

good English speakers. It is amazing to realize that they all grew up in the cruel, hateful and impoverished world Slobodan Milosevic had created for them in the 1990s. In the meeting, they provided one piece of very good news. One Otpor activist, Boris Karajcic, had testified in 1998 before the Helsinki Commission which I co-chair and was beaten up on the streets of Belgrade a few weeks later. Today, Boris is a member of the Serbian parliament. He is an active part of Serbia's future.

Otpor itself will also be part of Serbia's future. While Milosevic is out of power, there is much to be done to recover from the nightmare he created. First, they are investigating and compiling complaints about the police officers who brutalized them and other citizens of Serbia who opposed the regime, and they will seek to ensure that officers who seemed to take a particular delight in beating people for exercising their rights are held accountable. They want to see Milosevic himself arrested, both for his crimes in Serbia and the war crimes for which he faces an international indictment. The Otpor group also advocates the founding of a school of public administration, which does not exist in Serbia and is desperately needed as the government bureaucracies are swollen with Milosevic cronies who have no idea how to implement public policy. Along similar lines, they hope to begin an anti-corruption campaign. Finally, they pointed out that, with the fall of Milosevic, the united opposition now in power has no credible, democratic political opposition to it. Until Serbian politics develop further, they intend to serve some of that role, being a watchdog of the new leaders.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Otpor group with which I met has a track record of accomplishment, ideas for the future, and a good sense of how to bring those ideas into reality. While they have had the heart and the courage, they also have had the assistance of the United States through the National Endowment of Democracy and other organizations which promote democratic development abroad. I hope my colleagues will continue to support this kind of assistance, for Serbia and other countries where it is needed, which serves not only the interests of the United States but the cause of humanity.

COLEMAN INDUSTRIAL CONSTRUCTION OF KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the owners, Don and Diane Coleman, and the employees of Coleman Industrial Construction of Kansas City, Missouri, for their recognition by the National Railroad Construction Maintenance Association (NRC). Coleman Industrial Construction has been presented with the NRC's Contractor Safety Award. The NRC annually recognizes one firm with less than 25 employees from among more than 200 firms nationwide for their outstanding, accident-free record among small railroad contractors.

This distinction does not come about easily. It is the result of many hours of work, seminars, and training provided by Coleman Industrial Construction coupled with the tireless efforts of all its employees to focus on reducing the risks of accidents and injury. Due to the work of the experienced and professional employees and their "safety-first" attitude, Coleman Industrial Construction has been able to go 14 years without a "lost time" accident.

While Coleman Industrial Construction is being recognized among other small railroad contractors, their performance is a standard for all industries. Their continued emphasis on job safety serves as a worthy model nationwide.

Again, I congratulate and commend the owners and employees of Coleman Industrial Construction on their outstanding performance in reducing injuries at the workplace.

A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO REPEAL THE REQUIRED USE OF CERTAIN PRINCIPAL REPAYMENTS ON MORTGAGE SUBSIDY BOND FINANCINGS TO REDEEM BONDS, TO MODIFY THE PURCHASE PRICE LIMITATION UNDER MORTGAGE SUBSIDY BOND RULES BASED ON MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, in introducing our bill, "The Housing Bond and Credit Modernization and Fairness Act." Our joining together in introducing this bill today is indicative of the broad bipartisan support Housing Bonds and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (Housing Credit) programs enjoy.

The Congress has an unusual opportunity, without creating any new program, to create new housing opportunity for tens of thousands of low- and moderate-income families every year. All it will take is enactment of minor legislative changes to eliminate obsolete provisions in the two principal Federal programs that finance the production of affordable housing: Housing Bonds, or single family Mortgage Revenue Bonds (MRBs), as they are commonly known, and the Housing Credit.

This bill builds on important legislation Representative NEAL and I introduced and supported in the last two Congresses to increase the Housing Bond authority by nearly 50 percent to make up for the effects of inflation. In the 106th Congress this piece of legislation, as well as the Housing Credit legislation, had the phenomenal support of 375-plus House cosponsors from both parties, from all regions of the country, and from rural and urban districts. Finally, in late 2000, legislation applicable to both the Housing Bonds and Housing Credit was enacted into law.

The Housing Bond and Credit Modernization and Fairness Act does three things. First, the

bill would repeal the Ten-Year Rule, a provision added to the MRB program in 1988 that prevents States from using homeowner payments on such mortgages to make new mortgages to additional qualified purchasers. States estimate that, between 1998 and 2002, the Rule will mean the loss of over \$8.5 billion in mortgage authority, denying tens of thousands of qualified lower income homebuyers each year the ability to obtain affordable MRB-financed mortgages. Second, the bill would replace the present unworkable limit on the price of the homes these mortgages can finance with a simple limit that works. No reliable comprehensive data exists in all areas of the country to determine average area home prices. The current price limits were issued in 1994 based on 1993 data. They are obsolete and well below current home price levels in most parts of the country. Many qualified buyers simply cannot find homes that are priced below the outdated limits.

The answer is to modify the present limit, set in Washington, with a simple formula limiting the purchase price to three and a half times the qualifying income under the program.

We would like to acknowledge the leadership and support of our colleague Representative BEREUTER, who introduced last year and reintroduced in this Congress this element of our legislation as a freestanding bill.

Finally, the bill makes Housing Credit apartment production viable in rural areas by allowing statewide median incomes as the basis for the income limits in that program. This change would apply the same methodology in determining qualifying income levels that is used in the MRB Program. HUD data shows that current income limits inhibit Housing Credit development in at least 1,700 of the 2,364 non-metropolitan counties across the country.

It is noteworthy that the changes proposed by The Housing Bond and Credit Modernization and Fairness Act were endorsed by the bipartisan National Governors Association at its recently concluded meeting. The governors know how important the Housing Bond and Housing Credit programs are in giving states the ability to meet the housing needs of low- and moderate-income families. The governors know that we need to do more to ensure that the important increase in authority that over 375 House Members cosponsored last year really can reach as many qualified people as possible.

Even after the passage of last year's legislation, over 100,000 qualified lower income homebuyers are not able to get an affordable MRB funded mortgage and over 70 percent of non-metropolitan counties across the country will be inhibited in full use of the Housing Credit program.

For those of you that cosponsored those bills last year, and those of my colleagues who are new to the Congress, we hope you will join our bipartisan effort to see that these important provisions are enacted as part of tax legislation this year.

March 8, 2001

HOUSING BONDS AND CREDITS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Representative AMO HOUGHTON and I are today introducing legislation to make three important changes to two of the most popular and efficient housing programs before Congress, the single family Mortgage Revenue Bond (MRB) program and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program.

First, this bill repeals the ten-year rule, a provision added to the MRB program in 1988 that prevents the states from fully using mortgage bonds by limiting the extent to which new mortgages can be made on outstanding bonds on which prepayments have been made by the original beneficiaries. States estimate that, between 1998 and 2002, the ten-year rule means the loss of over \$8.5 billion in mortgage authority, denying over 100,000 qualified lower and moderate income home buyers affordable MRB mortgages.

Second, the bill replaces the present limit on the price of homes these mortgages can finance with one that works better given the fact that there is no reliable comprehensive data that exists to determine average area home prices. The current price limits were issued in 1994 based on 1993 data. They are, obviously, obsolete and well below current home price levels in most parts of the country. We propose a simpler formula limiting the purchase price to three and a half times the qualifying income under the program. This will work to preserve the goals of current law while providing a realistic limit on the program for almost all areas of the nation.

Finally, the bill makes housing credit apartment production more viable in rural areas by allowing statewide medium incomes as the basis for the income limits in that program. While this provision may need some technical adjustment, it is clear that the current rules do not provide sufficient incentives to build apartments in very low income rural areas.

Mr. HOUGHTON and I believe these changes, when combined with the increase in the caps on these programs enacted last year, will ensure a strong, effective housing program that will meet the needs of our constituents now, and well into the future. We hope these changes will be adopted in the near future.

CONGRATULATING THE 2000 PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE TEACHING WINNER, JOLYNN MELLIS FROM COLLEGE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN LADSON, SC

HON. HENRY E. BROWN, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today Mrs. JoLynn Mellis, a teacher from College Park Elementary School in Ladson,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

South Carolina, was awarded the 2000 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching Award by the National Science Foundation. I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Mellis on this prestigious award. This award, the nation's highest commendation for K-12 math and science teachers, recognizes sustained and exemplary work, both inside the classroom and out. These outstanding teachers serve as role models for their colleagues.

Mrs. Mellis exemplifies what is great about America's public schools. Mrs. Mellis recognizes that our children are our future; she has taken on the crucial responsibility to ensure her students master the math and science skills they require to make that future a bright one for South Carolina and for the United States of America. She has fulfilled this responsibility in outstanding fashion. I commend Mrs. Mellis for her hard work and dedication. Thank you, Mrs. Mellis.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill that will create incentives to reduce the price of prescription drugs for American consumers.

As I travel around the Second Congressional District of Tennessee, I speak with many people. One concern I hear over and over again is the high cost of medications. Many seniors, in particular, often face a choice between things like medicine, food and heat.

However, this problem is not isolated only to the elderly. All Americans face these steep prices. For example, single mothers and poor working families also have to buy medications. As a father, I cannot imagine anything worse than not being able to afford medicine for a sick child.

As has been discussed many times, there are a lot of complex reasons that prices are so high, and it goes far beyond greedy manufacturers as some have suggested. I believe the primary culprit is a bloated federal bureaucracy that adds years and literally tens of millions of dollars to the development cost of new drugs.

Some new drugs can cost more than a billion dollars to bring to market. In exchange, these drugs have a profound impact on the health of Americans and hundreds of millions of people worldwide. Fundamentally, we need to find ways to reduce these development costs.

The second great inequity is that many countries have draconian cost controls. While these formularies may be sufficient to pay the price to physically produce a pill or medicine, they rarely take into account the phenomenal expenses that went into the development of the drug. These development costs are then shifted to a much smaller consumer base of consumers who end up paying outrageously high prices. If manufacturers and researchers were ever completely stripped of the ability to recover these costs, the flow of new drugs would slow dramatically, if not end completely.

3319

Nevertheless, it is wrong that Americans are so often asked to pay the price for drugs that benefit all mankind. It is particularly frustrating to consumers when they see our neighbors to the North and South paying much lower prices for exactly the same drug.

I believe that this situation needs to be examined and addressed. In the meantime, my proposal would extend a new tax incentive to domestic manufacturers who could demonstrate that they are offering drugs to American consumers at the same average price the drugs are offered to citizens in Canada and Mexico. Hopefully this tax provision will strongly encourage drug makers to reduce their prices for average American consumers.

American ingenuity is fueling the greatest health revolution in the history of mankind. We need to do everything possible to fulfill the promise of this research and alleviate suffering for everyone. However, American consumers deserve fair access to the products of our Nation's research engine, and I hope my legislation will encourage manufacturers to find innovative ways to reduce domestic prices or more equitably spread development costs among a larger base of consumers abroad.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and improve healthcare for all American consumers.

INTRODUCTION OF VETERANS AMERICAN DREAM HOMEOWNERSHIP ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, thousands of former servicemen and servicewomen in five states are currently prohibited from receiving state-financed home mortgages. That is why Congressman HERGER and I, along with seven of our colleagues, are introducing the Veterans American Dream Homeownership Assistance Act. This legislation is similar to bills we introduced in the 104th, 105th, and 106th Congresses.

In order to help veterans own a home, Congress created a program where states could issue tax-exempt bonds in order to raise funds to finance mortgages for owner-occupied residences. Five states—Wisconsin, Alaska, Oregon, California, and Texas—implemented such a program for their veterans. Under a little-known provision in the 1984 tax bill, Congress limited the veterans eligible for this program to those who began military service before 1977.

As a result of the 1984 tax bill, veterans who entered military service after January 1, 1977 are prohibited from receiving a state-financed veterans mortgage. This means veterans who served honorably in Panama, Grenada, or the Gulf War cannot get veterans home mortgages from their state government. Are those who began serving our country after January 1, 1977 any less deserving than those who served before?

This arbitrary cutoff was created to raise additional revenue in the 1984 tax bill by limiting the issuance of tax-exempt bonds. When this