries to steal it from us.

Over the last 5 years, we have had many knock-down, drag-out fights in Washington to save Social Security.

In the Senate, I have led those fights each time, and with your help, we have stopped those who would weaken and destroy Social Security. By your countless letters, comments, and phone calls, you have given me great strength, and I am deeply grateful.

When they tried to eliminate the minimum benefits of \$144 a month—the only income for tens of thousands of our seniors—we stopped them. When they tried to cut by 40 percent the early retirement benefit for those with poor health—or who have lost their jobs—we stopped them. When they tried to eliminate the annual COLA adjustment—which only makes up the buying power that inflation has already taken away—we stopped them. They tried deep cuts in Medicare protection; we stopped many of them. But they're at it again.

They are driving the Medicare hospital deductible higher and higher—to \$492—a 23 percent increase in one year. And the Reagan Administration wants to jump it again to \$572 next year—a 43 percent increase in just two years.

They continue to target the seniors—to cut our feeding programs, our transportation programs, our energy assistance, our

senior housing. These cuts are wrong. They must be stopped.

We must fight them every inch of the way.

A nation that can spend \$1½ trillion in 5 years on national defense can afford to meet the basic human needs of our senior citizens and our elderly.

What good is protection against nuclear bombs, if we aren't protecting our seniors against hunger, against the winter cold, against bankruptcy from medical bills, or isolation and poverty and despair.

We need fewer bombs and more senior housing. We don't need poison gas—we need natural gas to stay warm in the winter. We don't need government surplus food rotting in warehouses—we need to feed our hungry seniors and all the other hungry in our land.

What we seek is economic justice. For seniors, yes, and for the young trying to get started—for people of all ages.

We seek a humane nation that puts its people first—that says we care about each other, that we are our brother's keeper.

I'm sick of the selfishness of some in national life who have it made—and don't seem to care about all the rest who are struggling to keep their heads above water.

I know thousands of seniors who have worked their hearts out over a long lifetime, and who have given their all to their country, and have answered every call of duty. Many of them have had no private pensions; many have had expensive and disabling illnesses; many gave their most productive years on foreign battlefields while others were safe at home building a nest egg. Some say life is not fair. We know that. But a decent society does something about unfairness. A decent society says every person is precious, and that every person should have a decent chance to live and give something of value to our society.

We meet here today to affirm those beliefs and values. We have gathered from across our state to join hands, and hearts, and purpose, and to say with a single voice: That senior citizens have an agenda for America that must be heard and made a leading part of our nation's future.

Thank God that those of you with the strength to come, are here today.

But what of the countless thousands of seniors across our state who lacked the strength or resources to come today, many on sick beds. They are counting on us—their future, even their very lives, depend on what we do. We must not fail them—and we will not fail them.

Let the word go out from this great hall today that we are a citizen army on the march. Let those in the White House, in the Congress, in our State Capitals, know that seniors want human justice for themselves and every other American.

We will use direct political action to support those who hear us and help us, and we will throw out of office those that turn a deaf ear, or try to hurt us.

We are not interested in kind words from those who then turn around and try to destroy Social Security or other vital senior programs. A lifetime of living has taught you to spot the phonies who talk a good game—and then vote against you. It is time those people were thrown out of office before they do any more damage.

Your voice and your vote have great power—and you must use them both.

Before concluding, I want to suggest another mission and purpose for you. I believe the different generations in our society must help each other.

I believe the young must help the seniors—and that the seniors must help the young.

These are difficult days for our young people, just as they are for many of you. Jobs are scarce, education is expensive, and young families find home ownership moving out of reach. Drugs, alcohol and violence are at epidemic levels. Our young people need our help too. And we must help them.

I ask each of you to do more to help the younger people that you can reach and influence. Talk to them—hear their problems, offer them your counsel, and your help and love. They need you just as you need them.

Social Security is an example—it helps retired workers and young workers alike. The disability protections of Social Security are there for the young worker who is injured or is stricken and can't work. And the survivors benefit protections of Social Security are there for the young spouse and children in the tragic event of an early death of the breadwinner. Social Security is a compact between the generations and if those who are younger now are graced by God to reach retirement age then the earned retirement benefits will be there to help them meet life's basic needs.

One thing we know, if God favors us with long life—we all become senior citizens. In the deepest sense, we are each other—we only stand at different moments in time. If we are selfish, whatever our age, we not only hurt others, we hurt ourselves.

Today, Japan is producing twice the number of engineers each year than the United States. We're falling behind. We have a massive trade deficit.

Our young people need education, and America must see that they get the education they need. So we must not let them cut the student loans, cut the work study grants, cut the money needed for an educational system second to none. We must also see that our elementary and secondary schools get the resources they need.

Our educated workers are the ones who go out each day and produce the national income that must pay the Social Security taxes. Today's students and workers are the key to our economic future. They deserve the best chance that we can give them—and that means the needed tools that must come from education and training.

So let us link hands across the generations. We need each other, and we must help each other.

It is our American creed that what we want for ourselves, we also want for our fellow citizens. No man or woman is an island unto themselves. We share a common fate. And so we must give in the same measure that we seek. We must help each other, and flourish together, or we shall surely perish alone.

John Kennedy, in 1961, said these words: "With a good conscience our only sure reward—and history the final judge of our deeds—let us go forth to lead the land we love."

"Asking his blessing—and his help—but knowing that here on Earth, God's work, must truly be our own."

God's work is our own. Senior Power Day—and what we must accomplish together—is part of God's work.

Let us summon the strength, and determination to leave here today and see that the work is done. Will you do it? I know you will.

Now I must return to Washington to carry on the fight.

I love you all and wish you Godspeed.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL EXPORT WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 310) to proclaim June 15, 1986, through June 21, 1986, as "National Agriculture Export Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 310, a resolution to commemorate the week of June 16, 1986 as National Agricultural Export Week.

The commemoration of this week marks two important events. First, National Agricultural Export Week commemorates the economic importance of agricultural exports to both the farmers of the United States and our economy in general. Second, during this week the National Commission on Agricultural Trade and Export Policy will make its final report to the President and Congress detailing what we must do to maintain and improve the competitive position of the United States in the area of agricultural exports.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of agricultural commodities and products; this trade is vital to the well-being of our Nation's economic system. America's trillion-dollar agricultural industry exports more than 40 percent of its annual production. Employment for one-fifth of our Nation's work force is also linked to our ability to maximize opportunities arising in the domestic and world market for basic agricultural commodities and value-added products.

The United States, however, has suffered serious and substantial setbacks in recent years, in large part the consequence of declining export sales. America's survival as a world leader in international trade is in question. However, there are practical solutions to even some of the most intractable problems facing U.S. agriculture in world trade.

National Agricultural Export Week will be America's most important agricultural trade event of this year. Known as AGEXPORT '86, this event will consist of a week-long program of high-level discussions, problem-solving and open dialog on the Nation's multibillion dollar annual world agricultural trade.

AGEXPORT '86 is a public affairs activity of the National Commission on Agricultural Trade and Export Policy. During the past 18 months, this 35-member independent Presidential commission has held hearings at points throughout the United States to study all aspects of this Nation's world agricultural hard-hitting program of recommendations to improve the Nation's agricultural trade. The release of the

commission's final report will be an important part of AGEXPORT '86.

During AGEXPORT 1986 farm leaders, private business executives, Government officials, and Members of Congress will join in Washington, DC, to begin the test of revitalizing and expanding America's agricultural trade with other nations. The goals and objectives for AGEXPORT 1986 are well defined:

First, provide for the submission and consideration of the National Commission on Agricultural Trade and Export Policy's final report;

Second, facilitate public dialog on the National Commission's recommendations;

Third, underscore and discuss the vital importance of agricultural trade to the Nation;

Fourth, educate the general public on matters of agricultural trade; and

Fifth, celebrate the activities of all engaged in agricultural trade.

In regard to the recommendations of the Commission, I would point out that many of these recommendations have already been put to good use. For instance, most of the agriculturally related provisions in the recently passed trade bill of this House are recommendations of the Agricultural Export Commission. Unlike some of the dangerous, anti-agriculture, protectionist provisions in the House-passed trade bill, the agriculture provisions which stem from the Agricultural Export Commission are pro trade, promarket development and positive for the farmers of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to pay close attention to the final report of the Agricultural Export Commission and to follow closely the events and discussion which will occur during AGEXPORT 1986 week. While relatively few Members in the House have constituents directly involved in farming, the constituencies of all Members of this House receive the positive benefits from this Nation's agricultural industry. From the bounty we enjoy each time we sit down to eat to the billions of dollars we export each year, we cannot forget that the production and processing of food is this Nation's No. 1 industry. National Agricultural Export Week is a fitting and timely celebration to the farmers and producers of this Nation. It is also an opportunity to begin planning to insure that the United States maintains its pre-eminent role in agriculture and agricultural trade far into the future.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 310

Whereas agriculture comprises the Nation's largest single industry;

Whereas the economic well-being of the Nation's agricultural industry is directly related to its ability to export and to compete in world markets;

Whereas earnings from agricultural exports have contributed \$333,000,000,000 to our Nation's balance of payments in the past decade;

Whereas these earnings have stimulated nearly \$1,000,000,000,000 in total national

economic activity and provided millions of man years of total national employment; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to expand international trade in United States agricultural commodities and products and to develop, maintain, and expand markets for United States agricultural exports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of June 15, 1986, through June 21, 1986, is hereby proclaimed "National Agricultural Export Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL PHILANTHROPY DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 207) to designate November 1, 1985, as "National Philanthropy Day," and ask for its immediately consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 207

Whereas there are more than eight hundred thousand nonprofit philanthropic organizations in the United States, employing more than ten million individuals, including approximately four million five hundred thousand volunteers;

Whereas contributions by people of the United States to support such organizations amounted to approximately \$70,000,000,000 in 1984;

Whereas philanthropic organizations are largely responsible for enhancing the quality of life for Americans and other people throughout the world;

Whereas our Nation owes a great debt to the schools, churches, museums, art and music centers, youth groups, hospitals, research institutions, and other institutions and organizations which aid and comfort the elderly, the disadvantaged, and the sick; and

Whereas the people of the United States should demonstrate their gratitude and sup-

port for philanthropic organizations and the efforts, skills, and resources of organizations and the efforts, skills, and resources of individuals who carry out their missions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That November 1, 1985, is designated as "National Philanthropy Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Page 2, line 3, strike "November 1, 1985," and insert "November 15, 1986."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution to designate November 15, 1986, as 'National Philanthropy Day'."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SAFETY IN THE WORKPLACE WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 131) to designate the week of June 16, 1985, through June 22, 1985, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 131.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep thanks to the chairman, Mr.

GARCIA, and to Mr. HANSEN, for bringing this matter forward.

This resolution takes note of the fact that National Safety Council statistics indicate that workplace accidents accounted for over 11,000 employee deaths and nearly 2 million employee injuries during the year 1983, and the cost in pain and suffering to the individuals involved and to the cost in financial loss to American industry is such that it warrants the attention of the Nation and the American Society of Safety Engineers and other safety and health organizations are promoting occupational safety and health.

This resolution and the proclamation that will ensue therefrom will help heighten awareness of this problem and the importance of occupational safety.

I again thank the chairman and the ranking member for their courtesy and I hope this will be approved.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the gentleman for his excellent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 131

Whereas the National Safety Council statistics indicate that workplace accidents accounted for eleven thousand three hundred employee deaths and one million nine hundred thousand employee injuries during 1983;

Whereas said accidents caused immeasurable pain and suffering to victims and their families;

Whereas the cost of occupational accidents amounted to over \$33,400,000,000 in losses to American industry during 1983;

Whereas the American Society of Safety Engineers and other safety and health organizations continue to promote occupational safety in all industries;

Whereas occupational safety and health organizations will be calling attention to the seriousness and magnitude of this problem through appropriate activities; and

Whereas this endeavor is worthy of our support and cooperation so that we may reduce the toll of workplace injuries and deaths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of June 16, 1985, through June 22, 1985, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week" commemorating the efforts of those organizations to promote safety and health for the American workers, and calling upon all Government agencies and the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Page 2, line 4, strike "of" and all that follows

through "1985," on line 5 and insert "beginning June 15, 1986."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning June 15, 1986, as 'National Safety in the Workplace Week'."

The title amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DOWN SYNDROME MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 321) to designate October 1986 as "National Down Syndrome Month," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 321

Whereas the past decade has brought a greater and more enlightened attitude in the care and training of the developmentally disabled;

Whereas one such condition which has undergone considerable reevaluation is that of Down syndrome—a problem which, just a short time ago, was often stigmatized as a mentally retarded condition which relegated its victims to lives of passivity in institutions and back rooms;

Whereas, through the efforts of concerned physicians, teachers and parent groups such as the National Down Syndrome Congress, programs are being put in place to educate new parents of babies with Down syndrome; to develop special education classes within mainstreamed programs in schools; the provisions for vocational training in preparation for competitive employment in the work force and to prepare

young adults with Down syndrome for independent living in the community;

Whereas the cost of such services designed to help individuals with Down syndrome move into their rightful place in our society is but a tiny fraction of the cost of institutionalization;

Whereas along with this improvement in educational opportunities for those with Down syndrome is the advancement in medical science which is adding to a more brightened outlook for individuals born with this chromosomal configuration; and

Whereas public awareness and acceptance of the capabilities of children with Down syndrome can greatly facilitate their being mainstreamed in our society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 1986 is designated as "National Down Syndrome Month" and that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the designated month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1845

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks, and to include therein extraneous material, on the bill, H.R. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOLLOHAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPEAKING UP FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN NICARAGUA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, June 4, 1986, was a great day in the debate over whether or not the United States should support freedom fighters in Nicaragua. Hundreds of ministers and religious leaders from across the country gathered here in Washington to stand behind the President and those who are fighting for their freedom in Nicaragua. It was a

day in which the Winston Churchills came to counter the misdirected efforts of the Lord Chamberlains.

It was my honor to welcome these men and women to our Capital City and accept their petition to the U.S. Congress. I would like to commend Tim LaHaye and Curtis Maynard of the American Coalition for Traditional Values, Stan Wachtstetter of the Apostolic Coalition, Rabbi Yahuda Levin of the American Jewish Coalition, and Henry Ferro of Concerned Catholics for Religious Freedom in Nicaragua. It was an excellent show of unity between protestants, Catholics, and Jews who courageously stand up in defense of this country's Judeo-Christian heritage.

The following resolution was passed and signed by over 300 of the top religious leaders in our Nation:

RESOLUTION OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS, JUNE 3, 1986

After much prayer and supplication we have gathered here from across our nation in response to the concern of many of our fellow citizens to express our sympathy for the plight of the Nicaraguan people and resolve as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has the direct responsibility to all citizens under our constitution to "provide for the common defense" and "to protect against invasion."

Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 87-723 signed into law by President Kennedy on October 3, 1962, states: "The United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, from extending by force or threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere."

Whereas the Marxist-Leninist regime in Nicaragua under the Sandinista leadership with direct support from Cuba, the Soviet Union, Libya, the P.L.O., and certain communist block nations, is guilty of genocide, harboring terrorists, destroying houses of worship, torturing of religious leaders and willful disregard of human rights, all of which are absolutely immoral.

Whereas no sacred writing of any recognized religion denies the right of people to defend their human rights or fight for their freedoms. In fact, it is generally accepted that these rights, considered by many as a divine gift from God, include a responsibility to diligently uphold freedom for individuals to exercise their religious heritage.

Whereas the Freedom Fighters of Nicaragua are resisting the forces of communism in our hemisphere consistent with the goals and objectives of the U.S. Congress and are fighting on our continent against the encroaching empire of an enemy whose expressed goal is to destroy our nation.

Whereas in March of 1986, a small group of religious activists stood on the Capitol steps claiming it is immoral for the U.S. Congress to give aid to the Freedom Fighters of Nicaragua: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the religious leaders assembled here today desire to clarify that those self-appointed individuals assembled in March did not speak for the nation's religious community as a whole; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn and deplore the immoral acts of the Sandinistas and call

upon the President and Congress to proceed quickly in compliance with Constitutional and Public Law to oppose by whatever means may be necessary, the totalitarian Marxist-Leninist presence in Nicaragua.

We hereby place our signatures and request that others of like mind throughout the Nation do the same.

Edmund Burke once said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." I commend these brave men and women for having the courage to take an uncompromising stand for freedom.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF GOV. MARIO CUOMO OF NEW YORK UPON HIS RENOMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week Gov. Mario Cuomo of New York was nominated by acclamation for a second term at the New York State Democratic Convention.

Also nominated by that convention was our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNDINE] for Lieutenant Governor. On the morning following these nominations, Governor Cuomo made his acceptance speech before a packed convention audience—one of the most exciting, upbeat speeches I have ever heard, and one that received rave reviews not only in New York but around the Nation.

I believe my colleagues in the Congress—Republicans as well as Democrats—will want to read this great speech given by one of the most exciting political leaders in our Nation, and one that most political experts regard as a very prominent contender for the Presidency in 1988.

At this point follows Governor Cuomo's exciting address:

GOV. MARIO M. CUOMO, ACCEPTANCE SPEECH, DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION, JUNE 3, 1986

Governor CUOMO. You know, you're going to make the whole speech anticlimactic.

I accept the designation with the deepest gratitude for your confidence. Thank you also for giving me a superb running mate; a man who's respected everywhere in the State, and certainly in Washington; a man who will work side by side with me as we lead New York from recovery to a whole new era of progress: Congressman Stan Lundine. (Applause.)

I congratulate our great Attorney General who has been a committed, relentless and effective people's lawyer for eight years, and with whom I am very proud to be running again this year: Bob Abrams. (Applause.)

And another good friend, intelligent, a highly-regarded public official with whom I've worked for years; the next Comptroller of the State of New York, Herman Badillo. (Applause.)

And you produced two choices for the United States Senate; both of them competent, committed and respected Democrats. I wish both John Dyson and Mark Green a productive campaign; a good one that keeps its focus on our common goal which is regaining Democratic control of the United States Senate. (Applause.)

I'm grateful to all of you, of course, for the vote yesterday but in a special way to the people who seconded my nomination: my good friends Denny Farrell and Louise Slaughter and Dominic Baranello, who spoke for me on the floor. (Applause.)

And I want to say a special word about the man who did me the very great honor of putting my name into nomination: Speaker Stanley Fink. (Applause.)

His announcement that he would not seek reelection signalled a great loss for the whole family of New York. Everyone who knows the Speaker knows his sparkling intelligence, his quick wit, his vast knowledge of government. Some of us, however, were privileged to learn more about Stanley. We know him to be totally committed to his profession, to his colleagues, to his principles; a man who came into government to make life better for the people whom he served. That was his mission. And he has never stopped pursuing that simple but profound mission for all the years he's been with us. And in the process, ladies and gentlemen, he has elevated the politics of this State. He has been a tower of strength, he has been a source of enormous instruction and encouragement and support to me through my entire term. He's a great leader, he's a classy guy and a good friend. We'll miss him. I wish you would join me now in telling him how much we're going to miss him. (Applause.)

Come on, get up! Get up! (Applause.)

Four years ago, in 1982, almost to the day I made the following entry in my diary and I'd like to read it to you. It says: "Papa came in 1926 without a penny. Half a century later the family that he and mamma started here are enjoying the milk and honey of the greatest and most abundantly blessed nation in the world. Just the idea," I wrote, "that I'm considered a possible choice for Governor is a dramatic illustration of what this country means. It's the definition of the word opportunity. I finished the day yesterday wondering if I will ever be able to repay the enormous kindness I have received." I wrote those words on June 6th, 1982.

And now, this afternoon, four years later your nomination reminds me again of the uncommon opportunity I've been given, the enormous kindness that I have received from you, and the great debt that I owe in return. And I and my whole family are trying to repay that debt. In 1982 we promised the People of the State of New York the hardest working administration in its history and that's just what we've done. (Applause.)

We promised we would lead the way to jobs and justice from Buffalo to Montauk Point, and that's just what we've done. (Applause.)

Now with the good Lord and the people of this State willing, in the next four years we will continue our progress until everyone remembers that New York is the Empire State, Number 1 in the United States of America. (Applause.)

Now I'm looking forward to this campaign, I really am. It's going to be for me five months of fun, five months of reminding New Yorkers of how much we've accomplished together. And in telling our story, one point I think will stand out as the most significant; and that is that in the last three and a half years we've proven that working together, all of us, Upstaters and Downstaters, suburbanites and city residents, the people of our beautiful rural areas, labor and management, men and women of all

colors, of all backgrounds and of all creeds, that all of us working together can achieve things and make progress that others didn't even believe possible.

We've proven over the last three and a half years that family works. Just think back a bit. Now everybody knows that by the early '70s we had become the most heavily taxed state in the United States and that our competitive position and economy were badly damaged. We know that. And let's remember who made us that way. For 16 years, from 1959 to 1974 the Republicans dominated the government in Albany and during that period they took us from 22nd in the United States, in terms of per capita taxation, to first in the United States. They've raised the state income tax to a nearly incredible 17½ percent rate. And in the process we lost hundreds of thousands of jobs. Now let's remember that, that they raised the taxes in this state. It was thanks to Hugh Carey's leadership that finally we were brought back from the brink of financial disaster and began to reduce those taxes. But by 1983, as you'll recall, we were still suffering from the after-effects of 16 years of crippling Republican increases.

We had higher unemployment rates than most other states. In 1983 we had a potential deficit of approximately \$1.8 billion. Our short-term credit rating was falling. Our roads and bridges were crumbling, under the influence of years and years, decades even, of neglect. The crime rate in this state was soaring. That was 1983.

But here we are three and a half years later. Let's look at the record. We've balanced the budget for four years for the first time, without the gimmicks and pretenses that had impaired our credibility in the past. For the first time we balanced it by generally-accepted accounting principles. We reduced our spring borrowing by \$800 million and won for the State of New York our highest long-term credit rating in ten years. We have the people of this State the largest tax cut in the history of the State of New York. Our tax cut will save the hard working taxpayers—(Applause.)

That tax cut is going to save taxpayers in this State more than \$3 billion over three years. And the reform removes 500,000 New Yorkers—think of it, 500,000 New Yorkers who are living below the poverty line—removes them from the tax rolls. And we cut the tax rates to their lowest point in 27 years, back to the time before the Republicans got their hands on it. (Applause.)

Let's look at that record. We started to build and rebuild all over the State. You can see the signs of progress everywhere. I told people earlier when we first started the construction work on the highways, "Take my names off those signs. I don't want my names on those signs" when all those obstructions were appearing all over the State and people are cussing. But now that they're opening the access ways and the roads are being—my name is going up on those signs. (Applause and chanting "Mario.")

Now with that largest bond issue in our history we're making our roads and our highways and our bridges safer. And we enriched our job development authority and our UDC and all other economic development instruments we used. We built, as you know, convention centers in our cities, and centers for advanced technology in our universities. We gave new support to agriculture and to tourism and to minorities and women to own businesses. And all of these investments together have paid off.

1982 we promised jobs and we have delivered them. There were 894,000 more people at work in New York on January 1st of this year than on the day I was inaugurated. 894,000. (Applause.)

Now that's 894,000 people. Hundreds of thousands of families given the chance to earn their own bread, and more given dignity. Real dignity. Today our unemployment rate is under the national average. Listen to this: One out of every five new jobs created in the United States of America in the year 1985, one out of every five new jobs created in this whole nation in 1985 was created right here in the Empire State (Applause.)

We have an economy now that's dynamic and thriving, and it's better equipped for the challenges and opportunities that the year 2000 will bring. We have proved that New York means business.

But we proved much more than that. We proved that the New York idea works; that we can balance our books, that we can practice fiscal prudence without ignoring the reasonable needs of our hard working middle class and of our struggling poor. We have proven that today government can have a heart and a head, that common sense and compassion can go hand in hand. And our principal point, we've made it over and over: that we are at our very best as a people when we recognize one basic truth: That we are all, all, of us, connected one to another. That no man is an island; no woman, neighborhood, no village, no county, no nation. And because of that, because we depend on one another, because we need one another, because we touch one another, we should work together and hope together for the good of all of us. That's the New York idea (Applause.)

Mostly I think we've proven that New York, as well as any place in this grand country, understands what has made this nation great, and that's opportunity. The chance to earn your own way, the chance to make it, to work for your own benefit and for your families, with no limit to how far you can go, how much you can do. No matter what your color is, no matter what your sex is, no matter the place where your ancestors came from. And that's what we're doing here in New York together: providing opportunity, proving every day that work is better than welfare. And at the same time meeting our obligations to those who are helpless, to those who can't work through no fault of their own; those who have grown too old to work, the very young, the disabled—disabled for reasons we don't understand; the distraught. People without enough to eat or a roof over their heads. We have not forgotten them in the Senate of New York.

That's the New York idea, the idea of family, yes, the word I love. Sharing the benefits and burdens. And it isn't a slogan in this state, it's the way we govern. And it works.

Just look at the record again, another small part of it. We have the most extensive affordable housing program in our history, providing 140,000 units of housing for middle class and poor families. We've strengthened the laws protecting tenants' rights and led the nation in providing shelter for the homeless.

We've invested massively in our elementary and secondary education systems. 42 percent more in resources than in 1983. Nearly \$100 million more this year to give our teachers salaries closer to what they truly deserve. (Applause.)

We've provided 72,000 computers so that young people won't be required to compete

in a high tech world with a lead pencil education.

We've built thousands of new prison cells, taken 7500 more hardened criminals off the street. We've increased the State Police to its largest force ever. We've funded the State and local police and prosecutors, improved our criminal justice technology, strengthened our criminal laws and we've gotten results. Over three years violent crime in this state is down nearly 13 percent. (Applause.)

I've had a great, great privilege. I have had the privilege of reconstituting our highest court, the Court of Appeals. This is the first time in the history of the State that any governor had the opportunity. And we have remade it with six appointments including an already-eminent chief judge, the first black to be appointed for a full term in the history of the court. (Applause.)

And, shame on us it took so long, the first woman in the history of the courts. (Applause.)

And all of them, all six, selected on the basis of judicial excellence. Even without reference to political affiliation, and frankly I think that's the way the court should be constructed. (Applause.)

It goes on and on. We passed the first acid rain law in the history of the United States. (Applause.)

And we passed the first seat belt law in the history of the United—(Applause.)

Now wait a minute. This was not a popular law, I'm telling you, when we first passed it. You see, we had this thing—the Legislature really got the idea for the seat belt law. Let's face it. And it wasn't very popular so they didn't mind my taking the credit in the beginning.

I remember on the day I was supposed to sign it the State Troopers told me the calls were like 8,000 to 11 against it. This is the truth. And a woman called up, somehow got through on the phone to me. I'll never forget. This is the truth. Got through and wants to talk to the Governor. I said "Yes." She said, "Is this you, Kukumo, Keemo, Koomo?" I said, "Yes, this is Cuomo, Governor Cuomo." She said, "You're going to sign that thing, the seat belt law?" I said, "Well, why?" She said, "You sign it, I hope you get in your car and that seat belt gets you right in the neck." (Laughter.)

So it wasn't popular in the beginning. But we signed it because we thought it would do some good things. And listen to how it has helped us, please. Of all the statistics we have, this is perhaps to me, one of the most significant. Our first in the nation seat belt law, together with our 21-year-old purchase age, together with our tough anti-drunk driving laws and our vast educational efforts have saved—saved, and we've counted them—last year hundreds of lives, and avoided hundreds of serious injuries. Judged by miles traveled. Last year because of the seat belt law, because of the 21-year-old purchase age, because of our efforts at education and our tough new laws, last year was the safest year on the highways of New York State in our entire history. (Applause.)

I tell you, you can see that we're going to have fun for five months this summer because it goes on and on. I could go on with the list of achievements and believe me, in the five months ahead of us, I'm going to. We're going to go everywhere delivering the good news of this record. (Applause and chanting "Mario.")

Thank you. We're going to heard from St. Lawrence to Suffolk. We're going to be heard from Clinton to Queens. We're going

to be heard from Franklin County to Franklin Square. We're going to be heard from Chataqua to Staten Island. We're going to be reminding—all right, so I left a few places out. (Laughter.)

We're going to be reminding New Yorkers of how we turned the poetry of our promises into the solid brick and mortar of our governance. And I can't wait, I'm telling you. (Applause.)

I'm looking forward to going to the hard-working couple in Westchester County and telling them how we fought against all the odds and all the opinion surveys on the question of disallowing the deductibility of state and local taxes, how we took on the White House on that issue. (Applause.)

How we took on the White House. We took on the White House because we wanted that couple in Westchester to be able to continue to afford the house that they had saved for years to buy without having to give up a college education for their kids. And we won that battle. And I want to be honest, we won that battle because of people like Stanley Fink, Fred Ohrenstein; because of people like Pat Moynihan in the Senate. Strong Democrats who fought with us. But also because we were joined by Republicans on that occasion: people like Warren Anderson, people like Al D'Amato, people like Clarence Rappleyea. What's right is right. It was Democratic leadership that got them there, but the whole state came together, even politically on that issue, and that explains our victory, and I'm grateful to all the people who participated. (Applause.)

I'm eager to go to Buffalo. I want to go back to Buffalo to tell the workers at American Brass that we're working to save other jobs just the way we saved them at American Brass. And Tioga, to tell the new employee owners of Twin Castings in the Village of Waverly that in the same way that we helped recapture an industry that was the backbone of that entire village we can help others as well, as indeed we preserved 4600 jobs at the GM plant in Tarrytown. I can't wait to remind the people of Steuben County—back to Steuben to tell them about my promise in 1982. I'll never forget it. I went to Steuben and I told them, "Look, make me governor. You'll have subway cars to work on here in Steuben County" and they're working on those subway cars today in Hornell. (Applause.)

Now it's going to be good, it's going to be good to sit with the grape growers and the dairy farmers and the others who coax the life out of the land, to discuss all we've done as a state to keep their taxes down, to expand their productivity and their markets and speed up the research that will make them still more competitive in the years ahead of us.

And while I'm in Western New York I will be pleased to remind our people of what I have said so often: that there are fairer and better ways to provide Downstate with the affordable energy it needs than by hurting the Upstate to do it, and that as long as I have anything to do with it, Upstate's hydropower will remain Upstate. (Applause.)

And in the north country, the great north country, how beautiful it is there. We'll talk about how we protected it and enhanced our magnificent Adirondack Park. And we'll discuss the tremendous opportunities that the Fort Drum expansion has produced.

And it will be great to go back to the City of New York to talk to the construction workers and the elevator operators and the crowds of Wall Street, to talk to my neighbors in Queens—(Applause.)

Talk to the people who live next door to Matilda's family in Brooklyn, 4701 Avenue K. And remind them that the mayor of their city, my good friend Ed Koch has said that no governor in the history of this State has been fairer in meeting the legitimate needs of the nearly eight million New Yorkers who live in the five boroughs. I'm very proud of that. (Applause.)

And, boy, I wish you could all be with me when we go back to Long Island. I can't wait to go back to Long Island. (Applause.)

Now wait a minute, back to Long Island to say it again, to tell the people of the Island that I was against it in the beginning when it was tough to be, I was against it in the middle when it wasn't much easier, and I'm against it now that Republicans are desperate to find room on the platform to stand next to us, agreeing that *Shoreham must not open*. (Applause and chanting "Mario.")

Now, of course, we have a great deal more to do. There's no question about that. The Republicans did an awful lot of damage from '59 to '74 with their high taxes. And no, we have to work on the taxes. They're not down low enough. We're very proud of our tax cut. It's the biggest in the history of the State. But it has come down further, the tax rate. We know that; we're committed to do that. (Applause.)

And there's more than that to do. We must bring down further the unemployment rate. There are too many people out of work.

And the drop-out rate. The drop-out rate in school is inexplicably, unacceptably high. (Applause.)

Then there are even more difficult problems. There are too many children having children or having abortions. We have to deal with both those problems.

We need to put the public back in the Public Service Commission through long overdue reforms. We need accommodation for a larger and larger population of senior citizens. We need to do more to curb the scourge of alcoholism and drug abuse that menaces our people and especially our youth. (Applause.)

And fewer and fewer people disagree with us on this: We need to divest from companies who encourage the ugly sin of apartheid in South Africa. (Applause.)

And we need to complete the rest of this year's legislative agenda and, of course, if you read this morning's papers—and you should—the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States could not be more correct. New York cannot rest content when one out of every seven people in this nation is poor. When one of every five children, more than one of every two children who are black are being born to poverty. The bishops have pointed it out. Of course they're right. Of course we have to do more to let the poor people join the rest of us who have been blessed with opportunity. We're committed to doing that in this State. (Applause.)

Now we need to do all of these things. But three and a half years have given us the sure knowledge that working together we can do them all. We can do all of these things and more. These three and a half years have given us a new belief in our ability to achieve good things. We've seen what's happened when we work together. And I can see a new spirit, I can see it in the faces of the people that I meet—and I meet a lot of them. I can hear it in their voices. I can read it in their letters. There's a new respect out there for the Empire State, a new confidence in this New York idea. They know that we've come a long way in the last few

years and that we're still moving. And I'll tell you, it's very exciting.

I see a wonderful, wonderful future for us as we get close enough to the year 2000 almost to reach out and touch it. For us and for our children and for their children, it can be a marvelous new century. I can see a future where our children and young people get a better start in life than anywhere else on this planet. Where there are preschools for all the children; where there are high schools of excellence for the specially talented; where there are special accommodations that give every disadvantaged child the opportunity to achieve all that he or she can.

I can see elements of our SUNY and CUNY systems achieving an excellence that ranks them even higher among the most eminent public universities in the nation. And the entire system of New York's higher education becoming the strongest in the country, well rounded, including the engineering and high-tech capacity that the future will demand. I see it happening. (Applause.)

It's very real, it's very plausible for those of us who have been privileged to be close. We see the evidence. We know how strong our potential is. We can all see our centers of advanced technology giving birth to hundreds of ideas in small businesses.

I can see the digital fiberoptic thruways. I hope you've heard about that—the digital thruways, the fiberoptic thruways connecting our super computers, connecting our communications networks all through New York and the Northeast, tying us together, closer than we've ever been.

I can see genetically-engineered vaccines. People are just beginning to understand them. We know about them in this state. Genetically-engineered vaccines and other discoveries from our own State research laboratories, bringing a time when fewer children will suffer from birth defects, disabilities and debilitating illnesses.

I don't believe that manufacturing has to shrink. I see manufacturing industries growing assisted by high tech, by new forms of collaboration between labor and management. That's what Stan Lundine taught us in Jamestown, how to put labor and management together in innovative ways. (Applause.)

I see us learning to find new ways to put employees into the business. That's what happened in Waverly; the employees took over the business. There are new ways for employees to participate with management in the operation and the profits from businesses. And I see us using billions of dollars of pension fund monies that we haven't used before, all to get our manufacturing going again. I can see all of this producing jobs, thousands of jobs for all of us who are able to work.

And I see an environment that's cleaner and safer and sounder because we had a bond issue. And we will have a bond issue and a super fund. (Applause.)

I see a future with all the government that the people need, but with only the government we need, at every level, with prudent restraints on spending, more efficient modes of measuring government productivity than we have now.

I see a whole new era of accountability accompanying our new era of opportunity. And I see New Yorkers—and I see it so clearly—I see New Yorkers being the best, the very best at all of this. And why not? Who's better able to be the best? We can have the most dynamic economy. We can

have the very best system of education. We can have the cleanest environment. And we can have the safest streets. Why not? We can provide the opportunity to rise up in this system to millions more. Yes, just as it was provided to us and to our parents and to their families before them, perhaps. We can offer more to people than ever before. Not handouts, but what they want more than all else: the chance, the decent chance to earn their own way with hope and dignity, as we did, and our parents before us, and perhaps theirs before them. (Applause.)

You see, we can do it. I know we can do it because we have proven that we have the ability to achieve enormous things in this state when we come together. We can do it all, if we build on the progress of the last few years. And if those of us who have already made it like you and I, the lucky ones, if we remember who we are, if we remember where we came from, if we remember that somewhere before us there was an ancestor dragged here in chains, or a refugee driven here by oppression, or a family fleeing from famine and despair, or an immigrant woman, a child in her arms, a bundle on her back and tears in her eyes because she didn't know the world she was entering. If those of us who have been educated and protected and maybe even fed by the whole community remember that for 50 years, from the day that great New Yorker Franklin Delano Roosevelt lifted himself from his wheelchair to lift this nation from its knees, this great state has always—(Applause.)

For all that time this great state has always found the wisdom and the strength to make the circle of opportunity wider and wider, allowing more and more outsiders to join those of us who have already made it. And this is a wonderful time to remember, a wonderful time. The 100th birthday of our Lady of Liberty, who has welcomed striving people to our shores for decades. Think of it. The Lady Liberty, magnificent symbol of freedom and hope of millions of improbable dreams; grand and towering in our harbor, lighting the way to opportunity for generations of our forebearers. The generation who were told it couldn't be done, and did it. The generations of quiet valor who turned those improbable dreams into the miracle called America. We are the children of those giants. We're the heirs to the legacy of courage and concern and achievement which they left us. And because we are their heirs, we will ignore the faint-hearted, we will ignore the nay-sayers who neither build nor dream, and instead we will remember who we are. We will remember where we came from. We will remember how much we've done, and then we will go from this place to lead the way to doing the rest. All of us, the whole family of New York together. Let's go do it! Excelsior! God bless you! (Applause.)

(Whereupon the acceptance speech of Governor Mario M. Cuomo was then concluded.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, on the recorded vote on the Fauntroy amendment to H.R. 1, I inadvertently recorded a "no" vote when I had intended to vote "yes."

I support encouraging tenant management in public housing and I appreciate having this

opportunity to state my actual position on this amendment.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order today, on the subject of nuclear proliferation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I should indicate that a number of Members, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK], were unable to be physically present for this discussion, but have asked that their remarks be submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I shall be doing that at the conclusion of my own remarks.

Mr. Speaker, with five countries already known to have nuclear weapons and many more possessing the capability to produce nuclear explosives, the insidious and continuing spread of nuclear technology and nuclear material demands the immediate attention of Congress, of our President, and of the American people. It is for this reason that my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, and I have joined in sponsoring this special order tonight to lay out some of our concerns on this subject and to call for a renewed commitment within this body and from President Reagan to addressing the problem of nuclear proliferation.

In this context, President Reagan's recent announcement that this administration will no longer be constrained by the limitations of the SALT II Treaty is significant. The fact is that while the arms race between our Nation and the Soviet Union has been the single issue dominating the nuclear agenda for the past 40 years, we have rarely acknowledged a much quieter race taking place behind the scenes: nuclear proliferation—the spread of nuclear material and nuclear technology to more and more countries.

Yet almost all experts agree that the most likely nuclear crisis scenario will involve a third party—a renegade nation or terrorist group—and that this scenario probably poses the most serious threat to our Nation's security. Some have characterized this kind of confrontation as "the Sarajevo of the nuclear age"—a regional conflict between India and Pakistan, an outbreak in the Middle East, or a crisis in south-

ern Africa that triggers a global nuclear holocaust.

It is obvious that seeking to restrain the nuclear brinkmanship between the two superpowers must remain a top priority on our national security agenda, but the stakes are simply too high to continue to ignore the terribly serious problems posed by the spread of nuclear weapons to new nations or subnational groups.

All you have to do is glance through a newspaper on any single day and the message is clear: international terrorism is on the rise. From Europe to Africa, from South America to the Middle East, we are all affected by the horror of this random violence. But pause for a moment and consider the implications should any of these terrorist groups "go nuclear." A nuclear-armed Qadhafi? Abu Nidal with the bomb?

I am very troubled that we are not now taking the necessary steps to prevent this from becoming a reality. I know that some people would like to believe that nuclear terrorism is a far-fetched possibility. All I can say is that the facts, in my judgement, tell a much more frightening story.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has heard testimony from expert witnesses indicating that from information obtainable through public literature, at least a dozen nations have the technical capability today to produce nuclear weapons. Only two conditions have to be met: first, a political decision to go ahead with the construction of such weapons and second, access to the roughly 20 pounds of plutonium or highly enriched uranium required to produce a nuclear explosive.

Against this backdrop, it is ironic that the way we safeguard the transportation and storage of our Nation's gold is far more thorough than our arrangements for plutonium, yet the latter is both more valuable and obviously much more dangerous.

It is fortunate that at the present, only five countries—the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, and the People's Republic of China—have established nuclear arsenals. However, as time goes on and the technology spreads, the likelihood of additional players joining the nuclear club increases. India, Israel, South Africa, and Pakistan all have highly advanced nuclear programs sufficient to produce nuclear explosives and none of these nations has signed on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty renouncing development of nuclear weapons. Other countries are known to be working very hard to acquire nuclear-weapons-related technology. Libya's Colonel Qadhafi has made numerous attempts over the past 15 years to get a nuclear device—includ-

ing a direct overture to buy a bomb from China.

There is much that must be done here in Congress. One proposal I have offered is H.R. 903, the Nuclear Explosives Control Act. This legislation is designed to strengthen our Nation's nuclear export criteria, to offer positive incentives to other countries to encourage them to forego the use of dangerous plutonium and highly enriched uranium in their nuclear programs, and to discourage world commerce in U.S.-origin nuclear explosive materials. Clearly, this is not the whole solution, but I do believe it represents a solid first step in the right direction.

We must advance the issue of nuclear proliferation as a key defense concern and matter of fundamental importance to the security of our Nation. I have been very concerned that in recent years we have allowed short run economic and political considerations to regularly take precedence in our country's decisionmaking over the longer run threat posed by nuclear proliferation and the increased risk of nuclear terrorism. In many decisions it appears that the serious concerns raised by the Department of Defense or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission have been deliberately overlooked or downplayed. To allow this to continue is, in my view, a prescription for ultimate disaster.

We must strengthen the role of the Department of Defense in determining the advisability of nuclear exports and the arrangements for nuclear technology transfers to other countries.

The President should be encouraged to work more aggressively through international channels to shore up international constraints and prudent restrictions on the exchange of nuclear material and technology. The horrifying accident last month at the Chernobyl nuclear plant in the Soviet Union well illustrates the profound interest we all share in assuring the most limited and secure use of nuclear material.

Increasing the penalties for and the vigorous prosecution of individuals illegally trafficking in nuclear goods must also be considered. The shadowy netherworld of nuclear exchanges—outright smuggling, selective use of export law loopholes, or sleight-of-hand transfers of dual-use items from peaceful to military nuclear purposes—is much more than an idle concern, as the example of Colonel Qadhafi proves.

There are no easy answers to the nuclear proliferation problem—but there is no time to waste in coming together as a nation to begin to explore solutions. I would particularly like to commend the Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies for their innovative and constructive contribution to this effort. Recently, the Roosevelt Center

began a national education campaign to help citizens gain a broader perspective on the spread of nuclear weapons around the world. The center's Wildfire Program gives students, community leaders, and local officials a chance to learn about this critical problem and to express their views to those of us in policymaking positions. It is an excellent example of the kind of non-partisan problem solving that is so essential if we hope to find lasting solutions to what is surely one of the most serious of all national security threats facing our Nation. The Wildfire campaign—which is now underway in many of our congressional districts—gives us all an opportunity to take stock of the nuclear proliferation issue.

I would urge my colleagues to utilize the Wildfire Program in their districts, as I have in mine. At the heart of the Wildfire Program is a fascinating simulation exercise modeled after simulations used to brief National Security Council members and senior White House officials. Wildfire participants actually take on the roles of government advisers to the United States, the Soviet Union, China, India, and Pakistan as they attempt to forestall an apparent Pakistani plan to explode a nuclear device in the midst of an escalating crisis with India. There is no better way to give people a sense for the complexities and extreme pressures of a crisis situation than by this kind of educational role playing. I had an immensely positive experience with a diverse group of community leaders in Lansing, MI, last month and have planned another Wildfire event in my district for late June.

The time to act is now, before we are faced with the reality of a regional nuclear conflict or act of nuclear terrorism. I call upon the President and those of us here in Congress to take up this challenge. Let us say clearly and firmly that we are committed to taking whatever steps may be necessary to prevent such a crisis in the first instance.

□ 1755

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for calling this special order. I think it is particularly appropriate in light of the problems which face us as a Nation in dealing not only with our own budgetary problems, but also in wrestling with the major issues between the super powers involving potential nuclear exchange.

I thought it was particularly appropriate that the gentleman earlier in his remarks mentioned the significance of the SALT II agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. as part of this discussion. I

think it is important that we keep in mind that the rest of the world looks to the United States and the U.S.S.R. to determine whether we really have a commitment to nuclear arms control.

How can we tell smaller nations around the world to halt their nuclear proliferation, not to become members of the nuclear club, when we are failing to control the growth of our own nuclear weaponry. Unfortunately, our Nation seems to be moving away from a commitment to arms control. We are asking for restraint from our allies and other countries in the world when we cannot demonstrate restraint on our own part. We are asking new and potential members of the nuclear club to trust both super powers, perhaps all five of the major members of the club, when neither of the super powers can show trust in one another.

I think it is a grave mistake for the administration to be moving away from SALT II, not only for the potential damage which it can cause between the United States and the U.S.S.R., but because of the lesson it sends around the world.

Some of the facts on SALT II are worthy of disclosure during this debate.

This treaty, which was never ratified by either country in full form, has by informal agreement curtailed Soviet production and required them to dismantle old systems as they put in new strategic systems. Since 1972, under our following of the SALT agreements, the Soviet Union has removed 1,007 land-based missiles and 233 sea-based missiles. They have also dismantled 13 submarines.

There is certainly more to be gained than lost by continued efforts under SALT II, not only because it releases the pressure on the United States and the U.S.S.R. to continue to build, but because it sends a message around the world that perhaps this confrontation and buildup of nuclear weaponry can come to an end, and it is not necessary for small and developing countries struggling with their own economies to dedicate precious resources to joining the nuclear club.

The gentleman from Michigan makes a telling point. There are Republicans and Democrats who will disagree about nuclear weaponry, but I can find no disagreement with the statement that we do not want nuclear weapons to fall into the hands of a Mu'ammar Qadhafi. At that point it is totally unpredictable. No rules apply. The world is unsafe for almost any reason.

I think it is important tonight that we also recognize the contribution made by the Roosevelt Center. In my home city of Springfield in central Illinois, we have engaged in the same exercise of Wildfire, the simulation so that students and community leaders

can put themselves in the shoes of world leaders and suggest what might occur if some nations should suggest a nuclear reprisal. It is an eye opener. People who think little or nothing about nuclear exchanges sit on the edges of their chairs and start to realize the dynamics of the situation, a situation which could easily lead to the destruction of the civilization that we have come to cherish in this world.

The conclusion that students and participants reached in the Wildfire exchange at our high schools in Springfield was that we have to do everything in our power to make certain that the nuclear club does not expand and that those members within it would contract their own nuclear arsenals.

I think that is really the only key to stability in the long run and to reductions in the fears which we all have that someday we will be faced with a nuclear confrontation.

We must make certain, though, that the United States not only preach the sermon, but live by the word as well. We cannot be gourmands preaching fitness or wasteful spenders urging thrift. If we are asking the rest of the world to turn down their nuclear arsenals and their efforts to increase them, we must show it on our own part.

It is especially important in these days with deficit constraints and budget constraints that we make certain that if there are cutbacks to be made, they are made because of joint agreements between the United States and the U.S.S.R. verifiable agreements which say that in fact we are reducing our arsenals. That is a message which can be delivered around the world and a message which could lead to the reduction in proliferation.

The gentleman from Michigan should be commended for this effort this evening. The Roosevelt Center is taking this message. As our words go across the Nation on C-SPAN, the Roosevelt Center is delivering that message in more specific settings around our country and they should be commended as well.

This is truly a bipartisan issue and I thank the gentleman for inviting me to participate in this special order.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution to this special order. I do hope that other of our colleagues who have not yet had the opportunity to take advantage of this extraordinarily exciting grass roots program that the Roosevelt Center has developed, I hope they will be encouraged to do so by the discussion we have had this evening. I think it will go a long way toward expanding public awareness and understanding of this all-critical issue.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies enjoys

widespread recognition as a major force for public education on crucial issues facing our Nation and our world, and deservedly so.

Last year, I had the opportunity to join high school students from the 10th District in playing a fascinating learning game about the Federal budget process developed by the center called "Debtbusters."

This year, the center's president, Roger Molander, former member of the National Security Council and his staff have focused on the dangers of nuclear proliferation with a new game called "Wildfire." This year, when Mr. Molander and national field coordinator John Parachini invited me to set up a session of Wildfire with students from area high schools, I was enthusiastic. Once again, it proved to be an invaluable experience.

On April 19, I joined a group of 50 students from New Trier and North Shore Country Day Schools in Winnetka to avert a nuclear "crisis." Working in terms representing the United States, the Soviet Union, China, India, and Pakistan, the players faced a difficult situation: Could they forestall an apparent Pakistani plan to explode a nuclear weapon in a border dispute with India?

They had their work cut out for them. As I looked on with faculty members Jack Mattox of New Trier and Bill Freisem of North Shore Country Day, the first of the three 10-minute "days" of the crisis began to unfold. The students spoke in hushed but urgent tones, considering their country's relationship with the others and debating diplomatic and military options. Before our eyes, what was a school library became a forum for preventing nuclear disaster.

Tensions increased as ambassadors from each country hurried from table to table carrying messages and requests for information. In one instance, the United States and U.S.S.R. joined with China to force a resolution of the crisis, reaching an agreement that demilitarized the Indian-Pakistani border and provided for negotiations to end hostilities. Watching these young diplomats, one could not help but wonder at times if they found wisdom that had escaped their elders.

It has been suggested that Wildfire may not provide an absolutely accurate simulation of an actual crisis, or that the solutions achieved by its players would not be possible in a real world conflict—but these criticisms miss the point of the exercise. Wildfire provides the general public with an opportunity to learn about the problems facing world leaders in controlling the spread of nuclear weapons and preventing their use.

Roger Molander and the Roosevelt Center this year embarked upon an ambitious program, to make people think about what can be done to slow or halt nuclear proliferation, arguably the biggest threat confronting the world today. Five nations are admitted members of the nuclear club, and at least four others either have nuclear weapons or possess the technology to assemble one.

Molander writes:

It makes you think, especially on starry nights, whether a species that gets this smart can really make it—survive technological maturity. You look out there and wonder if it's been done before—in this or any other Milky Way. Or whether anyone else has had a chance to try.

The Roosevelt Center is to be commended for educating the public on these issues, and more importantly, for reminding us that there is much work to be done to ensure that the most horrible destructive power ever unleashed on Earth will never be used again.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Michigan, Mr. WOLPE, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, for the valuable service they perform today with this special order on nuclear proliferation.

In the 40-plus years since the invention of the bomb, the political leaders of the world have managed to continue a torturous dance around the issue of nuclear proliferation. This irrefutable fact belies the oft-quoted assertion of Albert Einstein that "this basic power of the universe cannot be fitted into the outmoded concept of narrow nationalisms," and that "the unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our way of thinking."

Instead of confronting the political realities of the danger of nuclear proliferation, we have rather avoided the issue through textbook examples of denial. Clever euphemisms have been created to mask the unprecedented dangers we face. As a result, the growing roster of nations possessing nuclear capabilities becomes the "nuclear club." The horrific creation of the bomb is transformed into "letting the genie out of the bottle."

We name the most terrible weapon in our arsenal the Peacekeeper at the same time that plans are drawn up to erect a science-fiction "peace shield" over the continent to protect against attack. Again and again, we deny the horrible truth of nuclear proliferation and an ever-expanding global arms race.

When we created the bomb, we envisioned a monopoly over its possession in blatant disregard of human history. The monopoly, as we know, lasted for a matter of months. Now, we wonder not if the bomb will come into the possession of terrorists and hostile madmen, but when. That nuclear blackmail will occur is a given, considering the progression of the dilemma of nuclear proliferation. In the face of this awesome and terrible force, strategic superiority becomes a meaningless term, as somewhere in the world the downtrodden plot their revenge on the mighty.

Einstein once told us with remarkable prescience that "there is no defense, there is no possibility of control . . ." of our apocalyptic invention except for one, tenuous hope: ". . . through the aroused understanding and insistence of the peoples of the world."

Perhaps, today, we are seeing the genesis of this global movement away from the brink. As is so often the case, a disaster of unprecedented scope is required to open humankind's eyes to impending calamity. Perhaps Chernobyl, with its cloud of death spreading beyond national borders into the world's consciousness, has provided a spark of realization. We shall see.

In the meantime, the moment has long since passed for the so-called leaders of this planet to assume their responsibility to humankind's past, as well as its future. Each day that we fail to confront the issue of nuclear proliferation is another day closer to the "unthinkable"—another convenient euphemism

which should be stricken from the nuclear glossary.

The Swedish statesman Alva Myrdal starkly described the task before us. "Every government defends its participation in the arms race as necessary to guard its national security," he wrote. "But this is an illusion. What makes the arms race a global folly is that all countries are now buying greater and greater insecurity at higher and higher costs. The nonstop character of the arms race also poses ever steeper obstacles to disarmament negotiations. While the disarmers talk, the armories that were to be dismantled are being built higher and higher. Disarmament negotiations have, so far, been a sorrowful Sisyphus game and a long series of missed opportunities."

For many in the governments of the two superpowers and the rest of the nuclear "mob"—a more appropriate euphemism for holders of this destructive capability—arms control is an anathema to be avoided at all costs. I would say to them that the costs are far greater than any our species has ever known, and that they assume the height of arrogance when they presume that they have the moral authority to exact these tolls on all of humanity, on all that came before and on all that is yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, another opportunity is upon us now. We can take some small comfort in the fact that the superpowers are at the very least sitting in negotiation, though few of us hold out high hopes for what they may accomplish before the discussions are again dashed upon the rocks of narrow nationalisms.

It is clear that compromise and conciliation is necessary in this endeavor as in no undertaking ever assumed by the world's leaders. Let us get on with it. To again quote the words of another, "As soon as men decide that all means are permitted to fight an evil, then their good becomes indistinguishable from the evil that they set out to destroy."

I again thank the gentlemen for their effort of conscience today.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, after 40 years, it seems amazing that only five nations have access to nuclear weapons. However, how long will this situation last? Several other countries, including South Africa and Israel, have nuclear weapons capability. In fact, they may already have a stockpile of nuclear weapons.

There are also countries that are doing whatever they can to obtain nuclear technology. One of these countries is Libya. Imagine would a man like Qadhafi do with a nuclear weapon? As nuclear technology spreads, terrorists throughout the world have a chance to get their hands on weapons grade materials. The bombing of an airplane is a small horror compared to the detonation of a nuclear device in an American city.

The possibility of new nations—or even a terrorist organization—acquiring nuclear weapons is a problem that Americans must begin to confront together—and solve together. Only by educating ourselves to the dangers of nuclear proliferation can we begin the process of confronting this dangerous situation.

One such education program has recently been conducted in my district and in many of my colleagues' districts throughout the country. It is a program called Wildfire and it was

designed by the Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies. The Wildfire campaign was created to help citizens gain a long-term perspective on the nuclear dilemma, and in particular on the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

The Wildfire program, which was conducted at one of the universities in my district, combines speakers and town meetings with a simulation game. The simulation allowed students to assume the roles of leaders of different countries and then put them in a nuclear crisis situation. By putting students in a crisis—a nuclear weapons test by Pakistan—they were forced to confront the policy dilemma's of nuclear proliferation.

I commend the Roosevelt Center's efforts to bring the public into the debate on nuclear proliferation. Our democracy is based on citizen participation and this program offers every one of us an opportunity to become involved in an issue of critical importance to our Nation and the world. I only wish there were more projects of its kind.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my colleagues, Mr. WOLPE and Mr. PORTER, for organizing this special order on the topic of nuclear proliferation. This subject is one which must be confronted by all nations and steps must be taken to see that these destructive weapons do not fall into the hands of terrorists.

Like so many Americans, I am deeply concerned about the rapid buildup of nuclear weapons. During the next few years, the United States objective should be a radical reduction in the levels and the power of existing and planned nuclear arms. The United States must also pursue a process by which we stabilize the relationship between offensive and defensive nuclear weapons, whether they be on Earth or in space. We must address this issue now and instead use the increasing contribution of our nonnuclear defenses as our best deterrent to war. A world free of the threat of military aggression and free of nuclear weapons is an ultimate goal on which we, the Soviet Union, and all other nations can and must agree.

As Mr. WOLPE and Mr. PORTER have already eluded to, the Roosevelt Center For American Studies is in the process of carrying out a national campaign to help the people of this Nation gain a better understanding on the spread of nuclear weapons around the world. The Wildfire campaign is a concerted effort to help Americans from all walks of life acquire some basic knowledge about this issue and to share with those of us involved in the decision-making process, their views on this critical problem. I welcome this initiative because I believe it provides the people of this Nation a forum by which they can become involved and participate in finding a solution to a serious problem which threatens the security of this Nation and the future survival of our world.

Incidentally, the Wildfire campaign will be coming to my congressional district on August 11. I look forward to participating in this forum and sharing dialog with my constituents on this important subject.

One final point, nuclear proliferation is a terrifying process and one which threatens our very existence. In this time of increased international terrorism, the likelihood of nuclear

weapons falling into the hands of these groups must be considered. The spread of nuclear weapons is a subject we as a nation must learn more about together, and must solve together.

I would like to again thank Mr. WOLPE and Mr. PORTER for taking this time to consider this issue and also for allowing me the opportunity to participate in this discussion.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, not long ago in Cleveland a tense meeting took place during which a committed group of individuals strove to avert nuclear disaster on the India-Pakistan border. While skirmishes over Kashmir's borders threatened to turn into all-out war, Pakistan pulled its trump card and announced its intention to detonate a nuclear bomb in the air if India refused to back down. Three days of frenzied negotiations brought a reprieve, but not a solution: The bomb was not detonated and India made some concessions on the border dispute. But the long-term tensions remained and everyone there knew that the conflict and the threat would continue to simmer.

If you're curious as to why this crisis failed to make the front page, it is because the events were only on paper, the days were 10 minutes long, and the negotiators were citizens in the community who had come to learn about nuclear proliferation as participants in the Roosevelt Center's game of "Wildfire." What they learned goes far beyond the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons. They learned why reasonable people can be brought to the brink of disaster and consider taking that final, irrevocable step of pushing the button. They learned that reasonable people who want to rid the world of the nuclear threat might themselves also desire the power that comes from possession of the bomb. Most important, they learned that the situation they faced in an hour of play-acting is not at all far fetched; that it could, in fact, be on the front page at any time.

Only five countries admit to having "the bomb": the United States, the Soviet Union, the Peoples Republic of China, France, and Britain. India, South Africa, and Israel are all known to have the technology to build nuclear weapons, but deny having any arsenal. Rapidly approaching parity with those countries are Pakistan, Argentina, and Brazil.

Proliferation of nuclear weapons was not a passing fad of the 1960's when the technology was still fairly new. It is a real response to the perception created by our own dramatic arsenals that nuclear weapons are today's tools of power diplomacy.

I find sobering enough the prospect of an arms race in this country and the Soviet Union. I grow more disturbed at the spread of this deadly technology to Third World Nations who might be less reluctant to rely on the strength of the nuclear threat. But I am staggered by the thought of nuclear technology and materials falling into the hands of those for whom the taking of innocent life is the preferred mode of action—terrorists for whom a cause is worth any price.

The threat of nuclear terrorism cannot and must not be easily discounted, but it also need not be inevitable. Nuclear technology, though already widely available, is still control-

lable. Only with a much stronger commitment to its control, however, can the nuclear nations hope to stem the tide.

It is our own efforts and attitude toward arms control and nuclear restraint that set the tone. If the United States is willing to consider legitimate arms control, to pursue vigorously the issue of nuclear containment, to insist on verification procedures for the use of exported U.S. nuclear technology—in short, to make a top priority of nonproliferation, it is possible that the right tone will be set.

If, however, we continue with a reckless disregard of the possibility of unstable regimes or radical factions gaining the power of the atom, we can be sure the threat will become reality.

The first step—informing the public—has been taken by the Roosevelt Center. I encourage all my colleagues to ask how the Wildfire game might be brought to their district. It is an absorbing and revealing exercise. With that kind of effort, maybe we can help ensure that nuclear confrontation never goes beyond the reaches of our imagination, and never makes the front page.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Ukraine and the Mediterranean have dramatized the urgent need to control the spread of nuclear weapons. Although the accident at Chernobyl has already attained the status of the worst in the history of civil nuclear power, the number of victims is but a tiny percentage of those who would die in even a small nuclear exchange. And recent terrorist acts cannot help but raise questions about nuclear terrorism. How safe would the world be today if Muammar Qadhafi or the Ayatollah Khomeini had the bomb?

Where do we stand in 1986, 16 years after the Nonproliferation Treaty came into being? On the surface, the treaty appears to have been a success. Not one nation has been added to the list of confirmed nuclear weapons states: the United States, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, France, and the PRC. But there is concern that four nations—and maybe more—have secretly joined the nuclear club, none of which are parties to the treaty. There is also a whole group of countries which appear to have taken steps at one time or another in the recent past to develop the capacity to produce nuclear weapons, and there is considerable ambiguity about the current status of those programs. Some of those countries are parties to the treaty and some are not. The rapid dissemination of enrichment and reprocessing technologies over the past 16 years has added to the uncertainties and dangers.

So while we shouldn't characterize the treaty as a failure, nor can we say that it has been a complete success. To borrow a term from the vocabulary of arms control, sudden breakouts into the nuclear weapons club by several nations are possible.

What can be done to strengthen the nonproliferation regime to help prevent such breakouts?

First, nuclear export controls should be tightened, both in terms of subjecting more nuclear-related equipment and technologies to controls and by strengthening individual national export control systems. I believe this can be done without unduly impeding U.S. nuclear exports. Actually, the U.S. record in this

area is better than most, but even we need to tighten up our restrictions.

Second, we need to develop a system of sanctions to employ against countries engaged in developing nuclear weapons. Ideally an effective system of sanctions would make unnecessary such actions as the 1981 attack on Iraqi reactor.

Third, we need to look beyond the hardware and technology to the political motives underlying nuclear weapons programs. There are many reasons why a nation might undertake to develop its own nuclear weapons. In those cases where perceived or actual security threats drive the program, we need to see what we and our allies can do to defuse those situations.

Finally, we and the other nuclear weapons states need to work harder to reduce our own nuclear weapons stocks. In drafting the Nonproliferation Treaty, the states without nuclear weapons agreed to forgo them in exchange for a commitment by those with nuclear weapons to reduce their stockpiles. In the words of article 6 of the treaty, the weapons states agreed to take effective measures to bring an end to the nuclear arms race. The pursuit of mutual and verifiable strategic nuclear arms reductions is certainly the most important aspect of our bilateral relationship with the Soviet Union. Progress in that critical endeavor would serve to strengthen our moral and political standing as a leader in the nonproliferation arena.

The most immediate objective in the area of arms control is a mutual and verifiable comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union. With today's technology, verifiability is no longer a barrier to such an agreement. A test ban treaty would send a powerful message to would-be possessors of the bomb: the superpowers are serious about arms control.

It may not grab headlines, but the struggle against nuclear proliferation is one of the most important battles of our time. It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of millions may hang in the balance.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in calling attention to the game "Wildfire." A session of the game was conducted several months ago in my district, and the feedback from my constituents who participated in the program was very positive.

Representatives of groups such as the Vietnam Veterans of America, the John Birch Society, the National Organization of Women, the University of Tulsa faculty, students in the ROTC program at the university, and the League of Women Voters joined to participate in the game. To bring such diverse groups together at the same forum is in itself a great accomplishment.

Wildfire is very effective in bringing out the complexities of nuclear proliferation without partisan or ideological rhetoric. It educates and informs the participants in a reasoned, balanced manner. The exercise is designed in such a way that it can be played and enjoyed by people of all ages.

The issue of nuclear arms proliferation is one which we as members of Congress must face. The arms race is a deadly game which we and our allies play with the Soviets. We

spend larger and larger amounts of money to increase our arsenal as we face record deficits at home. We escalate the production of nuclear arms at the expense of the development of safer, less costly conventional arms, thus increasing the likelihood that the next major war, if it comes, may escalate into a nuclear conflict.

The American public has been slowly awakening to the threat posed by unbridled nuclear proliferation. Exercises like Wildfire enhance the education process, and allow the American people to make reasoned decision whether we should continue arms escalation or whether pursuit of mutual, verifiable arms reduction should be a major part of our blueprint for the future, and make this decision free of the emotional rhetoric found on both sides of this issue.

Wildfire also brings out the fact that nuclear proliferation is truly a global problem with the number of nations possessing nuclear arms projected to triple within the next few years. The possibility of an unstable regime in one country or another wreaking havoc on international diplomacy simply by virtue of the fact that it possesses a nuclear warhead is very real. It is an issue we must face.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Roosevelt Center for its development of Wildfire, and I wish the center continued success in its attempts to raise the American public's awareness of the issues facing us.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, so long as nuclear weapons continue to exist, the threat of nuclear accidents, nuclear wars, and nuclear holocaust remain threats that we often ignore, but will always exist. The possibility of nuclear mismanagement and catastrophe is not limited to exchanges between the superpowers. So long as the arms race continues, nuclear fuels and weapons become increasingly difficult to retain detailed scrutiny over, and the components of nuclear warheads fall increasingly into the wrong hands, the introduction of nuclear weapons into the arsenals of more and more countries and the risk of nuclear terrorism becomes an increasing threat to our country and the world at large.

This is not a new problem. Often, however, the debate on nuclear proliferation enjoy only limited public popularity and are quickly forgotten when other more immediate issues come into public scrutiny. Often discussed is abandoned in the face of perceived powerlessness, and lack of the perceived immediacy of the problem. But these perceptions are misguided: the problem is in need of immediate redress; public education on this issue is essential; informed judgments on these issues can make a difference in public policy; and only informed and determined response to this increasingly frightening situation can avert the possibility of major disasters in the future.

The Wildfire Program was created to heighten public awareness of the nuclear proliferation problem and encourage individuals to teach others about the problem and work toward solutions. This is a nonpartisan, non-dogmatic program. Wildfire does not attempt to direct specific action or specific programs for the solution of the nuclear proliferation problem. This is a complex issue, and may be interpreted and addressed in a number of

ways. Wildfire attempts only to alert people to the real urgency of this problem and to encourage them to draw their own conclusions as to what the need for action is, and what this action should be.

Because this issue has emerged over a long period of time and does not appear to become much worse from one day to the next, it is difficult to express the sense of urgency that this problem has. Because of this simple problem, it is especially difficult to rally public interest. The wildfire organization has been created to arouse the interest and concern of the public to this increasingly dangerous issue. I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues two pieces on the nuclear proliferation problem.

One is by Tobias J. Halliday, a concerned resident of the Eighth Congressional District and a former intern in my office; and the other is by Dr. Robert L. Beckman, an expert on nuclear proliferation and a consultant for the Congressional Research Service on these issues—the essay by Dr. Beckman will also appear in the July 1986 issue of *Arms Control Today*. I would like to take this opportunity to applaud the efforts of wildfire on raising public consciousness on this issue, and to offer my support to their mission. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this nonpartisan and very worthwhile organization. The essays follow:

**THE NEGLECTED DANGER OF NUCLEAR
PROLIFERATION**

(By Tobias J. Halliday)

JUNE 8, 1986.

Though the threat of nuclear disaster fundamentally influences our day-to-day existence, it is largely neglected, often as a result of the widespread belief that there is nothing the individual can do to prevent or prepare for such an occurrence. But as the meltdown at Chernobyl has helped to illustrate, the risks inherent in the utilization of nuclear technology will not go away or take care of themselves if the public chooses to ignore them. Refusal to take account of these risks and blind faith in policymakers and technocrats will more likely result in a continued lack of proper safeguards and emergency planning, as was the case at Chernobyl.

Chernobyl and the similar incident at Three Mile Island in 1979 reveal only one aspect of the danger of nuclear disaster. But the spectre of nuclear disaster has many faces. Nuclear war, triggered by computer malfunction or escalation of a regional conflict, is another threat which is considered unlikely by adherents of continued nuclear deterrence primarily because aggressive threats, thus far, have been dealt with at face value by rational minds. But a third and perhaps most-neglected danger of nuclear disaster concerns the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Since the detonation of the first atomic weapons by the United States in 1945, the possession of a nuclear arsenal has been associated with major power and international respect and prestige. As more nations have joined the "nuclear club," the quest by a number of small nations to obtain this capability has been increasingly intense. As technology has become more readily accessible, the delimiting factor has become access (usually through an existing nuclear power) to sophisticated tools and materials and, most importantly, high-grade fissionable material.

Although the Non-Proliferation Treaty was successful in restraining the spread of atomic weapons for many years after its signing in 1968, failure by the superpowers to control the escalation of their own nuclear arms has seriously undermined this agreement. Further, it is a fundamentally voluntary agreement, and many nations which are nearly able to build nuclear weapons have refused to sign. This, combined with a major escalation of sales of reactor technology and materials to Third World countries, primarily by Western European nations but also by the United States, has led to a snowballing problem in controlling the transportation and secure possession of fissionable materials in sensitive regions. At the same time, the minimal supervision and regulation of International Atomic Energy Association standards in Third World reactors over a growing span of time, contributes to a rising level of uncertainty about amounts, locations, and grade levels of nuclear fuel.

The problem of maintaining control of fuel is no less severe in the U.S. This leads to a growing possibility that weapons-grade Uranium—the critical "missing link" for any bomb builder—will not only be made available to a less secure nation, but may be illegally seized and fall into the hands of terrorist organizations. As recent events have demonstrated, there is no shortage of such organizations, and many have already indicated that their dedication to their causes is valued more highly than the lives of their own members. Clearly such dedication has important implications so far as the use of nuclear weapons by terrorist organizations is concerned.

The spread of nuclear technology has already expanded the number of nations with nuclear weapons, and that number could quadruple in as little as six years. Six countries—the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, China, and India—have all conducted successful tests of nuclear weapons. According to *Newsweek* (December 5, 1983, p. 56), Argentina, Canada, West Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, South Africa, Sweden, and Switzerland are all believed capable of building a bomb. Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Iraq, South Korea, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, and Taiwan are all thought to be capable of building a bomb within six years. While few of these nations are likely to pose a significant security threat to the U.S. in the immediate future, the mere existence of nuclear weapons under the control of a variety of governments greatly increases the possibility of nuclear weapons materials falling into the wrong hands.

Unless current practices concerning nuclear fuel and hardware are changed dramatically, logic compels one to believe that it is only a matter of time before a small nation, or even a terrorist organization, detonates a nuclear device. It may take 20 years, or perhaps as few as two. It could happen in a regional conflict in the Far East, or at a demonstration in New York City. But unless dramatic steps are taken soon, it will happen.

Clearly, a radical change is needed in the way we conduct our business in nuclear affairs. Ideally, the best solution to this problem is complete disarmament and dismantling of nuclear reactors. In the absence of this unlikely event in the near future, much more rigid control must be imposed in the handling and transportation of fissionable materials and nuclear hardware in the U.S. With our allies we must set in place strong

sanctions against nations which refuse to sign and abide by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Stricter guidelines and much stronger enforcement of existing rules must be adopted concerning the handling of fissionable materials in all nations, with adequate provisions for policing the operations of new reactors in previously non-nuclear countries. These guidelines must be firmly but evenly applied in all countries.

The first step in this process, however, must be the recognition that nuclear proliferation is an immediate and serious problem. Secondly, we must recognize that the public must play an important role in meeting this crisis. Awareness of the problem must spread, and policymakers must become sensitive to the issue. Only by recognizing the urgency of this problem and by putting pressure on elected officials to confront these dangers can ultimate disaster be averted. Only two events can generate the public interest necessary to prevent future disaster: spontaneous action, or action prompted by an unforeseen major disaster. Clearly, the first is preferable to the second.

In a famous quotation, Albert Einstein warned that the acquisition of nuclear technology must be accompanied by a radical change in thinking about issues of war and human suffering. He feared that without such a change in thinking this new power would ultimately spell our disaster. The course of events we have observed in recent years makes it apparent that the time has come for us to change our way of thinking about war, peace, and the prudent use of nuclear technology.

**THE ESSENCE OF NUCLEAR EDUCATION: BETTER
WELL-READ THAN DEAD**

(By Dr. Robert L. Beckman)

Vienna, Austria in April happened to be beautiful. I was there with a group of U.S. citizens representing the United Nations Association on a study tour of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] headquarters. Our ostensible purpose was to learn more about international nuclear safeguards. While we were there, the nuclear accident at Chernobyl was discovered.

It is always interesting to be in a foreign land and get a non-U.S. perspective on a world crisis. In this particular event, the top staff of the IAEA happened to be as much in the dark as our group as to the specifics of the meltdown in the Soviet Union. Thus, everyone was straining to learn just how catastrophic the accident might be, and especially whether Vienna would be in the fallout zone.

The initial words from the international press were confusing. The word from the United States was alarming; European analysts were not much comfort either. Fortunately, once more accurate information was released, the magnitude of the accident and the size of the radioactive release could be determined; then began the agonizing reappraisal. Naturally, most people want to know just how bad the health dangers are; only later do they get into the questions about generating electricity by splitting atoms.

Let us just say for modeling purposes that one percent of the core of that reactor got out into the atmosphere; that would be close to two tons of variously deadly radioactive particles. The cloud of particles is even now working its way over the United States and around the globe. Many of the particles will remain deadly for thousands of years. Perhaps 100,000 lives will be direct-

ly imperiled over time, and hundreds of thousands of square miles will be contaminated to some degree.

To give you some perspective on the scale of the accident, however, and to put last month's misery into a useful context, it needs to be remembered that of the over 1,400 nuclear weapons tests conducted since 1945, over 400 were above ground, and they introduced into the atmosphere an estimated five tons of plutonium, clearly one of the more deadly elements ever discovered by man. At Chernobyl, many more radioactive particles than just plutonium were released.

What is important to remember is that we are up against something which is bigger than all of us. This nuclear "problem" has dimensions which must be explored. Whatever one's personal attitudes about nuclear or nuclear weapons, no one is immune from the consequences; a nuclear explosion or a nuclear accident anywhere is a nuclear event everywhere. Thus, for the moment, instead of weighing the relative merits of one political system as against another, instead of debating the future of nuclear power, and instead of searching for scapegoats and stupidity, let us begin to understand the broader context of Chernobyl and nuclear arsenals.

There is a premise, in both educational and democratic theory, that knowledge is liberating; correspondingly, ignorance enslaves. People, to remain free, must be educated. In one sense, then, history can be read as a series of struggles for and against knowledge, a storybook of revolutions that inevitably spring from knowing, thinking about what we know, and eventually acting upon that knowledge. The enlightenment; the reformation; anticolonialism; human, equal and civil rights. Revolutions all, and all fundamentally rooted in a battle of ideas.

Successful revolutions inevitably lead to a change in the culture. Culture by its very nature is a set of shared customs, attitudes and ideas which are transmitted from generation to generation by learning processes rather than by biological inheritance. Education preserves and deepens the culture, as do the other transmitters of culture: politics, religion, social organizations, the economic system. Thus, revolutions, particularly those within technologically advanced democratic cultures, must change a vast array of dominant ways of thinking and acting within a culture before they are successful.

In pluralistic or democratic cultures there is inevitably a creative ferment of alternative belief systems which vie for dominance. These movements, or counter-cultures, threaten the dominant "cultural universals" which bind societies together in harmony. For the most part, democracies absorb potentially revolutionary ideas and movements through the process of acculturation, a sort of evolutionary cooptation. Through acculturation, the system in effect grinds the edges off most challenges to the status quo. Over time, would-be revolutionaries learn to conform, to fit in. Through compromise, the system may even absorb pieces of the revolution. Thus, the traumas of the 1960s and 1970s are ameliorated somewhat in the 1980s: underground nuclear weapons testing is still a norm; our war in Vietnam is ended; minorities and women have greater access to power; environmental issues have entered the political vocabulary; and even some communist systems are flirting with capitalism.

Rather than achieving a fundamental restructuring of the system, however, revolu-

tions in industrial democracies are lucky to effect change even at the margins. (Radical critics, of course, complain that such change is no change at all.) Institutions and mindsets have a resilience that is both pacifying and infuriating. We depend on and trust in consistency, yet that respect for routine, ritual and tradition can become smothering. The same homeostatic cultural bonds which make violent political revolution so unlikely in democracies can also stifle necessary and unnecessary changes alike. In a larger sense, habitual behavior at a global level makes peace possible, but it also makes revolution inevitable.

From time to time there occur technological revolutions which shape the intensity and timing of ideological revolutions. Several stand out in the twentieth century: aviation and space exploration; the computer; antibiotics and genetic engineering; the bomb. Both metaphorically and actually, aircraft and satellites have shrunk the globe so that few can ignore the meaning of Stevenson's phrase "spaceship earth"; computers continue to make the improbable merely mundane; antibiotics and genetics have made us as gods, able to rescue multitudes from death and transform the nature of life; and the bomb has, depending on one's point of view, either sustained all the other revolutions or rendered them immaterial.

THE BOMB AS A CULTURAL METAPHOR

The bomb. The idea, much like the weapons, has insinuated itself into the world's consciousness much as nuclear submarines into the sea, surfacing from time to time and then submerging again—modernized, refurbished, full of revolutionary potential. Periodically, pockets of opposition to some aspect of the nuclear world that we have created themselves surface, jousting Quixote-like with the demons. Like the bull to the cape, the causes are eventually impaled by the implacable opposition. Ban the bomb. Anti-nuclear power. Comprehensive test bans. Nuclear freezes. Non-proliferation. A dizzying array of nuclear mirrors behind which rest the nuclear culture, the ever-shifting but ever-present "need" for nuclear power. And so both nuclear weapons and nuclear power plants continue to multiply.

Increasingly, studies of the nuclear problems—the nuclear arms race and the worldwide spread of nuclear bomb material and the machines to make it—are being viewed as the same problem. It is well they should be, for the birth and growth of the nuclear arsenals preceded by only a few years the birth of the nuclear industry. Yet in the same way that the world is today wracked by fears about the continued proliferation of the superpower arsenals, there is mounting concern that decisions made decades ago about "peaceful nuclear commerce" may also need radical reconsideration.

For over three decades, nuclear power has been seen as the answer to two questions: How do we prevent future world wars? and How do we solve future energy problems? Nuclear "priesthoods" fostered dogmas and secrets, expounding the wisdom of the atom; indeed, the same men sired both atoms for war and atoms for peace. Two parallel nuclear "religions" were born, each with a need to convert the unwashed to the centrality of the atomic truths. Two were paramount: Nuclear arsenals in the right hands can free the world from the scourge of world war. And the peaceful civilian nuclear industry can free the human species from worries about energy.

The missionary zeal and success of the nuclear brotherhood has been awesome. However one may feel about nuclear deterrence and nuclear-generated electricity, they are inescapably part of the world culture. Despite the paradoxes, we may, because of the imbedded truths, be unable to live without them. Thus, any attempt to alter our evolved consciousness about who we are as a people—complete with our nuclear hopes and dreams—threatens our psychological as well as our institutional stability. Indeed, as any non-proliferator will attest, the idea of halting and reversing the spread of nuclear bombs and bomb material appears threatening because it is so destabilizing of the status quo.

Yet, in the battle to stop proliferation, as in most battles, propitious moments occur. For over forty years, galvanizing moments have occurred which spurred individuals from quite different disciplines to do battle with the nuclear curia over different aspects of proliferation: Hiroshima. The Super Fallout. The Cuban missile crisis. Three Mile Island. Pershing missiles. Nuclear winter. Chernobyl. All have sparked, to varying degrees, intense interest in nuclear disarmament. Likewise the "Reagan revolution."

It has been said that the Reagan administration is the greatest force for peace in the world today. Talk of fighting and winning nuclear wars; nuclear shots across the bow; massive defense budgets; Star Wars—all "deepen deterrence". A further irony is that, coupled with its views on nuclear exports, the administration has polarized debate in such a way that the underlying philosophical debate about nuclear power for war and peace stands out in stark relief. A cultural divide is again reached where people from many different disciplines are wondering if "reform" of the system is possible, or whether only a cultural revolution in the nuclear arena can redirect U.S. and world energies toward alternatives to the nuclear future.

WHO WILL STOP THE BOMB?

In the midst of the debate about the best way to ensure the world's security—both from nuclear war and from energy scarcity—a familiar but nonetheless little-noticed breed of reformers is busy working ridiculously long hours on creating a sort of "critical mass of consciousness" about the nuclear world. One such group is the Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies. Dedicated to clarifying "the policy choices before the nation and to encourage and facilitate the participation of citizens in the decision-making process at all levels of government," the Roosevelt Center has launched a three-year public education campaign on "the most critical threat the world faces—the spread of nuclear weapons."

The proliferation campaign of the Center, titled "Wildfire," includes a "consciousness-raising phase" of community events nationwide: a specially-developed role-playing game, films, teacher- and community-leader training sessions, and political study courses. A central part of the educational work of the Wildfire campaign is contained in the Center's primer on nuclear proliferation, *Who Will Stop the Bomb?* by Roger Molander and Robbie Nichols (Facts on File Publications, 1985, ISBN 0-8160-1283-0, paperback).

What is significant about the Wildfire campaign and the primer is the attempt to coordinate the educational campaign with the public interest sector, proliferation specialists, lawmakers, business and media lead-

ers, and national civic, professional and educational organizations. As anyone who has spent time with the proliferation and arms control communities knows, however, the Roosevelt Center project is up against formidable obstacles.

The Center is presided over by Dr. Roger C. Molander, familiar to many as one of the founders of the Ground Zero Movement which had a short, intense life earlier this decade. The Center staff busies itself with other issue areas like the national debt and U.S./Soviet diplomatic lessons, but its educational campaign to stop the spread of nuclear weapons absorbs the bulk of its emotional and monetary energies. With a campaign that is timed to make a major impact on congressional and presidential elections, the Roosevelt Center is betting that average citizens can be persuaded "to demand that their nation commit its considerable energies to an attempt to stem the tide of nuclear proliferation while there is still time."

Molander and his colleague Robbie Nichols challenge the reader to confront and alter trends in peaceful nuclear commerce that point toward a world full of nuclear weapons. In both a political and an educational sense, the primer can be viewed as an act of faith: that when citizens know the truth they will set themselves free. Naturally, some will argue that even if Molander and Nichols achieve the hoped-for turn around from proliferation, there will never be an end to nuclear weapons and bomb material—not for thousands of years, at any rate. The authors, however, are willing to bet that a mass movement will see the proliferation problem as cultural and will, over time, demand "a fundamental change in the security environment for nation-states."

As but one piece in an extensive effort to put information about potential nuclear anarchy (and perhaps even nuclear terrorism) into people's hands, the primer succeeds where other, more technical histories and manuals do not. Whereas Molander and Nichols never set out to break new ground on the technical side of proliferation (their book is free of technical jargon and consciously written in simple English), it is significant for the last chapters, "Where Do We Go From Here?" and "How to Make A Difference." In these, the authors explore a broad range of public and private options for action, policy choices, and ideas to stimulate thinking about alternative worlds. Through those chapters, the primer and the Wildfire campaign can be seen as action-oriented devices to compel informed and committed citizens to push their governments to take proliferation seriously.

The Roosevelt Center's strategy is to create a constituency for a fundamental cultural shift, literally millions of voices worldwide demanding that governments put proliferation at the top of the political agenda. Such a revolution in the way we think about the atom, naturally, is not a hopeful prospect in the short term, which is one reason the Roosevelt Center is hunkering down for a multiyear effort.

In a curious way, the coincidence of the accident at Chernobyl and the "Wildfire" campaign present a life-altering opportunity to confront the nuclear culture we have become. Events in the nuclear arena are accelerating. Before the next radioactive cloud is unleashed here at home—indeed, before we have nuclear education forced on us in the most uncomfortable way—we can all afford to sit still and listen to others who have thought through the options before us. The reader will find that the primer and

the Wildfire campaign, and the philosophical impulses behind them, could not be more helpful or timely.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as the Soviet Union counts its dead from the tragic nuclear accident near Kiev, we should all think about the implications of the growing use of nuclear power, the spread of nuclear weapons and our frightening inability to control either.

The deaths so far from the Kiev accident will be just a small fraction of the total casualties. People will be dying prematurely from radiation poisoning for years to come. Others will suffer disabling side effects or pass abnormalities along to their children. Russia's agricultural heartland could be poisoned for generations. The water supply will be contaminated. The entire food chain might be ruined as animals eat poisoned grass, people eat poisoned animals, and so on.

As frightening as that is, it is just one isolated accident. There are nuclear powerplants all over the world. As disastrous as the accident is, it is less terrible than the destruction that could be caused by one nuclear bomb.

The United States and the Soviet Union have about 50,000 nuclear bombs between them. Seven other countries can already make nuclear bombs and it is estimated that a total of two dozen could have them within 15 years. Nuclear technology is becoming so widely understood that terrorist groups could soon develop suitcase-sized nuclear bombs. We cannot delay any longer. The time has come to clamp down on other proliferation of nuclear energy and nuclear weapons before we face an unparalleled and unimaginable disaster.

I have introduced legislation that would deny benefits under a variety of trade preference programs to countries that have not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) by January 1, 1987. While some will argue that tying trade policy to nuclear policy is mixing apples and oranges, I believe that the case is overwhelming for linking these two and that the costs of not facing up to nuclear proliferation are much too high to be ignored.

All sane people are deeply concerned with the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. Just a fraction of the 50,000 nuclear weapons we have could destroy the human race. What have received less attention are the "second and third arms races"—the attempts by nonnuclear nations and terrorist organizations to master the secrets of nuclear weapons. This disregard is unfathomable. By the time a nuclear weapon is exploded by a nonsuperpower or a terrorist organization, we will likely be unable to solve the intractable complexities of proliferation in time to prevent a disaster.

The nuclear weapons club currently has nine members. Five—the United States, U.S.S.R., France, Britain, and China—have existing stockpiles. The other four, India, Pakistan, Israel, and South Africa, have become associate members, capable of producing nuclear bombs, if they have not done so already. Frighteningly, neither France nor China, nor any of the associate members has signed the NPT, which means that there are no safeguards or restrictions on the types of nuclear material they acquire or transfer.

Other countries which have nuclear aspirations and could soon have the bomb include Brazil and Argentina, which have not signed the NPT. Iran, Iraq, and Libya have signed but their recent behavior casts real doubt on the quality of any promises they may make. All of these countries, as well as all the associate members, are in currently or potentially volatile war situations. Several have a history of unstable government. How safe can we feel, knowing that these countries can acquire nuclear material, free from oversight by the International Atomic Energy Agency or any other body?

If that image does not leave you shaken, consider what a terrorist group could do with a nuclear weapon. It would not have to be a very large or sophisticated bomb for it would not have to elude missile defenses or penetrate a hardened silo. Such a bomb planted near the Capitol when the President was delivering his State of the Union Address could kill every leader of our Federal Government, decapitating the country. Imagine the abrogations of international law and individual rights that terrified governments could commit to guard against such an occurrence. We have already seen planes flying in international airspace forced down and retaliatory airstrikes that have left numerous civilians dead. With a nuclear terrorist threat, the willingness to violate agreed-upon rules and processes would mushroom, and the international order that we cherish would be severely threatened.

What implications would a world of uncontrolled proliferation have for the United States? First, it would render unworkable in most cases the doctrine of "proportionate response." Even in the case of an isolated attack by a government, where we could assign guilt with strong certainty, the decision to retaliate with a nuclear response would be agonizingly difficult. What if we were wrong? And even if we were right, to what extent can we hold citizens responsible for the actions of their leaders? There is no such thing as a surgical nuclear strike. But if there is no proportionate response, where is the disincentive for someone like Qadhafi to resist attacking? And what would we do in the case of a terrorist attack, where determining and locating the perpetrators would be tremendously difficult? Would we fail to act to protect our citizens or would we descend to the terrorists' level of behavior in our retaliation? Either would be unacceptable. The scenario calls to mind the poet's lines:

"Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and every-
where
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity."

Given that nonproliferation is a life and death interest for the United States, it is most reasonable to use trade sanctions as leverage to force compliance with the NPT. Trade benefits are a privilege for the recipients, not a right; as with foreign aid, we should and do expect something in return for them. The carrot and stick of access to the world's best market may convince many nonsigners to join this treaty. If a country refuses to make the basic sacrifices necessary to preserve the

world community, it should not be eligible for the benefits from membership in that community.

Of course, this legislation will not guarantee that all countries will sign and comply with the NPT; there must also be incentives from the nuclear club members.

First, there must be true arms control negotiations. The tradeoff in the NPT is that nonmembers will forsake nuclear weapons if the members seek to get rid of theirs. The United States and the U.S.S.R. have failed miserably at this, and until we abide by the sections of the treaty that apply to us, we won't persuade others not to seek nuclear capabilities. There should be deep cuts in existing stockpiles and those cuts should be combined with a comprehensive test ban.

Second, there will have to be aid in developing other sources of energy. The Atoms for Peace Program and the NPT both encourage the sharing of nuclear energy. Because of reprocessing technology and the basic dangers of nuclear energy, we should not continue on that path—I'm sure the people of Three Mile Island and Kiev would agree. Some type of alternative energy program is vital, though, if developing countries are to continue to develop.

Third, we need more and better security agreements so that countries do not feel that they are isolated and unprotected from a ruthless adversary that may get the bomb. Each of these is a monumentally difficult problem but, for our children's sake, they must be solved.

The recent spate of accidents related to nuclear energy and weapons should force us to change our policies. The developing countries are relying increasingly on nuclear power to provide their energy. With a growing number of inexperienced countries relying heavily on nuclear power, how many meltdowns can we expect in the next 10 years? As more countries acquire these weapons without having the technical safety expertise that the United States and the U.S.S.R. have, how long will it be before we have a catastrophic nuclear explosion? That it would be accidental would not diminish its destructiveness. If the space shuttle explosion taught us anything, it is that the most sophisticated technology can be the least safe. Yet we are going to develop a Star Wars program that would lift nuclear weapons into space and will rely on computer software many times more complex than that for the shuttle to function correctly. How terrible an accident will we need to discontinue this folly?

The world already spends over \$800 billion a year on armaments. The Reagan administration estimates that there are currently 42 military conflicts raging across the globe. We cannot afford the greater insecurity that a global nuclear race would spawn or the possibility that a regional conflict could go nuclear. We still are not comfortable with the ability of the United States and the U.S.S.R. to handle their awesome responsibility and both have possessed nuclear weapons for almost 40 years. How secure can we feel if a growing number of countries suddenly develop a nuclear capability without having had any experience in handling it? We cannot afford to find out. That is why we should use every tool at our disposal, including trade concessions, to stop the nuclear madness.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, nuclear proliferation is a subject that is often discussed, but seldom understood. While millions of Americans are genuinely troubled by the threat of nuclear war—a great deal of misinformation has been generated that often confuses the issue of nuclear weapon proliferation with nuclear power.

Wildfire, created by the Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies, is an excellent educational program that enables individuals to participate directly in nuclear proliferation decisionmaking. Wildfire give students, civic leaders, and local government officials a chance to learn about the critical problem of nuclear proliferation—while also enabling them to express their views to those of us in policymaking positions.

I had the opportunity to observe Wildfire in action at a high school in my district. Students were enthusiastically involved in strategies to avoid a confrontation between Pakistan and India.

Wildfire provided a forum for these students to realize the danger of the situation and to seek long term solutions. I was impressed with Wildfire and its potential to educate the public to the dangers and complexities of nuclear proliferation.

I offer hearty congratulations to the Roosevelt Center for its creative educational tool that will continue to stimulate discussion regarding the threat of nuclear proliferation.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, nuclear proliferation is one of the most compelling issues of our time, yet it is not often consciously considered and discussed by Members of the Congress or the public because of the ominous and incomprehensible consequences of its continued growth.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. WOLPE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress and the American people at this time.

Recent events in the Middle East and the Soviet Union remind us of the immediate danger to us all posed by the continued spread of nuclear weapons and the urgency with which we ought to act to begin to restrict their proliferation.

In early April, I had the opportunity to participate in a fascinating and instructive session concerning this matter organized by the Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies which was designed to draw the people of Bucks and eastern Montgomery Counties, PA into the discussion about nuclear proliferation. About 70 of my constituents participated in this informed debate and most reached the same conclusion: That the United States is not doing enough to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.

I urge all of my colleagues to join with the Roosevelt Center in putting together a Wildfire session in their own districts in order to give themselves and their own constituents this extraordinary opportunity to learn more about this critical problem and explore ways to begin to address it.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the spread of nuclear weapons is a critically important topic and one which has not received the serious, widespread attention it deserves.

Nuclear proliferation could be best described as the "other" nuclear arms race. A serious, responsible arms control policy must include a commitment to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. If left to proceed unchecked, we may soon face the day when the decisions about waging nuclear war will no longer be within the exclusive realm of the two superpowers. We must work to help retard the spread of nuclear technology and materials in order to prevent nuclear explosive devices from getting into the hands of terrorists and to prevent countries with loose controls and reckless intentions from obtaining and ultimately using nuclear weapons.

We must guard against the day when our diligent efforts for genuine nuclear arms control may be thwarted by a few dangerous, irrational people with destructive intentions. It is an issue that is critical to our national security and to our survival.

The United States must face up to the increasing traffic in the world of plutonium which is not under U.S. control. And we must recognize that as time goes on there will be more and more of this bomb material moving around.

A proliferated world is a very frightening prospect. This is the time for the United States to take a leadership role to help safeguard against the spread of nuclear weapons.

A strong U.S. nuclear nonproliferation policy will protect our security interests and further our efforts for nuclear arms control. If there is anything we must learn from the dangers of the nuclear age and the rapid pace of scientific and technological advancements it is that it is up to us to make the right decisions about how this knowledge will be used and whether it will be used for peaceful or military purposes.

Our export policy should be one that discourages the use of highly explosive nuclear materials and sensitive technologies. Unfortunately, the Reagan administration's nonproliferation policies have effectively weakened our antiproliferation controls and have undermined the bipartisan spirit that has always characterized our approach to solving this serious problem.

If we do not take the necessary steps today, the problem will have moved beyond our capacity to manage it, the capability to make nuclear weapons will belong to many others, and the decision to use nuclear weapons will be beyond our control.

We need not accept the inevitability of a proliferated world and we owe it to ourselves and our children to accept the responsibility to try to prevent it.

Time is on our side. Let's use it wisely.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no mission of greater importance today than keeping nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons technology out of the hands of those who do not now have them. I commend my colleagues for holding this special order to remind us that there is still much work to be done if we are to prevent nuclear weapons from becoming the common currency of international politics. I commend also the Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies for its efforts to educate the public about the continuing spread of

nuclear weapons to other countries around the world.

While the United States has one of the world's most stringent nonproliferation regimes, there are many things we could yet do both by statute and by example. In addition to broadening the applicability of our nuclear export control laws, we must bring pressure to bear on our allies so that they do not step in to sell what we will not.

But before we can convince our allies and the many countries now on the brink of building nuclear weapons that our concerns about the dangers of nuclear weapons are genuine, we and the Soviet Union—another strong nonproliferation proponent—must demonstrate by example that nuclear weapons are unthinkable as tools of war and unacceptable as tools of diplomacy. This administration should know that the example it sets today may be its undoing tomorrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHANDLER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today from 1 p.m. and for the balance of the day, on account of illness.

Mr. GROTEBERG (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HENDON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RUDD, for 60 minutes, on June 12.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DURBIN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MACKAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, on June 12.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, on June 12.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois, for 60 minutes, on June 17.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KOSTMAYER, prior to the vote on H.R. 2591, in the House, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, during consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 310, in the House, today.

Mr. PANETTA, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact

that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,337.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HENDON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. COURTER in three instances.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. McCAIN.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. RITTER in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. GALLO.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. McMILLAN.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. FAWELL in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. DIOGUARDI in two instances.

Mr. BOEHLERT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DURBIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. TRAXLER.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. GARCIA.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

Mr. VENTO.

Ms. OAKAR.

Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. TALLON.

Ms. LLOYD.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles.

H.R. 3570. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to reform and improve justices and judges survivors' annuities program, and for other purposes, and

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 12, 1986, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3687. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on the status as of June 1, 1986, of 83 rescission proposals and 66 deferrals contained in the six special messages of fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 99-233); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed June 11, 1986.

3688. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to pay or defray increment expenses for developing foreign country participation in combined exercises; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3689. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish authority for U.S. Armed Forces to engage in humanitarian and civic assistant activities accomplished in conjunction with authorized military operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3690. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to pay or defray the cost of participation by defense personnel of developing foreign countries in bilateral or regional cooperation programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3691. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 549 of title 10, United States Code, to remove limitations on the grades to which women officers of the reserve components of the naval services may be promoted and to provide that women officers and male officers shall be considered together for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3692. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of the direct grant programs and intergovernmental review of Department of Education programs and activities, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(i); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3693. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of the Student Loan Marketing Association annual report which includes financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1985, pur-

suant to 20 U.S.C. 1087-2(k); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3694. A letter from the Director, Institute of Museum Services, transmitting notification of the museums which have successfully competed in the fiscal year 1986 general operating support [GOS] grant cycle of the Institute; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3695. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Management), transmitting notification of an altered system of records maintained by the Bureau of the Public Debt, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3696. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3697. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3698. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3699. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the "Federal Coal Management Report, Fiscal Year 1985," pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 208-2; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3700. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the semiannual report on the civil misrepresentation activities of the service for the period October 1, 1985-March 31, 1986, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3013 (97 Stat. 1317); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

3701. A letter from the Chairman, Presidential Commission on the Space Shuttle Challenger Accident, transmitting a copy of the Commission report on the Challenger accident, pursuant to Executive Order 12546 of February 3, 1986; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

3702. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the results of the agency's review of independent certified public accountants' audits of the calendar year 1984 financial statements of the 12 Federal Home Loan Banks, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3703. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the certification to authorize military assistance and sales for Guatemala, together with the justification for the certification, pursuant to Public Law 99-83, section 703(a)(1) (99 Stat. 240); Public Law 99-190 (99 Stat. 1302); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2798. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of the status of certain individuals as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces or as a member of the National Guard (Rept. 99-626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4384. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to veterans' readjustment appointment (Rept. 99-627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1934. A bill entitled the "Mineral Lands Leasing Act Amendments of 1985"; with amendments (Rept. 99-628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4259. A bill to amend the Act of February 11, 1895 (28 Stat. 651), to authorize the donation of certain non-Federal lands within the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park. (Rept. 99-629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3554. A bill to provide for the restoration of the Federal trust relationship with, and Federal services and assistance to, the Klamath Tribe of Indians and the individual members thereof consisting of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 99-630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3526. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims respecting the San Carlos Apache Tribe of Arizona (Rept. 99-631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHEAT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 472. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4510, a bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-633). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 473. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4175, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1987 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Maritime Commission (Rept. 99-634). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 474. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4613, a bill to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the Commodity Exchange Act, and to make technical improvements to that act (Rept. 99-635). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4348. A bill to amend the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness law to change the authorizations of appropriations for resource management review and grants, referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than June 12, 1986, for consideration

of such portions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a), rule X (Rept. 99-632, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (by request):

H.R. 4973. A bill to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, and the Shipping Act, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLORIO:

H.R. 4974. A bill to establish an alternative dispute resolution procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4975. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, to improve the appeals process with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4976. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent secrecy in settlement of civil cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4977. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to make mandatory the imposition of certain costs in cases of frivolous claims and defenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4978. A bill to provide for the limitation of contingent legal fees, and the disclosure of defense counsel fees, in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4979. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require explanation of the basis for punitive damages in civil cases where such damages are awarded; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself, Mr.

BIAGGI, Mr. FISH, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GREEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. LELAND, Mr. HAYES, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. DORNAN of California):

H.R. 4980. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, to impose criminal penalties for damage to religious property and for injury to persons in the free exercise of religious beliefs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNES:

H.R. 4981. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide civil service retirement credit for certain employees and former employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 4982. A bill regarding lease and development of certain real property, San Diego, CA; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 4983. A bill to amend chapter 65 of title 18, United States Code, to provide a criminal penalty for interference with satellite communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Iowa (for himself and Mr. BERREUTER):

H.R. 4984. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to guarantee pools of qualified agricultural mortgage loans and to provide for the issuance of securities representing interests in such pools; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 4985. A bill to authorize the distribution within the United States of the USIA film entitled "The March"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. ATKINS):

H.R. 4986. A bill to reform the Work Incentive Program in order to establish comprehensive programs of education, training, and employment assistance in the States to enable families receiving public assistance benefits to achieve long-term self-sufficiency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 4987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals to receive tax-free distributions from an individual retirement account or annuity to purchase their first home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 4988. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that former prisoners of war are eligible for reimbursement for emergency medical expenses on the same basis as veterans with total permanent service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4989. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that for purposes of veterans' compensation, service-connected total deafness shall be rated as a 100 percent disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. FROST, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BARNES, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GEJENSON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. STARK, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 4990. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, and the National School Lunch Act to improve the availability of benefits under such acts; to provide for a program for nu-

trition monitoring and research; and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Education and Labor, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 4991. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for funeral expenses to veterans of any war who were recipients of the Purple Heart award; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4992. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide mortgage protection life insurance to certain veterans unable to acquire commercial life insurance because of service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4993. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to make direct low-interest loans to veterans eligible for specially adapted housing assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4994. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for special consideration for purposes of veterans' benefits of certain cases of loss or loss of use of paired extremities by a veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4995. A bill to amend section 110 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the standard for preservation of disability evaluations for compensation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NIELSON of Utah (for himself and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 4996. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to examine the activities of professional financial planners, to evaluate the effectiveness of existing governmental regulation of their activities, and to make recommendations to the Congress on the basis of the examination and evaluation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself and Mr. WYLIE) (by request):

H.R. 4997. A bill to strengthen and refine the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, to provide for more flexible assessment procedures, to improve methods for insuring deposits and for paying insured depositors, to establish priorities among claimants to the estates of failed banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4998. A bill to enhance the enforcement powers of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):

H.R. 4999. A bill to provide for improved disclosure of certain rail transportation contracts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SILJANDER (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBEY, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. PURSELL,

Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, and Mr. HEFNER):

H.R. 5000. A bill to protect the rights of victims of child abuse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 5001. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing suspension of duty on isometric mixtures of ethylbiphenyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 5002. A bill to require public disclosure by certain recipients of Federal funds of information required to be kept by such recipients as a condition of receiving such fund; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5003. A bill to require that the United States Government prepare and make public annual consolidated financial statements utilizing the accrual method of accounting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5004. A bill to amend title 5 and title 44, United States Code, to lengthen the time period between the publication of a Federal rule and the effective date of such rule, and the time period between the publication of notice of a hearing and the beginning of such hearing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5005. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish a uniform procedure for congressional review of agency rules which may be contrary to law or inconsistent with congressional intent, to expand opportunities for public participation in agency rulemaking, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Rules.

By Mr. RITTER:

H.R. 5006. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway demonstration project to extend Pennsylvania State Route 33 to provide a limited access highway to connect Interstate Routes I-78 and I-80; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. LEATH of Texas, and Mr. ROEMER):

H.R. 5007. A bill to amend part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act to specify the method of determining State allotments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 5008. A bill to amend part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the rate of increase in the inpatient hospital deductible and to change the extended care coinsurance amount and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase by 8 cents per pack the excise taxes on cigarettes and to earmark revenues from the tax increase to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Colorado (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. STRANG):

H.R. 5009. A bill to provide interim authority to clean up contaminated water supplies near the Rocky Mountain Arsenal in south Adams County, CO, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 5010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide special rules for discharge of qualified farm indebtedness of solvent farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H.R. 5011. A bill to improve the quality of teaching in American secondary schools and enhance the competence of American secondary students and thereby strengthen the economic competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 5012. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to increase civil penalty limits for safety violations by persons engaged in commercial aircraft operations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LENT, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. DE LA GARZA):

H.R. 5013. A bill to establish guidelines for damage awards in actions for personal injury incurred by seamen on fishing industry vessels and to require additional safety regulations for fishing industry vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself, Mr. DYSON, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FISH, and Mr. MONSON):

H.R. 5014. A bill to direct the Postmaster General to provide and sell stamps commemorating the crew of the space shuttle *Challenger*; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.R. 5015. A bill to temporarily suspend the use of tributyltin based paints on hulls of commercial and recreational vessels until such time as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has completed ongoing studies as to the safety of such paints and their impact on the aquatic environment; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEVINE of CALIFORNIA,

Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MICA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. UDALL):

H. Con. Res. 350. Concurrent resolution providing that the President shall continue to adhere to the numerical sublimits of the SALT agreements as long as the Soviet Union does likewise; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. OLIN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. REID, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LENT, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SAVAGE, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BARNES, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. WILSON):

H. Con. Res. 351. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the monkeys known as the Silver Spring Monkeys should be transferred from the National Institutes of Health to the custody of the Primarily Primates, Inc., animal sanctuary in San Antonio, TX; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STALLINGS:

H. Con. Res. 352. Concurrent resolution limiting the amounts available to Members of Congress for official mail costs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARNES:

H. Res. 470. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the current law deduction for contributions to individual retirement accounts should not be reduced as a part of tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACKAY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H. Res. 471. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives regarding prompt payment of Medicare claims; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 5016. A bill for the relief of Sueng Ho Jang and Sueng Il Jang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 5017. A bill for the relief of Filomena Barretto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5018. A bill for the relief of Miroslav Benckik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 97: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
H.R. 479: Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 585: Mr. TRAXLER and Mr. BREAUX.
H.R. 1402: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ROE, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1666: Mr. SHUMWAY.
H.R. 1701: Mr. SHARP, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1780: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1809: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1946: Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. LOEFFLER.

H.R. 1986: Mr. HAYES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MOODY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2337: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 2504: Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

H.R. 2589: Ms. MIKULSKI.
H.R. 2840: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 3006: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 3042: Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 3330: Mr. TORRICELLI.
H.R. 3355: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 3415: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. CHENEY.
H.R. 3442: Mr. ROE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WISE, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 3465: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3470: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PEASE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. REID.

H.R. 3487: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 3662: Mr. BROOKS and Mrs. BOXER.
H.R. 3776: Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 3800: Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. DASCHLE, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 3950: Mr. ATKINS.
H.R. 3995: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 4003: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SABO, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 4067: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 4085: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 4125: Mr. CHENEY.

H.R. 4145: Mr. HYDE and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 4148: Mr. ASPIN.
 H.R. 4223: Mr. RINALDO.
 H.R. 4286: Mr. MITCHELL.
 H.R. 4300: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. CARR, and Mr. LaFALCE.
 H.R. 4311: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. GALLO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. BEDELL.
 H.R. 4325: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 4326: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 4327: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 4333: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.
 H.R. 4338: Mr. St GERMAIN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. OAKAR, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. DAUB, Mrs. LONG, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. COELHO.
 H.R. 4344: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 4397: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. PICKLE.
 H.R. 4412: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4463: Mr. WOLPE, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. FISH.
 H.R. 4467: Mr. BATES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. HORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 4468: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CHAPPIE, and Mr. DIXON.
 H.R. 4484: Mr. DE LUGO.
 H.R. 4524: Mr. STUMP, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HENDON, and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 4545: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. FISH.
 H.R. 4546: Mr. WALGREN.
 H.R. 4627: Mr. MOODY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 4629: Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. GARCIA.
 H.R. 4638: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. AKAKA, and Mrs. BOXER.
 H.R. 4653: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 4655: Mr. ECKART of Ohio.
 H.R. 4671: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 4682: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. SIKORSKI.
 H.R. 4696: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. GUARINI.
 H.R. 4698: Mr. TORRICELLI.
 H.R. 4703: Mr. HAYES.
 H.R. 4711: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. VENTO.
 H.R. 4714: Mr. WEBER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HILER, and Mr. FRANKLIN.
 H.R. 4739: Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. MOAKLEY.
 H.R. 4762: Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. WEAVER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 4765: Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 4766: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 4812: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BEDELL, and Mr. OBEY.
 H.R. 4820: Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DiOGUARDI, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. DARDEN.
 H.R. 4824: Mrs. BOXER.
 H.R. 4825: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FISH, and Ms. SNOWE.
 H.R. 4840: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BATES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 4841: Mr. McEWEN, and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 4843: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. RUDD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. VENTO.
 H.R. 4854: Mr. EVANS of Iowa, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.
 H.R. 4856: Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. APPLIGATE.
 H.R. 4878: Mr. SOLARZ, and Mrs. BURTON of California.
 H.R. 4882: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LaFALCE.
 H.R. 4888: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.
 H.R. 4892: Mrs. SCHROEDER.
 H.R. 4909: Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H.R. 4945: Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Ms. SNOWE.
 H.R. 4952: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. GLICKMAN.
 H.R. 4953: Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.
 H.J. Res. 133: Mr. LANTOS.
 H.J. Res. 231: Mrs. BOXER.
 H.J. Res. 316: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SWIFT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. SHELBY.
 H.J. Res. 417: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BATES, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.J. Res. 435: Mr. NEAL.
 H.J. Res. 451: Mr. LUJAN and Mr. BARTLETT.
 H.J. Res. 504: Mr. Dickinson, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WIRTH.
 H.J. Res. 531: Mr. BREAUX.
 H.J. Res. 577: Mr. WOLF, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. RUDD, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. APPLIGATE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. DiOGUARDI.
 H.J. Res. 581: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii.
 H.J. Res. 583: Mr. OWENS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. ROE, Mr. BONIOR of Michi-

gan, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MONSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. CALLAHAN.
 H.J. Res. 587: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. REID, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. HYDE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. DARDEN.
 H.J. Res. 590: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. DYSON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. REID, Mr. STRANG, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. WISE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. PRICE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. CARR, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HOWARD.
 H.J. Res. 623: Mr. WALGREN and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
 H.J. Res. 642: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. TAUZIN.
 H. Con. Res. 198: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. APPLIGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LUKE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WIRTH.
 H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REID, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. WEAVER.
 H. Con. Res. 325: Mr. FRENZEL.
 H. Con. Res. 330: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, and Mr. FISH.
 H. Con. Res. 344: Mr. St GERMAIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
 H. Res. 373: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. ECKART of Ohio.
 H. Res. 386: Mr. SCHUETTE.
 H. Res. 404: Mr. MINETA.
 H. Res. 451: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FISH, and Mr. DAVIS.
 H. Res. 462: Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. KOST-

MAYER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. BIAGGI.
H. Res. 469: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. ANDERSON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2591: Mr. McCAIN, Mr. FRANKLIN, and Mr. BATEMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

382. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, Culver City, CA, relative to

Federal funding of the section 8 housing assistance program administrative costs; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

383. Also, petition of the Working Circle Hopi, Bad Mitterndorf, Austria, relative to the removal of the residents from their traditional homeland in the former joint use area of the Hopi reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

384. Also, petition of the mayor and council, Borough of Bay Head, County of Ocean, NJ, relative to legislation to license recreational salt water fishermen; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4510

By Mr. RAHALL:

—Page 9, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE WHICH WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

“(e) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY.—The Bank may make no loan, loan guarantee commitment, or other extension of credit to any foreign entity which is (or, if such loan, loan guarantee commitment, or other extension of credit were made, would be) involved in the production or manufacture of any commodity, mineral, material, or product which is produced or manufactured in substantial quantities in the United States if the production or manufacture of such commodity, mineral, material, or product by such foreign entity contributes to or, directly or indirectly, results in—

“(1) the importation of such commodity, mineral, material, or product into the United States; or

“(2) an increase in the unemployment rate with respect to any domestic industry or other sector of the domestic economy.”.