pointed out between consenting parties. Nobody is being coerced into accepting anything. All of the consumer laws are protected.

I ask the Members to support this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, today the House is taking an important step to bring our Nation's laws in line with the explosive growth of E-commerce.

In 1997 my office was the first to establish a virtual district office in the Congress. I quickly realized my constituents were not permitted to provide their authorization for any casework with an electronic signature.

Subsequently, I introduced the first piece of legislation addressing the issue of electronic signatures during the 105th Congress and succeeded in passing this bill into law. The legislation requires Federal agencies to make Government forms available online and accept a person's electronic signature on these forms.

Following on this success, I introduced a bill in the 106th Congress to expand the legality of electronic signatures to the private sector. Today, we're voting on a bill that Chairman BLILEY introduced which attempts to accomplish the same goal as H.R. 1320.

The Congress must ensure that there are no roadblocks impeding the growth of E-commerce. E-commerce is expected to generate over $1.3 trillion worth of business by 2003. Our laws should not impede this staggering growth so we must act to bridge the gap between now and the time when every State has passed an updated form of the Uniform State Law Code.

This legislation encourages States to pass a uniform law so that our Nation's consumers and businesses will not have to face 50 different sets of regulations to engage in E-commerce. I am concerned about the electronic records provisions in this bill, and hope that with further work, these concerns will be ironed out by conferees.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1714. Our Nation's economy will be the beneficiary.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1714, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to 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.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this Act to establish a program that enables college-bound residents of the District of Columbia to have greater choices among institutions of higher education.

SEC. 3. PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts appropriated under subsection (i) the Mayor shall award grants to eligible institutions that enroll eligible students to pay the difference between the tuition and fees charged for in-State students and the tuition and fees charged for out-of-State students on behalf of each eligible student enrolled in the eligible institution.

(2) MAXIMUM STUDENT AMOUNTS.—An eligible student shall have paid on the student's behalf under this section—

(A) not more than $10,000 for any 1 award year (as defined in section 481 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088)); and

(B) a total of not more than $50,000.

(3) PRORATION.—The Mayor shall prorate payments under this section for students who attend an eligible institution on less than a full-time basis.

(b) REDUCTION FOR INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (i) for any fiscal year are insufficient to award a grant in the amount determined under subsection (a) on behalf of each eligible student enrolled in an eligible institution, then the Mayor shall—

(A) first, ratably reduce the amount of the tuition and fee payment made on behalf of each eligible student who has not received funds under this section for a preceding year; and

(B) after making reductions under subparagraph (A), ratably reduce the amount of the tuition and fee payments made on behalf of all other eligible students.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Mayor may adjust the amount of tuition and fee payments made under paragraph (1) based on—

(A) the financial need of the eligible students to avoid undue hardship to the eligible students; or

(B) undue administrative burdens on the Mayor.

(3) FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the Mayor may prioritize the making or amount of tuition and fee payments under this subsection based on the income and need of eligible students.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible institution'' means an institution that—

(A) is a public institution of higher education located—

(i) in the State of Maryland or the Commonwealth of Virginia; or

(ii) outside the State of Maryland or the Commonwealth of Virginia, but only if the Mayor—

(I) determines that a significant number of eligible students are experiencing difficulty in gaining admission to any public institution of higher education located in the State of Maryland or the Commonwealth of Virginia because of any preference afforded in-State residents by the institution;

(II) consults with the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Secretary regarding expanding the program under this section to include such institutions located outside of the State of Maryland or the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

(III) takes into consideration the projected cost of the expansion and the potential effect of the expansion on the amount of individual tuition and fee payments made under this section in succeeding years;

(B) is eligible to participate in the student financial assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

(C) enters into an agreement with the Mayor containing such conditions as the Mayor may specify, including a requirement that the institution use the funds made available under this section to supplement and not supplant assistance that otherwise would be provided to eligible students from the District of Columbia.

(2) ELIGIBLE STUDENT.—The term ''eligible student'' means an individual who—

(A) was domiciled in the District of Columbia for not less than the 12 consecutive months preceding the commencement of the freshman year at an institution of higher education;

(B) graduated from a secondary school or received the recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma on or after January 1, 1998;

(C) begins the individual's undergraduate course of study within the 3 calendar years (excluding any period of service on active duty in the Armed Forces, or service under the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) or subtitle D of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.)) of graduation from a secondary school, or obtaining the recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma;

(D) is enrolled or accepted for enrollment, on at least a half-time basis, 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;

(E) if enrolled in an eligible institution, is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study the student is pursuing in accordance with section 484(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(c)); and

(F) has not completed the individual's first undergraduate baccalaureate course of study.

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

(4) MAYOR.—The term ''Mayor'' means the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(5) 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).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

(d) 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 to enable an eligible student to enroll in the institution.

(e) APPLICATIONS.—Each student desiring a tuition payment under this section shall submit an application to the eligible institution at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the eligible institution may require.

(f) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Mayor shall carry out the program under this section in consultation with the Secretary. The Mayor may enter into a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement with another public or private entity to administer the program under this section if the Mayor determines that doing so is a more efficient way of carrying out the program.

(2) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Mayor, in consultation with institutions of higher education eligible for participation in the program authorized under this section, shall develop policies and procedures for the administration of the program.

(3) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—The Mayor and the Secretary shall enter into a Memorandum of Agreement that describes—

(A) the manner in which the Mayor shall consult with the Secretary with respect to administering the program under this section; and

(B) any technical or other assistance to be provided to the Mayor by the Secretary for purposes of administering the program under this section (which may include access to the information in the common financial reporting form developed under section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090)).

(g) MAYOR'S REPORT.—The Mayor shall report to Congress annually regarding—

(1) the number of eligible students attending each eligible institution and the amount of the grant awards paid to those institutions on behalf of the eligible students;

(2) the extent, if any, to which a ratable reduction was made in the amount of tuition and fee payments made on behalf of eligible students; and

(3) the progress in obtaining recognized academic credentials of the cohort of eligible students for each year.

(h) GAO REPORT.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall monitor the effect of the program assisted under this section on educational opportunities for eligible students. The Comptroller General shall analyze whether eligible students had difficulty gaining admission to eligible institutions because of any preference afforded in-State residents by eligible institutions, and shall expeditiously report any findings regarding such difficulty to Congress and the Mayor. In addition the Comptroller General shall—

(1) analyze the extent to which there are an insufficient number of eligible institutions to which District of Columbia students can gain admission, including admission aided by assistance provided under this Act, due to—

(A) caps on the number of out-of-State students the institution will enroll;

(B) significant barriers imposed by academic entrance requirements (such as grade point average and standardized scholastic admissions tests); and

(C) absence of admission programs benefiting minority students;

(2) assess the impact of the program assisted under this Act on enrollment at the University of the District of Columbia; and

(3) report the findings of the analysis described in paragraph (1) and the assessment described in paragraph (2) to Congress and the Mayor.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia to carry out this section $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect with respect to payments for periods of instruction that begin on or after January 1, 2000.

SEC. 4. ASSISTANCE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary may provide financial assistance to the University of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year to enable the university to carry out activities authorized under part B of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1060 et seq.).

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia to carry out this section $1,500,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—For any fiscal year, the University of the District of Columbia may receive financial assistance pursuant to this section, or pursuant to part B of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, but not pursuant to both this section and such part B.

SEC. 5. PRIVATE SCHOOL PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts appropriated under subsection (f) the Mayor shall award grants to eligible institutions that enroll eligible students to pay the cost of tuition and fees at the eligible institutions on behalf of each eligible student enrolled in an eligible institution. The Mayor may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(2) MAXIMUM STUDENT AMOUNTS.—An eligible student shall have paid on the student's behalf under this section—

(A) not more than $2,500 for any 1 award year (as defined in section 481 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088)); and

(B) a total of not more than $12,500.

(3) PRORATION.—The Mayor shall prorate payments under this section for students who attend an eligible institution on less than a full-time basis.

(b) REDUCTION FOR INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (f) for any fiscal year are insufficient to award a grant in the amount determined under subsection (a) on behalf of each eligible student enrolled in an eligible institution, then the Mayor shall—

(A) first, ratably reduce the amount of the tuition and fee payment made on behalf of each eligible student who has not received funds under this section for a preceding year; and

(B) after making reductions under subparagraph (A), ratably reduce the amount of the tuition and fee payments made on behalf of all other eligible students.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Mayor may adjust the amount of tuition and fee payments made under paragraph (1) based on—

(A) the financial need of the eligible students to avoid undue hardship to the eligible students; or

(B) undue administrative burdens on the Mayor.

(3) FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the Mayor may prioritize the making or amount of tuition and fee payments under this subsection based on the income and need of eligible students.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible institution'' means an institution that—

(A)(i) is a private, nonprofit, associate or baccalaureate degree-granting, institution of higher education, as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)), the main campus of which is located—

(I) in the District of Columbia;

(II) in the city of Alexandria, Falls Church, or Fairfax, or the county of Arlington or Fairfax, in the Commonwealth of Virginia, or a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia located within any such county; or

(III) in the county of Montgomery or Prince George's in the State of Maryland, or a political subdivision of the State of Maryland located within any such county;

(ii) is eligible to participate in the student financial assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

(iii) enters into an agreement with the Mayor containing such conditions as the Mayor may specify, including a requirement that the institution use the funds made available under this section to supplement and not supplant assistance that otherwise would be provided to eligible students from the District of Columbia; or

(B) is a private historically Black college or university (for purposes of this subparagraph such term shall have the meaning given the term ''part B institution'' in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)) the main campus of which is located in the State of Maryland or the Commonwealth of Virginia.

(2) ELIGIBLE STUDENT.—The term ''eligible student'' means an individual who meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 3(c)(2).

(3) MAYOR.—The term ''Mayor'' means the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

(d) APPLICATION.—Each eligible student desiring a tuition and fee payment under this section shall submit an application to the eligible institution at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the eligible institution may require.

(e) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Mayor shall carry out the program under this section in consultation with the Secretary. The Mayor may enter into a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement with another public or private entity to administer the program under this section if the Mayor determines that doing so is a more efficient way of carrying out the program.

(2) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Mayor, in consultation with institutions of higher education eligible for participation in the program authorized under this section, shall develop policies and procedures for the administration of the program.

(3) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—The Mayor and the Secretary shall enter into a Memorandum of Agreement that describes—

(A) the manner in which the Mayor shall consult with the Secretary with respect to administering the program under this section; and

(B) any technical or other assistance to be provided to the Mayor by the Secretary for purposes of administering the program under this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect with respect to payments for periods of instruction that begin on or after January 1, 2000.

SEC. 6. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) PERSONNEL.—The Secretary of Education shall arrange for the assignment of an individual, pursuant to subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, to serve as an adviser to the Mayor of the District of Columbia with respect to the programs assisted under this Act.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia may use not more than 7 percent of the funds made available for a program under section 3 or 5 for a fiscal year to pay the administrative expenses of a program under section 3 or 5 for the fiscal year.

(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—Each of the programs assisted under this Act shall be subject to audit and other review by the Inspector General of the Department of Education in the same manner as programs are audited and reviewed under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(d) GIFTS.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia may accept, use, and dispose of donations of services or property for purposes of carrying out this Act.

(e) FUNDING RULE.—Notwithstanding sections 3 and 5, the Mayor may use funds made available—

(1) under section 3 to award grants under section 5 if the amount of funds made available under section 3 exceeds the amount of funds awarded under section 3 during a time period determined by the Mayor; and

(2) under section 5 to award grants under section 3 if the amount of funds made available under section 5 exceeds the amount of funds awarded under section 5 during a time period determined by the Mayor.

(f) MAXIMUM STUDENT AMOUNT ADJUSTMENTS.—The Mayor shall establish rules to adjust the maximum student amounts described in sections 3(a)(2)(B) and 5(a)(2)(B) for eligible

students described in section 3(c)(2) or 5(c)(2) who transfer between the eligible institutions described in section 3(c)(1) or 5(c)(1).

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, we have traveled a long way with the D.C. College Access Act. From March 4 when we introduced it, to markup in our subcommittee, unanimous approval in the Committee on Government Reform chaired by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON); to House passage on May 24, and then on to October 19, passage in the Senate with friendly amendments which we are pleased to accept today. I am deeply proud of our hard work.

My thanks to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking member of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia and all of the original cosponsors: The gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). My thanks to Speaker HASTERT, Chairman DAN BURTON and Majority Leader DICK ARMEY for their support and for permitting expeditious consideration of this. And my thanks to the Clinton administration and the Department of Education for working with us in a bipartisan spirit of cooperation to work out our differences and move this thing through for consideration.

My thanks to the D.C. Appropriations Chair ERNEST ISTOOK and his Senate counterpart, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, for including the money in the budget recommended by the administration. And my thanks to my own counterpart in the Senate, GEORGE VOINOVICH, for his patience and persistence in having such an excellent hearing and markup and for shepherding the amendments. And to Senator FRED THOMPSON, chairman of the Senate committee, for his support. My thanks as well to Senator JEFFORDS, Senator DURBIN and Senator WARNER for helping us to continue to keep this legislation on track and work to improve it.

And my thanks to some of the staff people who worked on this landmark law: My own staff director and counsel, Howie Denis; my chief of staff, Peter Sirh; and Jon Bouker of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia's staff.

I am grateful to those leading regional foundations and companies that have come together in an extraordinary and historic effort to assist District of Columbia students. The legislation we are passing today is essential to those great endeavors in the private sector.

In 1995, the District of Columbia faced a crisis of epic proportions. Congress, in passing the control board legislation, with its creation of the position of chief financial officer, and then in 1997 with the passage of the D.C. Revitalization Act and its related reforms, embarked on a critically important process to address the crisis in a truly bipartisan way. The legislation before us today would not be possible but for the progress the city has achieved with the initiative of Congress and the executive branch working together, and, I might add, with the leadership of Tony Williams and the city council.

The city's return to the private financial markets is solid evidence that what Congress did produced credible numbers and better performance. Key elements of our reforms include Federal assumption of certain functions performed by State governments, and incentives for economic development and private sector jobs. The economic recovery of the Nation's capital benefits the entire region and country by realizing the vision which has so often been expressed. The new MCI Center and the Convention Center project, a tax credit for first-time homebuyers, enhanced public safety and water quality are just some of the improvements we have seen.

Two months ago, Speaker HASTERT and I attended a moving ceremony at the Edison Friendship public charter school in the District. Majority Leader ARMEY, Education Chairman BILL GOODLING, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and PAUL COVERDELL were with us. The Edison school and many other charter schools represent another great success story in the District that Congress has helped us achieve.

We know that many concerns remain. Many of them are addressed in the budget and others will be dealt with later.

The bill before us today will enable District residents to attend public colleges and universities in Virginia and Maryland at in-State tuition rates. We have included tuition assistance grants as another option for private colleges in and adjacent to the District in those counties, including historically black colleges and universities in Virginia and Maryland. The CBO estimate fits within the money this bill authorizes and which the appropriators have included in their bill.

Mayor Williams has said that this bill is very, very important not only in improving education but in bringing the city back. I believe it is the best money we can spend and is a shining example of what a bipartisan urban agenda can achieve. H.R. 974 will level the playing field for District high school graduates. It will give them the key to higher education in this region.

Back on March 4 when I introduced the bill, we went to Eastern High School with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. It is not far from the Capitol. We announced the proposal to students and faculty. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and Mayor Williams were with me at the time. I was deeply moved by the reaction of the students. I will never forget how many took our hands and looked into our eyes and thanked us for introducing this measure. This gives them hope for the future, hope for an affordable college education, something that is enjoyed by students in 50 States in the United States but is not a reality in our Nation's capital.

Fighting for educational opportunity is one of the reasons I entered public life. I am proud of so much that we have been able to do in the Nation's capital for the almost 5 years that I have had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. Economic development, public safety, the real estate market and so many other aspects of city life have changed for the better and the city is working to improve itself. This is something that I think ultimately had to happen and is happening. But nothing has given me more satisfaction than working to improve educational opportunities for the city's youth. We need a healthy city to have a healthy Washington region.

This bill, expanding higher educational choices, is an enormous leap forward. It is our vision for the future.

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

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

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 974, the D.C. College Access Act, facing its final House consideration today, is a splendid and near typical example of the bipartisan way in which the gentleman from Virginia and I have worked together since he became chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia 4 years ago. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his unflagging and indispensable leadership and for the energetic work of his staff, especially Peter Sirh and Howie Denis, who worked hand in hand with my own able legislative director, Jon Bouker, every step of the way until we have gotten to final passage today.

H.R. 974 marks a turning point in our approach to lifting the Nation's capital from fiscal crisis and in affording its citizens a way to overcome the handicap of being without a State to assist it in offering higher education. Because of the importance of higher education today and its links to full and equal citizenship, the D.C. College Access Act is a bill of historic proportions and

ranks as one of the most important pieces of legislation for District of Columbia residents in our history. I am especially pleased that final passage of H.R. 974 today will allow Mayor Tony Williams and the city, working together with the Department of Education, to have the program up and running next fall.

□ 1600

Both the House and Senate and the administration have worked closely and collegially on H.R. 974. All deserve credit and praise today. I want to thank Senator GEORGE VOINOVICH, Government Affairs Subcommittee Chair; Senate ranking member, RICHARD DURBIN; and Senator JIM JEFFORDS for their vital work in helping to craft an acceptable compromise between the Senate and House versions of the bill and for securing unanimous passage in the Senate on October 20,1999.

I also thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), who has consistently supported and pressed forward bills benefiting the District; the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), whose valuable assistance has been unfailing; and appropriation chairs, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and KAY BAILEY HUTCHINSON for their critical support in assuring necessary funding for the program; and, of course, Secretary of Education Dick Riley for indispensable work on this bill in both houses.

I want particularly to recognize the President who included funds for this bill in his fiscal year 2000 budget, not only opening the way for the bill to pass today, but also assuring that there would be sufficient funds to do the job.

H.R. 974 offers District residents State public higher education alternatives similar to those available to other Americans as a matter of right. The central feature of H.R. 974 is an authorization for the Federal Government to pay the difference between the cost of in-state and out-of-state tuition fees for D.C. residents permitting students, once admitted, to attend public colleges and universities outside of the District and at in-state rates.

The mayor will administer the in-state tuition program in consultation with the Department of Education. In addition to full in-state tuition, the bill authorizes $2,500 per student for D.C. residents to attend private colleges and universities in the District and in certain counties surrounding the District.

The bill also contains an authorization granting the District's own State university, the University of the District of Columbia funded historical black college and university status in recognition of the fact that many D.C. students prefer to attend their own State university or for a variety of reasons cannot attend college outside of the District. UDC has already received HBCU funds beginning in fiscal year 1999.

Young people graduating from D.C. high schools now will be treated as are students in the 50 States. To qualify, a student must live in the District for 12 months before beginning college, must have graduated from high school after January 1, 1998, must begin college within 3 years of graduation, must be pursuing her first undergraduate degree and must be enrolled at least half time. The college must also sign a formal agreement with the mayor's office.

The bill we consider today contains three important protections negotiated with the Senate. First, the mayor will have the latitude to expend the in-state tuition program to the 50 States subject to cost instead of a blanket confinement to scarce slots in Maryland and Virginia. Second, students who will be freshmen, sophomores, and juniors when the program begins next year will qualify for in-state tuition rates. I appreciate that Senators VOINOVICH and DURBIN worked with us on this provision inasmuch as the Senate version of the bill originally applied only to freshmen.

District residents are particularly enthusiastic about the expansion of this particular provision because typically many go to college with just enough money for 1 year, yielding a high college dropout rate because of inability to meet college expenses. Third, institutions in counties close to the District including HBCUs in Maryland and Virginia where many D.C. residents often attend will be eligible.

It is important to note that our work on H.R. 974 is bolstered by an extraordinary private sector effort which is raising an even larger amount to help District students prepare to attend college and to supplement the costs beyond the tuition costs offered in this bill. Business leaders led by Don Graham, publisher of the Washington Post, and Lucio Noto, CEO of Mobil Oil, have already gotten commitments of $17 million and plan to raise $20 million in private funds to supplement the funds authorized by H.R. 974. This bill is a true public-private effort with the private sector more than equaling what we do here today.

The final passage of H.R. 974 today is a milestone in the effort to provide equal rights and citizenship for D.C. residents. This bill fills a unique and large educational gap that has had a particularly harmful effect on families here. Inequality in higher education opportunity hampers the continuing revitalization of the Nation's capital because, without the array of State offerings for higher education, residents have an incentive to move out of the District to neighboring jurisdictions.

As college costs have escalated, higher education opportunities have significantly affected, indeed caused, flight from the District. Consequently, the city has been left with many residents unable to meet their needs or talents to access to appropriate institutions from junior and specialized colleges to 4- year institutions. Thus, many have been left without the education necessary to contribute to the city's tax base. With the passage of H.R. 974, District residents will no longer be the only Americans among the States without access to the necessary choices for higher education today.

I want to express my personal thanks once again to the leaders of my committee and subcommittee and appropriation committees, as well as their counterparts in the Senate and the administration. I want to also express the gratitude of the parents and the children of the District who have let me and my office know in no uncertain terms that they enthusiastically and overwhelmingly support H.R. 974 and that they look forward to the historic opportunities provided by the District of Columbia College Access Act.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia and original sponsor of this legislation, who helped shepherd it through the subcommittee.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 974, the District of Columbia College Access Act, as amended by the Senate. I want to add my congratulations to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for the inception of the bill and carrying it through with his leadership inch by inch. I want to also commend the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her leadership in that; and as a matter of fact as has been mentioned and should be reiterated, this is an excellent example of bipartisan cooperation for the benefit of the United States on both sides of the aisle in both Houses with several committees on both sides who have shepherded this bill through.

And I do want to add my thanks also to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member. But the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) has been there from the beginning, and his wonderful staff and the minority staff have been there and the cosponsors; and I see the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who is also a cosponsor of this bill.

This higher education bill provides an opportunity for District of Columbia residents who are high school graduates to attend colleges in Maryland and Virginia at in-state tuition rates. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the D.C. College Access Act. I believe that it offers an extraordinary value. It will ensure that the most economically disadvantaged students in our Nation's Capital are going to have access to a variety of colleges, and it is going to go a long way toward ensuring that the Metropolitan Washington area has a well-educated workforce.

Access to college is one of the greatest achievements of our American education system. Escalating costs of our

Nation's colleges and universities have created anxiety about college affordability. As a matter of fact, I know firsthand about that disease called ''mal tuition,'' paying those bills. In terms of anxiety, paying for college ranks with how to pay for health care or housing or how to cover the expenses of taking care of an elderly relative.

From issues that affect women to children at risk, I have always tried to raise my voice in support of equality of opportunity. Well, the D.C. College Access Act will provide equal opportunities for students in the District. There is little doubt that high school graduates who live in the District have far fewer college choices than students in other parts of the country. Residents in all 50 American States have a network of State-supported colleges to attend, and this College Access Act will level the playing field for residents in the District of Columbia.

I have received many letters of support from my constituents in Montgomery County, Maryland, for H.R. 974. Montgomery College, a community college, is particularly interested in playing a major role in serving District residents. The college already enrolls nearly 150 District of Columbia residents, and even at their most costly out-of-state tuition rate with plans to expand the Tacoma Park, Maryland campus, the college expects to better accommodate more students from the District.

So again I want to reiterate my strong support for the bill and the Senate amendments to H.R. 974. With the swift passage of this bill, we are continuing a strong and necessary investment in education which will help America stay on top and help us to maintain our economic vitality into the 21st century.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who is not only a cosponsor of the bill but is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia whose leadership was important in assuring funding for this bill.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, who so ably represents the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the students of the District of Columbia are at a unique educational disadvantage today. They are the only students in the entire continental United States who do not have access to the State college and university system that every other American family is able to avail themselves of. I am not endorsing the concept of statehood, which would be perhaps one way to achieve that objective, although we would still then have to find the resources that would be necessary to build a comparable college system; but I am endorsing the notion that we should do everything we can to establish a level playing field for those students who grow up in the District of Columbia, and this legislation will accomplish that objective.

There are some extraordinarily gifted young men and women in the District of Columbia, but we will never fully realize their potential until they have access to the excellence that our college and university systems are able to provide; and by expanding their access to the colleges and universities in Virginia and Maryland particularly, they will have that kind of opportunity which is bound to benefit all of us, our economy, our society.

As the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Davis) so well knows, those students, those young men and women are, in fact, going to enrich the campuses and the classrooms of the colleges and universities in Virginia, as the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) realizes that the same will happen in Maryland. We are doing ourselves a service with this legislation, and that is why the D.C. appropriation act includes $17 million to fund this authorization.

□ 1615

This is a good idea. It will be one of the legacies that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) will be able to point to with pride, as I am sure his able assistants, Peter and Howard will as well, and John on the staff of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON). It takes a lot of work, it takes a lot of commitment to get legislation through as quickly as this was, but this provides a true incentive so that we will see the real talent and potential of the young men and women of the District of Columbia fully realized. It is good legislation, and we should pass it unanimously.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleague from Virginia for his eloquent remarks and also his help in the appropriations process and from all aspects as we worked to improve the district. The gentleman has been a true colleague in the essential part, as that term implies, in terms of working together to make these kinds of things happen for the region, because we recognize this is not just a city issue, it is a justice issue, but it is also a regional issue of great import, and I thank him.

Let me go briefly and talk about some of the changes in this bill from the Senate that were changes from the House version that passed earlier. These Senate amendments enable D.C. residents who are high school graduates the opportunity to pay in-state tuition rates upon admission to state colleges in Virginia and Maryland only. They would have to be admitted as out of state students, so they are competing in a larger pool, although the States themselves of Virginia and Maryland have the opportunity to create select pools for District residents should they choose to do that. But they will not be taking from in-state students in Virginia and taking in-state places.

The difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition would be paid from new Federal money being authorized and appropriated, up to $10,000 per individual in any award year.

This also provides tuition assistance grants of $2,500 for D.C. resident high school graduates who will be attending private colleges in D.C. and adjacent counties in Virginia and Maryland and funding of $5 million is authorized for this in FY 2000. It also includes private historically black colleges in Virginia and Maryland. This was an amendment that my colleague Senator WARNER put on in the other body.

I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) on working also for the University of the District of Columbia, that they are not lost in this. In fact, they are a beneficiary of this legislation as well. She has given them HCBU status and additional funding for the University of the District of Columbia so they can hone and I think make greater their role for education than they do today in the District. That should not be lost sight of as well.

What UDC does not have and cannot be by itself, as no university can be by itself, is a state university system. It will be one component of the educational equation for D.C. residents, but it will now have assistance from other areas as well, and, with this additional money, I think its role will be strengthened in offering educational opportunities to students from the District of Columbia.

There is no means test in this legislation, but if an authorized, appropriated amount is insufficient, there is a ratable reduction, and if a ratable reduction is necessary, the mayor, the local leaders there, will have the ability to prioritize based on income and need of eligible students. So we will be having the city make that, and it will not be Congressionally mandated, should we have more people use this legislation than are currently foreseen as doing so.

Actually, I think that would be a good thing. We hope this is utilized, because I think the more people who are able to use this and go to college, the better off we all are. Residents in the 50 states already have a network of state supported colleges to attend. This bill levels the playing field for students in the District of Columbia. High school graduates would have to be a D.C. resident for at least one year prior to eligibility, and they would have to begin undergraduate courses within 3 years of high school graduation, excluding active military service. This applies to those receiving recognized equivalent of secondary school diplomas. It provides for an incentive for population stability in the Nation's capital. It gives graduates more choices. It does not affect admissions policies or standards. Regional companies and foundations are helping students qualify for college admission,

and this legislation compliments that effort.

My friend from the District of Columbia mentioned Lou Nodo at Mobil Corporation, Don Graham at the Washington Post. Steve Case at America On-Line has been another leader, and many other companies in the region I think have contributed private dollars that will compliment this effort.

We have had extraordinary bipartisan Congressional and administration cooperation, as my colleague from Maryland noted. This will commence applying to students who graduated in January and June of 1998. The city will run the program with Federal oversight. Disbursements will be made directly to the eligible colleges, and UDC, as I noted before, will receive $1.5 million additional per year if it does not receive funds as a historically black college under the Higher Education Act from this legislation.

Once again though, the basic concept is to give children in the District of Columbia the same educational opportunities for an affordable college education that all of our children enjoy in the 50 states, an affordable college education. This will help narrow the gap between the very rich and the very poor in an information age, and education is the key to narrowing that gap.

In Fairfax County, across the river from the District, over 90 percent of those who will be graduating from high school this year or are eligible to graduate from high school, will go on to higher education. In the District of Columbia, those 18-year-olds, if they graduate on time, it will be less than 25 percent, a huge disparity. One of the reasons for this is for many of these kids there is no hope or opportunity of an affordable college education. This legislation takes an important step in giving them hope for the future.

I will just note in Fairfax County today our unemployment rate is under 2 percent, it is about 1.8 percent. It is about 3½ times that in the District of Columbia. Over the last 10 years, our economy regionally has grown. Our Nation has prospered. My Congressional district has prospered. But in the bottom quarter of economic strata there has been very little movement, and in places in the District there has been little movement. The way to equalize this is through educational opportunities, and it is not by the government coming in with greater subsidies. That is a last resort. Giving people equal opportunity is the best resort. That is what this legislation does.

It guarantees a quality of opportunity by allowing college and technology educations to be affordable for everyone. When the educational opportunities are equal, when college is affordable for D.C. residents, as well as Maryland and Virginia residents, we are going to see more District of Columbia students attending college, being trained for the jobs of the future, so they can start businesses, earn good salaries, support their children, return a tax base to the District of Columbia, and make our Nation's Capital the city it deserves to be and has the potential to become.

This legislation is a giant step forward. It is not the whole equation, but it is a vital part of the equation, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again thank my good partner in the District in this House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for the way he has worked steadfastly on this bill. When we met small problems along the way, and they were almost always small, we simply gathered our forces and with his staff and mine and he and me, we kept charging forward.

The way in which we worked on this bill should be noted as well, because when we got to the Senate and found that there were differences, instead of squaring off, we simply closed in and Senate and House worked together until we got a bill that both of us could in fact support.

Mr. Speaker, I want to place this bill in its historic context. I believe it fair to say that this bill belongs in the category of bills that have made an historic difference to the District of Columbia, bills like the Home Rule Act, the Revitalization Act, and my tax benefits such as the $5,000 home buyer credit.

This bill brings the kind of benefits to the District that will have the same kind of broad effect on individuals, as well as the city itself. It keeps the city's demographics intact, and yet it aids individuals. It is a win-win in all of the ways that matter.

This bill, as the chairman has indicated, did not overlook the residents of the District of Columbia who cannot leave this town. Many of them have family obligations, many of them do not want to leave the District, so UDC receives historically black college and university funded status, something the university has sought for decades, and receives in this bill only because this bill opened opportunities in other ways and the chairman was willing to work with me to make sure that in this particular way we filled this gap for students who remain in the District.

It is a win-win for youngsters who have friends in other states across the United States and see them having a choice of institutions, from junior college, to all kinds of specialized schools, to 4-year colleges, and see themselves with a struggling state university, one that many of them love, but simply does not provide them the array of choices that youngsters in the 50 states have.

It is a win-win for the region because all of us understand that our region has no borders and that when we work together and open opportunities for District residents, the entire region benefits.

It is a win-win for private business, which has stepped in with its own version of the D.C. College Access Act, a private version which inspired in many ways the public version which we pass today.

Mr. Speaker, everywhere I go in the city I meet the same response to this bill. I go in the poorest sections of the city all the time, and I go into the sections of our city where people have many opportunities, and the only way you would know the difference is by the color of their skin, because you certainly will not know it by the way in which they have received this bill.

This bill is of the very first priority to District residents, the District residents who would have no other opportunity to go to institutions of the kind that will be available to them except through this bill, and residents who have other opportunities, but would as soon move out of the District than be left to pay the difference, to pay the fine, as it were, of remaining a District resident once their children get ready for college.

Like my tax bills, this bill draws a big circle around the city and all gathered to join it. This bill is not one that we might have thought would pass even a couple of years ago, but with the city returning to full health, it is just the kind of response from the Congress that will encourage the city to do what it needs to do, because the sine qua non of this bill is that there is no free ride and no free lunch. You cannot get access to this bill unless you graduate from high school. What this bill will do will be to encourage youngsters who did not see any reason to go through all the work to graduate from high school because there was nothing there afterwards for them. Now there is the same thing that there would be if they lived in any of the 50 states.

I speak, I know, for the residents of the District of Columbia and every ward of the city when I express my gratitude to the chairman and to all who have worked on this bill and to the Congress of the United States for what I hope will be final passage unanimously today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and urge unanimous passage of H.R. 974.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague, I have enjoyed working with her on this legislation. I think it is landmark. I appreciate the support of the other Members, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the other sponsors, many from the region, some outside it, and the support of the administration. Without all of us working together, putting aside some of the jurisdictional issues, we would not be where we are today.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker I rise today in support of the District of Columbia College Access Act.

This legislation would allow high school graduates from the District of Columbia to pay in-State tuition rates at public colleges and universities in Maryland and Virginia. Specifically, the bill would allow District students to apply for up to $10,000 a year, subject to a $50,000 cap, to offset the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition rates. Furthermore, students who choose to attend private schools in the District and the adjacent Maryland and Virginia counties may also apply for up to $2,500 to offset the cost of their private tuition.

Although the District of Columbia Appropriations Act has not been signed into law, I am pleased the latest version contains $17 million for this important initiative.

As many of you know, I graduated high school just across the border in Prince Georges County in 1957. My parents were from very modest means and quite frankly were not in the financial position to help me pay for college. I consider myself lucky though. Lucky because when my stepfather, who was in the Air Force, was transferred up to Andrews Air Force Base our family settled in Maryland.

Going part time I was able to go to the University of Maryland. I used to go to school during the day and at night I worked first as a file clerk at the Central Intelligence Agency and then on Capitol Hill. It was not always easy balancing school and work and it took me 6 years to earn my undergraduate degree. However, I was able to do it because I had in-state tuition and I consider my decision to attend the University of Maryland as one of the best decisions I have made in my life.

The legislation that we have before us affords high school graduates in the District of Columbia the same opportunity that I had. The opportunity to attend an excellent university at a reasonable cost.

I would like to thank Congressman DAVIS and Congresswoman NORTON for all their work on this legislation which I am pleased to cosponsor. Additionally, I would like to thank D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman ISTOOK and Ranking Member MORAN for including funding for this legislation in their bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, and as a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 974, the District of Columbia College Access Act.

The Washington metropolitan area is one of America's leading centers for high technology. Telecommunications giant MCI was founded here. In the suburbs lies America Online, the MAE East, and several powerful and growing engines of the global internet economy. Yet, that growth, and these opportunities, lie beyond the reach of young people in the Nation's Capital City, who lack affordable access to many of this region's institutions of higher learning.

We can change this situation for the better, for the betterment of our country, and for the betterment of the young people of this great city.

I want the young people of the District of Columbia to have a fighting chance to achieve the American dream. I want for the global internet economy to be their economy too, and to be of their making.

The D.C. College Access Act simply provides the young people of the District of Columbia an opportunity to have access to discounted "in-state' tuition rates to public and private educational institutions in the state of Maryland, the commonwealth of Virginia, and here in the District of Columbia.

The D.C. appropriations bill recently adopted by the House provides $17 million toward this program. I hope that the President will support that appropriation.

I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for developing this important legislation. And I also hope that my colleagues will support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 974.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas) at 6 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 348, by the yeas and the nays;

H.R. 2737, by the yeas and the nays; and

H.R. 1714, by the yeas and the nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

FEMA AND CIVIL DEFENSE MONUMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 348.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 348, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 349, nays 4, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—349

Abercrombie	Crowley	Herger
Ackerman	Cummings	Hill (IN)
Aderholt	Cunningham	Hill (MT)
Allen	Davis (FL)	Hilleary
Andrews	Davis (VA)	Hobson
Armey	DeFazio	Hoeffel
Bachus	DeGette	Hoekstra
Baird	DeLauro	Holt
Baldacci	DeMint	Hooley
Baldwin	Deutsch	Horn
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hostettler
Barcia	Dickey	Hoyer
Barrett (NE)	Dicks	Hunter
Barrett (WI)	Dingell	Hutchinson
Bartlett	Dixon	Hyde
Barton	Doggett	Inslee
Bass	Dooley	Isakson
Bateman	Doolittle	Istook
Becerra	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Bentsen	Duncan	Jenkins
Bereuter	Dunn	John
Berman	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Berry	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Biggert	Ehrlich	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Emerson	Jones (NC)
Bilirakis	English	Kanjorski
Bliley	Eshoo	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Etheridge	Kasich
Blunt	Evans	Kelly
Boehlert	Ewing	Kennedy
Bonilla	Farr	Kildee
Bonior	Fattah	Kilpatrick
Bono	Filner	Kind (WI)
Borski	Fletcher	King (NY)
Boswell	Foley	Kingston
Boucher	Ford	Kleczka
Boyd	Fowler	Knollenberg
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Brady (TX)	Franks (NJ)	Kucinich
Brown (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Kuykendall
Bryant	Frost	LaFalce
Burr	Gallegly	LaHood
Burton	Gekas	Lampson
Buyer	Gephardt	Lantos
Callahan	Gibbons	Largent
Calvert	Gilchrest	Larson
Camp	Gillmor	Latham
Campbell	Gilman	LaTourette
Canady	Gonzalez	Lazio
Cannon	Goode	Leach
Capps	Goodlatte	Lee
Capuano	Gordon	Levin
Cardin	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Graham	Lewis (GA)
Chabot	Granger	Lewis (KY)
Clayton	Green (TX)	Linder
Clement	Green (WI)	LoBiondo
Clyburn	Gutknecht	Lofgren
Coble	Hall (OH)	Lucas (KY)
Combest	Hall (TX)	Lucas (OK)
Condit	Hansen	Luther
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (CT)
Cox	Hastings (WA)	Maloney (NY)
Cramer	Hayes	Manzullo
Crane	Hefley	Markey