

punch and come back strong. The American steel industry is the Rocky Balboa of the global market.

None of us will forget those difficult days 15 years ago when American steel was on the ropes. We had become too content with the status quo and our overseas competitors exploited this. But management and unions worked together and American steel was reborn.

We have seen real and significant growth since then. In my district, Beth Steel cranks out 9,000 to 10,000 tons of quality American steel a day!

That's 9,000 to 10,000 tons of quality steel a day when operating under normal conditions. But these days things are anything but normal. Steel producers in our country are decreasing production, laying off workers, and reporting losses.

I understand that there are serious economic problems around the world—problems that are already affecting us. But we must protect our businesses, our employees and our country first.

The American steel industry has done nothing wrong. It shouldn't pay the price for other countries' mistakes.

I'm proud to be here to stand up for steel and my friends who produce it. This is an industry rich in tradition. This is an industry which literally made this country. From the Golden Gate Bridge to the Alaskan oil pipeline—Baltimore's Beth Steel has been there.

This industry has proved it can take a punch. But it shouldn't have to weather a storm of low blows, which is what this foreign dumping amounts to.

This has nothing to do with protectionism. Insisting that our trading partners adhere to international law and play by the rules is not protectionism. I'd call it something much simpler: it's called fairness.

It's not fair that Beth Steel lost \$23 million in the last quarter because of these low blows. The bill we're here to introduce today would become the referee in a fair fight.

We want the amount of steel imported into the United States to return to the rates we saw last summer when the global steel industry competed on a level playing field.

This industry is being forced to fight with one arm tied behind its back. It's taking a pummeling. Congress should release the other hand.

Pass this bill, let this industry fight fairly and, believe me, Rocky will win another.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EQUAL EDUCATIONAL STATUS ACT

### HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 2, 1999*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the University of the District of Columbia Equal Educational Status Act. The University of the District of Columbia (UDC) is the only publicly funded institution of higher education in the District of Columbia. The District, like most large cities, has a large population which requires access to a publicly funded open admissions institution to go to any institution at all.

Under existing law, UDC is, by definition, a Historically Black University that qualifies for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) funds because it meets the three salient requirements: (1) UDC was created from colleges established before 1964; (2) it served primarily black people; and (3) it is an accredited institution. Though technically an HBCU, UDC was denied the funding benefits of HBCU status because of a factual error. In the HBCU provision of Title III, UDC is discussed in the same section with Howard University, and it explicitly indicates that the University receives a direct payment from the federal government. This has never been true, and in any case, the District itself no longer receives a federal payment.

The importance of HBCU funding and status is that there is an annual appropriation for HBCUs. I have attempted to get HBCU funding for UDC before. The only reason that UDC has not been included is that no extra funds were available to accompany the request, and the entry of UDC was seen as diminishing the appropriations available for the 103 existing HBCUs. I would remove this impediment by proposing that an amount to be determined from the \$17 million in the President's budget for college bound D.C. students be allotted to UDC. The amount in the President's budget is not based on specific underlying assumptions about the available pool of students to go out-of-state. The \$17 million is sufficient to allow some funds to go to desperately needed technology and infrastructure at the University. This is now possible to satisfy the needs of all our students—those prepared to go out-of-state as well as the larger number of students who will not be able to take advantage of the scholarship proposal.

I support the proposal of Congressman TOM DAVIS, Chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia who, acting on suggestions from District and area business people, is writing a bill for public and private funds to pay the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition for D.C. residents outside the District. I am pleased that in addition to federal funds, private business in this area is also raising funds for this effort. Mr. Davis' staff and mine have begun working together on a joint UDC-scholarships approach. I have also discussed this idea with Mayor Tony Williams and have asked and gathered his suggestions about how funding for UDC should be targeted. Mayor Williams also supports the UDC-scholarship approach.

Working with the White House, we have been able to secure funds sufficient not only for the scholarship proposal but also for the needs of the majority of D.C. students who could not possibly take advantage of out-of-state opportunities. A scholarship—only approach would leave the largest number of college bound D.C. students stranded with access only to a university severely injured by the fiscal crisis. I am pleased that with adequate funding, there is no reason to ignore the demographics of D.C.'s typical student population in need of public higher education.

Who is the typical college bound D.C. resident? The profile of UDC tells the story. Two-thirds of UDC students work; many are single parents with obligations to young children; many go to college after years in the workforce; others could not afford living expenses away from D.C.; and many can only attend an open admissions university. The Davis pro-

posal was never meant to be, nor could it substitute for, a public university which serves the residents of this city in this city.

UDC funds would not be used for the operations of UDC but would be carefully targeted to urgently needed infrastructure needs that have no hope of finding the needed priority in the D.C. budget for years. The city is constantly being asked why our young people are not being trained for rapidly growing technological jobs in the region but they are left with antiquated computers and other hopelessly out-of-date technology.

Further, deferred maintenance has produced pitiful results, such as elevators that don't work, that are shameful in a public institution. Part of the reason for UDC's condition is that it took an enormously hard hit during the fiscal crisis. Its budget went from \$69,631 million in fiscal year 1994 to \$40,148 million this year, not counting huge reductions that began early in the decade. In the one year since February 1, 1998, the number of full-time faculty has plummeted from 375 to 246, not counting enormous cuts to which the University has been subjected throughout this decade.

The University was forced to close for three months in 1996, a calamity that would have destroyed most colleges and universities. Yet, D.C. residents are voting with their feet and returning to UDC. Despite the University's hardships, entering freshmen enrollment rose dramatically by 70% in only one year, from 661 in fall 1997 to 1125 in fall 1998. Today, the University's enrollment of 5,284 represents, an 11% increase in one year.

Some emphasize the undeniable fact that UDC needs money. Others indicate that District youngsters need increased opportunities for higher education, a truism if ever there was one. However, I told UDC students who visited the Capitol yesterday that it is wrong to pit individual justice against institutional justice. I say the same thing to my colleagues—we must do the right thing and assure that we have a win-win for higher education for our young people in this city.

ON THE DEATH OF VIRGINIA GOV.  
MILLS GODWIN

### HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 2, 1999*

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today in the borough of Chuckatuck, Mills E. Godwin Jr., a former Governor of Virginia, was laid to rest. He was not just a Governor of Virginia, he was in my view and that of many others, the greatest Governor of the Commonwealth in this century.

Mills Godwin served Virginia in the House of Delegates, in the Senate of Virginia, as Lt. Governor and then from 1966–1970, as Governor for his first term as a Democrat. Later, after sitting out a term, he was elected to a second term as Governor, this time as a Republican. Mills Godwin has the distinction of being the only person twice elected Governor of Virginia in this century, and is the only person elected Governor of a state once as a Democrat and once as a Republican.

The first term of Governor Godwin was a magical time in Virginia. For too long, unrealistic fiscal policies prevented Virginia from investing in its future by elevating the level of