

February 6, 2001

INTRODUCTION OF THE HOUSING
PRESERVATION MATCHING
GRANT ACT OF 2001

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Housing Preservation Matching Grant Act of 2001 previously championed by our esteemed colleague, the late Representative Bruce Vento.

With the recent rise in real estate prices, many owners of HUD-assisted and insured projects are finding it more lucrative to repay their mortgages and operate their buildings in the private market. The tendency to opt-out of Section 8 contracts is placing hundreds of thousands of affordable housing units at risk. According to the National Housing Trust, there are over half a million Section 8 apartments in all 50 states that are below market and in danger of losing affordability. We simply cannot allow this vital housing stock to evaporate.

The Housing Preservation Matching Grant Act would provide assistance to states for operating costs, capital expenditures, debt restructuring, and acquisition of projects with HUD-insured mortgages, Section 8 contracts, and resident ownership. This project-based assistance is a necessary complement to tenant-based approaches by preserving the units that accept vouchers, and ensuring that low-income families have a safe and affordable place to live. Federal matching grants would also give states a much needed incentive to either continue or create innovative programs to preserve their housing resources.

Before we can create new affordable housing we must preserve the resources we already have, and stop the rising tide of low-income rents to the private market. This legislation achieves both these goals, and hopefully will entice states to appropriate more money for public housing programs knowing that the federal government will provide a substantial share of the cost. By setting up a mechanism for federal and state partnership, this legislation fosters cooperation and coordination between all those responsible for administering and maintaining housing programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Housing Preservation Matching Grant Act of 2001 is an important part of any broader strategy to save affordable housing, and I ask all my colleagues to support it.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUR
CHAPLAINS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this month is the 57th anniversary of one of the most heart touching incidents of World War II, the coverage of the four chaplains.

We are fortunate in that we are living in an era when the sacrifices of what is now called "The Greatest Generation" are finally being

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

fully appreciated. The release of recent films and books, the groundbreaking last Veterans Day for the official World War Two Memorial, and other historic events, are underscoring for younger generations the magnitude of the commitment of all the American people to their task at hand in World War Two.

However, of the countless incidents of heroism during that conflict, none have the emotional impact or the relevance to today's society as the story of the four chaplains.

It is now 57 years since that fateful night of February 3, 1943, when four brave chaplains—George I. Fox and Clark V. Poling, Protestant ministers; Alexander D. Goode, a Rabbi; and John P. Washington, a Roman Catholic Priest—laid down their lives aboard the U.S.S. *Dorchester* so that others might live on.

The *Dorchester*, carrying 902 servicemen, merchant seamen, and civilian workers, was traveling across the North Atlantic, towards a U.S. Army base on the coast of Greenland, when it was attacked by a German U-boat. The German submarine fired a series of torpedoes toward the *Dorchester*, which struck the transport ship well below the water line, and injuring her beyond repair.

As water began to flood in through the ship's battered hull, chaos set in aboard the *Dorchester*, and it was into the ensuing scene of utter hopelessness and despair that the Chaplains' legacy was woven.

When it was discovered that the supply of life jackets aboard the *Dorchester* was insufficient, the Chaplains—without hesitation—removed their own, and offered them to four frightened young men.

The Chaplains then stayed with those injured by the initial blast as the ship slanted towards the icy water, and were last seen clutching hands together, offering prayers for those around them.

The qualities which the Chaplains embodied—self sacrifice, unity, faith, and respect for each other's creeds—are the qualities upon which our nation rests, and which, at the dawn of the new millennium, are relevant for us today more than ever. It is for this reason that the Four Chaplains deserve our respect and our honor as true American heroes.

As we pay homage to the Four Chaplains today and throughout this month, let us reflect for a moment upon the attributes which defined their actions, and forget not those four heroic men. The uniquely American brand of heroism which they represented and the countless other men and women who gave their lives in the name of our country must not be forgotten.

Nathaniel Hawthorne once wrote: "A hero cannot be a hero unless in a heroic world." Accordingly, it is fitting to note that the Four Chaplain's sacrifice came in the midst of a conflict which called upon all Americans to make sacrifices in order to guarantee the preservation of our way of life and to eradicate tyranny from the world.

In my Congressional District, many veterans and patriotic organizations paid tribute to the Four Chaplains this month with appropriate ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker I invite our colleagues to join in commemorating these courageous remarkable American heroes . . . The *Dorchester's* Four Chaplains.

1443

GLOBAL GAG RULE

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on his second day in office—also the 28th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*—President Bush acted to reimpose the "global gag rule," a policy begun in the Reagan years to restrict international family planning assistance. I am seriously concerned about what this step will mean for the more than 150 million women worldwide who currently want access to family planning resources. I am concerned as well that President Bush's action might be only the first step in a longer-term effort to chip away at women's reproductive rights.

Not only would the reimposition of the "global gag rule," keep women's rights advocates around the world from working to prevent the suffering that results from unsafe abortions, but such restrictions would also prohibit international family planning organizations from spending their own, non-U.S.-funds to provide legal abortion services or to advocate for changes in abortion laws in their own countries.

In explaining this step, President Bush stated that he did not want taxpayer dollars to be spent to perform or promote abortions overseas. This is a misrepresentation of the nature of international family planning funding. Currently, no U.S. funds are spent to perform or promote abortions overseas, nor can they be under current U.S. law.

President Bush also stated that he hoped the reimposition of restrictions would help make abortions more rare. But when the policy was previously in effect, it didn't achieve this stated goal. Instead, according to the Center for Reproductive Law and Politics, it reduced access to health care and caused more unintended pregnancies and more abortions.

Anti-abortion activists remain adamantly opposed to using U.S. aid for international family planning programs. Yet as the Denver Post points out, an investment in these programs is important "not only to save women from horrible deaths, but also to quell the population explosion in impoverished nations. . . . Using tax dollars to prevent unwanted pregnancies is far more cost-effective than spending huge sums to feed starving populations who remain unenlightened about family planning."

Mr. Speaker, I agree, and for the benefit of our colleagues, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the full editorial from the Denver Post, another editorial from the Boulder Daily Camera, and a letter to the Denver Post in opposition to the "global gag rule" written by former Colorado first lady Dottie Lamm, who also served as a delegate to the UN Conference of Population and Development in 1994.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 24, 2001]

GLOBAL GAG RULE BACKFIRES

Nobody likes abortions—not the women who have them nor the activists who believe in a woman's right to choose.

Yet the most adamant anti-abortion activists were rejoicing Monday when President

Bush instituted a ban that likely will spur even more abortions in Third World countries.

Bush banned federal aid from international organizations that perform or "actively promote" abortion as a family planning method.

Yet those are the same groups that promote birth control so women can avoid abortions. And because illegal abortions are rampant in Third World countries, those organizations cannot eliminate abortion discussions from their services.

Such groups must be able to counsel women who are seeking illegal abortions. Without such counsel, many women die during illegal abortions—and many don't learn about family planning methods that can make abortion unnecessary.

The only way to stem the high rate of abortions in such countries is to make family planning readily available. But when the U.S. strips money from family planning groups, it also strips hope that Third World women will have access to birth control.

So Bush's action, while oddly satisfying to anti-abortion forces, ironically guarantees that abortions will continue to increase.

Opponents denounced it as an "international gag rule" on discussion of abortions, a move that would be unconstitutional if imposed in the United States.

Yet some anti-abortion activists even question why the U.S. should provide any family planning to foreign countries. "I'm not sure it's an effective use of our tax dollars . . ." said Chuck Gosnell, president of the Colorado Christian Coalition.

The Post, however, has historically upheld the need to support worldwide family planning—not only to save women from horrible deaths, but also to quell the population explosion in impoverished nations.

Using tax dollars to prevent unwanted pregnancies is far more cost-effective than spending huge sums to feed starving populations who remain unenlightened about family planning.

We deeply regret Bush's action Monday, and we urge the administration to reconsider the ultimate effects of such a ban.

[From the Daily Camera, Jan. 25, 2001]

Bush the Divider

During his campaign, President George W. Bush sought to keep the hot-button issue of abortion off the radar screens of both the media and the voters.

When pressed, he pointed to his long, strong anti-abortion record. But often he tempered that message by saying "good people can disagree" on the issue—as well he might, given his wife Laura's recent remarks in favor of keeping abortion legal, and his mother's similar sentiments. He also suggested he might be a moderate on the issue when he said repeatedly that many hearts and minds would have to be changed before the nation was ready to overturn Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision that made access to abortion a constitutional right.

Following the disputed election—in which pro-choice Al Gore won the popular vote by more than a half million votes—many abortion-rights supporters hoped that Bush's lack of a mandate would keep his anti-abortion instincts in check.

Some of those same optimists even crossed their fingers and hoped that John Ashcroft, Bush's profoundly anti-abortion nominee for Attorney General, was telling the truth when he said his personal views would not affect his enforcement of abortion-related

laws, from clinic access to Roe v. Wade itself. Ashcroft went so far as to declare that he considers the landmark case "the settled law of the land."

Such hopes surely were dashed Monday—Bush's second full day in office—when he marked the 28th anniversary of Roe v. Wade by reinstating the "global gag rule," which prevents overseas family planning organizations that receive U.S. aid from even discussing abortion or lobbying for legalized abortion in their countries.

Using U.S. funds to pay for actual abortions, or even to promote abortion, already is prohibited under the annually-renewed Helms Amendment, adopted in 1973. This "gag rule" was tied on by President Reagan in 1984 and maintained by President George H.W. Bush. It was overturned in the opening days of President Clinton's first term.

Bush's reinstatement is mostly a symbolic bone thrown to his anti-abortion supporters, since statistics show the gag rule hasn't reduced abortions in the past. But forcing family planning agencies to choose between desperately-needed dollars and providing full and accurate information means that many women will go without any care at all.

Bush also took pains to issue encouraging words (albeit through a proxy) to an anti-abortion protest in the capital Monday: ". . . you are gathered to remind our country that one of those ideals is the infinite value of every life."

And, to complete a Monday trifecta, Bush's chief of staff Andrew Card told reporters that the new administration is "reviewing" the recent Food and Drug Administration approval of the abortion pill, RU-486.

And so, despite recent public opinion polls that show about 60 percent of Americans believe abortion should be legal in all or most cases, despite hopeful predictions that he would hew to a moderate line in the wake of his tenuous election victory, Bush the self-declared "uniter" has thrown down the abortion gauntlet from the outset.

Some political analysts have suggested he may be trying to fatten his supporters on the socially-conservative right with treats right now so they'll still be sated later on in the banquet, when the time comes to reach compromise with hungry Democrats.

That may be. But surely Bush could have chosen a less contentious issue to mollify his conservative base. By rushing in to demonstrate his allegiance to those who would impose their beliefs on the nation and ban abortion, he has demonstrated in his first week that he missed some important lessons of his sketchy victory.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 24, 2001]

GAG RULE DECRIED

Re: "Abortion opponents jubilant," Jan. 23 news story.

President Bush's re-instatement of the gag rule on international family planning aid is the worst example of "compassionate conservatism" possible.

As Sylvia Clark, a life-long Republican and president and CEO of Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains, said Monday:

"In short, the U.S. government will be telling the desperately poor women of the developing world, 'Don't you dare ask about abortion options, because if you do, you will lose access to the family planning that could prevent you from ever needing an abortion in the first place.'"

Some history here: From 1984-1993 Ronald Reagan's "Mexico City Policy" prohibited recipients of international family planning

assistance from providing abortion services or offering medical advice to women dealing with an unintended pregnancy.

President Clinton rescinded that policy in early 1993.

Right now, nearly two out of every five pregnancies worldwide are still unintended. Early and frequent pregnancy contributes significantly to the deaths of infants, children and women in developing countries, where a woman dies literally every minute in childbirth or because of complications of pregnancy.

But, when contraceptive prevalence rates rise, rates of unintended pregnancies, maternal deaths and abortion go down.

Restrictions on international family planning assistance will do nothing to stop abortion. In fact they will increase the number of times desperate women turn to abortion as a means to control family size.

Instead of reinstating the gag rule, Bush should have made good on his original promise stated to The New York Times "to find common ground and reduce the number of abortions that happen."

Yet, President Bush's gag rule policies will promote exactly the opposite. It will increase the number of abortions that happen. For shame, Mr. President!

DOTTIE LAMM,
Denver.

ARIEL SHARON'S COMMENT

HON. CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, how dare Ariel Sharon comment about Condoleezza Rice's legs. I wonder what his legs look like. And let me go on to say how "unsexy" some people might think he looks. But they don't say it out loud! Probably they would be too busy thinking about that and unable to keep their mind on their work.

Why would he say such a thing out loud?

But does that have anything to do with his effectiveness as an Israeli leader? No.

Neither his legs nor his sexiness has anything to do with whether he will stand for peace, make war, or whether he is competent to do the job for which he has been chosen.

Likewise, Dr. Rice's looks have nothing to do with her effectiveness as a leader or as National Security Advisor to President Bush.

The press seems to think this episode is cute.

But it's an insult for all the women out there who go to school, study hard, then work long hours to break the glass ceiling. The last thing we need is for some boorish man who can control neither his libido nor his tongue to come on publicly to women he finds attractive.

I think Mr. Sharon owes all women, especially working women, an apology.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my sympathies to the family of the late