earnestly to find solutions for the problem of violence in our schools and throughout our society. At the same time the 6 o'clock news reports school violence, it reports the violence of war. So I wonder and I ask out loud, is it possible that our children are imitating the actions of our government, that every time we have a difference with another country, we use violence to solve that difference?

Secondly, this week on the agriculture appropriation bill we will say ''no'' once again to selling food and medicine to Cuba. Food and medicine. Economic violence. Is it possible that our children are simply imitating the violence they see coming from our adult behavior?

ON MILK POLICY

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, very soon a great debate will begin to rage here in the halls of Congress. That debate will be about how we price milk. My friends from other regions of the country will complain that if the system is reformed and the playing field is leveled, their dairy farmers would receive less or they would lose relative to other parts of the country.

But, Mr. Speaker, we should understand that dairy farmers in my region of the country have been losers under the current convoluted milk marketing order system for over 60 years. This makes no economic sense. Even Justice Anton Scalia has called the system ''Byzantine.'' All we are asking for is equal pay for equal milk, and we will not give up this fight until we get it.

TRADE DEFICIT HITS RECORD HIGH

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, another record. For the third straight month, America's trade deficit is going through the roof. It is now averaging $20 billion a month. That is 400,000 good-paying American jobs being lost every single month. It is so bad even Commerce Secretary Daley said America cannot continue to subsidize the world. Unbelievable. Something stinks.

Why is this administration still coddling to China on MFN and WTO membership? Enough is enough. America is going bankrupt at warp speed and Uncle Sam is buying the rocket fuel. I say it is time to get to the bottom of this action with China. Tell us the truth, White House, before we do not have a job left.

OPPOSE H.R. 45 AND KEEP NUCLEAR WASTE OUT OF NEVADA

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, when I was a young child, people used to say that little green men lived on Mars and the moon was made of cheese. That is when fantasies and rumors were the tools that shaped opinions and science was the unattainable.

Unfortunately, many of my colleagues look at transporting and storing high-level nuclear waste in Nevada in much the same way.

Fantasy and nonsense have no place in scientific studies, studies which prove that a repository site at Yucca Mountain is 10 times more prone to earthquakes and lava flows than government scientists previously estimated, studies that show Nevada ranks third in the Nation for current earthquake activity and has experienced over 650 earthquakes in the last 20 years.

That means with over 30 earthquakes a year. Clearly Yucca Mountain is not suitable and is one of the worst places to store the deadliest material ever created by man.

The space program proved that the moon is not made of cheese and that little green men do not live on Mars, and if the DOE properly addresses this new scientific information as the law requires them to do, they will not force green people to live in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, oppose H.R. 45 and place true science before fantasy, misinformation and conjecture.

COMBATTING SCHOOL VIOLENCE

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, mercifully events in Georgia last week produced no deaths in the school shooting. But this shows why it is that all of us at every level of government and every part of our community have to be working harder to reduce school violence. There are things that this Congress can be doing, things that our communities can be doing.

One area that we are working on in West Virginia and which I hope might be of benefit in other areas is we are designing a school safety report card: What are the elements of a safe school, listing them and then giving that to each community so each community can evaluate its own school.

One thing that I have learned following four hearings across our State is that there is no one-size-fits-all. We have to tailor our responses to each community and to each school. But we also have to dedicate ourselves to the proposition that as school ends this year, that when it resumes next year the schools will be safer than they have been.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 6 p.m. today.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 974) to establish a program to afford high school graduates from the District of Columbia the benefits of in-State tuition at State colleges and universities outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''District of Columbia College Access Act''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

There is hereby established the District of Columbia College Access Scholarship Program (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Program'') under which the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall award scholarships in accordance with section 4 using amounts in the District of Columbia College Access Fund established under section 3.

SEC. 3. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established on the books of the government of the District of Columbia the District of Columbia College Access Fund (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Fund''), which shall consist of the following amounts:

(1) Amounts appropriated to the Fund under law.

(2) Gifts and bequests.

(3) Refunds paid under section 4(b)(4).

(4) Interest earned on the balance of the Fund.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia shall administer the Fund, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.

(c) USE OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be used solely to award scholarships in accordance with section 4, except that not more than 10 percent of the balance of the Fund with respect to a fiscal year may be used for the administration of the Fund during such year.

(2) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR SCHOLARSHIPS.—With respect to each academic year for which scholarships may be awarded under this Act, the Mayor shall determine the amount available from the Fund for awarding scholarships.

(d) INVESTMENT.—The Mayor shall invest such portion of the Fund as is not in the judgment of the Mayor required to make current payments for scholarships. Such investments shall be in such form as the Mayor considers appropriate.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) APPLICATIONS.—Any qualified graduate seeking a scholarship under the Program

shall submit an application to the Mayor in such form and containing such information as the Mayor may prescribe by regulation. The Mayor shall make applications for scholarships under the Program available not later than October 1 of the academic year preceding the academic year for which the scholarships will be awarded, and shall announce the recipients of scholarships under this section not later than a date determined by the Mayor in consultation with the Secretary of Education.

(b) AWARDS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) AWARDS TO EACH QUALIFIED GRADUATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—From the amount available from the Fund under section 3(c)(2) for any academic year, the Mayor shall award scholarships to each qualified graduate submitting an application that is approved pursuant to subsection (a).

(B) AWARDS TO STUDENTS AT ELIGIBLE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS BASED ON IN-STATE TUITION.—Subject to subparagraph (D) and paragraph (2), such scholarship shall provide, for attendance at an eligible public institution located outside the District of Columbia, an amount equal to the difference between—

(i) the amount of the tuition normally charged by that institution to a student who is not a resident of the State in which that institution is located for the program of instruction in which the qualified graduate is enrolled or accepted for enrollment; and

(ii) the amount of the tuition normally charged by that institution to a student who is a resident of such State for such program of instruction, or the amount of the tuition normally charged by that institution to a student who is a resident of the county in which the institution is located for such program of instruction, whichever is less.

(C) TUITION ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO STUDENTS AT ELIGIBLE PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS.—Subject to paragraph (2), such scholarship shall provide, for attendance at an eligible private institution, a tuition assistance grant in a uniform amount determined by the Mayor, not to exceed $3,000 for the academic year.

(D) CAP ON AMOUNT PROVIDED.—The amount of a scholarship provided to an individual under subparagraph (B) for an academic year may not exceed $10,000.

(2) RATABLE REDUCTION IF FUNDS INSUFFICIENT.—If the amount available from the Fund under section 3(c)(2) for any academic year is not sufficient to pay the scholarship amount determined under paragraph (1) for each qualified graduate submitting an application that is approved pursuant to subsection (a), the amount of such scholarships shall be ratably reduced. If additional sums become available for such academic year, such reduced scholarships shall be increased on the same basis as they were reduced (until the amount allotted equals the amount determined under paragraph (1)).

(3) DISBURSEMENT.—The scholarships awarded under this section shall be disbursed to the eligible institution at which the qualified graduate is enrolled or accepted for enrollment by check or other means that is payable to and requires the endorsement or other certification by such graduate.

(4) REFUNDS.—The Mayor may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to provide for the refund to the Fund of a portion of the amount awarded under this section in the event a recipient of a scholarship under this section withdraws from an institution during a period of enrollment in which the recipient began attendance.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require an institution of higher education to alter the institution's admissions policies or standards in any manner in order for a qualified graduate to receive a scholarship to attend such institution under this Act.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) QUALIFIED GRADUATE.—The term ''qualified graduate'' means an individual who—

(A) has been a resident of the District of Columbia for not less than the 12 consecutive months preceding the academic year for which the scholarship is sought;

(B) begins his or her undergraduate course of study within the 3 calendar years (excluding any period of service on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the Peace Corps or Americorps) of graduating from a secondary school, or receiving the recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma;

(C) is enrolled or accepted for enrollment in a degree, certificate, or other program (including a program of study abroad approved for credit by the institution at which such student is enrolled) leading to a recognized educational credential at an eligible institution;

(D) if the student is presently enrolled at an institution, is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study the student is pursuing, as determined under section 484(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(c));

(E) is a citizen or national of the United States, a permanent resident of the United States, able to provide evidence from the Immigration and Naturalization Service that he or she is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose with the intention of becoming a citizen or permanent resident, or a citizen of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, or the Republic of Palau;

(F) does not owe a refund on grants previously received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and is not in default on any loan made, insured, or guaranteed under such title;

(G) has not completed his or her first undergraduate baccalaureate course of study; and

(H) is not incarcerated.

(2) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible institution'' means eligible public institution or an eligible private institution.

(3) ELIGIBLE PUBLIC INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible public institution'' means an institution of higher education that—

(A) is established as a State-supported institution of higher education by the State in which such institution is located;

(B) is eligible to participate in student financial assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

(C) has entered into an agreement with the Mayor containing such requirements for the management of funds provided under this Act as the Mayor may specify, including a requirement that the institution use the funds to supplement and not supplant assistance that otherwise would be provided to students from the District of Columbia.

(4) ELIGIBLE PRIVATE INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible private institution'' means an institution of higher education that—

(A) is located in the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland, or the Commonwealth of Virginia;

(B) is not established as a State-supported institution of higher education by the State in which such institution is located;

(C) is eligible to participate in student financial assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

(D) has entered into an agreement with the Mayor containing such requirements for the management of funds provided under this Act as the Mayor may specify, including a requirement that the institution use the funds to supplement and not supplant assistance that otherwise would be provided to students from the District of Columbia.

(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given that term under section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(6) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term ''secondary school'' has the meaning given that term under section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM AND FUND.

In carrying out the Program and administering the Fund, the Mayor of the District of Columbia—

(1) shall consult with the Secretary of Education; and

(2) may enter into a contract with a nongovernmental agency to administer the Program and the Fund if the Mayor determines that it is cost-effective and appropriate to do so.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for payment to the Fund such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2000 and for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the University of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2000 and each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to enhance educational opportunities for the University.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, first of all my thanks to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for permitting the expeditious consideration of this bill. My gratitude as well to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and all the cosponsors and those who have expressed encouragement and support for our efforts.

I would also like to thank some of the staff people who have worked so hard on this legislation: My former staff director Peter Sirh, staff director and counsel Howie Denis, communications directory Trey Hardin, Anne Mack Barnes, Jon Bouker the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia's staff, and Noah Woofsy of the legislative counsel's office.

Today we take a giant step forward in our quest to enhance educational opportunities in the Nation's capital. My

thanks to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, the ranking member of the subcommittee I chair, and all the others who have expressed encouragement and support for our efforts.

The bill we consider today, H.R. 974, the District of Columbia College Access Act, reflects the constitutional reality that Congress is the de facto State legislature for the District of Columbia. The city by its very nature lacks the capacity for a university system of higher education as that concept is understood in the 50 States. The same choices and opportunities simply do not exist for students and parents here as exist elsewhere in the United States. This has too often led to an out-migration of population in order to take advantage of the higher educational opportunities all other Americans enjoy as residents of a particular State.

A strong element in all of our reform legislation since the creation of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia has been directed at stopping the bleeding of the population out of the District. This is critical for us all, as you cannot have a healthy Washington region without a healthy city.

The District has lost hundreds of thousands of residents in recent decades, particularly middle-income taxpayers. The Subcommittee on the District of Columbia has helped to lead a strong bipartisan evident in Congress to change that. Our efforts have included economic development, such as facilitating the MCI Center and the new convention center project. We have encouraged home ownership with the $5,000 tax credit for first-time homebuyers. We have improved personal safety, water quality and financial stability itself. Congress can be proud of its efforts to revitalize the Nation's capital.

Congress, in full cooperation with the city and the Federal Government, has in fact restructured relationships so as to have the Federal Government assume many of the functions normally performed by States, such as care for felony prisoners. This has put the District on a glide path to recovery. It is now in a better position to improve delivery of municipal services.

I am pleased to commend those leading local foundations and companies that have banded together in an extraordinary and historic effort to assist District students. The legislation we are voting on today is essential to those great efforts in the private sector.

It is my strong belief that this is the best money the Federal Government will ever spend in this city.

Mayor Williams has characterized H.R. 974 as ''very, very important legislation not only in improving education but in bringing our city back.'' This bill can be a shining example of a bipartisan urban agenda.

While giving graduates more choices, subject to the caps and limits in the bill, this legislation fully respects and leaves untouched college admission policies and standards.

The bill will enable District residents who are high school graduates to attend public institutions at in-State rates in other States in the union. We have included tuition assistance grants as another option for other colleges in D.C., Virginia and Maryland. This is yet another incentive to encourage local population stability through educational enhancement. This TAG program is highly successful in Virginia and many other States.

H.R. 974 helps to level the playing field for District high school graduates. I was deeply moved by the reaction to this bill as I saw it in the eyes of students at Eastern High School, not far from our Capitol building. These students need and deserve a break. They need and deserve the same opportunities that students in other school systems in other States across this land have.

As the students took my hand, looked into my eyes and thanked me for introducing this bill, I knew we were on the right track. Fighting for educational opportunity legislation is one of the reasons I entered public life. I look forward to working with colleagues who share this vision for the future as we move this bill to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The District of Columbia College Access Act before us is but one example of a series of bipartisan bills benefiting the residents of the Nation's capital on which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and I have worked since he became chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. I want particularly to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his indispensable leadership on legislation that has been critical to the rescue of the Nation's capital from fiscal crisis. I particularly appreciate his work on H.R. 974, the District of Columbia College Access Act, a bill that signals the move of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia from crisis to rebuilding.

May I also take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) who has treated the city's problems with great attention and urgency, always moving bills quickly and helpfully; the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) whose assistance and wise counsel has been much appreciated; and the members of the subcommittee, all of whom support H.R. 974 and have contributed to this and other bills that have rescued the Nation's capital.

□ 1415

The committee, the subcommittee and the administration have worked closely together on H.R. 974 in an indispensable collaboration. We have worked closely with officials of the administration including Mrs. Clinton, Secretary Richard Riley and Assistant Secretary Scott Fleming in crafting H.R. 974.

I want to particularly thank the President, who included funds for this bill in his own budget, raising substantially the amount that would otherwise have been available.

In its three features, H.R. 974 goes a considerable distance toward offering District residents and students the State public higher education available to residents of the 50 States. Funds are authorized for grants for students to attend State colleges and universities anywhere in the United States at in-State rates for a limited private college alternative, such as some States offer to broaden the State's option, and for the District's own public admissions university, the University of the District of Columbia.

The central feature of H.R. 974 is authorization for funding for students to attend any State college or university where admission has been granted at in-State tuition rates. This provision is essential because unlike every State in the Union, the District has only one public institution of higher education, an open admissions university. One size does not now and never has fit all in higher education and certainly not in today's fast-moving technological society.

In addition, the in-State tuition provision is critical to keeping and attracting taxpayers, the sine qua non for the continuing recovery of the city. The cost of higher education is so high today that it alone drives many parents with children out of the city.

H.R. 974 also provides more limited funding for private colleges in the District, Maryland and Virginia, just as States often offer some funding for private college attendance in order to increase the diversity of options students need today.

Encouraged by H.R. 974, the private sector is raising an even larger amount to help District students prepare for and attend college. Business leaders in the District and the region approached the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and me some months ago, disturbed that many students in the District did not go to college or dropped out for lack of funds. These leaders have raised nearly $20 million in private funds to supplement money D.C. parents and students raise or win on their own. They suggested that in-State tuition rates could greatly enhance the educational opportunities they were raising funds to expand. Thus, H.R. 974 is a true public-private effort with the private sector, more than equaling what we do here today.

The symmetry and opportunities in this bill take higher education in the Nation's Capital a great distance toward providing D.C. residents with equal opportunity, compared with opportunities routinely available the residents of the States. Many students can now go out of State. Some will remain in the District to get limited

funding to attend private colleges and universities in the district or go to Maryland and Virginia with such funds. Many more will attend the District's own open-admissions State university that allows any student to qualify for admission to college. The UDC pool of students will not be able to take advantage of the in-State provision. Two-thirds of UDC students work, many have families, many go to college after years in the work force. Despite severe financial hardships resulting from the fiscal crisis including a 6-week shutdown, entering freshman enrollment rose dramatically by 70 percent in only 1 year. This extraordinary growth is the best evidence that D.C. residents must also have their own State university in addition to the out-of-State options provided in this bill.

In the State tuition and UDC provisions, H.R. 974 tries to achieve a mirror image of what D.C. parents and students would have if they lived in other jurisdictions. Residents who have stuck with the city during the tough times when so many have left deserve some encouragement to remain. The fact that there is near unanimous support in the city for this bill is some indication that it is probably already having the effect of encouraging residents to remain in the District. What we do here today is a step along the way of assuring equal citizenship for District residents.

H.R. 974 addresses a critical educational deficit that not only affects students and other residents, but the revitalization of the city itself. No longer will D.C. youngsters be the only Americans without access to the full complement of the State university systems that are routinely available to the residents of every State as a matter of right.

I want to again not only express my personal thanks to the leaders of my committee and the members of my subcommittee. I want also to assure the House that the parents and the children of the Nation's Capital are particularly grateful for the opportunities provided in the District of Columbia College Access Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just note, as my colleague, this does not level the playing field for District students as opposed to other States, but it goes a long way toward that. They still have to compete to get into these university systems out-of-State as out-of-State students, which in many cases is an admissions hurdle that one would not get if they lived within that State; so they are not taking in-State slots, they are taking out-of-State slots.

But should they achieve that, should they overcome that obstacle, this legislation simply says they would then only have to pay in-State. At least it makes that dream affordable for them, and that is all this legislation does.

We are giving to the students in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital, the same affordable educational opportunities that we are finding in the other 50 States. It is a modest step forward, but it is a very important one if we are to integrate our kids in our District with the rest of the region, have them pick up jobs we need to fill in this region. The Northern Virginia Technology Council recently estimated that there were 18,000 available jobs that we could not find qualified applicants to fill.

We want the District of Columbia to be part of this regional economy as well. There is no reason that they should not be given the equal opportunity and affordable educational opportunities this legislation offers.

Mr. Speaker, I am just very proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the words of our chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), this bill in and of itself will encourage youngsters to go to college in the first place who simply would never have tried, despite their qualifications. They know full well that they have the money only for a semester or for a year, and now with this bill, providing 4 years of tuition to go to college, what we have here is a bill that encourages youngsters to do well in school, in junior high school and in high school.

The District of Columbia College Access Group that is supplementing our own efforts with private funds has indicated that it was astonished at how many of our youngsters simply drop out of college after getting into college and earning the right to go to college. The gentleman from Virginia has indicated something very important here, and that is that these youngsters have to get into college in the first place. So here we have an incentive to do well enough to get into college, and what this will do for youngsters is indicated by reference to the gentleman's own premier university, the University of Virginia, one of the best colleges in the United States.

Well, a youngster in Virginia, no matter what the family income, from the richest to the poorest, pays less than $5,000 to go to one of the best universities in the United States. If a youngster from my side of the river applies to go to University of Virginia, those parents must come up with about three times that amount of money, or $16,000. Imagine what it means to my taxpayers to know that they can encourage a youngster to compete to go to UVA or to go to University of Maryland and that the parents will be able to afford that.

I want to mention something else to the gentleman. The gentleman from Virginia and I have fought very hard for this bill to be nationwide, and I want to inform the gentleman that he and I are going to have to continue that fight.

Our bill says that if one gets into the University of Michigan, if one gets into a junior college in Texas, they can take this money and have it follow the student, and we are going to have to fight for that provision. And I think that is a very important provision, as much as I admire the roster of colleges in Maryland and Virginia, but I want to encourage youngsters to fly, to broaden their horizons, and this is a provision we are going to have to fight for.

One of the reasons that I want us to fight for this provision is that they have other bills introduced which do not have nationwide application, but the reason they do not have nationwide application is because there is a need to make sure that there is enough money. The bill that the gentleman and I have worked on recognizes that it may be necessary to circumscribe the bill based on the amount of money. So the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and I have delegated to the mayor of the District of Columbia, whomever he appoints, the task of drawing the bill in to fit the funds.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) has acted wisely in this regard, not only for home rule reasons, because, of course, the mayor and those closest on the ground know best, but because we do not want to have the first year or two some of these funds go unused because we have prematurely circumscribed who can, in fact, get these funds. How silly we would feel if, because some youngsters may get scholarships to private schools, they do not want to go to school in Maryland and Virginia, we have leftover funds from this bill that could desperately be used by a student who has achieved admission to the University of Michigan or the University of Alabama, but cannot go because from on high, in the capital of the United States, we have without any data and any way to get any data circumscribed how the bill should be drawn.

Let me finally say that the gentleman has often spoken with good reason about the extraordinary number of jobs in the region, one of the fastest-growing technological regions in the country that has jobs that cannot be filled, and they are all the way from jobs way down on the technological ladder to way up. Our own State university has not had the technology to adequately prepare students for these jobs with the grant to allow UDC to become a historically black college and university. We go a long step toward preparing youngsters for jobs in the regions since that money will be used for technology and infrastructure and, of course, within State tuition, allowing our youngsters access to some of the best schools in the United States. We, of course, allow them to get the preparation necessary to make our regional jobs available to everyone in our region

including the residents of the District of Columbia.

I want to say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that his own hard work on this bill has been absolutely indispensable. Where we have worked together trying to fashion a bill that he and I could both agree upon, we have reached out to the residents in order to find what their concerns were from the private colleges who wanted to make the kind of private college alternative available here that is available in Virginia. We have reached out to UDC where there are students who cannot possibly take advantage of out-of-State tuition and because we have worked so closely together and worked with the Secretary of Education and with members of the administration, we have reached a bill that we think fits and serves the residents of the District of Columbia.

He spoke, the chairman spoke, about the students at Eastern High School, and I do not believe that he exaggerated when he spoke about how absolutely thrilled these youngsters were to think of going to school outside of the District of Columbia, to have their opportunities broadened so spectacularly with one bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the members of my committee and the leadership of the full committee for a Herculean effort not only in designing this bill but in working with the Speaker and the minority leader to bring this bill forward so that it could get and achieve early passage so early in the 106th Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me just add one final point and that is this, if we really want to change the culture in this city where education becomes the thing to do for high school students, where it becomes matter of fact that one goes to high school and they move on to college or higher education, this is the kind of legislation that is needed because right now it is only a dream and not an achievable dream for many.

To be able to go to a quality private or State university system and have an array of choices and have that affordable to someone, we think will break that cycle and will encourage more people to go in.

The contrast between the surrounding suburbs where sometimes over 90 percent of the kids who graduate from high school go on to higher education and in the city is astounding. This, I think, could help change that around by making it truly achievable. Again, I commend my friend, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her efforts in this and look forward to prompt passage.

Ms. NORTON. I could not agree more with the words of the gentleman, and so much so that I want him to know that I will be working with the city to see if residents can use this bill beginning with this school year.

If they tool up, I think that they can make it happen, even though our fiscal year begins October 1 and school usually begins in August and September. I thank the gentleman again for his leadership and for his great assistance on this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 974, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 974, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

NOAL CUSHING BATEMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1251) to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 8850 South 700 East, Sandy, Utah, as the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1251

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Postal Service building located at 8850 South 700 East, in Sandy, Utah, shall be known and designated as the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK) introduced H.R. 1251 on March 24, 1999, designating the United States Postal Service building located at 8850 South 700 East, Sandy, Utah, as the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''. This legislation is cosponsored by each Member of the Utah delegation to the House of Representatives pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform.

The Congressional Budget Office has determined that enactment of this measure would have no significant impact on the Federal budget and would not affect direct spending and receipts.

Pay-as-you-go procedures, therefore, would not be applicable.

Mr. Bateman, honored by the bill before us, served in the Sandy City council for 20 years and was mayor for 6 years. He also served as head of the local PTA chapter and led a successful school construction bond campaign. He attained leadership positions in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, H.R. 1251.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), in bringing to the House Floor five postal-naming bills. These five measures have met the Committee on Government Reform requirement and enjoy the full support and cosponsorship of their respective House congressional delegations. All of these bills were reported unanimously out of the Subcommittee on Postal Service and the full committee. I urge their immediate consideration and approval.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is poised to pass H.R. 1251, a bill to rename the post office in Sandy, Utah, the Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Noal Cushing Bateman represents the best of Utah. In his lifetime, he has seen Sandy City grow from a struggling farming community of 3,000 to a thriving business center with over 100,000 residents. Not only has he witnessed the growth but his planning and vision in large measure made it possible. His service to the community has spanned most of the 20th century.

Beginning in 1935, he served 20 years on the Sandy City council, 14 years as Sandy City treasurer and 6 years as mayor. He served for 35 years as the director for the Salt Lake County Water Conservancy District. At an age when many people retire, Noal Bateman was just catching his second wind. At age 69, he chaired the Community Development Block Grant Committee, a position he held for 9 years.