

enrolled in an accelerated nursing program that prepared them to replace graduate nurses going overseas.

The Jennie Edmunson Memorial Hospital Class of 1944 is part of this honorable tradition of nursing service. As we remember the end of World War II, please join me in recognizing June Heitman and all of the hard-working members of the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps for their devotion, patriotism, and service to the United States.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1995

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, President Clinton and HUD Secretary Cisneros announced on new program to help thousands of families realize the American dream of homeownership.

Calling on all national housing-related organizations to form a partnership for this national homeownership strategy, the President set a goal of creating 8 million additional American homeowners over the next 5 years. The accomplishment of this goal will have dramatic effects on those young families setting out on the quest for the American dream, will stimulate the real estate and home building industries, and will strengthen the economy through the ripple effect on the secondary and tertiary industries which rely on homebuilding and resale.

One of the industries which can play a major role in the achievement of the President's goal is the manufactured housing industry. Last year, more than 300,000 homes sold in the United States were manufactured homes. As younger families come into the market for a home, and as the population in this Nation ages, and shifts to retirement communities, manufactured housing will become the preferred housing for thousands of citizens looking for quality housing at an affordable price.

The ability of the manufactured housing industry to continue to provide quality, affordable housing will depend most directly on the industries ability to loosen the regulatory stranglehold currently imposed by the Department of HUD.

Over the last 20 years, the manufactured housing industry has evolved from one providing a temporary, mobile dwelling to a sophisticated, highly efficient producer of permanent housing. Unfortunately, the regulatory apparatus ensconced within HUD has not kept up with the changing industry on a timely basis. It is time for a change.

As the Congress contemplates the overall future of HUD, certain small steps could be taken now to reinvent the oversight of Federal housing programs. Since the manufactured housing industry received no Federal funds, the issue is how to recreate a regulatory body which would regulate and enforce manufactured housing codes and regulations while maintaining some oversight by HUD or whatever new housing agency would be created.

Three years ago, the Congress created a Commission which was tasked to look into the industry and make recommendations. The Commission did propose that a new consen-

sus committee or office be created which would oversee the industry in a more efficient, less bureaucratic manner. I believe it is time to create such an entity.

A new manufactured housing committee or office created outside of HUD, would be comprised mostly of representatives of the industry, but could include local authorities and a consumer watchdog. The Secretary or Housing Administrator, could appoint one committee member to serve as his liaison who would shuttle regulatory recommendations back and forth between the Housing Administrator and the industry. Current Federal uniform building codes and its enforcement program would be maintained but the committee would be empowered to contract with a private organization to be its code enforcement authority and it would continue the current practice of imposing fees on the industry membership in order to fund the committee's operation and its outside contracts.

Finally, any legislation creating such a new system should remove unnecessary restrictions, such as the permanent chassis requirement, which would help lower the cost of producing these homes. In fact, recent action taken by the California State Assembly called on the Congress to take just such action on the chassis issue. I am enclosing a copy of the joint resolution passed by the State legislature.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7— RELATIVE TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AJR 7, Hauser. Manufactured housing.

This measure would memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the definition of "manufactured home" in federal law to allow these homes to be designed to accommodate a removable chassis, so long as the home is intended to be permanently sited on a foundation and so long as the floor system is designed to accommodate appropriate design loads.

Whereas, Manufactured homes constructed pursuant to the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act provided an important source of unsubsidized affordable housing to Californians; and

Whereas, The State of California is a national leader in efforts to encourage and expand the use of manufactured housing by eliminating unnecessary regulatory barriers and by developing and encouraging innovative land use and financing policies; and

Whereas, The State of California has deemed manufactured homes a permitted use in all residential zoning districts, subject to the same development standards applicable to other dwellings in that zoning district; and

Whereas, Construction and safety standards for manufactured homes are established in federal law and regulation and all such standards preempt local and state codes; and

Whereas, The federal Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards have been determined by the State of California to meet or exceed performance standards established for other dwellings; and

Whereas, Federal law requires every federally certified manufactured home to be constructed on a chassis which must remain a permanent feature of the home's substructure; and

Whereas, The chassis is not necessary for the home's structural integrity if the home is sited on a permanent foundation and the home's floor system is designed to accommodate appropriate design loads; and

Whereas, This mandatory feature represents an unnecessary regulatory barrier to

greater design flexibility for manufactured homes; and

Whereas, This regulatory barrier prevents innovative uses of manufactured homes to meet the demand for affordable housing in California; and

Whereas, This regulatory barrier prevents manufactured home producers from developing a recycling program for chassis systems which could save consumers between \$1,000 and \$2,000 per home; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the definition of "manufactured home" in federal law to allow such homes to be designed to accommodate a removable chassis, so long as the home is intended to be permanently sited on a foundation and so long as the floor system is designed to accommodate appropriate design loads; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the House Committee on Banking, Housing, and Financial Services, the Senate Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs, and the House and Senate appropriations subcommittees on HUD/VA and independent agencies.

Mr. Speaker, if we as a Nation are going to succeed in this new strategy to help thousands of Americans realize their dream of homeownership, the manufactured housing industry must play an important role in providing quality homes at an affordable price. To start this process, the industry must be removed from the regulatory burdens placed on its operation by a Federal bureaucracy which cares little for the industry and shows no interest in an efficient system of regulation and enforcement.

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS HONORED

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the most outstanding religious leaders in the world, Archbishop Geron Iakovos. Head of the Greek Orthodox Church of the Western Hemisphere, Archbishop Iakovos is retiring after 36 years of distinguished service as a spiritual leader and fighter for worldwide justice.

Archbishop Iakovos, born Geron Iakovos in Istanbul, Turkey, was ordained a priest in Lowell, MA, in 1940. He is a graduate of the Harvard University Divinity School. In 1959 he ascended to the leadership of the Greek Orthodox Church in the Western Hemisphere. He has been at the forefront of the worldwide ecumenical as well as the civil rights movement.

In 1959 he met with Pope John XXIII, thus becoming the first Greek Orthodox Leader in almost 400 years to meet with a Roman Catholic Pope. He also served as copresident of the World Council of Churches for 9 years.

As an outspoken religious leader against segregation in the United States, he marched with the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. in

Selma, AL. He has continually fought for the independence of Cyprus, preservation of Greece, and enhanced United States-Greek relations. He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1980 by President Jimmy Carter. He is a magnificent and stalwart friend of American Jewry, voiced support for Soviet Jews, and has been a strong advocate for Israel.

This extraordinary spiritual and religious leader has been a very sensitive pastor at every level. His warm pastoral dimension expresses itself to not only his own people, but to people of all religions, cultures, and nationalities. Beyond fulfilling his duties to the Church, he has been a leader in the cause of justice in America and all over the world. I know all of my colleagues join with me in wishing this extraordinary individual the very best in his retirement.

THE MEDICARE PRESERVATION ACT OF 1995

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1995

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the Medicare crisis to share with my colleagues the suggestions I have received from my constituents about how best to preserve, protect, and strengthen Medicare.

In April, when the Medicare trustees issued their annual report which stated quite clearly that the Medicare Trust Fund would be bankrupt in 7 years, I felt it was my duty to inform the people of the 11th Congressional District of the problem.

I mailed the facts of the trustees report to over 22,000 people in my district. I met with the presidents of nearly every senior citizens club in the area. I listened to thousands of Medicare beneficiaries at Morristown Memorial Hospital, the Morris Plains VFW, and at St. Clare's Riverside Medical Center in Denville. In addition to discussing the Medicare crisis, I also asked people for suggestions on how we could save and improve the program, while holding down costs.

Mr. Speaker, the response has been overwhelming. Who better to suggest ways to improve Medicare than the very people who have to deal with the system every day? As you might imagine, the meetings yielded a litany of suggestions. A man from Sparta suggested that Medicare should have a better verification system to weed out overcharges and duplication of services rendered. A couple from Livingston strongly suggested that millions of dollars could be saved by reducing the mountains of paperwork involved in the Medicare bureaucracy.

The responses touched on other subjects as well. At the Morris Plains VFW, several people indicated that more preventive care was needed such as mammograms, prostate screenings, and diabetes screening. I agree. This would not only help reduce costs but greatly improve people's health and I was surprised that the current Medicare program was weak in this area. If we can keep people healthier and provide routine health care and appropriate checkups, we can avoid using the most costly method of health care which is the emergency room.

I have listened to all of these concerns and brought them back to Washington. In fact, I applaud the leadership for giving Members an opportunity to testify on behalf of our constituents. I was pleased to have that opportunity, and testified on September 7, on what I have learned from the people of the 11th Congressional District. One constant theme was that the people know there is a problem, and they want to be part of the solution. If we do not give them that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, then we have really solved nothing at all.

To be sure, I will continue this thoughtful and important discussion and listen to these very knowledgeable people. Last week, when the preliminary Medicare preservation options were presented to us, I called for a series of town meetings so that my constituents could share the exact information given to me on possible solutions and plans to strengthen Medicare. I am sure they will take a hard look at these options, and will continue to provide guidance for me and this Congress as we fulfill our responsibility to preserve Medicare for all Americans—present beneficiaries as well as the next generation. The Medicare Preservation Act is just that, a comprehensive plan to ensure a better Medicare.

On September 16, hundreds of older Americans attended two town meetings in Fairfield and Parsippany, and listened to the broad outline of the proposed Medicare Preservation Act. I expect that the turnout will be even heavier this weekend, September 23, when we continue the Medicare discussions at town meetings in Roxbury and Madison.

I welcome this open exchange of ideas and encourage my colleagues to continue the dialogue with the American people on how to save this important program. While it is very easy to be sidetracked in Washington by special interest groups, media hype, and partisan politics, listening to people on a face-to-face level permits a much clearer message to emerge.

Mr. Speaker, the message that I hear more and more is that we know there is a problem and we are willing to fix it. They have said that Medicare is indeed important for us but is also important for our children and grandchildren. And finally, they tell me that if Medicare is really going bankrupt, then we as Members of Congress have a responsibility to save it.

I have confidence that we are moving toward fulfilling that responsibility, and I thank the thousands of people in the 11th Congressional District for their guidance on these very complex issues. Their willingness, contributions, and suggestions will assure successful reforms of the Medicare program and its preservation. I am fortunate to be their Representative, and am also fortunate to help deliver a comprehensive plan which will ensure a better Medicare system for years to come.

THE COMPENSATORY TIME FOR ALL WORKERS ACT OF 1995

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1995

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing "The Compensatory Time for All Workers Act of 1995" which would allow private sector employers to offer employees the

choice of taking time-and-a-half compensatory time as payment for overtime. In 1938, the Fair Labor Standards Act [FLSA] was written for a predominantly male work force and a marketplace primarily comprised of manufacturing firms. These demographics have dramatically changed. Today, women make up a much greater percentage of the work force, private enterprise is dominated by service and high technology industries rather than heavy manufacturing, global competition has significantly increased, and the lines between white and blue collar workers have been blurred.

The FLSA, however, has failed to keep pace with these changes and, as such, restricts the ability of employers to meet the needs of their work force. The Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, which I chair, has heard from employees and employers of large and small companies, and State and local governments on a variety of problems which they face because of the act.

Currently, the FLSA impedes an employer's ability to accommodate employee requests for greater flexibility in scheduling. Companies who want to be family friendly find that flexible scheduling can be extremely difficult for those employees who are covered by the act and whose hours must be kept track of. Suppose an employee has a terminally ill parent who lives several States away. Days off with pay can become precious for that employee when a 2-day weekend does not provide enough time to travel and spend time with that parent. Thus, when that employee works a few hours overtime each week, he or she may prefer to be paid with time off rather than money. However, the FLSA says the employee must receive money instead and is therefore forced to use previous paid leave to spend time with the ill parent.

In 1985, Congress provided the public sector with the flexibility to use compensatory time in lieu of overtime pay. Congress has gone even further in providing flexibility for Federal workers. In 1978, Congress passed the Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act, which enabled Federal workers to arrange alternative work schedules which meet their personal needs and their employers' needs. This was so successful that Congress reauthorized the program in 1982 and 1985. President Clinton acknowledged the benefit of flexible scheduling when he directed all executive departments and agencies to expand their use of flexible family friendly work arrangements in a memorandum on July 11, 1994. In issuing the memorandum, Mr. Clinton stated, "broad use of flexible work arrangements to enable Federal employees to better balance their work and family responsibilities can increase employee effectiveness and job satisfaction, while decreasing turnover rates and absenteeism."

It is time that private sector employees be given greater flexibility similar to what the public sector has enjoyed for some time. This legislation would allow employers to offer employees compensatory time off in lieu of overtime pay under an agreement with the employee. If an employer made compensatory time available, employees would be free to choose to have their overtime compensated with cash or with paid time off. As with overtime pay, the compensatory time would accrue at a rate of time and a half. Employees who prefer to receive overtime pay would be free to choose this. Similarly, employers would have the