Florida for 90 days at a time. Many of these individuals would like to spend more than 90 days in the U.S. but are scrupulous about not overstaying their visit. These foreign retirees leave the U.S. within 90 days, spend some time in their country and then come back to the United States for another 90 days. Many of these individuals may end up spending a large amount of time in the U.S. using the VWPP but they can do so only by constantly going back and forth from their country to the United States. Of course, foreign citizens also use the B–2 visitors visa to spend time for pleasure in the U.S. Again, the use of the B–2 visa requires the holder to return to their home after a relatively short period of time before coming back to the U.S.

The 4-year visa period proposed in the legislation is intended to reduce the need for foreign retirees to frequently travel back and forth from the U.S. to their home country in order to comply with U.S. immigration requirements. At the same time, a 4-year period would ensure that retirees making use of this visa do go home periodically to renew their status by demonstrating that they meet the requirements outlined in this proposal, such as residence in a foreign country which the alien has no intention of abandoning. The visa would be renewable as long as the application was filed from the retiree's country of citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, there are clearly important practical and policy distinctions between long-term nonimmigrants and permanent residents holding green cards. This legislation does not aim to change that. For example, an important distinction between these nonimmigrant foreign retirees and permanent residents is that the amount of time they spend in the United States would not accrue for naturalization purposes. Also, a green card confers important benefits on permanent residents, such as the ability to engage in employment or receive government aid, which would not be available to a nonimmigrant under this legislation. This bill would not provide work authorization or eligibility for any Federal means-tested programs. Instead, these nonimmigrants would be required to own a residence in the United States, maintain health coverage, and receive income at least twice the Federal poverty level.

In its simplest terms, this visa would serve as a much needed mechanism in which foreign retirees would have the opportunity to comfortably reside in the United States. Let me give you an example of how this will work by using August and Gerda Welz as an example. August and Gerda Welz have spent more than $380,000 in the United States since taking up a residence in Palm Coast, Florida three years ago. Native Germans, the Welz's saw Florida as an ideal place to spend their retirement years, with its pleasant climate and sound economy. They own a home, pay taxes and volunteer in the community. Couples, such as the Welz's, represent the growing number of foreign retirees who wish to stay for an extended period of time in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, by simplifying the process for this unique group of retirees, this legislation would provide new and exciting opportunities for foreign retirees—a practice that would benefit all parties involved. There is no reason to discourage such individuals from spending some of their retirement years in the U.S., contributing to the economy and enhancing our communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this proposal.

## REFORMING PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

### HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 6, 1999*

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Presidential Debate Reform Act. The situation surrounding the 1996 Presidential election has highlighted some flaws in our current method for selecting a President and Vice President of the United States of America. One critical flaw involves the way Presidential debates are scheduled.

My legislation would create the framework for deciding the participants and structure of Presidential debates. This framework would include a commission of three people nominated by the President. The President would nominate one person from a list submitted by the Republican National Committee, one person from a list submitted by the Democratic National Committee, and one person who is unaffiliated submitted jointly by the RNC and the DNC. These commissioners would then schedule several debates.

One such debate would be optional and include any Presidential candidate who is on the ballot in 50 states or polls at 5 percent in popular polls among likely voters. This could include major party candidates, although it would provide a forum for lesser known candidates to express their views.

The commission would then establish debates for Vice Presidential and Presidential candidates of the two major parties and anyone polling over 5 percent in polls taken after the optional debate. The penalty for a candidate choosing not to participate in the debates would be a reduction in the amount of Federal funds that candidate's party will receive to run the next convention. The reduction would be equal to the fraction of ''mandatory'' debates missed. I cannot imagine that a party would want to miss out on $3 million, which is approximately the amount that would be lost by missing one debate, based on the cost of the 1996 conventions.

This has nothing to do with whether I think certain people should or should not participate in debates. However, I do believe that we need to have an established framework with defined ground rules to ensure fairness in the system.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill and I look forward to pursuing this as the 2000 election heats up. I urge my colleagues to review this legislation and support its passage.

## F–1 STUDENT VISAS

### HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 6, 1999*

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to give American high schools the ability to welcome foreign exchange students into their schools without requiring them to charge tuition. I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. PICKETT of Virginia.

It was brought to my attention that individual schools which participate in informal programs to allow foreign exchange students to attend school in the U.S. are required to charge these same students tuition. The F–1 visa is for students who seek to enter the U.S. temporarily and solely to pursue a course of study. Under existing law, even if the school and the local school district do not want to charge the student for accepting an invitation to study in the U.S., the student will not be able to receive an F–1 visa without paying the fee. In some cases, the school, which otherwise would welcome a foreign exchange student, may be deterred from allowing them to attend due to the administrative burden of administering the fee. In other cases, American schools entering into informal sister-school exchanges with a foreign school may find that they are forced to charge the foreign student tuition while the American student is attending their sister-school for free.

This tuition requirement does not apply to foreign students who come to the U.S. to study in a program designated by the Director of the United States Information Agency (USIA). These students receive a J visa and are not required to reimburse the school for the cost of their attendance. On the other hand, foreign exchange students in the U.S. under an F–1 visa are usually attending school under informal arrangements, with a teacher or parent having invited them to spend time in the U.S. as a gesture of American hospitality and goodwill. Some schools participate in informal sister-school exchanges where one of their students will go abroad and the school in turn will sponsor a foreign student here. Although these are informal, flexible, private arrangements between schools and students that are not designated by the USIA, they are no less valuable in developing goodwill and greater understanding among people of different nations. In many cases, it simply does not make sense to charge tuition to foreign exchange students simply because they have an F–1 visa rather than a J visa.

The legislation I am introducing today will give schools the ability to have the Attorney General waive the F–1 visa tuition fee requirement. Schools that certify that the waiver will promote the educational interest of the local educational agency and will not impose an undue financial burden on the agency will be able to allow foreign exchange students to attend without charging a fee. on the other hand, schools that do not want to waive the fee will still be able to collect it. This legislation will simply give schools added flexibility to sponsor foreign exchange students without limiting the right of schools to collect needed fees. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

## STATE OCCUPANCY STANDARDS AFFIRMATION ACT OF 1999

### HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 6, 1999*

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the State Occupancy Standards Affirmation Act of 1999, declaring

the rights of States in establishing occupancy standards for housing providers.

During the 105th Congress the House Committee on Banking and Financing Services passed a public housing bill. Within the debate of this bill at the committee level, occupancy standards were discussed, but a real standard with real definitions was left out of the final product. This bill would amend the Quality Housing and Word Responsibility Act and insert the standards and definition that should have been put in originally.

I believe that it is important to firmly establish the rights of the states in determining this standard, especially when considering that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) could require housing providers to house more people than is considered appropriate and reasonable.

Currently, many states have occupancy laws or guidelines in place, and there is a national consensus among housing providers that the maximum number of occupants most housing can accommodate is two people per bedroom. This legislation allows the inclusion of one infant to the already established two-people-per-bedroom limit. Beyond this level, the negative effects of overcrowding, including providers possibly decreasing the stock of affordable housing, could be triggered. It is important that reasonable limits be set for the number of occupants in a housing unit to provide safe living conditions, to protect from property damage, and to make sure that requisite services can be provided for all residents.

The bill I am introducing is a simple clarification of existing law and practice. It says that States, not HUD, will set occupancy standards and that a two-per-bedroom plus an infant standard is reasonable in the absence of a State law. American taxpayers have spent billions of dollars on HUD programs designed to reduce crowding. It is time to ensure that overcrowding will not be a possibility. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

## A SECURE SOCIAL SECURITY CARD

### HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 6, 1999*

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will make the Social Security card more tamper-resistant and less susceptible to fraudulent use. Eliminating Social Security document fraud is a vital first step in controlling our borders and stopping illegal immigration. It is simply unacceptable that the one document that is most commonly used to prove eligibility for employment—the Social Security card—is nothing more than a paper document that is easily counterfeited. As it stands, an illegal alien wanting a Social Security card can go to a street corner and purchase a fake for as little as $30.

Improving the Social Security card is of the utmost importance for two fundamental reason: (1) it reduces the incentive for illegal aliens to come to the U.S. by making it more difficult for them to get a job, and (2) it makes it easier for employers to comply with existing law by making employment authorization documents more reliable. It is that simple.

Mr. Speaker, the only way to control the crisis of illegal immigration is to eliminate the lure of employment. The 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act created employer sanctions, making it illegal to knowingly hire an illegal alien. That law requires everyone seeking employment in the U.S. to produce evidence of eligibility to work. The most commonly used form of verification is the combination of a driver's license with the Social Security card. These reforms were well intentioned but a decade later, it is clear that fraudulent documents have weakened the impact.

One of the primary reasons that employer sanctions are not working today is the rampant fraud in the documents used to prove eligibility to work, including the Social Security card. As long as the Social Security card can be easily counterfeited, employer sanctions will not work. The fact that illegal aliens can easily counterfeit authorization documents undermines this important law and the lure of easy jobs continues to pull illegal aliens into this country.

My legislation would require a simple upgrading of the Social Security card. This would replace today's card with one that offers the best possible security against counterfeiting, forgery, alteration and fraudulent use. This proposal would require the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to make such improvements to the Social Security account number card as are necessary to make it as secure against counterfeiting as the 100 dollar bill and as protected against fraudulent use as the United States passport. I chose these performance standards because of the many counterfeit-resistance features that are built into these two documents, including the type of paper, watermarks, background pattern of inks and security threads.

Mr. Speaker, with this legislation, the Commissioner of Social Security would be required to offer more than a bare assertion concerning the card's security. This legislation directs the Comptroller General to perform an annual audit regarding the progress and status of developing a secured social security account number card, the incidence of counterfeit production and fraudulent use of social security account number cards, and the steps being taken to detect and prevent such counterfeiting and fraud.

The legislation also provides that, beginning on January 1, 2008, any Social Security card that is used for employer sanctions purposes, i.e., to show that an individual is eligible to work in the U.S., must be one of the new, secured Social Security cards. By a date certain we need an improved Social Security card to be the only Social Security card acceptable for employer sanctions. Other documents, such as the passport, would still be acceptable. This would make the older, easy to counterfeit cards, worthless to illegal aliens.

Immigrants bring growth, creativity and opportunity to America. They are the cornerstone of much of our great nation's cultural heritage. Immigration should once again be seen as a noble experience that enriches America—both economically and culturally—rather than one demeaned by criminality and deceit. To accomplish this, we must make employer sanctions work and cut off the magnet of jobs. Adopting measures, such as a secure Social Security card, to reduce document fraud is the first pivotal step that must be taken.

If we do nothing and continue to allow the use of the Social Security card without making it tamper-resistant, fraud will remain rampant, employer sanctions will not work, and the country will continue to be overrun by illegal aliens. This is a modest proposal to ensure that the SSA uses the latest inking and anti-counterfeiting mechanisms now used on paper issued in the form of the $100 bill and the U.S. passport—both of which boast extremely low rates of fraud. These would be specific, clearly outlined performance standards. In 9 years or so, only such an upgraded card would qualify as a Social Security card for the purposes of confirming employment eligibility. These modest steps are the least we can do to stop the unrivaled wave of illegal immigration hitting our nation.

## RELIEF FOR ROBERT ANTHONY BROLEY

### HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 6, 1999*

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill for the relief of Robert Anthony Broley. After enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), Immigration Judges lost most discretion in granting suspension of deportation of certain criminal aliens. Any relief must be sought from Congress. The case of Robert Anthony Broley is, in my opinion, sufficiently compelling to have Congress grant him relief from pending deportation.

Robert is the son of Robert M. Broley and Barbara Broley, Mrs. Broley was born in Canada but is a U.S. citizen, having been naturalized in 1962. Mr. Broley is also a naturalized U.S. citizen. The son, Robert Anthony Broley, was born in Canada in 1966 and remains a Canadian citizen.

Robert Anthony Broley entered the United States with his parents at the age of 2 in November 1968. He lived with his parents in the United States until they accepted employment in Canada when he was nine. Robert Anthony Broley was admitted again in October, 1978 and, for the most part, he has remained here since. He has an American citizen son, Matthew.

Robert Anthony Broley had personal problems beginning with his senior year in high school. He stole checks from his parents in 1990. In 1992 he was convicted of Driving Under the Influence. He stole furniture from his family in 1993 in order to sell it for cash. His parents felt the need to turn him in to the authorities in order to help Robert in the long run. He served 5 months in prison and was released in October, 1993 and given probation, which he violated by returning to Canada.

His father finally convinced Robert Anthony Broley to return to the United States in order to accept the consequences of this actions. While attempting to enter the United States to turn himself in for violating his probation, he was apprehended and is currently serving a term for parole violation with a release date of March 20, 1999. Once released, he is deportable under Section 212(a) and 237(a) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (as amended by IIRIRA).

While serving time in prison, Robert was involved in a very serious accident that has left his face permanently disfigured. His family feels that their son has completely changed