

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