HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, October 9, 1985*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 8, 1985.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS S. FOLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday, October 9, 1985.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Make a joyful noise to the Lord, all the lands!

Serve the Lord with gladness! Come into his presence with singing!

Know that the Lord is God! It is He that made us, and we are His; we are His people, and the sheep of his pasture.

Enter His gates with thanksgiving, and His courts with praise! Give thanks to Him, bless His name.

For the Lord is good; His steadfast love endures forever, and His faithfulness to all generations.—Psalm 100.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of October 3, 1985, the House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at about 10:15 o'clock a.m., the following proceedings were held:

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE LEE KUAN YEW, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, the Honorable James T. Malloy, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the Prime Minister of the Republic of Singapore into the Chamber: The gentleman from Washington, Mr. FOLEY; the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL; the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. ALEXANDER; the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. OAKAR; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL; the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. LOTT; and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BROOMFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort, the Senator from Kansas, Mr. DOLE; the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. SIMPSON; the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. THURMOND; the Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR; the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. CHAFEE; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. NUNN; and the Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 10 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m., the Doorkeeper announced the Prime Minister of the Republic of Singapore.

The Prime Minister of the Republic of Singapore, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and personal pleasure to present to you the Right Honorable Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of the Republic of Singapore.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE LEE KUAN YEW, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Prime Minister LEE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President of the Senate, distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, I am greatly honored by your invitation to address this joint meeting of the U.S. Congress. It cannot be often that someone representing 2½ million people, coming from a small country in the Third World, is offered the opportunity to address the representatives of 240 million people who form the world's most wealthy, and most advanced nation. America is a great nation not just because of its power and wealth, but mainly because it is a nation moved by high ideals. Only the elevating power of her idealism can explain the benign manner in which she has exercised her enormous power since the end of World War II and with magnanimity and generosity has shared her wealth to rebuild a more prosperous world. This idealism which inspired the Founding Fathers of this Nation has, down the ages, also affected and inspired free men and women throughout the world.

The decisions made in this august Chamber, especially in the decades since the 8th of December 1941, have determined the course of human history and settled the shape of the contemporary world. If the era after the war has seen a world relatively at peace, much of the credit must go to American leadership.

At a time of domestic disquiet over large imports and possible loss of jobs, the attention of America's legislators has been drawn away from the fundamentals. These fundamentals, which successive administrations and congresses have successfully pursued for four decades from 1945 are: A world in which all peoples can seek to fulfill themselves without having to conquer or to dominate or to exploit other people.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

America has encouraged a world which respects the sovereignty and the dignity of all, the great and the small, the mighty and the weak—a world which enables all to work and to be rewarded for their efforts because what they produce is desired by others willing to pay for such goods and services under fair rules of exchange.

For many months now troubled voices come from the U.S. Congress.

I want to refocus your attention, distracted by the problems of trade imbalance, job loss, high value of the U.S. dollar and budget deficits, back to the basic issues of war and peace.

Since World War II, the United States has been involved in two major wars, both in the Western Pacific: Korea, 1950-53, Vietnam, 1965-73. This was not accidental. East Asian societies are on the move, seeking to transform their ancient civilizations into modern industrial societies. All are seething with restless energy. Their people want to catch up with the rest of the world and have the better life. If Japan can do it, they believe they, too, can.

In the 1950's and 1960's, trade with the United States of all countries in the Western Pacific, except Communist China, North Korea and North Vietnam, increased. Many received U.S. investments. By the late 1960's, Japan had emerged as a second dynamo. The countries of East Asia, the Association of Southeast Nations, ASEAN, Australia and New Zealand list the United States and Japan as either their first or their second single most important trading partner with between 10 to 45 percent of their total trade.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. President, I suggest that the 40 years of relative peace the world has enjoyed since World War II is not just because of the atomic bomb. It is because the United States had learned the lessons of World War I and II, understood the desire for the better life through industrialization and trade that had caused the squabbles over markets and expansion of empires in order to build up larger markets and acquire resources. So at the end of World War II and the emergence of the Cold War, the United States put determined pressures on the European empires to decolonize.

More pertinent, when the war ended in 1945, the United States set out, with her European allies, to establish an open and fair trading system under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] in force since the first of January 1948. With it was a stable system of currency exchange under the original IMF agreement at Bretton Woods. These agreements led to a huge growth in trade, banking and finance throughout the world.

Indeed, political leaders in the former colonial territories watched in wonderment as the British, French, Belgian, and Dutch Governments dismantled their empires from 1945-65, and saw these peoples grow more prosperous in the 1960's and 1970's. Their former subject peoples had expected them to decline into relative poverty after they lost their empires, as Spain and Portugal. The secret lay in GATT and the IMF which ensured that trade and investments continued and expanded after decolonization.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, the East Asian phenomenon of high growth is well reported. Japan took off; the South Koreans, the Taiwanese, and then Hong Kong followed in her trail, picking up steam in her wake. They supplemented the Japanese economy, and followed the Japanese into the American and European markets. With investments both from the United States and Japan, they exported their manufactures to Europe. By the early 1970's, the countries of Southeast Asia in ASEAN also joined in this fast-growth group.

These developments have had a most profound impact on the leaders of China after Mao. After nearly three decades of Maoist seclusion and self-sufficiency, Deng Xiaoping decided that closing China's doors on the world was the cause of stagnation. China needs and wants to modernize. China has opened her doors to trade, investments, technology, and tourism. She wants to get the same economic uplift that Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and the ASEAN countries have had from the free market economies of the West by plugging into their trading and investments power grid. In the few years since this decision, China's trade with the United States and Japan has gone up many times, 13 times with the United States from half a billion in 1975 to $6.4 billion in 1984; and three times with Japan from nearly $4 billion in 1975 to nearly $14 billion in 1984. China is seeking growth through trade, not territorial aggrandisement. Her quest for a better life for her people is through peaceful cooperation in trade, investments, transfer of technology and knowhow, not the use of force for territorial conquests and the carving out of a sphere of influence or a trading bloc.

Now, the North Koreans too have been impressed by the market economies of the West. They want to emulate what they see of the transformation of the South Korean economy. They have borrowed an estimated $1.4 billion from Japanese/Western banks in the 1970's. Unfortunately, the investments were not successful and their debts had to be rescheduled.

But China's decision is a most significant factor for peace, stability and growth in Asia. For nearly 30 years, from 1949 when the Communists took power until Mao died in 1976, an ideologically fervent China was a ceaseless spoiler of other countries' economic plans as she undermined their stability. She was an exporter, a proud exporter, of revolution. She provided the arms, the ideology, and the radio support to guerrilla insurgencies throughout Southeast Asia. But now China has, for the present, discontinued such support.

Every Chinese schoolboy knows how China's civilization began: Through the Emperor Qin Shihuang unifying the seven warring states by conquest and diplomacy. The Chinese know from their own history that the time-proven method for a dynamic, vigorous people to achieve greater economic power is to carve out a larger territory with a larger population to form a greater base on which peace and order in the Empire are established. Then with a wide range of soil, climates, and peoples, there will be more wealth from a greater diversity of goods and services for exchange.

The Vietnamese also know this. Fortunately for Asia, Vietnam's attempt to carve out an empire for itself, Cambodia, and Laos has resulted in her economic stagnation. Vietnam gets no investments or trade from the West. She is bogged down in a guerrilla war in Cambodia and will be worn down in a clash of wills on the Sino-Vietnamese border with an immensely larger neighbor.

A younger generation of Americans may not know that it was the carving out of empire that Japan undertook when in 1931 she set up the state of Manchukuo in Manchuria. In fact, Japan had embarked on a modern empire earlier in 1895 when she annexed Taiwan, and in 1905 when she annexed Korea.

The success of the countries in East and Southeast Asia has caused much of the Third World to rethink their policies. Once infatuated with socialist economic policies of nationalization and autarchy, Third World nations and their leaders know and have come to see that stagnation and decay have followed these policies. More and more Third World leaders are seeking a better life for their peoples by opening up their doors to trade and investments.

Putting up barriers to America's markets would halt the economic advancement of the free market-oriented developing countries. It would send a signal that the model provided by the countries of East and Southeast Asia is no longer available as an option. It would set off a chain reaction which would result in a downward spiral of the world economy.

China was a founder member of GATT, the China of 1948. The present Government of the PRC abandoned its membership in 1950, a year after they took over in 1949. Recently, she

has sent out feelers for re-admission as a developing country member of GATT. If the United States cuts down China's growing trade with her, then China has to rethink her economic strategy. Shutting out China's products, especially textiles, which is the one commodity she produces in abundance from America's markets, has far-reaching implications for she must then look for other ways of getting foreign exchange to pay for modernization. If, as is likely, she cannot get enough alternative markets to make up for the loss of her American markets her modernization will slow down. She will become restive.

And Japan squeezed in such a protectionist trap, has few attractive options. After thrashing around looking for market extensions in Latin America, Africa, West Asia, Japan will turn back to her two major options: Closer links with the Soviet Union, or closer ties with China. She could try to do both and reconcile or postpone the conflicts inherent in such a policy. In the end, she will have to choose one of the two. Either choice conjures up disquieting consequences for the rest of Asia, and for the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Singapore has been an independent country for only 20 years. Whether it will be allowed to remain so, to work, to thrive and prosper, to pay its way in this world depends on the rules under which big and small states are allowed to compete and to cooperate in trade and finance. Forty-three years ago in 1942 the British could not prevent the Japanese from capturing us and our neighbors in the ASEAN countries. We were incorporated as part of Japan's "Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere." I suggest the present multilateral economic cooperation offers so much more to all of us, to Singapore, to ASEAN, to Japan, and for the rest of the world.

The irony is that is was the United States and Europe that forced a reluctant China and a hermit-like Japan to open up their countries to trade with the West. They were two oriental societies happy to be self-sufficient and to keep out the outside world. It seems preposterous that because America has temporary difficulties with her balance of trade, due in part to an overvalued dollar, resulting from high interest rates and a budget deficit, that the United States should begin to close her markets. And that now it is the Japanese and the Chinese instead who may have to come knocking at America's door to get in to trade. What a bitter-sweet irony of role-reversals.

Whatever might have been the position today had American policies been different since 1945, the rapid changes in the trade in the Western Pacific will not stop. It is the result of the resurgence of dynamism in these societies as they recover their balance and forge their will to compete and to get on the move. They are societies capable of organizing themselves, of implementing and achieving high standards of universal education, of mastering the skills and the knowledge of industrial societies, of acquiring new technology, of improving product design and marketing, and of carrying out research and development. They have strong cultural bases to build modern technological societies upon.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, there are two scenarios for the 21st century. The first is bleak: If, because of domestic problems, the United States loses the will to maintain open and fair trade—there are I understand over 300 bills in Congress dedicated to the protection of the U.S. market—protectionism and retaliation will shrink trade and so reduce jobs. Is America willing to write off the peaceful and constructive developments of the last 40 years that she has made possible? Does America wish to abandon this contest between democracy and the free market on the one hand versus communism and the controlled economy on the other, and this at a time when she has very nearly won this contest for the hearts and minds of people in the Third World? Never in the history of this world have peoples enjoyed such high standards of living. For 40 years the maintenance of the political boundaries that have emerged after the war has been made possible because trusting, and usually aggressive, peoples have been able to fulfill their drive to better their lot through trade. If this method for adjustment and accommodation between societies moving at different speeds is no longer possible, then a return to traditional ways of conquest and spheres of influence is most likely.

Therefore America will find that the putting up of trade barriers alone is not enough. She will have to go one step further: She will have to be the policeman, to enforce order over her sphere of influence of the world outside the Soviet bloc.

After World War I, the United States left the League of Nations and withdrew into isolationism. Nevertheless, inexorably, she was drawn into the vortex of war by December 1941.

The Soviet Union, since 1948, has a different philosophy. She dominates her allies as satellites in Comecon. It is a simpler structured order. The Soviets maintain the balance between them and other aspiring Communist societies like Cuba, Vietnam, and Ethiopia. In like manner, without adjustments through open and fair trade, the United States must enforce some kind of dominance over her own allies in Europe and Japan. And America and Europe must together police and keep the peace between the jostling and contending societies in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The more dynamic societies, prevented from thriving through trade, must also be prevented from rechannelling their energies toward expansion of their territories or of their spheres of influence to get assured markets. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately for the rest of the world, the American Constitution enshrines a system of open government which does not allow its leaders to exercise such dominion over other countries and governments in the same way that leaders of totalitarian states can.

Let us then not forget, Mr. Speaker and Mr. President, that protectionism and less trade means less growth for the developing countries. This also means that debt burdens cannot be discharged. Defaults may be inevitable, with incalculable consequences for the international banking system. Even if the banks survive these upheavals, these developing countries will have to abandon all thoughts of liberalization toward plurality and more democratic freedoms. For severe and repressive government is the other side of austere or negative economic growth.

An over-strong dollar has caused the huge deficits. A volatile and speculative foreign exchange market has exaggerated the factors working toward a strong dollar. The recent meeting in New York of the G5, Finance Ministers of five largest industrial nations, has given grounds for optimism that over-valued dollar can be brought down by concerted actions of the G5 Finance Ministers and their Central Bankers. Congress may wish to stay their hand and allow these efforts time to work.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, in case lobbyists for Japanese interests believe that they are going to be joined by some one from Singapore who ought to register his interests, let me add that I do not suggest that the Japanese should not be cajoled, and if necessary coerced, with all the powers at America's command, to open up their markets. America can legitimately and justly use all means to knock down Japanese barriers and obstacles to imports. There was a time in the 1950's and 1960's when Americans looked with amusement and tolerance at the ingeniousness of Japanese obstacles to imports. But, after Japan has become the second largest economic power, as a result of open and fair trade, it is right that she should be made to abide by the rules that have brought her to such unprecedented prosperity.

The rest of Asia will cheer with joy, for then their goods will also get into Japan without going through an obstacle course. Let me add and declare my position that 96 percent of United States goods enter Singapore duty free and quota free. And for 14 out of the

last 15 years, the United States has enjoyed trade surpluses with Singapore and we are not complaining. But for America to put up tariffs and barriers to Japanese goods, instead of tearing down Japanese barriers to American exports, will hurt the rest of Asia twice over. First, by having these same tariffs and barriers to overcome in America, and second, by not being able to sell to Japan because the Japanese will be selling less to America.

It is right to compel not only the Japanese, but also the others, to help the system function better. And if threatening retaliation for unequal access to markets is part of this process toward open and fair trade, then so be it. America has the right to ask that those who have benefited from America's markets open up their own. Some countries, like those in the Association of Southeast Nations, have supported the U.S. initiative to have GATT begin a new round of discussions for lowering barriers to trade in goods and perhaps also to regularize trade in services. The answer to job losses is more, not less trade.

America can upgrade her declining low value-added industries or they will continue to decline whether America goes protectionist or not, just as the ancient agricultural societies of pre-industrial China and Japan, with their self-sufficient, subsistence economies based on buffalo and manpower, had to change with the advent of steam and the industrial age. Rapid and profound change is the kind of world Americans have created by their inventiveness. American legislators now have the awesome responsibility of deciding under what rules the peoples of so many different countries should undergo rapid changes in their ways of making a living, and yet avoid violent conflicts.

In every age, the leading power has to carry the burden of encouraging the peaceful acceptance of the status quo. This is done by punishing aggression and rewarding peaceful cooperation. The British carried this burden for over 100 years after they had pioneered the industrial revolution. This responsibility passed to America after the second World War.

It is inherent in America's position as the preeminent economic, political and military power to have to settle and to uphold the rules for orderly change and progress. Americans are still leaders in a marathon for technological change and product innovation. American enterprise is blazing the trail into the microchip and computerized world of tomorrow. It is in the interests of peace and security that America upholds the rules of international conduct which rewards peaceful cooperative behavior and punishes trangressions of the peace. A replay of the depression of the 1930's which led to World War II would be ruinous for all. All major powers in the West share this responsibility for not repeating this mistake. But America has the primary responsibility, for she is the anchor economy of the free market economies of the world. In your hands, therefore, lie the future of the world. Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of the Republic of Singapore, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 16 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until the hour of 12 o'clock noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY] at 12 o'clock noon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates, the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On September 23, 1985:

H.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution designating the month of October 1985 as "National High-Tech Month."

On September 27, 1985:

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 15, 1985, as "National Dental Hygiene Week"; and

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 22, 1985, as "National Adult Day Care Center Week."

On September 30, 1985:

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3414. An act to provide that the authority to establish and administer flexible and compressed work schedules for Federal Government employees be extended through October 31, 1985; and

H.R. 3452. An act to extend for 45 days the application of tobacco excise taxes, trade adjustment assistance, certain medicare reimbursement provisions, and borrowing authority under the railroad unemployment insurance program.

On October 1, 1985:

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution recognizing the accomplishments over the past 50 years resulting from the passage of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, one of this Nation's landmark preservation laws;

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution to recognize both Peace Corps volunteers and the Peace Corps on the Agency's 25th anniversary, 1985-86; and

H.R. 3454. An act to extend temporarily certain provisions of law.

On October 4, 1985:

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to designate October 1985 as "Learning Disabilities Awareness Month"; and

H.J. Res. 394. Joint resolution reaffirming our historic solidarity with the people of Mexico following the devastating earthquake of September 19, 1985.

On October 7, 1985:

H.R. 1042. An act to grant a Federal charter to the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association.

On October 8, 1985:

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive 1-minute speeches at this time.

CONTINUING RECORD TRADE DEFICITS HURT AMERICAN ECONOMY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, continuing record trade deficits mean the American economy is not running on all cylinders. Last month's unemployment numbers were as loud as bad engine knock. In September, we lost another 110,000 manufacturing jobs—30,000 just in the automobile industry. This is the worst 1-month drop since the 1982 recession. The total job loss in manufacturing for 1985 stands now at 340,000. A total of 1½ million jobs have been lost since 1980. No question about it, the manufacturing engine in America is stalling.

The President and the Secretary of Labor are ecstatic about the increase in service sector jobs. Well, we need service sector jobs too, but not as a replacement for manufacturing jobs. One is not a substitute for the other. In the long run, service sector jobs depend on manufacturing jobs. When will this administration wake up and recognize what is happening to our manufacturing base so our economy hums once again?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order at this moment to request a call of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that we have 1-minutes which have been requested, and perhaps after that time the gentleman would like to make such a motion.

Mr. WALKER. At the end of the 1-minute requests, at that point it would be in order to move a call of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

A TRIBUTE TO E.B. WHITE

(Ms. SNOWE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, E.B. White died of Alzheimer's disease in North Brooklin, ME, his principal residence for almost 50 years. He was 86, but for those who loved his work, he was ageless. For the millions of us who alternately smiled and wept over the life and death of a spider in "Charlotte's Web" and who struggled with the complexities of the English language in "The Elements of Style," his is a loss we will all mourn.

Some literary critics have called him the best American essayist of this century. For most of us, he was a friend who wove images with words. Thus, it was the greatest of ironies that this man would die from a disease that robs the words and thoughts from its victims. Fortunately, it could not steal from us that which is etched in our hearts and minds. It is with deep regret that we say goodbye to a dear friend.

THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD COME CLEAN ON AID TO THE CONTRAS

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Post carried a story alleging that, when he was faced with a cutoff of military aid to the Contras, President Reagan approved a secret plan to replace CIA funds with assistance from American citizens and U.S. allies. According to the article, administration officials maintain that the White House role in establishing an aid network ended by October 1, 1984, when the Boland amendment went into effect.

I do not know whether the story's allegations are true. But I do know that Congress and the American people have the right to know the facts. The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere has requested the National Security Council to supply all materials relating to this matter so Congress can determine the truth. Unfortunately, the administration has refused to comply.

I call upon the administration to provide the documents Congress has requested. Administration denials are simply not good enough.

The administration should come clean on aid to the Contras.

COMPARABLE WORTH AND PAY EQUITY—BAD LEGISLATION

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, shortly we will be addressing H.R. 3008 which has been variously called by its proponents comparable worth and pay equity. There seems to be a good deal of confusion about this bill and what it may or may not do.

Let me clear up two points. First, what is this legislation? It is bad legislation, and it is bad economics that runs the risk of throwing this Nation into a lawsuit that would enforce wage administration by a Government organization or agency that would disrupt our labor markets and result in a new inflationary spiral in America.

What is it not? It is not just a harmless study. That story has been fought before by at least 11 State legislatures that have franchised the study, and once the study has been completed, with a biased methodology and generally a loaded commission, as is the case in this legislation, the study has resulted in automatic lawsuits being brought as a followup, at enormous expense and risk to the States.

This body ought to study the deliberations today very, very carefully, and I know it will then act in a responsible manner and defeat this legislation which threatens only cost to the Government and disruption to America's labor markets.

IT IS TIME TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE PAY EQUITY ACT

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note today that this body will be taking under consideration the Pay Equity Act. I think it is a time in America when the Congress of the United States must move forward on what I think is precedent setting legislation for this Nation; to the benefit and to the positive aspects of this Nation.

Moreover, I am happy to note that that study will also include the treatment of Hispanics, blacks, and women, and their treatment as Government workers.

I think this bodes well for the American Government. I think this bodes well for the American people so that we can begin to move out and move into the 20th century and see to it that there is equity across the board.

I thank the Speaker.

WE SHOULD BALANCE OUR BUDGET BY 1991

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we meet today in this body, our Government is in danger of running out of funds to meet its financial obligations.

The other body in our Nation's Capitol is expected to vote this afternoon to provide for a temporary deficit extension, and hopefully next week when we come back from the Columbus Day recess this body will have the opportunity to seriously address and permanently end the deficits that have been plaguing our Nation for many years. You see, in the other body there has been an amendment attached to the debt ceiling legislation that would require that we balance our budget by 1991. This is serious legislation. It has been introduced in this House by Congressman CONNIE MACK of Florida. One hundred and fifteen Members have cosponsored this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that when we come back from the Columbus Day recess the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to vote up or down on whether we want once and for all to end the deficits that have plagued our country and get back to a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the other Members of this body who have not cosponsored this legislation to do so, and to come back to the Capitol next week prepared to vote in a positive fashion on this legislation.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

BALANCED BALONEY ACT OF 1985, A QUAGMIRE OF BUDGET DEFICITS

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard today during the 1-minute period, the Nation is bogged down in a quagmire of budget deficits, trade deficits, fiscal confusion, and

lack of direction by our Nation on the future that we should take economically, which includes trade. Many quick-fix schemes have been proposed; one from the other body which has been referred to as the Balanced Baloney Act of 1985. But today we were privileged in this Congress to receive an address by the Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, who gave us a direction which had not heretofore been stated.

I urge my colleagues who were not in attendance to hear this address to read it, because it states that the fundamental problem that we have in our economy today is an overvalued dollar which prevents us from trading and also prevents us from balancing our budget.

I urge my colleagues to consider that address and for all who have immediate answers to these problems I would ask of you only the indulgence to consider the point of view of an enlightened man.

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

WE ARE TIRED OF STUDIES AND WAITING FOR CONGRESS TO ACT ON THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. DIOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, the time of reckoning has finally arrived and we now have the opportunity to act on the deficit. Unfortunately, some of our colleagues as well as the New York Times and Washington Post are saying that the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act is a gimmick and that we need more time to study the deficit issue.

My constituents are tired of studies and tired of waiting for Congress to act on the deficit. The time to act is now and it is unconscionable that some are dragging their feet.

The balanced budget legislation is a clear blueprint and plan to achieve deficit reduction by fiscal year 1991. It will send a signal to the financial markets and the American people that we mean business.

The effect of the Mack-Cheney balanced budget legislation is that it will finally place an institutional bias on saving, not spending. It will force Government bureaucracies to be more efficient and productive. There's nothing wrong with this—businesses do this every day and I believe its time for Government to clean house. No one can argue that over the years public sector bureaucracies have grown with little apparent benefit to what should be their bottom-line concern: Accountability to the taxpayer.

The Mack-Cheney House version of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act will bring some fiscal discipline to Government and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

TRICKLE-DOWN ECONOMICS RESULT IN DEVASTATION OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, 5 years ago some Republicans here in the Congress developed an economic plan which they said would balance the Federal budget within 5 years.

Well, here we are. It's 5 years later. We quickly accepted their plan, their half-baked notion which has been called a lot of things but which is best called trickle-down economics. The result is devastation of America's primary industries, an unemployment rate that is apparently stuck at far too high, 7 percent, a trade deficit that is out of control, and a Federal deficit, which they promised would not exist, is now the greatest in history.

□ 1215

We have stacked up more deficits in these last 4½ years than were created under all previous Presidents, George Washington through Jimmy Carter, combined.

The same people who brought you that now have a new budget plan to balance the Federal budget within the next 5 years. Their plan again is simple, their plan again appears to be popular, and once again they are dead wrong, and this Congress should have none of it because the American people cannot afford gimmicks that do not work, are politically sound in the short run and economically disastrous in the long run.

BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important to this Nation than the compelling necessity for this Congress to forcefully express its commitment to bring this budget into balance in a specified time under a plan that convinces this Nation, the administration, and even ourselves that we mean business.

While crossing Independence at New Jersey, yesterday, my light was green, but one policeman was motioning cars to move ahead on Independence while the other was directing traffic through on New Jersey. Fortunately they got together before we had a disaster.

The confusion on Independence matched that of this House. Congress is at a vital intersection on Federal spending. Too many Congressmen with fiscal schizophrenia are advocating a balanced budget with one hand and voting ongoing spending increases with the other. You can't have traffic flowing on both streets at the same time.

Like the policemen at Independence and New Jersey, we are directing a fiscal collision.

There is an answer. If we really are willing to put the taxpayers' money where our mouths are, I urge your support of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Control Act.

ADMINISTRATION SHOULD PRESENT FACTS REGARDING CONTRA FORCES IN NICARAGUA

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

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the outrage of Americans who are appalled at the alleged attempt by this administration to cover up its role in illegally supporting the Contra forces now attempting to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua.

This administration's active recruitment of rightwing zealots to finance the Contras would be an intentional subversion of the laws of this Nation, which at that time banned direct or indirect U.S. military aid to the rebels. We are a Nation of law. This is what separates us from the closed societies we often condemn.

If, as this administration claims, they did not violate any U.S. law, I would question why National Security Adviser Robert C. McFarlane has continually refused to respond to a congressional request for documents on the National Security Council's contacts with the Contra forces.

Mr. Speaker, the disillusionment of the people of this Nation after our defeat in Vietnam rested in large part on our discovery that our leaders had consistently lied to us. We must require that this administration present us with the facts, to clear itself from blame if that may be the result. But most important, we must compel the leaders of our Nation to respect the laws of a moral society whose ideals we are attempting to export to countries where democratic institutions do not exist.

PALAUNI M. TUIASOSOPO ELECTED SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

(Mr. SUNIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUNIA. Mr. Speaker, the South Pacific Commission is an international organization which is made up of 27 countries and territories in the Pacific. The United States, France, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand were the founding members. Today, all of the new independent nations of the Pacific are members as well as all of their territories. It is a mini-United Nations.

Last week, this organization unanimously elected an American Samoan, Mr. Palauni M. Tuiasosopo, to the top post, the Secretary General.

I believe this is an achievement worth noting, both for Mr. Tuiasosopo and to our country. This marks the first time a national of the United States, from any of its territories, has been elected to head the SPC.

I applaud Mr. Tuiasosopo's achievement and commend the countries and territories of the Pacific plus France and Great Britain for making such a wise choice. I am confident Mr. Tuiasosopo, a constituent and a dear friend, will give a good account of himself and his country.

"Browine", as he is known both in American Samoa and amongst members of the South Pacific Commission, is a graduate of the Samoana High School, the Puhahou School of Hawaii, and the University of Oregon. He has held several important posts in the American Samoa government and was a special assistant to the Governor for several years.

He is identified with the territory's efforts in the development and preservation of arts and culture.

As the Secretariat General of the South Pacific Commission is located in Noumea, New Caledonia, Mr. Tuiasosopo, his wife, Tupu, and family will live there for the 3-year term.

Congratulations and Malo Lava!

ANTICOMPETITIVE ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT RAILROADS AND ELECTRIC UTILITIES

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

(Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn that there is transportation related legislation being considered by the Judiciary Committee, H.R. 1140, which would place into law the sweeping assumption that any railroad line that does not have a competitive railroad nearby is in violation of the antitrust laws and must offer the use of its trackage to a competitor.

I understand that it is the big electric utilities who are pushing this legislation. Now, what's good for the goose is good for the gander, so if this legislation comes to the floor, it is my intention to offer an amendment to extend this sweeping antitrust assumption to include electric utilities. If forced competition is the appropriate way to control rail rates, then the same method should be used to control utility rates. Let the utilities open up their transmission lines to their competitors. In the last 4 years the price of electricity to consumers rose 38 percent, while the rail transportation costs to electric utilities rose only 27 percent. Moreover, all fossil fuel costs (oil, gas, and coal) accounted for only 5 percent of the utilities' increased operating costs in those years. If we want to start legislating anticompetitive assumptions about any industry, the electric utility industry is a good place to start.

Mr. Speaker, I'm inserting a more detailed statement in today's extensions of remarks.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD NICARAGUA

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

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I read with great distress a report in the Washington Post indicating President Reagan's direct participation in approving a secret plan to supplant CIA funding of Contra operations with private financing. White House officials appear confident that this latest stratagem against the Sandinista government remains within the confines of existent law. While this may be true, I believe these actions are in clear violation of at least the spirit and intent on congressional actions barring continued U.S. military assistance to the Contras.

It seems to me that we are once again faced with the question of executive branch disregard of congressional participation in the formulation of United States foreign policy toward Nicaragua. National Security Adviser Robert McFarland denies that his staff has violated the Boland amendment yet ignores our requests for documentation on National Security Council contact with the Contras. I believe it is up to the Congress to determine whether or not such violations have occurred and would urge my colleagues on the appropriate investigating committees to insist upon receipt of all relevant documents pertaining to this particular episode, especially the logs of Lt. Col. Oliver L. North.

LEGISLATION BROUGHT TO HOUSE FLOOR WITHOUT NOTICE

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the American people wonder why we get such lousy legislation out of this House. Well, one of the reasons we do is because we do not do what the American people want. And if you listened to some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle here this morning, you will hear them saying we should not be trying to balance the budget right now, we ought to be doing other things. Evidently, they have a better plan, and from what I gather from what they are saying is, their plan is to spend us into oblivion. And maybe we have no better example than the bill that we are going to have before us today. It is going to be paraded out here as an innocent study, a little bit of a study of something that ought to be done in the future. However, it has the potential for becoming a multibillion-dollar add-on to the deficits of this country.

How did it get here? Well, it got here with 15 minutes notice. We pulled the bill that was supposed to be on the schedule today and then finally came up with this bill. And why did we come up with this bill? Well, because evidently they want to sneak it past the House. It is brought to the floor without notice, and we are supposed to take it up here without much preparation.

We should be embarrassed, Mr. Speaker, to bring legislation to the House of this type, and particularly embarrassed to bring it before us under these kinds of circumstances.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO SIT TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation may be permitted to sit on Thursday, October 10, 1985, during the 5-minute rule of the House.

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

There was no objection.

FAIR TRADE

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

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, do you believe it is the responsibility of this great Nation to lead and defend the free world? If your answer is yes—and I believe and assume that it is—can we accomplish this without an industrial base? For the past several months, I have traveled in your States, in many of your districts. I have heard your people, I have seen your press releases, I have read reports of your speeches. You say that what we want is fair trade, you

say what we want is a level playing field. Well, at some point within the next week you are going to get the opportunity in the textile bill that is coming up to put your words into action. It will probably be the only trade bill that will come up this year.

I serve on the Trade Committee. I know how difficult it is. And when this bill comes up I would hope that all of the heads of state and all of the people involved would get in the room at one time because I would like to talk to them about the third worlds of this Nation, the 2 million people who are employed in this industry. But there will be no place to hide when this comes up. You have expressed your support for fair trade, a level playing field. I expect you to measure up when you have the opportunity to vote.

IF EGYPT WANTS OUR CASH, EGYPT SHOULD BUY OUR GOODS AND USE OUR SHIPS

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, for fiscal 1985 and 1986, Congress has authorized $601 million in cash transfers to Egypt. Now the Agency for International Development [AID] is disbursing this cash without a guarantee to buy and ship American.

In 1979, when the first cash transfers were made to Israel, Congress legislated that the President was to ensure exports to Israel would not decline below what had occurred under its commodity imports program [CIP] arrangement. As a result, Israel has given the United States a side letter each year guaranteeing that Israel would continue to buy manufactured products and grains in the same proportions it did when using credits, and half the grain shipments would be on American vessels. Israel is expected to sign a similar letter for 1986.

We should expect no less from Egypt, even though the Congress failed to include the requirement when it approved the cash transfers.

For Egypt's first cash transfer in 1984, Egypt only agreed to try to buy grain from the United States. No commitment was made for manufactured goods nor for U.S. shipping. Since there is no accounting, no United States Government agency knows whether Egypt did or did not.

There must be more than an understanding that Egypt or any country receiving cash transfers will continue to buy and ship American. As it stands, the United States has provided cash funds to be spent anywhere in the world.

Let us put this agreement in writing, like we did for Israel, so there will be no mistakes on how the cash will be used.

□ 1230

HEARING ON CRUISE SHIP SECURITY

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the hijacking and hostage taking aboard the *Achille Lauro* is now over. It also appears that the passengers aboard, including the Americans, are safe and unharmed. Though under very strange circumstances.

There must be a lesson learned from this incident. It is imperative that we tighten security aboard cruise ships—which can now be best described as inadequate if not nonexistent.

As chairman of the House Merchant Marine Subcommittee the subject of cruise ship security will be the primary focus of a hearing I have scheduled for October 22.

I remain concerned about the copycat syndrome which we have seen practiced so often by terrorists. It is, therefore, vital that steps be taken now to improve security before another vessel is seized.

For the good of the millions of passengers who use these ships as well as for the good of the industry, which can only suffer if people are apprehensive about security, let us move forward and improve security. I hope my hearing can make a positive contribution toward an early solution to this new but highly dangerous problem.

AMERICAN HOSTAGE CRISIS IN 571ST DAY

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

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 571st day Americans have been held hostage in Lebanon.

William Buckley was kidnaped on the streets of Beirut on March 16, 1984, 571 days ago today.

Today marks the beginning of the 9th month of captivity for Father Lawrence Jenco, a priest from Joliet, IL.

Two hundred and six days ago today, Terry Anderson, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut, was taken hostage in Lebanon.

David Jacobsen, director of the American University Hospital in Beirut, was kidnaped 133 days ago.

Thomas Sutherland, dean of the American University School of Agriculture, was taken hostage in Lebanon 121 days ago.

Today also marks the 308th day since the kidnaping of Peter Kilburn, the American University librarian.

Mr. Speaker, the American hostage crisis is now in its 571st day. The crisis didn't begin with the hijacking of the Italian cruise ship. It won't end until the Americans held hostage in Lebanon are returned to the United States safe and sound. It won't end until every last one of them is secure, alive, and well, free of all constraints. With Jeremy Levin and Ben Weir home, we are still two down, six to go.

LET US HAVE COMMON SENSE BEFORE WE FURLOUGH EVERY JOB WE HAVE

(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, during the election, the President continued to say that if we flood the country with cheap imports, it will bring the price down for the American consumer. Even if these foreign entities are in fact subsidizing their industry, that is money in the pocket for Americans.

No one has yet to say that the American consumer is the American worker. If the American worker does not have a job, who is going to consume over here?

Many people believe that it is impossible for America to fall into the throes of financial collapse. I am not quite so sure that is true. The Americans are starting to speak up and there is a Member here that said he was speaking on behalf of all Americans. If he was speaking on behalf of all Americans, what Americans are saying is, "Protect my job; quit letting my job go overseas with these crazy types of trade policies."

It is true that Americans are concerned about tax reform, but they are really concerned about trade reform. It is true America is concerned about the budget deficits, but America is critically concerned about the trade deficit and their jobs. So all these free traders who continue to say that protectionism is a dirty word, I might like to say it is a little bit of common sense that should be practiced by our administration before we furlough every job that we have.

SUPPORT URGED FOR THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, I am constantly dismayed as the budget process collapses into a mire of partisan spending feuds. Many of us are committed to re-

ducing the Federal deficit, yet it would seem that Congress as a whole has abandoned the single most important goal for which we were sent to Washington last November. We are now facing a public debt limit in excess of $2 trillion. Irresponsible spending is swiftly and tirelessly rotting the fabric of the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, both national polls and visits with constituents show deficit reduction to be a high priority. We in Congress now have an opportunity to show our constituents that we, too, are concerned and that we are going to do something about this problem. In the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, we have a proposal that—at last—puts teeth to our bark about deficits.

The legislation mandates annual reductions in the Federal deficit to produce a balanced budget by fiscal 1991. If Congress and the President fail to make the mandated reductions, automatic, across-the-board spending cuts would go into effect, with the exceptions of Social Security and payments on the national debt. Adoption of this bill will indicate to the American people—our constituents—that Congress is serious about ending our deficit problems. I urge my colleagues to support the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MR. ARAFAT OWES THE WORLD SOME EXPLANATIONS

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, Americans in the world are overjoyed at the reports that the hostages aboard the *Achille Lauro* have been released unharmed. But the incident raises many questions that must be answered. Indeed, it seems that there is something fishy in the Mediterranean this morning. How did Yassir Arafat negotiate so quickly with the same terrorists he was yesterday calling his most dire enemies. When the terrorists stated, as they released the hostages, that they were releasing them because world opinion had come out so quickly about the Israeli raid and the bombing of Tunis, they ignore the fact that the mission was planned weeks before that bombing and world opinion had actually congealed days before the terrorists started their action.

It seems indeed, Mr. Arafat, there is certainly more, or should I say less, than meets the eye. Your already minuscule credibility in the world is on the verge of disappearing. Mr. Arafat, you owe the world, the hostages, and their families some explanations.

EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, throughout this Coangress we have heard countless pledges, from both sides of the aisle, to reduce our enormous deficit and eventually balance the Federal budget. Fellow members, talk is cheap. The time has come to show the American people that these discussions are not merely political rhetoric, but express our genuine concern and commitment to fiscal responsibility. The Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 does just that.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to place my name on this bill as an original cosponsor. Through the establishment of gradually decreasing budget deficit limits, the Emergency Deficit Control Act offers a realistic approach to achieving a balanced budget by 1991. It has become apparent that only through passage of such legislation will Congress match expenditures with revenue and finally make significant strides in reducing our deficit.

Supporting this measure is not taking a partisan stance; it's taking a responsible one. While searching for solutions to our economic woes on an international front, let's not overlook those in our own backyard. I strongly urge my colleages to join me as a cosponsor of the Emergency Deficit Control Act and make a balanced Federal budget a reality.

COMPARABLE WORTH

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, in just a few moments, we will take up the bill, H.R. 3008, the so-called pay equity bill. Now, the proponents of this bill will tell you that this is not comparable worth. Mr. Speaker, let me read from section 6(a) of the bill.

> The Commission shall provide, by contract with the consultant selected under section 5(b) for the conduct of a study under which job-content analysis and economic analysis shall be applied with respect to a representative sample of occupations in which either sex is numerically predominant.

Mr. Speaker, that is comparable worth.

□ 1240

REPUBLICAN'S "OPERATION OPEN DOOR" FLOPS IN HAWAII

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

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues may have seen a story that appeared in the Washington Post this Saturday concerning the recall election of three Honolulu City councilmen who switched their affiliation from the Democratic to the Republican Party.

The Honolulu recall has attracted nationwide attention. That attention was due to the White House and Republican National Committee efforts to defeat the recall attempt and to spotlight the defection of our Honolulu city councilmen as part of their "Operation Open Door"—a program to convert Democratic elected officials. If the situation in Hawaii is any indication, "Operation Open Door" must be considered a flop.

Despite a last-ditch media blitz involving an Oval Office address by President Reagan, Saturday's recall was conclusive—all three Honolulu city councilmen who switched parties in the middle of their terms were recalled by their constituents. Many voters in Hawaii felt betrayed because these officials ran for office and were elected as Democrats but switched their party affiliation after the mandate the voters gave them in their election.

While I have been and remain good friends with these three individuals, their recall demonstrates that every elected official must heed the demands of their constituency or suffer the consequences.

RECIPROCITY IS BASIS OF TRADE PARTNERSHIP ACT

(Mrs. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Trade Partnership Act introduced yesterday is based on the bipartisan idea of reciprocity—that we should demand equity in the treatment of American goods and services.

This comprehensive legislation does that in part by strengthening the USTR's authority in 301 cases and by shortening the timeframe by half. The Trade Partnership Equity Act allows the President only 15 days to override the USTR's decision, and it provides for a fast-track procedure by which the Congress can overturn the President's decision.

Perhaps the most important aspect of this bill is that it requires that an overall reciprocity test be included for the first time in determining our trade relationships.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, particularly those on the other side of the aisle with whom I have worked on trade issues and whose interest in those issues goes well back before they were so popular, to join in cosponsor-

ing the Trade Partnership Equity Act. Trade policy must be bipartisan. America must speak with one voice to our trading partners.

OPEN AND FAIR TRADE IS GOAL OF HOUSE MAJORITY

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we were honored this morning by the presence of the Prime Minister of Singapore. He called for the end or for the avoidance of protectionism, and we welcome that call.

He also said, and I quote: "If threatening retaliation for unequal access to markets is part of this process toward open and fair trade, then so be it." That has been the major purpose of legislation introduced by the majority in this House.

Then he went on to say: "The answer to job loss is more, not less, trade."

But the question is, what if more trade leads to a further imbalance between the United States and our trading competitors? And what if more trade leads to the further erosion of this country's industrial base? Up until now the administration's position has been not so benign neglect.

Mr. Speaker, we are glad the minority is now joining in this effort, and we on the majority side in the House intend to persevere until there is a policy that protects America's basic economic interests.

COMPARABLE WORTH BACK ON THE AGENDA

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

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, the comparable worth concept keeps creeping its way back into this Chamber and many of our respectable colleagues are buying off on this idea of recasting pay practices and offering equal pay for different work.

I've accused Congress before of wasting valuable time on worthless issues, but with so many critical matters before us, we should not be delving into the nonsense of comparable worth. Those who examine it with any degree of seriousness and apply even a small dose of common sense, will find it to be one of the most preposterous ideas floating around Washington.

Too many people have bought off on the rhetoric characterizing it as a vehicle for correcting unfair pay practices. As the U.S. Court of Appeals in San Fransico recently confirmed: This bill is not a pay equity issue, it is not a civil rights issue. It is a guise for expanding an already bloated bureaucracy. It will not equalize pay, it will complicate the labor market and keep the courts of this country forever tangled in its web of confusion. I suggest we act on the important issues of the day and recognize comparable worth for what it's worth and it's not worth our time.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN NICARAGUA

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

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, we all know how good the Republican Party is at fundraising. It can raise funds for virtually anything and everything except perhaps for balancing the Federal budget. Now we have learned that this vaunted fundraising machine has been put to a deceitful and illegal use by the White House, namely, to raise money to support a mercenary army in Nicaragua, despite a clear ban imposed by the people's Congress.

In the President's view, this is a "voluntary program." In my view, that is Orwellian doubletalk.

With the consent of the President, members of the National Security Council have formed a Contra booster club. Most booster clubs hold bake sales or car washes to finance their activities, but not this one. No, this one solicits so-called "charitable" contributions to feed and arm a mercenary army fighting a war the American people do not support.

This is a clear violation of the law of the land. Congress has been trying to formulate a firm but responsible and reasonable policy toward Nicaragua, but the President, by going behind our backs, shows that he would rather play an underhanded game of hide-and-seek. I think he is wrong.

SUPERFUND LEGISLATION PREEMPTED BY COMPARABLE WORTH

(Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, if rhetoric could balance the budget around here, we would have a $2 trillion surplus.

This Congress talks about bureaucrats causing problems. Who created the bureaucrats?

This Congress talks about taxes being too high. Who created the high taxes?

This Congress talks about deficits being too high. Who created the deficits?

We talk about a trade deficit. Who created that?

Mr. Speaker, we were supposed to debate a textile bill this morning. Now we are going to take up comparable worth. We were supposed to reauthorize Superfund. Even though hazardous waste contamination is the most serious health and environmental threat facing the United States today, with the United States generating 650 million metric tons of it per year, even though there may be 10,000 hazardous waste sites nationwide, we did not reauthorize Superfund; we gave it a 45-day extension.

Mr. Speaker, we were supposed to deal with a balanced budget. We are trying to deal with a balanced-budget proposal that is to come over here, but we want to have more study, even though we have a national debt now approaching $2 trillion and deficits approaching $150 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, a frustrated constituent said to me on my last trip home that "The difference between the Congress and the Boy Scouts is that the Boy Scouts have adult leadership."

TRACKING THE GROWTH OF THE DEFICIT

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the President came to power promising a major increase in defense spending. He was also promising that he would balance the budget and he would cut taxes. Now, the average 10-year-old in America knew that did not add up. Even with new math, it did not work.

Now the President professes that he has no idea where this deficit came from, this deficit that has escalated to an all-time high, this deficit that is causing us all sorts of trouble in trade negotiations and leading to a trade imbalance, this deficit that really clouds our children's future, because if we ever have any kind of a downturn in this economy, this deficit impairs our ability to act at all.

□ 1250

I think now we need a thoughtful approach to trying to cure this whole deficit problem and not theatrics. Unfortunately, we are seeing theatrics, and we are seeing promises that they will balance the budget by 1991. The promises are not new. We have had them before, but we have never done it.

I think all the rhetoric needs to be turned down. I think the President has to stop pretending like he is so surprised by this deficit that everybody else could have predicted was going to happen, and try to come to the table with some real meaningful solutions rather than just trying to blame other people.

COME LISTEN TO ALVARO JOSE BALDIZON AVILES IN 2200 RAYBURN BUILDING TODAY

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have taken note of the last few 1-minute speeches where colleagues are concerned about the manner in which the White House is trying to prevent the establishment of yet another Communist bastion in this hemisphere, this time in Nicaragua upon our own continent of North America.

One of the saddest things that I have witnessed on Capitol Hill over 9 years, is the refusal of some people to get educated to the hard facts about Communist expansionism and oppression. If we had ever had a chief investigator of the Soviet KGB defect while Mr. Andropov was head of that agency, and was involved in such evils as plotting to kill the Pope, we would, obviously, have had a human treasure trove of priceless intelligence information.

Well we have testifying on Capitol Hill this afternoon the Nicaraguan equivilant. An intelligence treasure trove—a chief investigator of Tomas Borge's Ministry of Interior. The intelligence officer who sought asylum July 1 is Alvaro Jose Baldizon Aviles. I beg my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, before they continue their policy of ripping apart our President's Central American policy, go to the Foreign Affairs subcommittee room in the Rayburn Building, 2200, and listen carefully to Mr. Baldizon. Put your toughest questions to him. He says there are seven times the political prisoners under the Sandinistas as was imprisoned under the Dictator Samoza. He says the torture is worse and capital punishment is institutionalized.

I beg you to get smart. Smart about communism and terror. I hope you will be there, Mr. Speaker.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 348]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—389

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Armey
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Barton
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Biaggi
Biliraki
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Grotberg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)
Zschau

□ 1305

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFNER). On this rollcall, 389 Members recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

□ 1315

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was not in Washington, DC, and so I was unable to cast some votes on H.R. 2100, the Food Security Act of 1985. If I had been here I would have voted:

For the Petri amendment;

Against the Stangeland amendment;

Against the Alexander substitute;

Against the Miller amendment; and

Against final passage of the H.R. 2100.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I missed the vote on the farm bill, H.R. 2100. I was coming into the door of the Chamber when the machine was closed. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, October 9, 1985.)

FEDERAL EQUITABLE PAY PRACTICES ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 241 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3008.

□ 1316

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3008) to promote equitable pay practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal civil service, with Mr. TORRES, (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, August 1, 1985, section 1 was open for amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to section 1?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Black Caucus, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND].

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to commend the gentlewoman form Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for her outstanding leadership as she has displayed in carrying forth this issue of pay equity for not only women, but also minorities.

I think that there is something awry in this House. If I am not mistaken, and the gentlewoman may correct me if I am wrong, just last year there was a vote on this very issue except in the expanded version including minorities now, of 413 Members of the House voting in the affirmative for this very same study, and only 6 Members voting against this issue. Is that not correct?

Ms. OAKAR. That is correct.

Mr. LELAND. If the gentlewoman will yield further, through the committee process and the reintroduction of this legislation, if I am not again mistaken, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] further expanded the issue to include minorities and not just women in this study. Is that not correct?

Ms. OAKAR. That is correct.

Mr. LELAND. Then can one assume that in this body that after this body had voted 413 to 6 last year when only women were included, and now that minorities are included, that this matter tends to smack of some kind of racial overtones?

I do not necessarily want the gentlewoman to respond, but I am very disturbed, because we in the Congressional Black Caucus, and I know my brothers in the Hispanic Caucus and those minorities who are in the Federal work force today and those who would want to work in the Federal work force have arrived at certain conclusions at this time in our history.

I know for a fact, through the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation's findings as well as other statistics that have been made available to us that things have not changed drastically for either women or minorities in 1 year.

It seems to me that it ought to be, in this body, a favorable consideration as it was last year, at least in the same proportion; that the Members of this body should support the legislation as they had last year. I do not understand what is going on in this House.

Have the Members of this body lost compassion for women and minorities in 1 year?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. I will be brief, Mr. Chairman.

I would like very much to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], also chairperson on the Congressional Black Caucus.

I think, having said what he said, what I would like to now say to my colleague from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] is that we are all deeply appreciative for the work that the gentlewoman has put into this pay equity.

There is no question in my mind that it is long overdue, and necessary. I am just sorry that the debate has taken the form and shape that it has this year, when in reality last year we really did not have a problem with it.

On behalf of those persons that I represent, we are deeply grateful to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] for his input and for pointing out to the Chair of the subcommittee that there was a necessity to include Hispanics in the study, since we have not done a study of this kind since 1923 when less than 5 percent of the work force were minorities and women.

It seems reasonable, as the work force has changed so dramatically, that we do a study and include Hispanics and blacks and other minorities in the study. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the committee, and I am deeply grateful.

I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for yielding and I associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman and congratulate her on her leadership to bring about a study in an area that has long been neglected, as reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. OAKAR was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The last time a study of this type was conducted was 1923.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the confusion that has arisen that is associated with the legislation pending stems from the fact that allegations have been made that the bill would do more than conduct a study. For the purpose of those who are confused by those allegations, would the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] state clearly and succinctly the scope and impact of the legislation that is pending, when enacted?

Ms. OAKAR. As the gentleman knows, I chair a subcommittee related to employee benefits and compensation for Federal workers; no one else. It is those Federal employees who are under the classification system, GS-18 to 1.

Now, many Members are not quite as familiar with that, not being on that committee. We believe very strongly that the Federal work force has changed. As a result, members of the committee on both sides of the aisle voted overwhelmingly last year and again this year, to conduct a study on the classification system of Federal employees.

That is what it is; it does not relate in any way, shape or form to the private sector. I would not want a study on Federal classified employees be applied to the private sector just as when AT&T did their study on their employees, I would not want their study to apply to our classified Federal employees.

□ 1325

We have a responsibility in this Congress because we do in fact set the wages and the benefits of classified Federal employees. We vote on this all the time. We are, indeed, the employers. So we have an obligation, just as every good corporation. Forty-five States have done studies on their State employees, corporations, fine corporations, have done studies on their employees. We have an obligation to do a study on our employees. That is simply what it is, no more, no less.

I hear outrageous assumptions about costs and so forth. The Chair does not think or presume to know the results of the study, and I think there has been an awful lot of exaggeration, an awful lot of misleading on the issue, and I think it is very, very unfortunate.

More essentially, it is unfair to Government employees.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentlewoman on her leadership, and I appreciate her explanation.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear to me that in no way what we are debating today applies to the private sector.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was very impressed by the arguments made momentarily by Mr. GARCIA of New York and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], and the concern that they have for the major change, apparently, in the thinking that the body seems to be exhibiting on the issue of pay equity for women.

I am reminded of an experience I had just several weeks ago when I was driving in my district and saw on the highways a young woman driving in an automobile with a bumper strip, a Reagan-Bush official campaign bumper strip, that said, "Women's equality is pay equity. Reagan-Bush."

It seems to me perhaps some of the people who campaigned on this issue, who tried to tell the American public, if women who may even characterize themselves as feminists, that it was possible for women to support the Reagan-Bush team, because even though there may be some questions about ERA there was no question about where the administration and the Republican Party stood on the issue of equality for women in terms of their compensation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the attitude of the administration was very well stated by the President, and he stated on a number of occasions that he was for equal pay for equal work. Pay equity, as you call it, is comparable worth, comparing eggs with apples, and nobody is for that.

Mr. FAZIO. I would reclaim my time.

The bumper strip was very clear. I think probably it deluded some people into thinking that we would find the same kind of support from the Republican Party now that we found before the election on an issue that is so basic to women of all economic brackets.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. OKAR was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman continue to yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is so basic to women who may have some questions about the other implications of ERA, never had any doubt about the benefits to them, to their children, their families that pay equity would bring about. So I think it is very disturbing that we see this marked change in the views, I think, of Members of the other body and of the other party in this instance on an issue that is so basic to the future of women in this country.

I hope that we would see more than the projected 20 or 30 votes from the other side of the aisle that the gentlewoman estimates to be all we can count on at this time. It would seem to me that without a sizable vote from the Republican Party, we have seen people going back on their political commitments from the last election.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio be given an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but certain comments were made by Members on the other side of the aisle close to characterizing the motivations of Members on this side of the aisle as to the way they are going to vote. Reference has been made three times now, and I think a timely response would be appropriate. I have been waiting here for that. I will not object at this time, but I will object to any further requests for time so that we might have some equality of debate here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman continue to yield to me?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman, my distinguished minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman for undertaking her extensive work on the pay equity issue and for bringing this measure to the floor. I understand the gentlewoman has been trying to meet many of the objections that have been raised to this bill.

So that we are all quite clear, would the gentlewoman state if the fundamental objectives of this bill are to promote equitable pay practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal service? And that this bill does not apply to the private sector, is that correct?

Ms. OAKAR. The gentleman is correct. This study in no way, shape, or form applies to the private sector. And I would oppose the bill if it did.

Mr. GILMAN. And as I understand it, the gentlewoman is about to revise the measure on the floor today to meet some of the further objections that have been raised with regard to the bill?

Ms. OAKAR. The gentleman is correct. As a matter of fact, with the gentleman's help, along with the distinguished minority member of the committee, the leader of the committee on your side of the aisle, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, we have changed the bill initially meeting the objections that were raised during some of our hearings.

For example, we put an economic analysis into H.R. 3008, which is the marketplace factors that some individuals wanted. We revised the membership of the commission to truly make it a bipartisan commission. This was done with the able assistance of Mr. MYERS and other members of the committee like the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentlewoman would yield further, it is our understanding from what the gentlewoman reports that there are some 46 States at the present time studying pay equity and that the Federal Government is yet to undertake its first study.

Ms. OAKAR. Forty-five States have either completed or are in the process of doing studies on their State employees only, and a number of others.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GILMAN and by unanimous consent, Ms. OAKAR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. OAKAR. Forty-five States have either completed or are in the process of completing their studies along with many other fine municipalities. Again, their studies are limited to their own employees, just as our study is limited to classified employees, classified Federal employees, something that we have a responsibility to take a look at.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would yield further, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3008. This bill promotes pay equity

and seems to eliminate certain discriminatory wage-setting practices within the Federal civil service. I feel confident that the legislation addresses the Federal Government's role in providing fair and equitable pay and classification systems for women and men in the Federal work force. Incorporated in H.R. 3008 are the best possible elements required to identify discrimination, if it exists, in the Federal Government. Fair treatment and equality at the worksite are goals every employer and employee should strive to attain. It is as vital today to eliminate discrimination as it was over 20 years ago when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was adopted by this body.

The State of New York and 45 other States have already undertaken action to address the issue of pay equity. Sixteen have initiated or completed studies of their pay systems. The Federal Government's role in pay equity has been far less progressive than the States. It is time for the largest employer in the Nation—our Federal Government—to examine any discrimination practices in its own structure.

H.R. 3008 maintains a high level of objectivity. I believe that the legislation will result in a thorough study of the Federal pay and classification system to determine if they are influenced by discriminatory practices. Such a study has never been conducted in the 60-year history of the classification program. Our Federal workers are entitled to know that they are being treated fairly and that their pay is not subject to discrimination.

Accordingly, in the interests of promoting equitable pay practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal civil service I therefore urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3008, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman. He is a very valuable member of the committee, and I thank him for his questions and his remarks.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, comment was made on this floor a moment ago that because we had such an overwhelming vote a year ago and since there are some new elements to this bill that perhaps the reason now for people changing their minds is related to the racial inclusion or the minority inclusion.

I am sorry that that was injected into the debate here on the floor. I am sorry that this is what the general debate evidently is going to be, to create the atmoshpere for the discussion of this bill.

By the very admission of the chairman of the relevant committee that we have before us bringing this bill, there were things wrong with the bill that we voted for overwhelmingly. I am astonished. If the bill was go good last time that anybody who would now vote against a version of the bill after last year's edition, if that is the reason why we should not even consider a reconsideration of our vote, why they would change one word, one sentence, one phrase. By their very admission, last year's bill was seriously flawed. Some of us believed that there are other flaws existing, and maybe or maybe not those flaws would be taken care of with the amendments.

But to somehow come here and characterize those of us who want to rethink our position, those of us who may have more knowledge now, those of us who may have paid attention to a ninth circuit ruling on the case in the State of Washington, is astonishing.

What we are talking about here is whether the Federal Government will venture into a new area for the Federal Government, whether it will now attempt to devise some sort of subjective system which says that by these criteria which we establish we will determine the ultimate worth of a particular job.

In fact, in this country the marketplace establishes that and has established that. Where we cannot show specific discrimination with respect to a particular job, where people who are of different sexes are being treated differently within the confines of a specific job, where we are not talking about that particular area, we have never tried to determine how you compare one to the other.

I mean, I may think that football players and basketball players are outrageously paid. I once suggested to someone that when I voted for a pay increase for Members of Congress that there was nothing wrong with Members of Congress being paid one-third of what the average person in the NBA is paid.

I told that to a player who happened to be related to a Member of Congress, and he assured me that that was no longer the case because in the ensuing 6 months we were then paid one-fourth of what the average NBA player was paid.

I mentioned that to someone in my district, and the response of the person in the district was, "Yes, but those people are highly talented."

So what I am suggesting here is that it is in the eye of the beholder.

I went home to my son one day, and I said to him, "Did you see what Moses Malone got paid? Two millon dollars a year." And he said, "Yeah, Dad, but he plays 48 minutes a game."

What I am saying is, we have all sorts of quote/unquote disparities from one job to another that I do not think any subjective panel can go out and therefore decide how you make the comparison if what you do is take out the idea of the marketplace making certain decisions.

So let us not have this debate be in terms of rhetoric about Members or against minorities, Members are against women because they don't adopt the plan that the committee has come forward with.

If I had the truth, if I saw the light, I would present it to you here on this floor. I do not see the truth, I do not have the light in all things.

I try to do the best I can with the issues that are before me.

So let us not characterize this as so black and white that if anybody now changes his or her mind from last year they are doing it and activated by some racial motivation or some ill concern for minorities.

That ill serves this House.

I already thought we had the general debate on this issue some time ago. Evidently that general debate created a construct in which the proponents of the bill do not think they can be successful. So now we have a new atmosphere being created here.

I am very sorry to see it. I hope that we will not see it from now on. Let us look at the amendments as they come forward. Let us look at the substance of the bill, let us do what we are paid to do, even though we are not paid as much as people in the NBA or the NFL or the NHL, we are paid for what we do, make well-reasoned judgments on the facts before us as we see them, and let us not use scare tactics on one side or the other.

I thank the Chairman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. If I have any time left I will be happy to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just one quick observation here, and that is, the gentlewoman in her discussion a while ago indicated that this study was kind of an innocuous thing that we should not be concerned about.

A very similar study was alluded to by my colleague from California.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana and by unanimous consent, Mr. LUNGREN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, a similar study was conducted in the State of Washington,

and because of that study a suit was filed and a $1.1 billion judgment was made, and it was subsequently repealed in a higher court. Now I talked to people at the Justice Department, and they told me that there is absolutely no doubt if this legislation passes that a suit will be filed immediately. And we have 30 times the number of employees that they have in the State of Washington.

Mr. LUNGREN. If I can reclaim my time, can the gentleman tell me who was to pay that $1.1 billion? Was it not the taxpayers of the State of Washington?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It was the taxpayers of the State of Washington.

Mr. LUNGREN. So if we are going to talk about something much larger than that, we must presume it is very important and it may very well have severe impact on that person rarely talked about here, the lowly taxpayer.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Exactly.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

□ 1340

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 3008, the Federal Pay Practices Act of 1985.

There are many misconceptions about this bill that I would like to clear up once and for all.

First, it provides only for a study and nothing more. It does not mandate any new pay system. All we are doing here is taking a long overdue look at the pay classification system, something that has not been done for decades, in an attempt to determine if it discriminates on the basis of sex, race, or Hispanic origin. This is all it does, despite some rather reckless allegations to the contrary.

Earlier this year the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, by a recorded vote of 18 to 4, ordered the bill reported with an amendment, requiring a Commission on Equitable Pay Practices to include in its report a determination as to whether any portion of any differential in pay between or among occupations may be discriminatory.

The legislation establishes an 11-member bipartisan Commission consisting of representatives of the administration, the Congress, the Federal employee unions, women's organizations, and civil rights groups.

The Commission, in turn, would hire a consultant to conduct a job content analysis of the Federal pay and classification system.

With the Commission acting as overseer, it is contemplated that the study would take 18 months and would determine whether, or to what extent, the classification and wage systems are affected by discrimination based on sex, race, and Hispanic origin. It will include information on pay differentials between male- and female-dominated occupations.

After completing the study, the Commission will submit it to the President and the Congress, along with recommendations for changes. The Commission will cease to exist within 90 days after submitting its report.

So this bill in no way creates a national pay policy or creates a bureaucracy on pay. It does not set down any policy. All it does is say that we should look into pay practices, with professional help, to determine if there is discrimination.

Frankly, I don't see how anyone can object to this, unless there is something that we are trying to hide.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Federal Government has an obligation to determine whether there is discrimination in its pay practices and what can be done to make the system more responsive to the exigencies of our times.

To oppose this measure is to deny even a professional look into pay practices—to deny an enlightened examination of how we as a government determine whether we are treating people fairly when it comes to how we pay them.

I cannot stress enough that this bill is not going to tell anyone how people will be paid. It does not make any changes in pay. It will provide us with nothing more than a guide on which to base later decisions.

It affects only executive branch employees of the Federal Government, not State and local entities or the private sector. It does not create a pay czar to mandate wages for all American workers. It does not establish a stacked commission that will rubber-stamp findings of a study. It will not set off a wave of lawsuits against the Federal Government.

It will do only one simple thing—allow us to take a hard, cold look at what is going on so that we in this body can determine if we want to make any changes.

To me, that objective seems both fair and necessary.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the chairman of the committee and also the author of the amendment for yielding me this time.

For purposes of this discussion, I have two or three what I consider to be friendly questions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

(On request of Mrs. ROUKEMA and by unanimous consent, Mr. FORD of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FORD of Michigan. If the gentlewoman will permit me to let the gentlewoman from Ohio tell me how to answer them, I will be glad to answer them.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Then I will address them to my good friend from Ohio, and she is my good friend, but she also may know that I have some lingering questions. I listened with interest to your response to Mr. ALEXANDER on the subject of the confusion that has arisen over this bill because of the definition of what is comparable worth and what is pay equity.

So I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Ohio: How do you explain the differences between the two concepts? I ask because I think it is the crux of confusion of many Members of this Congress. Is this comparable worth? If not, what is pay equity, as defined in this piece of legislation? What is the charge of the Commission?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. First of all, comparable worth is not in the legislation.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I understand that.

Ms. OAKAR. And, second, if I wanted to do a comparable worth bill, it would not be done in the way the Civil Rights Commission defined comparable worth.

Part of the misinformation, even about that concept, which I heard on the floor today in a 1-minute speech, is that if you take the disparity between a man's wages and a woman's wages, then it is comparable worth, and it is all due to sex-based wage discrimination. Nobody, not even the most zealous advocate of comparable worth, says that, although the Commission on Civil Rights defined the concept in that way.

But the point is, we are talking about a classification system the highest of Federal employees—not basketball players, football players or corporate people, just our classification system—the highest level is a person who is at a GS-18 level, who makes $67,800. The lowest level is a person at the GS-1 level, making $9,000.

We have to take a look at the classification system because we know that certain categories, for example—and this has nothing to do with comparable worth, by the way—are capped. A nurse, for example, who has a doctorate in immunology working at NIH has a cap level of her salary. She can work 40 years for the Federal Government and never make more than $18,000 a year, and because she is classified as a nurse and not an immunologist, she makes $22,000 less.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I ap-

preciate what the gentlewoman is saying, and it is for that purpose, I think, that the gentlewoman put in a job content analysis definition.

Ms. OAKAR. Right.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. It is, as I understand it, to take into consideration marketplace pressures.

Ms. OAKAR. That is right. We have two factors. We have the marketplace factor, which is the economic analysis. And, by the way, most of the studies done around the country do not include the marketplace factor we do.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Now, I have another question.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has again expired.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. ARMEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I will not object now, but I would like to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that I, too, like others, did not come here today to repeat the general debate on this bill. But since it has begun, I have, I think, been fairly patient awaiting my turn to be recognized. I would hope I will be recognized very soon after this.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, in light of that, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] be allowed to prcceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I think it is perfectly legitimate to reopen this discussion because there has been a change of circumstances since we had this original debate. For example, the court of appeals decision has come up, and that is a significant difference, and that is to the point of my second question.

It appeared to me, when the appeals court made its decision, that this would negate or open to further question, in my mind, whether or not it was wise to have such legislation, and I want to hear the gentlewoman's response to this, because the appeals court has now reversed the decision of Washington State, and therefore it is my understanding that the issue will be appealed to the Supreme Court. Pending a Supreme Court decision, it seems to me that we do not yet know whether the study per se will be used as an avenue for further litigation or prima facie evidence in further litigation. So I would like to hear a response to that.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. If I could reclaim my time, let me comment on that.

The study in Washington, or anyplace else, does not create a new cause of action for anybody. The study was simply cited in evidence during the trial. You may know that United Airlines was successfully sued by its female flight attendents a couple years ago and had to pay several million dollars in back pay. Michigan Bell Telephone Co. a few years ago had a similar problem because of discrimination against female telephone operators.

The cause of action is already there for people. All that the study was used for in Washington was evidence of the fact that in some classifications in Washington certain circumstances exist from which the court in evaluating the evidence drew the conclusion that it constituted a violation of their constitutional rights.

Ms. OAKAR. If the chairman will let me quote from the decision—and you should be relieved by the decision—it says:

> A study which indicates a particular wage structure might be more equitable should not categorically bind the employer who commissioned it.

If anything, that court case should relieve you. But the point is, nobody wants to abdicate a Member of Congress responsibility. We have the responsibility to deal with classified Federal employees, not the courts, and it is not my intention in any way, shape or form to see this study be used as a court case; but, if anything, that court case should relieve you.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand the court of appeals decision. My concern was with the appeal to the Supreme Court and the pending Supreme Court decision and its application to the results of this study.

Ms. OAKAR. First of all, the whole case had a lot more to do with other things than a study.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a comment about the comment of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that this would not precipitate additional litigation.

The Justice Department told me at one of our hearings, committee meetings, that it is very likely that if we pass the comparable worth or pay equity bill, or whatever you want to call it, that there will be immediate litigation. As a matter of fact, I have here from Mr. William Bradford Reynolds, Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, a statement concerning information about this legislation. And on page 5, there are 2 paragraphs I would like to read into the RECORD. It says:

> By mandating a "comparable worth" study of the federal pay structure dependent neither on proof of equal work nor on proof of intentional discrimination, such a bill disregards the long-established principles of pay discrimination under the Equal Pay Act, and goes well beyond the Supreme Court's interpretation of the reach of Title VII in Gunther. In so doing, such a bill gives rise to the very problem Congress sought to avoid in imposing an equal (rather than "comparable") work requirement in the Equal Pay Act.

Then he goes on to say;

> Any such study could be the basis for class-action litigation seeking a judicially mandated restructuring of the Federal Government's pay and classification system.

So litigation is very likely to occur. We have 30 times the number of employees as the State of Washington, and we could conceivably be involved in a $30 billion lawsuit and the taxpayers will bear the brunt of this suit if one should occur, and it very likely will, according to the Justice Department.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

I will get the gentleman some more time.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate that, and I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Did the gentleman say Mr. Reynolds signed that opinion?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I am puzzled by the suggestion that he thinks, as an Attorney General and in a very high position over there, that a citizen can bring suit to force the Congress to do anything. Nobody in the Federal Government in the executive branch has the authority to establish pay, grades, or classifications. We do that by statute. And in the absence of congressional action, you cannot change them.

□ 1355

You can bring action against a member of the Government who was applying them improperly, and that has been done from time to time; as a matter of fact, it happens quite frequently. But you cannot bring a suit against the President and tell him to change it.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would allow me to reclaim my time before it runs out.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman may have an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is granted an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. May I just respond?

I would be very happy to give my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, a copy of this statement and he can read it. I would assume that the U.S. Department of Justice knows a little bit about this problem since they——

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would please allow me to reclaim my time. You know, I am a patient fellow.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be restored to my original 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the Chair. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest. As you may know, I am interested in this bill. I first became interested in this bill when I was not a Member of this body during the 98th Congress, and I have followed it with a great deal of interest and I might add, a professional interest, since I still indeed consider myself a practicing economist.

In any event, I think there was a very interesting and important question that was raised in the early moments of this cryptogeneral debate that we have gotten ourselves into. The question is what has changed from the 98th Congress, when indeed there were only six dissenting votes, to this Congress, where there is some concern that perhaps there may not even be enough votes in favor of this proposition to pass it.

Let me address this question of what has changed. Three things have changed, Mr. Chairman. One, time. If you review the experience of this legislation in the 98th Congress, it came and it went like a fleeting dart. The Members scarcely knew what it was they were voting on. They did not understand the proposition, and they saw it as an issue of social policy and never really had the time to understand it as an economic policy issue.

The second thing that has happened, and I might add, by the way, with respect to that, that time has worked on our side in this case, those of us who are concerned about it as an economic issue. Even when I came back from the July recess and we began to debate and work on this issue, most of the Members saw it as only a harmless study designed to promote social policy, and it was only after hours and hours of persuasion that we were able to get them to understand that this is a very serious economic issue that we are dealing with here. Now that is understood.

Second, experience. Will there be lawsuits? Will there not be lawsuits? The fact is, experience tells us there have been lawsuits. Every time a State legislature has passed a study and received that study, there has been a lawsuit.

Ms. OAKAR. Would the gentleman yield?

Would the gentleman name me the 45 State lawsuits that there are——

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentlewoman would—Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have yielded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] controls the time.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentlewoman would please allow me, because I suffered through a good deal of smoke earlier. If indeed I am creating smoke, let it be my own.

Now, at this point, I am suggesting to the Members look at the experience we have observed. What has it cost the State of Washington already to just find their way back after the lawsuit? How about the State of Illinois where female workers and nontraditional employments had to incur the expense of filing a counterlawsuit to protect the rights to wage increases they had won through normal, collective bargaining practices from the imposition of this kind of bill in Illinois.

So, yes, indeed, our experiences have told us this is a dangerous business we are up to here.

The third thing, of course, is understanding. With the passage of time and the observation of what is really happening in that real world out there, where this kind of a comparable-worth concept is taken too lightly by State legislatures. We understand that it imposes a risk and an expense to the taxpayers, where indeed, even the State will have to incur an enormous expense of taxpayers' money just to prove that they should not be brought under the jurisdiction of such legislation by the courts irrespective of any enacting legislation by the governing bodies of that State. That is the risk that we put the entire government in if we pass this legislation. That is an expense that not only we cannot afford in dollars and sense, but we cannot afford in terms of disruption and discrimination unhappily, against the most courageous and least traditional, most innovative women in the working force today.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to determine whether the Government's position-classification system under chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, and prevailing-rate system under subchapter IV of chapter 53 of such title, are designed and administered in a manner consistent with the general policy, as expressed in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, that sex, race, and ethnicity should not be among the factors considered in determining the rate of pay payable to any individual or for any position.

(b) LINKAGE WITH GENERAL SCHEDULE.—In the performance of any comparisons or analyses pursuant to this Act, subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, under which General Schedule pay rates are established, shall be considered to be part of the position-classification system referred to in subsection (a).

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SIKORSKI

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments.

The Clerk read as follows.

Amendments offered by Mr. SIKORSKI: Page 2, line 8, insert "(1)" before "whether".

Page 2, line 16, strike out "position." and insert in lieu thereof "position; and (2) whether the Government's appointment and promotion practices with respect to individuals applying for or occupying positions covered by either of the systems referred to in paragraph (1) are generally consistent with applicable provisions of law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex, race, or national origin.".

Page 3, line 3, strike out "(a)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)(1)".

Page 4, line 11, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "2(a)(1)".

Page 5, line 17, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "2(a)(1)".

Page 10, line 20, strike out "of this Act," and insert in lieu thereof "set forth in section 2(a)(1),".

Page 11, line 6, strike out "2(a)" and insert in lieu thereof "2(a)(1)".

Page 11, after line 9, add the following:

(c) APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS.—Under the contract, the consultant shall also be required to perform a separate study to carry out the purpose set forth in section 2(a)(2).

Page 12, after line 12, add the following:

The consultant shall also report any findings and conclusions of its study relating to appointment and promotion practices of the Government.

Page 13, line 15, strike out "2(a)" and insert in lieu thereof "2(a)(1)".

Mr. SIKORSKI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, and that they be considered en bloc. I do so because the first amendment goes to section 2, but there are additional technical amendments.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would expand the scope of H.R. 3008 to include a separate study of hiring and promotion practices in the Federal Government to determine whether discrimination exists based upon sex, race, or national origin.

My colleague from Indiana has a substitute amendment which would replace the study set forth in H.R. 3008 with a study of hiring and promotion practices. I disagree with the hiring and promotion study for job content and economic analysis. I do believe, however, that performing a hiring and promotion study is a worthwhile undertaking and would afford the most comprehensive review of possible discrimination in the Federal work force ever undertaken.

It is my intention that the hiring and promotion study should be performed separately from the job content and economic analysis and that the results of the study should be reported separately by the consultant to the Commission on Equitable Pay Practices. The Commission should also set forth any recommendations based upon this part of the study distinct from those which may result from the job content and economic analysis. It is important that the studies proceed independently, since they are designed to review areas of possible discriminatory practices. I have been advised that the same consultant who performs the job content and economic analysis could also undertake the hiring and promotion study without incurring additional costs or requiring a more lengthy study period.

It is also important to note that the hiring and promotion study would include national origin, as well as sex and race. National origin should be interpreted to include those of Hispanic origin and other ethnic groups who may have historically suffered discrimination. In deciding which ethnic groups should be included in the study, the Commission should pay particular attention to applicable court rulings defining the term "national origin." It is my intention that this term be construed as broadly as possible within the limitations of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

By adopting this amendment, we will make certain that H.R. 3008 will result in the most exhaustive analysis of possible discriminatory practices within the Federal civil service ever initiated. The current classification and wage systems have not been the subject of a thorough analysis since they were established in 1923, nor has there been a study of hiring and promotion practices of the magnitude set forth in my amendment. For these reasons, this amendment should be adopted and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

□ 1405

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of entering into a brief colloquy with the floor manager of the bill, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Is it the understanding of the chairwoman that the meaning of the term "national origin" in this amendment includes individuals of all ethnic backgrounds that have been historically discriminated against, such as Italian, Polish, German, Irish, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Yugoslavian, Czechoslovakian, or other ethnic backgrounds?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPINSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Is it also the understanding of the chairwoman that the consultant selected by the Commission will use this meaning of "national origin" while conducting the study mandated under this amendment?

Ms. OAKAR. That is my understanding, yes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]. I stand in strong support of the Sikorski amendment, and ask all my colleagues to support it.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI], and the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. LIPINSKI] as well, for the amendment.

Basically the amendment is a two-part amendment. It includes the amendment that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has filed in the RECORD which is a review of hiring and promotion practices so that it be an integral part of the study. We think that ought not be a substitute for the study but that is important and we accept that.

Second, there are many other individuals besides those mentioned in the legislation that have come before our committee like custom workers, for example, most of whom are men of various origins, that we ought to take a look at, and I want to commend Mr. SIKORSKI and Mr. LIPINSKI for including that area. We really should do an in-depth analysis with respect to the whole issue of national origin.

So, Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. I think it is a good one, and I hope that the members of the minority will agree to accept it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to make sure that I understand this amendment. I have just recently had it placed in my hands.

As I understand it, what we will do, then, is we will divide the study into two parts. One part will deal with the traditional kind of study that I at least tend to associate with comparable worth—the question, as I think is defined very nicely on page 10 of the bill, that we would examine occupations that have numerical predominance of either sex in juxtaposition to one another, and the second part being the part that returns to existing civil rights legislation that addresses the question of equal access to employment opportunity and equal pay for equal work.

May I ask the framer of the amendment, Is my understanding correct?

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the gentleman's question, yes, it is a two-part study. It is presumed to be done by the same consultant, with no additional cost and no requirement for time, and so that the results of the hiring promotion study be reported back to the Commission independently and distinct from the economic analysis or the pay equity portion.

In response to the second thrust of the gentleman's question, the study embraces, as set out in the amendment, the goal of looking at whether the Government's appointment or promotion practices with respect to individuals applying for or occupying positions covered by either of the systems, the civil service systems, is generally consistent with applicable provisions of law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or national origin.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

Mr. Chairman, it does appear, then, that we have, I think, the appearance that there is some change here. But we fall back on a problem, at least to me, with the fact that we would still have the study carried out by that one single consultant who would be employed or chosen by that one single Commission comprised primarily of a biased group of people who are already biased themselves in favor of comparable worth. So we still end up ignoring the numerous studies that have been done, and indeed we still ignore the one that is currently under review within the OPM.

I think the intent of the amendment is a very good intent, and might I suggest that given that you have this concern and have expressed this intent, perhaps this would be an excellent time for us to withdraw this bill from consideration and have the committee return to consideration of that study that is currently on the desk of the Office of Personnel Management rather than to have all of that work that has been undertaken in the 30-some-odd studies totally ignored in this process. Perhaps we do intend to move a little too hastily in this area.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SIKORSKI. If we did that, we would not have the benefit of the gentleman's counsel.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I would just like to observe that I would be happy to get right on with it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I understand that I had yielded to the framer of the amendment.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if this bill does not pass, I would be left with no alternative than to do what I am being pressed, and have been for 2 years, to do, and that is to begin legislating on the issue. I felt that we ought to have this bipartisan commission give us a basis upon which we might do that legislating.

If you want to have a chance to vote here on legislation on classifications, with the women's groups and the chambers of commerce and everybody else fighting in your office and mine about which amendment they want and which one they do not, we can bring you a bill like that, and that would be the alternative to undertaking this 2-year study. We have that kind of legislation pending before the committee, and I have promised the sponsors of the legislation that if we do not have the study, we will take it up.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, neither of us would want to engage in such a disastrous and urgent action.

If I may return to another point, yes, on my part I would like to make this offer. If indeed you did decide to withdraw this bill and go back into the subcommittee and study all of these things, I would be more than happy to come before the committee and provide you with my testimony and give you the benefit of my considerable expertise in the field.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there amendments to section 2?

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] in a colloquy on the bill.

Some of the earlier colloquy I have heard answers some of the concerns I have had about the impact of what this study would do, and I appreciate those earlier comments. You have made it quite clear that this study would have no impact or is not intended to have impact upon the private sector. I would like to ask a further question, and the question is this:

Does H.R. 3008 create a new standard of discrimination or expand the current civil rights law in any way?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, again the answer is no. The purpose of the study is to determine whether the Federal Government's pay and classification systems are being administered in a manner consistent with current laws, which prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, sex, and ethnicity. Any new standard would have to be authorized separately by law. This bill does not authorize any corrective action, should the study show that discrimination in the Federal civil service does exist. I would emphasize to the gentleman that this bill authorizes a study, and a study only of the classified employees of the U.S. Government.

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that response, and I have a final question, if the gentlewoman will continue to respond. On page 15 of the bill, section 10(2)(c) mentions that other factors which are unnamed may be included in an economic analysis of the Federal pay and classification system. Might "other" be considered to include an examination of prevailing market rates as a factor for comparison with Federal wage scales, recognizing that market forces, the competitive market, may be the reason for pay differences?

Ms. OAKAR. I think, yes, that prevailing market rates of pay would be a factor included in the study, as would supply and demand. It is my expectation that these factors would be analyzed by the consultant. Pay scales can reflect the market and be nondiscriminatory.

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for her clarification.

□ 1415

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the bill.

I thought it might be helpful if early in this discussion, I shared with my colleagues the experience that I had as a State senator and have continued to have as a resident of the State of Connecticut with regard to this matter.

We did some years ago pass a bill entitled "the Objective Job Evaluation Bill," precisely the same study that we are considering passing here today, and I hope we will pass with very broad and overwhelming support as we did in the last session of Congress.

We passed that bill in Connecticut and, as a result of its passage, those people who sat at the collective bargaining table representing the State employees in Connecticut had at their fingertips the data that indicated that there was indeed a discrepancy between the compensation offered to certain categories of employees and the skills required to qualify for those jobs and the responsibilities required of those employees.

Now, it is not difficult to understand why there are such discrepancies. Indeed, my colleague from Texas comments about the influence of the market explain why there were discrepancies. Many years ago when women only had the option of applying for two or three jobs out there in the public and the private sector, there was indeed an oversupply for the limited numbers of opportunities that were available for women. Consequently, the base salary in the 1800's and the 1900's started low. Thereafter, and particularly in States where there has been collective bargaining, salary increases were generally granted on an across-the-board percent increase basis. So you started with an unreasonably low base because the market set that low base, because there was discrimination in our society as to what jobs women could apply for. You started from that base, and then a more enlightened society that finally even gave women the remarkable right to vote did allow them all to apply for other jobs. But by this time, you were stuck with pay traditions that reflected a different attitude and outlook many decades ago in our history.

So what we are seeking through this kind of setting is to gain the information that we need to identify those compensation discrepancies that are the result, in fact, of historic bias in our hiring system which allowed the market indeed to distort the established wage practices. Those of us who have been the recipients of that system are well aware of the disadvantage that it put us at.

What happened in Connecticut is even more important than what you believe were the causes of the original situation. What happened in Connecticut was very simply that instead of agreeing to collective bargaining agreements that provided across-the-board wage increases of 2 percent or 3 percent or 4 percent, the negotiators agreed to across-the-board increases of 2 percent, set aside the rest of the money in what they called in "equity pot," and used the "equity pot" to address the identified disparity between compensation and responsibility that resulted from the information brought to life by the study. In the course of about 6 years now, we have rectified the problems that we identified.

It has been rational process, a fair process. It has dealt with very real problems, and it promises a healthier future for all the employees in Connecticut.

What we are trying to do in this study is merely to study the Federal employees, classification system and to

look at those issues, including market education, merit, seniority and all those other things and how they have influenced and do influence current compensation, and to provide ourselves with the information that we need to evaluate whether or not some factors that historically had influenced compensation schedules continue to influence those schedules at this time in our history.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's point of view and I think she has expressed it very well.

There is no question about it, we do look at and understand the tradition and the history of occupational choice and the impact that that has had, giving us the often-cited pay differential.

One of the things that I would admonish the gentlewoman to understand is that, for example, even today as we look at the statistics, that differential if we look at it long enough is diminishing.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. ARMEY, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. JOHNSON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I just wanted to point out that the younger and the unmarried woman worker in America is diminishing this differential to practically nothing.

What I am suggesting as I respond to this is that change is taking place in an orderly fashion, thanks largely to the civil rights legislation we have had earlier. We do have now, as Newsweek pointed out 2 weeks ago, women moving into nontraditional occupations in droves. We see this.

My concern is if we move to the implementation of the recommendations of a study of this nature that we will remove the pay differential that is now the existing incentive for women to make that jump into the nontraditional occupations and we will thwart this movement and it will have the result of more than ever before locking women into traditional female-dominated occupations, but even under more serious circumstances where they suffer even more competition from men for those jobs. Indeed, you would have a risk then of a de facto compromise of their equal access to work which is guaranteed to them under civil rights legislation.

My point is that I certainly do not want to have anyone suppose that I am indifferent to this historical experience. I am very much aware of it, but this legislation cannot resolve history. It can only affect the future and the future impact on all workers in general, but women workers in particular is indeed a very important concern that I have as I address this legislation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to congratulate her on her statement, because I think she raises an important point here today with respect to this debate and that is what has taken place in the State of Connecticut and 44 other States throughout this country in addition to many, many local governments, who have initiated and implemented pay equity studies.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] has again expired.

(At the request of Ms. SNOWE, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. JOHNSON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, it is difficult to understand here today why we have complicated this issue with respect to a job evaluation study of the Federal wage scale, when women are concentrated in lower grades and in some of the lowest salaries offered by the Federal Government.

The fact of the matter is that even the Court of Appeals' decision that was rendered in the AFSCME versus State of Washington, they applauded using job evaluation studies as a diagnostic tool. They applauded employers for using that as a way of evaluating the salaries that are given to employees.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Maine is clarifying that this tool has been used in both the public and private sectors fruitfully; is that correct?

Ms. SNOWE. Absolutely. My understanding, in fact, is that it is predominantly in the private sector as a tool for evaluating.

We compare jobs every day. I do not understand why we have decided to complicate this issue on a study of the Federal wage system. We need to know if discrimination does exist. There is no presumption that it does.

The fact is, I think the court case that was rendered with respect to AFSCME versus Washington made some very important points in our favor.

So I thank the gentlewoman for pointing out to us here today what has taken place in the State of Connecticut. I do not understand why we are so afraid to act when 100 State and local governments have taken such actions. There are no adverse consequences to knowing what is there and what we need to address in future years.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Maine. I appreciate her point.

The purpose of this whole bill is to develop information and certainly a democracy is based on the fundamental belief that education will lead to enlightened decisions.

I think for us to fear the development of information is for us to contradict our own most basic traditions and beliefs.

I would also like to comment, though, on the earlier statement made by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. JOHNSON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. JOHNSON. The comment made by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, earlier that this might interfere with the motivation of women to move into nontraditional jobs is a complicated one.

First of all, I am delighted with the progress women are making, moving into the nontraditional jobs, and I would not for a moment do anything that would undercut their motivation for doing so; however, I do not want them to make that decision because they are underpaid in a job in which they are assuming a great deal of responsibility and that required them to get a lot of education to get that job.

The gentleman also alluded to the fact that in the private sector adjustments are going on and, indeed, they are. One of the problems in the public sector is that we have classification systems that are more rigid, and it is more difficult for those classifications to respond to change in the contemporary world than in the private sector. That is one of the reasons why it is very important that we do this study in order to reflect contemporary knowledge and information and use it to change the classification system, which is more rigid than the compensation system that most companies in the private sector use to determine compensation for their employees.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's point. Indeed, we do want to be very careful about all these things.

I think perhaps the gentlewoman from Ohio used a rather unfortunate example of the kind of problems the gentlewoman is trying to correct. She talked about a Ph.D. who found herself stuck in an $18,000 a year job.

Now, the normal thing that we would expect anybody with the credentials of a Ph.D. to do if they did not like their $18,000-paying job would be to use those credentials to move on to another one.

I would hate to think that we would study the possibility or the feasibility of reworking the entire Federal system in order to relieve Ph.D.'s from the burden of taking their credentials and seeking out another job, perhaps in the private sector. This is indeed the problem that I have encountered many times in the university.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. JOHNSON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman to complete his statement.

Mr. ARMEY. I might also point out that indeed where we have seen this methodology employed, for example, the Willis methodology employed in Washington, we have seen the bias in favor of white-collar workers with as it were paper credentials, as opposed to blue-collar workers with the credentials that one gets in the school of hard knocks or on-the-job training; so we do have risks here of hurting the very people we are most concerned to try to help.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut and the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] and my minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the gentlewoman from Rhode Island, CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER, and others. This is truly a bipartisan bill and we always intended it to be that. I really appreciate the work that they have done on the bill.

I wanted to comment about the gentleman's remarks relative to having women have opportunities in so-called nontraditional jobs. The fact of it is that we have had testimony from a number of States who have implemented their study, like the State of Minnesota. They found that it cost the State payroll less than 1 percent per year phased in over a 4-year period.

One of the interesting things they found was that 15 percent of those individuals who had their salaries adjusted did in fact move into the so-called nontraditional jobs. That was an incentive for them, once their morale and productivity was picked up, because they were treated more fairly. They in fact pursued nontraditional jobs; so in no way does this factor to correct inequities limit the opportunities for women and minorities, and men, for that matter.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

I think it is absolutely true that we cannot shrink from our responsibility to develop information and to develop a fair compensation system because someone might not be motivated to get a different job. We must do what is right and just for our employees.

□ 1430

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. ARMEY, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. JOHNSON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that is an important observation, but yet there is a larger observation because, as we know, as the price of anything goes up there will be less of it purchased, the law of downward sloping demand, one of the first things we generally learn in our economics courses.

Indeed, even in San Francisco, as we know, the mayor of San Francisco had to veto the legislation because she foresaw that the $76 million deficit that would come as a consequence of that to her city would result in a possible layoff of 800 employees. If, indeed, we raise costs, cause inflation, lay off workers, then indeed we reduce employment opportunities for all people, and especially within a rigid system such as ours, the first-in/first-out would probably damage a good many people.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned San Francisco and what the mayor vetoed. What she vetoed was not a pay equity study or changing salaries. She vetoed a meal program. They apparently wanted meals paid and she said no, that was asking a little too much, and that is pretty much what she vetoed.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a further point here, because I know the issue has been raised with respect to what the consequences are of implementing a study of the Federal wage system.

I might suggest that we do not need a study to sue the Federal Government. We do not need a study to sue others. Individuals can initiate those actions on their own, irrespective of any study that might be conducted. So that is the issue here today.

One thing further: I think we are overlooking the major objective, and that is to undertake a study that will analyze why women are concentrated in the lowest grades and in the lowest salary positions in the Federal Government. I think that is a respectable objective that this Congress could support.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be established a commission to be known as the Commission on Equitable Pay Practices.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of—

(1) the Comptroller General of the United States;

(2) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management:

(3) 5 members appointed by the President, of whom—

(A) 2 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives; and

(B) 2 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the majority leader of the Senate in consultation with the minority leader of the Senate; and

(4) 4 members appointed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, of whom—

(A) 2 shall be appointed to represent the respective labor organizations representing (as exclusive representatives) the largest and the second largest numbers of individuals in Government service;

(B) 1 shall be appointed to represent employee organizations having as a purpose promoting the interests of women in Government service and composed primarily of women holding positions covered by either of the systems referred to in section 2(a); and

(C) 1 shall be appointed to represent employee organizations having as a purpose promoting the civil rights of individuals in Government service and composed primarily of minority group members holding positions covered by either of the systems referred to in section 2(a).

To the extent practicable, appointments under this section shall be made with a view toward maintaining a fair balance in the interests represented and the functions to be performed by the Commission.

(c) CONDITIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP.—(1)(A) Members of the Commission appointed under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (b) shall not be officers or employees of the United States.

(B) If any member of the Commission referred to in subparagraph (A) becomes an officer or employee of the United States, that individual may continue as such a

member for not longer than the 15-day period beginning on the date that such individual becomes such an officer or employee.

(2)(A) A member of the Commission appointed under subsection (b)(4) shall be the highest elected official (other than an officer or employee of the United States)—

(i) of the organization (or 1 of the organizations, if that individual represents 2 or more organizations) which that individual represents;

(ii) who agrees to serve.

(B) If any member of the Commission referred to in subparagraph (A) ceases to be the highest elected official from an organization who is eligible to serve on the Commission, that individual may continue as such a member for not longer than the 15-day period beginning on the first day that such individual ceases to be so eligible.

(3) An individual on leave without pay from the Government shall not, for purposes of this subsection, be considered an officer or employee of the United States.

(d) COMPENSATION.—(1) Members of the Commission shall receive no pay on account of their service on the Commission (except as provided in paragraph (2)), but while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(2)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), a member of the Commission appointed under subsection (b)(3) may be paid at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule for each day (including travel time) the member is engaged in the performance of services for the Commission.

(B) A member of the Commission appointed under subsection (b)(3) shall receive no additional pay by reason of service on the Commission for any period during which that individual continues to serve after becoming an officer or employee of the United States.

(e) TIMING OF APPOINTMENTS; QUALIFICATIONS.—All appointments under paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b) shall be made within 20 days after the effective date of this Act and shall be made from among individuals who are especially qualified to serve on the Commission by virtue of their expertise and experience.

(f) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall be subject to any conditions which applied with respect to the original appointment.

(g) CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.—The Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

(h) QUORUM.—Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(i) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair or a majority of its members, but at least once every 2 months.

(j) NONAPPLICABILITY OF LIMITATION.—Appointments under this section shall not be considered for purposes of section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(k) TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after completing the applicable requirements of section 7.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 3?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: In section 3, strike out subsections (b), (c) and (d) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 14 members, of whom—

(1) 7 shall be appointed by the President in consultation with the majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House of Representatives; and

(2) 7 shall be appointed by the President upon the joint recommendation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of the Senate.

To the extent practicable, appointments under this section shall be made with a view toward maintaining a fair balance in the interests represented and the functions to be performed by the Commission.

(c) CONDITION FOR MEMBERSHIP.—(1) Members of the Commission shall not be officers or employees of the United States.

(2) If any member of the Commission becomes an officer or employee of the United States, that individual may continue as such a member for not longer than the 15-day period beginning on the date that such individual becomes such an officer or employee.

(3) An individual on leave without pay from the Government shall not, for purposes of this subsection, be considered an officer or employee of the United States.

(d) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall receive no pay on account of their service on the Commission, but while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

In section 3(e), strike out "paragraphs (3) and (4) of".

In section 3(h), strike out "Six" and insert in lieu thereof "Eight".

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce an amendment to H.R. 3008. My amendment would eliminate the Commission bias, in the bill. The present Commission is obviously stacked in favor of those who would use the comparable worth standard to ratify their current presumption of discrimination. Instead of having a Commission tilted toward one side, I propose that Democrats appoint seven members, and that Republicans appoint seven members.

In H.R. 3008 the President and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management must appoint people from specified groups. The result of this is to set up a loaded Commission.

We should have an open-minded Commission. The appointment of seven members by each party is as fair as possible. How can either party honestly justify more than an equal share for themselves? I hope that all of us can support this evenhanded approach.

This amendment takes an already political process and makes it reasonable. The goal of this amendment is "A fair balance in the interests represented." We should all be in favor of that goal and this amendment.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana because I think that with the exception of committee amendments, we should oppose the various amendments to this bill.

The gentlewoman from Ohio has worked very hard within the committee to make certain that the bill that has come out is a simple, well-balanced bill that is very bipartisan in its approach. The Commission that has been authorized by the bill is a bipartisan Commission with an independent consultant who will, indeed, offer the findings of the Commission to the Congress and to the President in a very unbiased manner.

I feel that we have gone a little astray from what this legislation truly does, and I think the time has come, before we consider any other amendments, to have a pithy explanation of the essential elements of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. LONG] for an explanation of what H.R. 3008 portends to do.

Mrs. LONG. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do think we are getting a little off the track and I would like to go back and review exactly what it is we are talking about.

Today, the House will be completing its consideration of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. This bill is an amended version of legislation which passed in the last Congress by an overwhelming vote of 413 to 6.

H.R. 3008 calls for a study of the Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether discrimination based on sex, race, or Hispanic origin is present. The language contained in H.R. 3008 is consistent with civil rights policies enacted 20 years ago which prohibit sex and race-based wage discrimination. The bill is designed to provide information and guidance to policymakers on pay practices within the Government. As a study of the Federal Government, it will have no effect on any private corporation or any State or local government. The study will use both job content analysis and economic analysis methods of

job evaluation as was recommended by the General Accounting Office.

I think the bipartisan Commission established in the bill is a very fair one. It is responsible for reporting to the President and Congress on findings made by an independent consultant. It is a fair Commission and I think, too, that we are forgetting that this bill is a result of a need demonstrated by the fact that extensive hearings were held on it. We would not be here today working so hard for this were it not for the fact that the need has been demonstrated.

I think that a study is in order. It has been a long time in coming and I certainly commend the staff and the gentlewoman from Ohio for the very hard work she has put into this effort.

Mrs. BOGGS. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and I would like, Mr. Chairman, to say that the bipartisan aspect of this bill was certainly demonstrated by the 18-to-4 vote by which it was reported out of committee.

When we consider that 45 States, including our own State of Louisiana, have indeed undertaken this kind of study that the bill urges, the overwhelming show of support is not surprising. I might say that the gentlewoman from Connecticut and the gentlewoman from Maine represent the north and northeastern part of the United States, and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana and I perhaps represent the southern axis, so we know the bill has nationwide support. It is not surprising that it has this support.

What is surprising is the campaign of distortion that has been waged against the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act. The reaction from the bill's opponents is way out of proportion to what this simple, straightforward and just legislation aims to accomplish—a study to ensure that our civil service wage and classification systems are free of bias.

I urge my colleagues to defeat any amendments that are not committee amendments to this bill.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for his amendment. I know he has worked very hard on this legislation and, of course, I realize that the committee has worked very hard in drafting that bill which will give them exactly what they want. Indeed, that begins in this section of the bill with exactly that Commission they want. One does not have to have a Ph.D. in anything to read this bill and to realize that when we get done with this Commission, we will have six members of the Commission who are already on record as being proponents of the concept of comparable worth and five who may or may not be.

□ 1440

Obviously, there is no desire for a fair commission.

But I was distressed about another thing I heard just a moment ago, the recommendation that we reject all of the amendments that might be offered. It seems to me fairness, which is something obviously we are all clamoring for here, begins with an open mind, a consideration.

Is it possible we do not have the perfect bill? We did not have it in the 98th Congress. We did not have it in the committee and some changes were made. There have been changes brought to the floor by the committee today to make further changes.

Is it conceivable, is it conceivable that some of us who have taken so much of our time and our interests and our expertise to study this bill with respect to its alleged objectives, is it conceivable that some of us might have a better idea, and perhaps those ideas, having been heard, might be acceptable to this body. Or should we just at the outset, before we hear them, draw a conclusion that we will accept none of them?

Let me talk about a couple of other points. Will this be confined to the Federal sector or not? Eleanor Smeal does not think so. Eleanor Smeal said at a press conference called by the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. OAKAR, Eleanor Smeal said first the Federal Government, then we will move on the private sector.

And in yesterday's New York Times, the distinguished gentlewoman is quoted as saying that she believes the Federal Government should be a bellweather for the private sector. I understand that there is legislation regarding the private sector that has already been submitted to this body.

Yes; we have real concerns about the extent to which this idea spreads. You know, I have been a student of the behavior of the private sector, and going back at least to World War II, one of the things we can see is every bad habit you see, every bad business practice you see in the private sector is an idea they have gained from the public sector, from the Government. And this looks like the genesis of another bad idea for the private sector.

Is there widespread support? In a poll taken just last July, we find that over 80 percent of the women that were polled favor enforcement of existing civil rights legislation and only 18 percent would choose the passage of additional laws.

I am suggesting to you that not only do the Members of this body have a better understanding of this legislation, but the public at large understands this legislation and in particular, the working women of America understand this legislation, and they do not want this legislation.

But if indeed the legislation should be passed, let us at least examine the amendments and see if it is possible that we might find a way to make it less pernicious to the public interest.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to follow up on one comment you made, and that is that this is going to be the catalyst for legislation involving the private sector on the comparable-worth issue. I just wanted to get your opinion on what that would do, as an economist, to the entire private sector, and whether or not this would end up in socializing the private sector to a degree?

Mr. ARMEY. Well, yes, as a matter of fact, and it is because I am an economist that I have been concerned over this legislation. One, it will be inflationary, irrespective of any testimony to the contrary. One of the best definitions is paying people more money for the same or less work. This will do that. And two, it will be disruptive.

But more than anything else, it will give an agency or an organization of the Federal Government the authority to set wages by job classification, and that is a dangerous precedent for us to set in the public sector.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has expired.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 30 additional seconds.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, in fairness, I would ask my friend not to object at this point.

Mr. ROBINSON. With all due respect, I have heard enough. I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for 30 seconds.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I do not understand the gentleman's concern about this, but he has the right to object.

My concern is that we are heading in a direction where we are going into uncharted waters, and nobody in this country wants to see socialism. When you start putting a Government agency or commission in charge of deciding what different jobs are worth, I think you are treading in very precari-

ous waters, and I think this is a mistake. That is one of the reasons I pursued this with the previous speaker.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, as a capitalist Member of Congress.

Let me just say that one of the things we did was work out a compromise with my friend from Indiana.

In the original bill last year, which was passed overwhelmingly, the makeup of the Commission was comprised of five labor organizations representing Government workers and OPM.

This year, with the help of the minority leader of the committee, we changed the makeup of the Commission. The Commission's current composition ensures that it is a balanced group representing all interests. As outlined in the bill, the Commission would consist of the Comptroller General of the United States, who, by the way, is appointed by the President; the Director of the Office of Personnel and Management, who, by the way, is appointed by the President; five members appointed by the President, two upon recommendation from the Speaker, two upon recommendation from the majority leader of the Senate. After consulting with the minority leaders of both bodies, four members appointed by the Director of OPM, again appointed by the President, representing Federal labor groups, women's groups, representing federally employed women and civil rights organizations with an interest in Federal employees.

The bill also stipulates that the members of the Commission should have expertise and experience in Federal compensation practices.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], my friend, would base the selection of the Commission on party affiliation, ensuring that the Commission would be partisan. We do not want to do that.

In addition, the Commission proposed by my friend from Indiana would preclude participation by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and the Comptroller General of the United States. OPM has responsibility for Federal personnel practices and policies and should be represented on the Commission. The GAO has the experience and expertise because of its prior work in this area to facilitate the study.

Furthermore, the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] does not require or recommend that the Commission members be experienced in conducting studies of this nature. So the gentleman's amendment, which was previously rejected by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and disrupts the nonpartisan balance of the present composition of the Commission, is unacceptable.

I therefore urge the rejection of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] because frankly we changed the makeup of the Commission in compliance with my friend from Indiana, Mr. MYERS.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Rhode Island [Mrs. SCHNEIDER].

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I thank my colleague for yielding. I would like to commend her on her reasonable approach and her analytical and thorough assessment of the makeup of this Commission, because I think it has been a point of some confusion.

I also want to congratulate the gentlewoman for her willingness to compromise and to come forward with what I believe to be one of the most fair and equitable approaches to structurally providing a mechanism whereby we can accomplish the ultimate goal, and that is of doing a study. So I commend my colleague, and I likewise urge the defeat of this amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank my friend.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I am happy to yield to the minority leader of the subcommittee.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank my Chair for yielding. To confirm what she has said, the original bill that you did introduce was unsatisfactory as far as I was concerned in composition. I must admit, if I had sole responsibility of appointing a commission, this would not be the composition of a commission that I would appoint. However, this was a compromise. It is not what you would have liked, either. The authors of this legislation did not like this, either.

But since legislation is an art, if that is what it is, of compromise, it is the best that either side could come out with.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has expired.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] be given 2 more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I suppose I may border on the facetious here, and I certainly do not mean to. I take this as a very serious subject. But we have heard so much talk about compromise, and we combine that talk with fairness and, of course, we all like compromise, and we all like fairness. But look at what we are talking about here.

First of all, we have a committee that has a disproportionate number of members on your side of the aisle to the membership in the House, and so in effect you outnumber us. And we have a committee that has a sense of unified position with a minority of members of that committee taking that position, which is generally the case.

So in effect, what we have done is to obtain a majority compromise with a minority to create a commission that has a majority of membership that represents the point of view of the majority of the committee, and that, in my estimation, is hardly a fair compromise.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I would like to correct one thing on the record. I believe that the ratio of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is below the ratio in the House. We have one more Republican to Democrat than we should have, but as the chairman, I have no objection to it because I have full confidence in the Republican Members of that Committee. And nobody on my side has complained that the Republicans are theoretically overrepresented on the committee.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. I just wanted to say one of the things that we attempted to do in working closely with the minority Members was to have witnesses who opposed the bill and those who are for the bill appeal at our hearings, and we tried to be eminently fair about it. Frankly, it is true that I had the votes to work my will through the committee, but I do not think we should operate that way. That is why we worked out this compromise, and I think the Commission is not drafted the way I would have wanted. But it is a compromise. It was equally compromised in this case, and I appreciate my distinguished minority leader yielding on that.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. If you would please, I would like to at least reclaim my face a little bit. I think the distinguished chairman of the committee made a very good point and I commend him for his failure to raise an objection to that. This is indeed one of the few committees, and I did not realize there were any committees where such ratios existed. And I have to say in all fairness, you did get me on that one.

But, in fact, on the committee, the majority of the members do, indeed, support the comparable-worth concept, and a compromise worked out by the committee membership, as evidenced by the number of Republicans speaking on behalf of the bill. We are still a little edgy and I appreciate it.

I do want to be sure that we do not make too big a thing of a compromise with the odds stacked in that favor.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Reclaiming my time, I do not think necessarily because you have a majority and a minority party, that there must be differences of opinion. There need not be an adversary and a proponent in every case.

There are going to be some areas here, and as I researched it, there are some areas that I do not agree with in the legislation and we have talked about it. But again, this legislation was a compromise. It is not the ideal.

But I am going to talk about this later. This is certainly not the dangerous bill that some have portrayed it to be, and I am concerned and alarmed by the misrepresentation by some organizations throughout the country and some from within this body.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I will submit for the RECORD, as long as one organization has been mentioned, a list of 31 different women's organizations from the League of Women Voters, to the American University Professors and the National Commission on Working Women, which endorse H.R. 3008. The list shows a real cross section of women across this country who suport this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that for the RECORD:

The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues.
The Congressional Black Caucus.
The Congressional Hispanic Caucus.
AFL-CIO.
The National Federation of Business and Professional Women.
National Education Association.
American Nurses Association.
League of United Latin American Citizens.
National Political Congress of Black Women.
Amercian Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO.
American Association of University Women.
Communication Workers of America, AFL-CIO.
Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO.
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.
Federally Employed Women.
National Federation of Federal Employees.
National Women's Political Caucus.
League of Women Voters.
National Commission on Working Women.
Mexican American Women's National Association.
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.
Public Employees Department, AFL-CIO.
Industrial Union Division, AFL-CIO.
Women's Equity Action League.
National Organization for Women.
National Treasury Employees Union.
Americans for Democratic Action.
American Civil Liberties Union.
International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL-CIO.
National Committee on Pay Equity.
Federal Managers Association.
National Association of Social Workers.

□ 1455

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. And I do not belong to a single one of those organizations, but I still support the legislation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Burton amendment. I had not intended to speak on its behalf, but due to the debate that has just transpired, I thought it might be educational for the Members of this body to see just what this Commission is composed of.

Remember that there are going to be a total of 11 members. Two of those members are going to be appointed upon the recommendation of the Speaker of the House; one would assume that those two members would be predisposed to voting in favor of the gentlewoman from Ohio's idea about what comparable worth is.

Four are going to be appointed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. On the surface, one would think that they might be open minded and fair; but when we look at the four that the Office of Personnel Management director must appoint, we see a different story. We find out that two of those members must represent the respective labor organizations representing, the largest and the second largest number of individuals in Government labor unions. One shall be appointed to represent the employee organization, having as a purpose promoting the interests of women in Government service, and composed primarily of women holding positions covered by either of the systems referred to. One shall be appointed to represent employee organizations having as a purpose promoting the civil rights of individuals in government service, and composed primarily of minority group members.

Now, these four members that the Director of OPM is going to appoint are honest individuals; they are individuals of highest integrity; but the very fact that they represent labor organizations and organizations of this type indicate they are going to be predisposed to make recommendations that may not be nonbiased in the truest sense of the word.

Therefore, I think that Mr. BURTON's amendment to appoint a more equitable and fairer Commission should be supported and we should vote in favor of it.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I find an interesting sort of an anomaly involved in me constantly defending the Republicans here today, but the implication of what is being said is that if you have seven Democrats and seven Republicans appointed by some test that establishes that fact, that the Republicans would not appoint anyone who is a representative of a labor organization, representing Government employees, and the Republicans would not appoint anybody from an employee organization promoting the interests of women, and the Republicans would not appoint anybody representing employee organization promoting civil rights.

Now I submit that that is not what the experience we have had with Republican nominations to commissions of this kind is, and I think it is unfair to suggest as some have that the makeup of the commission indicates that these would be more Democrats than Republicans.

For that reason, I rise to the defense of the Grand Old Party, which is having enough trouble these days.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think the point that my colleagues were trying to make was that because the selections by OPM and by the President would be limited to certain categories, that the Commission would be stacked; and my amendment says seven Republicans and seven Democrats, and gives the President a lot more latitude in who he can pick.

Now I have a great deal of confidence in the President's judgment, and I am sure that the people he picks are going to have expertise in this area; he is not going to just pick somebody off the street.

So seven Republicans and seven Democrats would give us a fair Commission, I feel confident.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. The gentleman does not believe that he can find a Republican woman associated with women's rights or a member of a minority group associated with civil rights who is a Republican?

51-059 O-86-45 (Pt. 19)

Phyllis Schlafly would not take very kindly to what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Do not put words in my mouth.

Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. One of the groups involved is the National Federation of Business and Professional Women. When last checked, that was a woman president, a Republican woman. Open and overt. Practices it in public.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am sure that there are going to be some competent people picked for that Commission, as it is currently preceived.

What I am saying is, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] said earlier, that the selections are so limited that it is bound to be stacked if we follow the proposed legislation.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I hesitate to prolong this, Mr. Chairman, but I think if you had seven and seven you would have a deadlock and probably not accomplish anything; maybe that is what is wanting to be done here, but in fairness, if you want anything at all you almost have to have one over a balance; one way or the other. I do not know which way this will roll out; I will suspect it will roll out the way that the proponent of this amendment is suggesting.

Nevertheless, the minority members, if they are unsatisfied or dissatisfied with the report, can always write minority views as we do in committee. My goodness, we get rolled here all the time as minority Members, but we have every right to still write minority views; and then we, after the report comes back to us, we as individual Members of this Congress, if we ever have to act on the suggestions from this report, then we can side with the minority if we want, or you in the majority can side with the minority, or we can side with the majority; but at least every view will be expressed, and we are not precluded from doing so.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for those comments, and I would simply like to observe that this Commission's final product, it seems to me, will have more credibility if it is on its face made up of people selected by the President because of the positions of presumed knowledge and background that they have than because of their particular party preference.

In the one case the gentleman has them branded right off the bat as people who got their jobs because they could be identified with one of the two major political parties, as distinguished from people who were selected because they run the Office of Personnel Management or they run the GAO or anything else.

It just does not seem rigth to denigrate this kind of a Commission, which we are trying to give the outline of and the structure of a group that would have credibility when you look at the report, that they know what they are talking about; that they know how to develop something like this that will mean something.

I would not like to legislate and have somebody, say by a 7-to-5 vote, the Democrats decided that this recommendation ought to be done with this class, and by a 7-to-5 vote the Republicans decided something else.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FORD of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The gentleman brought up one interesting point in your comments just now, Mr. Chairman, and you mentioned the GAO. There is going to be a member of the GAO possibly serving on the Commission.

My question is, if you have a member of the GAO serving on the Commission, how can they be expected to audit the Commission if requested to do so by Congress? Is not that a conflict of interest?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. If I said that, I misspoke. I am not talking about a member of GAO or an employee of GAO sitting on the Commission.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think the bill provides that a member of the GAO can be appointed to the Commission. Is that not correct?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Well, the Comptroller General will designate a person, and presumably somebody he knows.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the chairman will yield further, I am not trying to raise a red herring here. I feel there would be a possible conflict of interest if there was somebody from GAO on that Commission and we wanted to have an audit. How would it be done?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Well, the President appoints the Comptroller General, and I am sure that if he thought there was any conflict of interest going on, he would take care of it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there further discussion?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 272, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—150

Archer	Gregg	Packard
Armey	Grotberg	Parris
Badham	Hammerschmidt	Pashayan
Bartlett	Hansen	Porter
Barton	Hartnett	Quillen
Bateman	Hendon	Ridge
Bentley	Henry	Ritter
Bereuter	Hiler	Roberts
Biaggi	Holt	Rogers
Biliraki	Hopkins	Roth
Bliley	Hubbard	Rowland (CT)
Boulter	Huckaby	Rudd
Broomfield	Hunter	Saxton
Brown (CO)	Hyde	Schaefer
Broyhill	Ireland	Schuette
Burton (IN)	Kasich	Schulze
Callahan	Kemp	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Kindness	Shaw
Carney	Kolbe	Shumway
Chandler	Kramer	Shuster
Chappie	LaFalce	Siljander
Cheney	Lagomarsino	Skeen
Coats	Latta	Slaughter
Cobey	Lent	Smith (NE)
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Smith, Denny (OR)
Coleman (MO)	Lewis (FL)	Smith, Robert (NH)
Combest	Lightfoot	Smith, Robert (OR)
Courter	Livingston	Snyder
Craig	Loeffler	Solomon
Crane	Lott	Spence
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Stangeland
Daub	Lujan	Strang
DeLay	Mack	Stump
DeWine	Madigan	Sundquist
DioGuardi	Martin (IL)	Sweeney
Dornan (CA)	Martin (NY)	Swindall
Dreier	McCain	Taylor
Duncan	McCandless	Thomas (CA)
Eckert (NY)	McCollum	Vander Jagt
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Vucanovich
Emerson	McGrath	Walker
Evans (IA)	McMillan	Weber
Fawell	Michel	Whitehurst
Fiedler	Miller (OH)	Whitley
Fields	Miller (WA)	Whittaker
Franklin	Molinari	Wortley
Frenzel	Monson	Young (FL)
Gallo	Moorhead	Zschau
Gekas	Nielson	
Goodling	O'Brien	
Gradison	Oxley	

NOES—272

Ackerman	Boner (TN)	Collins
Akaka	Bonior (MI)	Conte
Alexander	Bonker	Conyers
Anderson	Borski	Cooper
Andrews	Bosco	Coughlin
Annunzio	Boucher	Coyne
Anthony	Boxer	Crockett
Applegate	Breaux	Daniel
Aspin	Brooks	Darden
Atkins	Bruce	Daschle
AuCoin	Bryant	Davis
Barnard	Burton (CA)	de la Garza
Barnes	Bustamante	Dellums
Bates	Byron	Derrick
Bedell	Carper	Dicks
Bellenson	Carr	Dixon
Bennett	Chapman	Donnelly
Berman	Chappell	Dorgan (ND)
Bevill	Clay	Dowdy
Boehlert	Clinger	Downey
Boggs	Coelho	Durbin
Boland	Coleman (TX)	Dwyer

Dymally	Lehman (FL)	Roe
Dyson	Leland	Roemer
Eckart (OH)	Levin (MI)	Rose
Edgar	Levine (CA)	Rostenkowski
Edwards (CA)	Lipinski	Roukema
English	Lloyd	Rowland (GA)
Erdreich	Long	Roybal
Evans (IL)	Lowry (WA)	Russo
Fascell	Luken	Sabo
Fazio	Lundine	Scheuer
Feighan	MacKay	Schneider
Fish	Manton	Schroeder
Flippo	Markey	Schumer
Florio	Martinez	Seiberling
Foglietta	Matsui	Sharp
Foley	Mavroules	Shelby
Ford (MI)	Mazzoli	Sikorski
Ford (TN)	McCloskey	Sisisky
Fowler	McCurdy	Skelton
Frank	McDade	Slattery
Frost	McHugh	Smith (FL)
Fuqua	McKernan	Smith (IA)
Garcia	McKinney	Smith (NJ)
Gaydos	Meyers	Snowe
Gejdenson	Mica	Solarz
Gephardt	Mikulski	Spratt
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	St Germain
Gilman	Mineta	Staggers
Glickman	Mitchell	Stallings
Gonzalez	Moakley	Stark
Gordon	Mollohan	Stenholm
Gray (IL)	Montgomery	Stokes
Gray (PA)	Moody	Stratton
Green	Moore	Studds
Guarini	Morrison (CT)	Swift
Gunderson	Morrison (WA)	Synar
Hall (OH)	Mrazek	Tallon
Hall, Ralph	Murphy	Tauke
Hamilton	Murtha	Tauzin
Hatcher	Myers	Thomas (GA)
Hawkins	Natcher	Torres
Hayes	Neal	Torricelli
Hefner	Nelson	Towns
Heftel	Nichols	Traficant
Hertel	Nowak	Traxler
Hillis	Oakar	Udall
Horton	Oberstar	Valentine
Howard	Obey	Vento
Hoyer	Olin	Visclosky
Hughes	Ortiz	Volkmer
Hutto	Owens	Walgren
Jacobs	Panetta	Watkins
Jeffords	Pease	Waxman
Jenkins	Penny	Weaver
Johnson	Pepper	Weiss
Jones (NC)	Perkins	Wheat
Jones (OK)	Petri	Whitten
Jones (TN)	Pickle	Williams
Kanjorski	Price	Wilson
Kaptur	Pursell	Wirth
Kastenmeier	Rahall	Wise
Kennelly	Rangel	Wolf
Kleczka	Ray	Wolpe
Kolter	Regula	Wylie
Kostmayer	Reid	Yates
Lantos	Richardson	Yatron
Leach (IA)	Rinaldo	Young (AK)
Leath (TX)	Robinson	Young (MO)
Lehman (CA)	Rodino	

NOT VOTING—12

Addabbo	Early	Marlenee
Brown (CA)	Gingrich	Savage
Dickinson	Kildee	Wright
Dingell	Lungren	Wyden

□ 1520

Mr. COMBEST changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. ERDREICH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to section 3? If not, the Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) DIRECTOR; TECHNICAL ADVISORS; DETAILS FROM OTHER AGENCIES.—(1) The Commission—

(A) may appoint and fix the pay of a director without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, except that the rate of basic pay payable to the director may not be equal to or exceed the rate payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule; and

(B) shall procure the services of not less than 3 and not more than 5 experts under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, to serve as a source of technical advice for the Commission.

(2) Upon request of the Commission, the head of an agency may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act.

(b) HEARINGS; OBTAINING INFORMATION; SUBPOENA POWER; MAIL; SUPPORT SERVICES.—(1) The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(2) The Commission may secure directly from any agency any information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Commission, the head of such an agency shall, to the extent permitted by law, furnish such information to the Commission.

(3)(A) The Commission may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(B) If a person issued a subpoena under subparagraph (A) refuses to obey such subpena or is guilty of contumacy, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which the hearing is conducted or within the judicial district within which such person is found or resides or transacts business may (upon application by the Commission) order such person to appear before the Commission to produce evidence or to give testimony relating to the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as contempt thereof.

(C) The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures for the United States district courts.

(D) All process of any court to which application may be made under this section may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(4) The Commission may use the United States mails, and receive administrative support services from the administrator of General Services, in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies.

(5) Any member of the Commission may, if so authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take under this subsection.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3008, the equitable pay practices in the civil service.

I commend Representative MARY ROSE OAKAR for sponsoring this important measure and I would like the record to show that I was a cosponsor of Representative OAKAR's original measure this session, H.R. 27. Unfortunately, I missed the chance to have my name listed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3008.

Mr. Chairman, according to the Census Bureau, the average earnings for year-round, full-time female workers were only 66 percent of the earnings of men. Women employed by the Federal Government earn an average of 62.8 percent of the wages of their male counterparts. In addition, Office of Personnel Management data indicate that women working in the Federal Government are concentrated in fewer occupations than are men, and that these positions are ranked at lower grade and pay levels. This data are quite startling.

We cannot merely assume away the possibility that these wage gaps are the result of discrimination. Certainly we owe it to our Federal employees to explore this issue. There has never been a full and complete study of the Federal pay and classification system since its inception and, like many of my colleagues, I believe it is time we had such a study.

H.R. 3008 mandates such a study—a study to determine whether Federal employees are affected by discrimination on the basis of sex, race, or ethnic origin.

Only Federal job classifications will be studied and the recommendations will be limited to the Federal civil service. The study will be conducted by an 11-member bipartisan Commission which, after 18 months, will report its findings and recommendations. I do not believe that this study will be an easy one to conduct. The issue of discrimination and the ways by which it can be measured are admittedly difficult. But we should not shrink from a challenge to explore what is clearly evidenced by the Census and Office of Personnel Management data.

With the Commission's report, Congress will be provided with a complete and accurate review of the wage gap which exists between men and women in the Federal civil service and whether that gap is the result of factors of sex, race, or ethnicity. If the Commission finds that the Federal civil service is marked by discrimination, Congress should move quickly to end it. As already stated by many of the propo-

nents of this measure, equity and fairness must continue to be our goal.

I again commend Representative OAKAR and the other members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for bringing this important measure to the floor.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KINDNESS

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KINDNESS: On page 8, line 23, strike the language beginning with the word "that" through to "Commission" on line 24, and insert in lieu thereof: "to which the Commission is entitled under subsection (b)(2)"

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Chairman, this will not take very long. If I may just take a moment to focus on it, I appear before the committee at this point as a watchdog from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to limit the materials that can be required to be produced pursuant to a subpoena issued by the Commission to that kind of information to which the Commission is entitled under existing law under the preceding paragraph under which they are authorized to request information.

I think it is questionable whether a temporary commission should have subpoena power, to begin with; and as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary I do concern myself with such things, but I am satisfied that the Commission does have, under the terms of this bill, to go to court in order to enforce a subpoena, and there is an opportunity at that point for anyone questioning the scope of the subpoena to have a hearing. Therefore, I do not feel that the subpoena power is excessive here. I would only have questioned initially whether a temporary commission should have such subpoena power at all.

This amendment, however, Mr. Chairman, does not go so far as to question that subpoena power, but only to limit it to that information to which the Commission is entitled under existing law. I believe it is important for the amendment to be offered and for the bill to be corrected in this respect because we are dealing essentially with personnel records here. The Privacy Act comes into play, the Freedom of Information Act interplays with the Privacy Act, and we want to be assured that personnel records of Government employees are sufficiently protected in accordance with existing law and that we do not create an exception here.

I have discussed the amendment with the gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentleman from Indiana on each side of the aisle, and I would yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say to the gentleman that I agree with his analysis. It was never the intent of the legislation to in any way go beyond the existing law. So I am certainly willing to accept the amendment. It is a reasonable amendment. I would be happy to accept it.

Mr. KINDNESS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINDNESS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. The minority does accept the amendment. As the gentlewoman from Ohio has said, it was never the intent of the committee to ever give any extra authority to the Commission, and what the gentleman is doing here was the intent of the committee but the gentleman clarifies and certainly limits that authority to subpoena, and we support it.

Mr. KINDNESS. I thank the gentleman for that support.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if I might inquire of the gentleman, when he limits the Commission to subpoena authority to information they are entitled to under law, does that prohibit them, then, from making a subpoena to obtain information from the private sector, from private-sector employers?

Mr. KINDNESS. The Commission is authorized under subsection (b)(2) to request information from any agency to enable it to carry out this act, so it is limited to the purposes of this act and information that is in the possession of any agency of the U.S. Government; therefore, it does not reach the private sector.

Mr. ARMEY. Is the gentleman satisfied that that limits it to the Federal Government, as opposed to State and local governments?

Mr. KINDNESS. I understand the meaning of "agency" to be codified in title 5 of the United States Code, whereas it is defined very specifically to include the agencies of the U.S. Government and does not include State or local government agencies or any private entity.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KINDNESS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to section 4? If not, the Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. CONSULTANT.

(a) LIST OF QUALIFIED CONSULTANTS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and, as soon as practicable after the Commission is established, submit to the Commission a list of at least 5 consultants which, on the basis of their impartiality, expertise, and experience, the Comptroller General considers appropriate to conduct the study under this Act. Selections under this subsection shall be made in accordance with the laws and regulations governing procurements by agencies generally.

(b) FINAL SELECTION.—The selection of a consultant to conduct the study under this Act shall be made by the Commission from among the consultants included on the list prepared under subsection (a).

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, one of which is to section 6, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ARMEY: Page 10, strike out lines 4 through 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5. CONSULTANTS.

(a) LISTS OF QUALIFIED CONSULTANTS.—(1) The President, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the committee of employee representatives under paragraph (2) shall each prepare and, as soon as practicable after the Commission is established, shall each submit to the Commission a list of at least 5 consultants which, on the basis of their impartiality, expertise, and experience, are considered by the authority involved to be appropriate to conduct a study under this Act. Selections by each authority under this subsection shall be made in accordance with the laws and regulations governing procurements by agencies generally and shall be made by each such authority acting independently of the others.

(2) In order to prepare one of the lists under this subsection, there shall be established by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management a committee consisting of 3 individuals, each of whom shall be the highest elected official (agreeing to serve) from the employee organization representing (under exclusive recognition of the Government) the first, second, and third highest numbers of Federal employees, respectively. An individual shall not be deemed to be an employee of the Government, and shall not receive pay, by reason of being a member of the committee.

(b) SELECTION OF 3 CONSULTANTS TO PERFORM INDEPENDENT STUDIES.—(1) The Commission shall select 3 consultants under this subsection, with 1 consultant being selected from each of the lists prepared under subsection (a). Each consultant so selected shall (acting independently of the other 2 consultants) conduct a study in accordance with the requirements of section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 6. STUDY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) METHODOLOGY.—In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Commission shall provide, by contract with each of the consultants selected under section 5(b), for the conduct of

Page 11, strike out lines 14 through 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) a copy of the report prepared by each of the consultants selected to perform a study under this Act; and

(2) comments of the Commission relating to each such report.

(b) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED IN EACH CONSULTANT'S REPORT.—Included in each report referred to in subsection

Page 13, line 19, strike out "the" and insert in lieu thereof "each".

Page 13, line 20, insert "accompanying" before "comments,".

Mr. ARMEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, because I want to make sure I have all copies of the amendments we are talking about here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] reserves a point of order on the amendments.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's concern is that she has both amendments. They are here. The amendment to section 5 relates to the consultants, and the other relates to the study requirements. I believe the gentlewoman should have them together. They should be attached to one another.

Mr. Chairman, my problem here is with respect to the use of only one consultant and the methodology that would be applied. Instead of using only one consultant, this amendment would use three consultants acting independently. The President, the Controller General and a group of employee representatives chosen from the three largest Federal employee unions will each prepare a list of five consultants based upon experience and expertise. From those three groups of five, the Commission will choose one from each group. Each consultant acting independently will conduct a study in accordance with the requirements of section 6.

Now, the reason I offer these amendments is that, indeed, as a professional economist who has done considerable research in this area, I realize how subjective such work must necessarily be. Indeed, it is very difficult to come up with a scientific methodology by which we could conduct such studies. I think, if nothing else, the Willis methodology employed in Washington State demonstrates the dangers of such subjectivity and the extent to which even the criteria employed by a single consultant might have a substantial bias in favor of one work classification as opposed to another. In this case, blue-collar workers were considerably disadvantaged by the methodology of this single consultant. In this case, we would have three studies. As we employed these three studies, we could use various methodologies and various forms of empirical data bases. I am very concerned about the extent to which the data itself can be objectively obtained. But to the extent that we are able, we should have every possible effort.

□ 1535

Now, as I looked at the Commission's makeup and the amendment we just passed, I am concerned that we would still have a Commission that has a membership that has a bias in favor of the comparable worth concept. Who would they select for that one consultant? I am deeply concerned that indeed they may select, for example, Mr. Willis.

If Mr. Willis, whose name has gotten around and who is probably the most well known consultant in this area were to be selected, he would carry that bias that he displayed in his methodology in Washington State against blue-collar workers into the Federal level. I think this would be a terrible disadvantage for large numbers of workers, and end up with difficulties like we have seen for example in the Illinois case, where female employees were compelled to file a countersuit to assure that their rights would not be overridden by the methodology.

The empirical base is extremely important. Where does it come from? As we consider this bill and review the hearings that have been before it, I am concerned about the large quantities of research and study that have been done largely from the academic community with respect to such things as time use analysis and so forth, that have been overlooked already. I see no evidence of a great deal of research that has been carried out in this whole area from across the Nation, having been presented in the Willis methodology.

Indeed, what bothers me most about the Willis methodology is that it seems that Mr. Willis is more of a practitioner of scenario than he is of science. We run that risk.

In this case, we have three alternative consultants from whom we could compare results and come up with some kind of an analysis, one even regarding the feasibility and the possibility of achieving any degree of science in this whole area. We would avoid the possibility of the procedures necessarily locking us into a consultant and a methodology that would automatically come to a conclusion. These are the kinds of things I think we need to do.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. ARMEY. The proponents have emphasized that they want only a study. What I am suggesting then is let us get the maximum opportunity for science to be involved in that study. I am afraid this bill does not present that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] insist on her point of order?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, just to make sure, are we speaking of the Armey amendment No. 38?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chairman understands that is the one the Clerk read; yes.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the gentleman in our committees and elsewhere indicate that he considers himself to be the most fiscally conservative Member of this body. I think I have heard him say that with some sense of pride, and he has been rapidly, since the first of the year, convincing me that that is true. I am somewhat shocked.

Here we authorize people to go out and spend money to hire a consultant. Now that means a consulting firm. I do not know how many people it is going to be, what it is going to cost, but we have been hiring consultants with my committees and I want to tell you, they do not come cheap.

Here the gentleman wants us to hire three companies to do this for the Commission. There is no committee around here that has the gall to try to hire three sets of consultants at one time. We just never would get that through the House Administration Committee. So what he does is literally triple the cost, because that is the most costly part of the conduct of this study; the professional assistance that the consultant will have.

Why is it necessary to have this kind of check and balance of conflicting or at least contrary potential results from the studies? Where does the Commission get its consultant? If you look at page 10 of the bill, you will see section 5, "Consultant." The Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare, and, as soon as practicable after the Commission is established, submit to the Commission a list of at least five consultants which, on the basis of their impartiality, expertise, and experience, the Comptroller General considers appropriate to conduct the study under this Act."

We do not even let the Commission decide who is an appropriate person to do the study. The Comptroller General will give them a list of people that

he will qualify by their expertise and experience and lack of bias, and from that list, they will select their consultant.

Now, that seems to me to provide all the protections that the gentleman thinks or seems to think he would get by having three competing consultants working at the same time. A few moments ago the gentleman expressed a notice of concern about the possibility of having subpoenas bothering people. Well, how would you like to be an agency head that has on Monday, consultant "A" coming into your agency saying I want 10 people to give me all your personnel records and go over them with me. On Wednesday, consultant "B" comes in, and then the following Monday consultant "C" comes in and you have to go over the same ground three times. That is like having the Internal Revenue visit your place of business three times. That then becomes also cumbersome because we are going to have three sets of consultants taking up time necessarily with the Federal agencies that they are going to get the information from their personnel records.

I think that at best, amendment adds nothing but expense and would be, I suppose, characterized as being good in the sense that it spreads more wealth around amongst the kind of people who sell this consulting, and at worst, it is mischievious.

Final Selection. The selection of a consultant to conduct the study under this Act shall be made by the Commission from among the consultants included on the list prepared under subsection (a).

They cannot appoint anybody except someone who is on the list prepared by the Comptroller General. I can think of no more responsible agency in the Government to give that authority to and no agency that is more highly trusted, regardless of what administration is in, no one has ever questioned the integrity of the Comptroller General in handling matters of this kind. I think that the committee has wisely reposed that authority in the Comptroller General to make those determinations. They are particularly well equipped professionally to do this better than any of the members of a commission perhaps, individually or collectively might do it on their own. It is a reasonable protection; I think that it is adequate. Therefore I urge the body to vote down the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to address the gentleman's point about my fiscal conservatism. No doubt about it. There are two costs we incur here; up front, the study costs, and then later the implementation costs. If we come up with the wrong study, we can make that implementation cost several times over what it can be with a better study. We need to guard against the possibility of unnecessary and grossly inflated implementation costs.

The second point is the gentleman's remarks regarding the Comptroller General. I suppose the Comptroller General and his agency is as highly regarded, respected, and trusted by the American people as any agency of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

(On request of Mr. ARMEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. FORD of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. Mine allows the President, at least, who is clearly much more highly trusted by the American people to offer up one of the consultants. Where I come from, we just do not trust Federal agencies too much to either be competent or dependable.

□ 1545

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], and I associate myself with the chairman's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it would be contradictory to have competing consultants. The consultant, as outlined in the bill, is going to be chosen by the Commission. I am not going to be part of the Commission, nor is the gentleman, but we do not tell the Commission what consultants to choose. The gentleman mentioned a couple of consultants that I have never heard of, and frankly it would not be the decision of this body as to who the consultants would be.

The gentleman may not trust Federal agencies, but Dr. Donald Devine headed up OPM. I am assuming the gentleman had some confidence in the former OPM Director and has some confidence in the current OPM Director, who would be part of the makeup of that group which would choose the consultant.

So I think what the gentleman is really doing is adding on a triple layer of bureaucracy that is unnecessary. I think the gentleman is really adding to the cost, of the study. The cost by the way, would be folded in on OPM's budget.

Furthermore, we do have a provision in the bill for technical assistance, three to five people are included. So I really think that this is being expensive. The gentleman's amendment would cost a lot of money in adding three as opposed to one consultant by this bipartisan Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope we defeat this. I think it adds to the bureaucracy and certainly adds a lot to the cost.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on two Commissions, one the Procurement Commission, and then I served on the Paperwork Commission, and I was elected the Chairman of the Paperwork Commission, which completed its work in 1977.

In most instances Commissions appointed by the Congress do not have this restriction on them, namely, the restriction that the Comptroller General, who is the head of the General Accounting Office, which is an arm of the Congress, is to make a list, and as was said by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the statutes specifically provide that the Comptroller General shall select five, based on their impartiality, expertise, and experience, and that is a very important requirement that the legislation has provided. Then they make that list, and it is from that list there is selected a consultant. And so I think that this is an unusual requirement, taking it away from the Commission but leaving the selection to the Commission from a list made up by the Comptroller General.

Then the other point is that it does duplicate, and I think it would be very counterproductive to have three groups of people trying to act in this capacity.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and urge its defeat.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering legislation that would require a study of the Federal work force to determine if discrimination exists, and to what degree, within the Federal work force. Stronger legislation passed this body last year by a vote of 413 to 6. But a court decision in Washington State has caused many to distort both the intention and the implications of H.R. 3008.

This legislation has been criticized as being everything from "unnecessary" to "the first step toward socialism." It isn't either of these. It is a study. It is a study designed to examine what may be a problem within the Federal work force. Quite honestly, I am surprised at the campaign being waged against its enactment. We in this body and in this country should not be afraid to study an issue, an issue that may point out some very serious problems. And then, again, it may not. I have heard criticism of the Commission, of definitions in the bill, and the like. I worked with Congresswoman OAKAR in revamping areas where criticisms were leveled. Many of these were addressed, which is why we are today considering H.R. 3008 instead of the

earlier version of this legislation, H.R. 27. H.R. 3008 incorporates improvements that were suggested and then accepted by proponents of this bill.

And on the issue of Washington State, many people contend that this State's "comparable worth" study was implemented by the courts. That decision was appealed. It was overturned. It isn't valid anymore. But that isn't the point. If we refuse to study this or any area out of fear over possible court action, the implications extend far beyond a study of discrimination in the Federal work force. Perhaps we shouldn't study or investigate anything. If we do, a court somewhere may implement its findings, or may use the information as a basis for all or part of its decision, or the study may be used as a basis for litigation.

Litigation is a fact of life in this country, and I am thankful that it is. Regardless of what we do, discrimination will continue to be the focus of attention in the courts. And it should be. Maybe there is a problem in the Federal work force. Maybe we should do something to correct the problem. Maybe there isn't, and maybe we shouldn't. We won't know for sure, or to what extent, unless and until we examine this area. Such a study of the Federal work force hasn't been conducted in decades. I'm not afraid of a study, and I'm voting for the bill. I hope my colleagues will do the same.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. One of the things that I am confident you will find if you have three different studies is that you will have three different conclusions.

Mr. HORTON. Well, that may be.

Mr. ARMEY. In scientific inquiry, whenever you have that result, you have a measure of the degree to which you are not dealing with a scientific subject. This is a subjective process. The final decision under this bill concerning who will carry out the process of study is biased in favor of final selection by an already existing biased Commission, and I can almost guarantee you that we are going to end up in this case with a study that recommends the implementation of a very, very costly program of Government wage administration.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the point I am making is that the Commission makes the decision, not the consultant. All the consultant is going to do is make recommendations to the Commission, and for us to require the Commission to have three consultants is, I think, very expensive and not necessary. I think it is counterproductive, and I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for one further point, he is exactly right, and my point, too, is that the Commission, which is loaded six to five in favor of comparable worth, will make the decision.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Years ago, when I first came here, one of the senior Members of Congress, one that we all remember, told me that if you want to kill an issue, if you really want to kill an issue, provide for a study. I guess this study might kill the issue, I do not know.

It has been said here by many people that it is a bad idea to have this study, that it is not good. If that is true, then if three consulting firms make three studies, it would be three times as bad.

We are all concerned about the cost of this study or any other study. I do not know how many consulting firms there are in the country, but for the life of me, I do not know how in the world we can come up and say that three studies by consulting firms are better than one if one is already bad.

If there is nothing else, the direct cost of three studies by three consulting firms is going to be tremendous. But there is an indirect cost, and that is the cost by the agencies that will have to testify before the consulting firms or at least provide information, as the committee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, has provided here. Those of us who serve on committees are often told by agencies that have to come before us as committees of this Congress of the tremendous number of hours that it takes them in preparing for their testimony to come before our subcommittees and our committees, of the number of hours it takes to appear before several committees in this body, and then they have to duplicate it to go to the other body. They tell us of the preparation time as well as the time to come down here. Now we are asking those agencies that are going to have to present their criteria and their information to these consulting firms to do it three times. I think it is unreasonable, and I do not think we should vote yes for this amendment.

I am not trying to criticize the gentleman from Texas. I am sure he means well, and possibly he has more experience than any of us here. He has advised us that he is the most senior Member here as an economist. But I would have to question this. I am not an economist. I am just an old country farmer, but I would not want to plow a field three times, I am telling you that. Once it has been plowed, it has been plowed, and I am not going to waste my fuel plowing it three times. That is what we are asking here, for them to plow it three times.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am not an old country farmer, but my grandparents were, and it has been my experience that sometimes my grandfather had to plow more than once to get the weeds out.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Well, we have other systems here to get the weeds out if you find them out there, and that is what this committee is all about, to find where the weeds are. If you cannot see them, you cannot plow them out. That is what this Commission and this consulting firm is doing. It identifies where the weeds are, if they are there. That is all we are asking. Let us find the weeds.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to section 5?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

SEC. 6. STUDY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) METHODOLOGY.—In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Commission shall provide, by contract with the consultant selected under section 5(b), for the conduct of a study under which job-content analysis and economic analysis shall be applied with respect to a representative sample of occupations in which either sex is numerically predominant, any race is disproportionately represented, or either ethnic group is disproportionately represented.

(b) COMPARISONS.—In performing the study, comparisons shall be made—

(1) both within the same system (as referred to in section (2)(a)) and between the respective systems (as so referred to); and

(2) both on an intra-agency and on an interagency basis.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 6?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DEADLINE.—The Commission shall, not later than 18 months after the date of its establishment, submit to the President and each House of Congress—

(1) a copy of a report which shall be prepared by the consultant selected to perform the study under this Act; and

(2) comments of the Commission relating to such report.

(b) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED IN CONSULTANT'S REPORT.—Included in the report referred to in subsection (a)(1) shall be a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the consultant, pursuant to its study, with respect to differentials in rates of basic pay between or among occupations compared on the basis of sex, race, and ethnicity, including—

(1) a list of any groups of occupations with respect to which differentials were found although the work performed in the respective occupations comprising any such group involved skills, effort, responsibilities, qualification requirements, and working

conditions which, while not identical, were equivalent in totality;

(2) the extent to which any differentials identified under paragraph (1) can be accounted for by the application of job-content and economic analyses; and

(3) the extent to which any differentials identified under paragraph (1) cannot be accounted for by the application of job-content and economic analyses.

Any portion of a differential identified under paragraph (1) which cannot be accounted for by the application of job content and economic analyses is inconsistent with the general policy expressed in section 2(a) that sex, race, and ethnicity should not be among the factors considered in determining any rate of pay.

(c) COMMISSION COMMENTS.—(1) Included under subsection (a)(2) shall be recommendations by the Commission concerning appropriate measures for eliminating any differentials under subsection (b) if, and to the extent that, such differentials cannot be accounted for by the application of job-content and economic analyses.

The Commission shall identify which (if any) of the measures under paragraph (1) may be carried out pursuant to any authority available under existing law, and shall make recommendations for any legislation or administrative action needed to carry out the other measures under such paragraph.

(3) The Commission may not make any recommendation under this Act which involves a reduction in any rate of pay or grade.

(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The Commission shall furnish a copy of the consultant's report, together with the Commission's comments, to each appointing authority in the legislative branch of the Government.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 12, strike out line 13 and all that follows through line 18.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] seek recognition on the committee amendment?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the committee amendments be dispensed with, and that they be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The text of the remaining committee amendment to section 7 is as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 13, after line 9, add the following:

(4) Also included under subsection (a)(2) shall be the Commission's determination as to whether any portion of any differential identified under subsection (b)(1) which cannot be accounted for by the application of job-content and economic analyses may be inconsistent with the general policy expressed in section 2(a) that sex, race, and ethnicity should not be among the factors considered in determining any rate of pay.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] seek recognition on the committee amendments?

Ms. OAKAR. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment to page 12 strikes out language which provides that any differential in rates of basic pay between or among occupations which cannot be accounted for by the application of job content or economic analysis is inconsistent with the policy that sex, race, and ethnicity should not be among the factors considered in determining any rate of pay.

The second committee amendment to page 13 requires the Commission on Equitable Pay Practices to include in its report its determination as to whether any portion of any differential in rates of basic pay between or among occupations not accounted for by the application of job content or economic analysis may be inconsistent with the policy that sex, race, and ethnicity should not be among the factors in determining any rate of pay.

□ 1555

Mr. Chairman, these were amendments that we had in committee and hopefully they are not too controversial.

As a matter of fact, I think that these amendments will relieve some of the concerns expressed by Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: In section 7, page 12, after line 6, insert the following new subsection and renumber succeeding sections accordingly:

"(b)(2) Such study shall include and measure the impact on wages in similar jobs negotiated under collective bargaining agreements."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there should be very much controversy about this amendment. We have a longstanding tradition and policy in this country that collective bargaining agreements once entered into should be held as sacrosanct within the employment process. In this particular instance all I am suggesting is that the study ought to include the impact upon the wages of the people involved as it relates to their collective bargaining agreements. I do not think that we ought to allow this study to go forward without some kind of an understanding of how it is going to impact upon the collective bargaining process and upon the collective bargaining agreements.

I do not think it is the intent of the committee, I do not think it should be such certainly the intent of this House to have a study that would have the potential effect of negating what has been won in collective bargaining agreements.

All I am suggesting in this particular amendment is that the study ought to include some indication of what the impact is upon the collective bargaining arrangements within the Government and that we ought to have some feel for that overall impact within the process.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, what does the gentleman mean in his amendment when it says, "shall include and measure the impact on wages in similar jobs?" What is a similar job? Could the gentleman define what he means by a similar job?

Mr. WALKER. It is my understanding that what you are attempting to do is evaluate the similarity of jobs, or at least the equity between jobs. All I am saying is that as you establish those equities that we ought not to allow that kind of equity to impact upon the collective-bargaining process.

Let us say we find that there is equity between one type of job and another particular type of job, within the structure we ought not to allow that determination to be made as opposed to collective-bargaining agreements, at least without defining what the impact would be.

All I am suggesting is that when you have that kind of situation that arises, I think we ought to know the impact as a part of this study.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. Certainly, I am glad to yield.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. The thing that bothers me with "similar jobs," the concept or the ideal of what the gentleman is talking about here sounds like it is something I could support; but what bothers me is that we have taken out comparable worth in this bill, tried to take everything out related to comparable worth, because I think that would be an impossible thing. If we start comparing jobs here, we handle this tool here and somebody else down the line still handles it, it is still the same job. Obviously, it is not.

Comparable worth is so difficult to define and to enforce, so we have taken comparable worth out, which I think would make it absolutely unworkable; but I am afraid "similar jobs" is bringing back in that old comparable worth thing.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana, of course, interprets the bill somewhat differently than I do. I do not think we have abandoned comparable worth. That is one of this gentleman's concerns about the bill.

We are, in fact, staying with the pay equity concept. Pay equity implies throughout this bill that we are in fact evaluating different jobs in different locations in the Government.

The fact is that in different jobs in different locations in the Government, they may well be covered by different collective bargaining agreements.

I think we ought to know what the impact is on those collective bargaining agreements as a part of this study. That is all the amendment does. It says that as you evaluate all this, that we ought not to have a study that does not include an analysis of the impact on those collective bargaining agreements.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield one more time?

Mr. WALKER. Certainly, I am glad to yield.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. What about similar jobs, one is negotiated, contracted, the other is not. Would the gentleman bring both of them in under the same wage that was negotiated?

Mr. WALKER. The amendment directly refers to collective bargaining agreements. It is my intent to simply assure that the study could not at some point in the future be used to break a collective bargaining agreement without us at least having some idea of what the impact would be. That is the only intent behind the amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield one more time, I think that would be understandable; but when it gets into similar jobs is the part that bothers me.

Mr. WALKER. But it also relates directly to the whole collective bargaining arrangement. It seems to me to turn this down is to say that what we are doing is having a study which in fact could have an adverse impact on collective bargaining arrangements, and I cannot imagine that is what the committee wants to do.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from from Ohio will state her point of order.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] proposes to expand greatly the scope of the bill under consideration. As such, the amendment violates clause 7 of House Rule XVI and is nongermane.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is very limited in scope. It relates only to employees of executive agencies, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 105. The bill is further limited in scope in that the study it mandates is limited to salaries and wages of executive agency employees in positions under the Government's position classification system under chapter 51 of title 5, and the prevailing rate system under subchapter IV of chapter 53 of title 5. Clearly the bill relates only to certain employees in the executive branch and their salaries and wages. It in no way concerns salaries or wages of private-sector employees.

Mr. Chairman, I am frankly surprised that the gentleman would want to expand this study to private-sector employees, which we are not trying to do. Maybe this Chamber ought to get after the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] on the other hand would expand the scope of the study mandated by the bill to "include and measure the impact on wages in similar jobs negotiated under collective bargaining agreements." This obviously would expand the study to cover Government agencies not presently covered, such as the Postal Service and the Tennessee Valley Authority. It also apparently expands the study to cover private-sector wages, which unlike most wages in the executive branch are negotiated under collective bargaining agreements. Thus, the amendment greatly expands the scope of the study and the bill. As such, it is nongermane.

Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WALKER. I certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little at a loss to understand to what part of the bill the gentlewoman from Ohio thinks I am amending, because the part of the bill that I am amending refers directly to the consultant's report. In that particular language, it is very, very broad in its coverage as to what the consultant should report about. He is to report on basic pays between or among occupations compared on the basis of sex, race, ethnicity. That is a fairly broad definition.

Then we go over to the section that I am directly amending and we find out that it is going to have a list of groups of occupations, occupations comprising any such group involved in skills, efforts, responsibilities, qualification requirements, working conditions, all kinds of broad categories.

The only thing that my amendment does suggest is that another one of the determinants within that ought to be the existence of a collective bargaining agreement. It has absolutely nothing to do with the private sector, unless this bill involves the private sector, because it refers back to the study that the bill requires be done; so therefore, if we are going to have something in this amendment that refers to the private sector, then we have suddenly learned something new about this bill that it includes the private sector, because my amendment speaks directly to information to be provided in the consultant's report, and so therefore the only way that the private sector could get involved in this would be if that is the intent of the committee to have that consultant's report refer to private sector activities. This language goes directly to that particular aspect of the bill. That particular aspect of the bill is very broad and this would simply be additional language that relates to collective bargaining agreements.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Ohio wish to be heard further?

Ms. OAKAR. Yes; Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, on page of the bill, so that there is no confusion about the purpose of the bill, even though there has been a deliberate attempt to distort it, it says in section (3), "occupation" means any grouping of positions within an agency, as identified or defined under chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, or subchapter IV of chapter 53 of such title.

It is very clear which employees we are referring to. It is a very, very specific group.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. WALKER. Yes; Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it is very clear in my amendment which employees I am referring to. I am referring to those included under collective bargaining agreements and it therefore is within the scope of the bill, because those specific employees that would be covered under chapter 51, title 5, United States Code, include employees who are in fact covered under collective bargaining arrangements; so we are in fact talking about the same people.

So if that is the gentlewoman's point, then she has just the case for my amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TORRES). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair believes that the amendment as drafted may be interpreted to apply to a different category of employees from those covered by the bill. If the Chair may cite from the precedents of the House on the germanness rule, the Chair cites as such:

To a bill dealing with a certain class of Federal employees (the U.S. civil service in this case), an amendment to bring other classes of employees within the scope of the bill is not germane.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order in this case.

Are there further amendments to section 7?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON OF TEXAS

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTON of Texas: Page 13, strike out lines 7 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(3) The Commission shall include a cost estimate for each measure under paragraph (1).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have a saying in Texas and I am told that it is prevalent throughout the United States, that "when something is not broken, you don't fix it."

Well, we have in my opinion a pay equity system in the Federal Government that is not broken and does not need to be fixed, but since we do have a bill before us that proposes to redo this system and make some changes, I think it is important that we fix the bill, and in my opinion the bill is definitely broken and it is broken for one very important reason.

Currently, under the bill, under section (7), which is titled "Reporting Requirements," most of section (7) is fairly straightforward until it gets to the provision that says: "The Commission may not make any recommendation under this Act which involves a reduction in any rate of pay or grade."

Now, think about that for a minute. We are saying that we are going to have a study to review the Federal pay system, but we cannot make any recommendation that would lower a pay rate or a pay grade. Now, that is not a study. If you think about that for a minute, what that is telling us is that the commission is going to go in and it is going to hire these consultants, whether it is one, five, three or whatever, they are going to make this study, but if they find an inequity where somebody in the Federal Government is being paid too much, they cannot make a recommendation that that grade be lower or that that pay rate be changed.

Now, what you are saying there is that everybody in the Federal Government is either being paid exactly the right amount or they are not being paid enough. I do not think that is right. If we are going to have a study, it ought to really be a study and if it finds something that is too low, let us recommend that it go higher. If it finds a pay rate or a pay grade that is too high, let us make the recommendation that it go lower.

Now, the second point, if we allow this study to take place and to make these recommendations, whether they are to go higher or to go lower, I think we also desperately need to know what these recommendations would cost us if they were to be implemented.

□ 1610

There have been several estimates of what this bill that is before us would cost if the recommendations were made, as we expect they would be, and the changes would have to be made. They range just for Federal employees alone in the neighborhood of from $5 billion to $8 billion. That is per year for the Federal Government.

When we are trying to do everything we can to reduce the deficit and to get Government spending under control, it does not make sense to me to come in and pass a bill where we do not even refer to what it might cost. We at least ought to have the recommendations to know what it would cost if we wanted to implement these recommendations.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, that part of the gentleman's amendment I do not have any problem with in terms of indicating if, in fact, there are to be some changes to be made and how much it would cost. I think that would be a natural thing to do.

The part that the gentleman wants to cut, though, is in compliance with title VII, which says that if there is any form of discrimination that you cannot remedy it by lowering anybody's wages. That is what we were trying to do, so that we did not build up this confrontation between men and women.

What the gentleman is trying to do is have me take off that section. I would be happy to compromise with the gentleman about the cost factor. I do not have a problem with that. But when the gentleman says that we cannot comply with title VII, which is the law of the land, then I have a problem with that because we cannot mandate that we automatically lower wages, and so on. No State has ever done that when they implemented their studies, and I do not think we want to get into a confrontation between men and women. I have a feeling that is not the gentlemen's intent, but that is what I think this amendment would do.

So if the gentleman wants to take the portion of it that relates to the cost factor, I would certainly go along with the gentleman asking unanimous consent and I would accept that, but if it includes the whole thing, rather than build up this confrontation between men and women I would oppose the amendment strongly.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I appreciate the gentlewoman informing me of her objection to the first part of my amendment. I would agree with her that I do not want to mandate that anybody's pay rate be lowered or their pay grade be lowered, but as the gentlewoman has said herself in the debate today and in previous days on this bill, we are trying, in her opinion, to actually do a study.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON of Texas was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If, in fact, we actually want to do this study, the study should do the best it can to find the truth, and in my opinion the truth is going to be that there are some recommendations that would be made that pay rates and pay grades should be lowered, just as there would be some recommendations that pay rates and pay grades be higher.

Ms. OAKAR. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is aware of the President's commission's report that the President signs that says that the average government worker makes about 19.1 percent lower than the private sector. A GAO report confirmed a very similar thing. We have been working on the retirement system led by the chairman, and so forth. Furthermore, this would conflict with title VII of the Civil Rights Act, to mandate that we look at that.

So that is why we reinforced that and that is why that portion was in the bill.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 276, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—148

Archer	Carper	Dickinson
Armey	Chandler	DioGuardi
Badham	Chappie	Dornan (CA)
Bartlett	Cheney	Dreier
Barton	Coats	Duncan
Bateman	Cobey	Eckert (NY)
Bedell	Coble	Edwards (OK)
Bennett	Combest	English
Billirakis	Coughlin	Evans (IA)
Bliley	Craig	Fawell
Boulter	Crane	Fiedler
Brown (CO)	Dannemeyer	Fields
Burton (IN)	Daub	Franklin
Callahan	DeLay	Frenzel
Campbell	DeWine	Gekas

Gibbons
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gregg
Grotberg
Gunderson
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hansen
Hartnett
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Hopkins
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Monson
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Nielson
O'Brien
Oxley
Packard
Porter
Quillen
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Roth
Rudd
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whittaker
Wortley
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOES—276

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bates
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hertel
Holt
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
Meyers
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—10

Addabbo
Bonker
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Carney
Early
Kildee
Lungren
Parris
Wright

□ 1620

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Lungren for, with Mr. Kildee against.

Messrs. WIRTH, TAYLOR, SAXTON, MOLINARI, and HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Messrs. ROWLAND of Connecticut, GALLO, and FISH changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MOORHEAD and Mr. ENGLISH changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985, which authorizes a study of the Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether they are operated and administered in a manner consistent with current antidiscrimination law.

This measure has generated a certain degree of controversy based largely on misunderstanding of its content. I think it would be valuable as the House begins debate to step back and separate fact from fiction as to what the measure actually does.

I understand the concerns raised by the opponents of this legislation. However, a dispassionate assessment of the bill should dispel those concerns.

The opponents of the Federal pay equity study contend that, no matter how well intentioned, the authority contained in H.R. 3008 extends far beyond fair and legitimate economic practices and would interfere with private sector management decisions. This fear is unfounded.

Any misunderstanding about the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act can be cleared up by an accurate reading of its provisions. Nowhere in the bill are the words "comparable worth" mentioned. Nowhere in the bill is authorization granted to implement or act upon in any way the recommendations of the Commission study. Nowhere in the bill is the Commission empowered to subpoena or prosecute any person or party in the Federal pay and classification system. The bill will have no effect on the private sector.

H.R. 3008 simply authorizes a nonbinding study of Federal pay and job classification practices to determine if the Federal Government, our country's largest employer, is upholding current laws prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex, race, or ethnicity. When its work is done, the Commission which oversees the study will disband and its findings will be transmitted to the administration and Congress. No further action is mandated or allowed by the bill.

This examination of Federal practices is much needed and long overdue. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

□ 1635

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: In Section 7, on page 12, after line 6, insert the following new subsection and renumber succeeding sections accordingly:

"(b)(2) Such study shall include and measure the impact on wages in occupations as defined in SEC. 10(3) which have been negotiated under collective bargaining agreements."

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this is essentially the same amendment that I had brought to the floor just a few minutes ago. It has been modified to meet the questions raised in the point of order of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], and I would be glad to yield to the gentlewoman at this point.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as redrafted, I have no problem with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. I am happy to accept it.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentlewoman, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for modify-

ing the language, to carry out the intent that he originally had, and we accept it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments of section 7?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STENHOLM: In section 7(c), strike out paragraph (4).

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer continues in what I believe a constructive way what the committee has already done with a committee amendment.

Might I say in the beginning that I regret very much that Members of this House have chosen to interject racism or some other inferences on those of us who have had a change of mind regarding this legislation since the last time it was voted upon.

I would remind my colleagues that when this particular issue was voted upon before, it was a part of another bill. This is the first time that we have had opportunity to focus purely and simply on this particular legislation.

When we voted on this issue before, it was a part of a much bigger legislative package. It is always easy for we Members of Congress to vote for a study; that is easy. What has created problems for many of us with the legislation that was originally proposed is that it was going much further than the proponents were saying that they intended to.

Like most Members of Congress, I certainly believe that equal work should receive equal pay. When a man and a woman or individuals of different races or ethnic background perform the same work—I strongly agree that they should be paid fairly and we already have laws that deal with that particular issue.

My concern, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has met the first part of this concern by striking, on page 12 from the bill, line 13 through line 18; that met a large part of the concerns that this individual Member has.

My amendment strikes the rest of the concern that we have, and it is my understanding the gentlewoman will also agree to striking from report language that same language that is in the bill that has created problems for many of us. If she agrees to do that, that too removes a large part of the opposition that this individual has had with the legislation before us.

I would remind my colleagues that there is one other thing that has occurred since we last voted upon this issue; the courts have gotten involved in this particular issue; and there are those and not the chairwoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]; certainly she has convinced me in our private conversations and I have been on the floor most of the day listening to the debate; that it is not her intent to utilize this legislation for comparable worth purposes. That is a step in the right direction.

My concern, and why I offer this particular amendment at this time to complete doing that which I believe the gentlewoman has agreed to do with what she has already done, is to completely and totally do that which we have all agreed; and that is remove the possibilities of legal challenge as a result of this Commission. Remove the possibilities of legal challenge as a result of this Commission on the comparable worth issue.

That is the reason behind my offering this amendment. Might I further say, in conclusion, the difficulty that I have with a commission doing what has been suggested we need to do is the experience that I have had as a manager of a rural electric cooperative with 30 employees, and a Member of Congress with 20 employees; of dealing fairly with pay equity, of making those decisions on a day-to-day basis that fairly define the worth of an individual and of determining the pay scale of that individual and seeing that fairness in fact is prevalent.

It is extremely difficult to do, and I personally believe that a much better way to do it is the way that I had thought and hoped that we were already doing it within Government, and that is to allow individual branches of Government to deal with that particular question in their own area, as we Members of Congress have the right to do on a daily basis.

I have been told that that is not quite the way it is, so if a study to help in the setting of the pay qualifications and the pay standards and the differentiations is in need today, and it would be something that would be in addition to those 20 studies that we have already had, the last of which occurring in 1985, this year.

If there is additional study needed in order to more fairly treat our Federal employees in handling this difficult job, quite possibly, with the adoption of this amendment that I am proposing, this is what would be done and what should be done.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the thrust of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, women are making progress. We can see it in some of our "superstars" like Sally Ride and Geraldine Ferraro. One took us into the far reaches of outer space. The other took us higher than we've ever gone in politics.

We've also made legislative gains. We've reformed our pension system. We've enacted tough child support enforcement programs.

Best ideas that have become legislative victories came from the grassroots. Trickle Down doesn't work economically and it doesn't work to bring about change.

The best ideas come from the bottom up.

The ERA must continue to be the keystone of our movement. It must be the number one goal of our political action.

As I told Rev. Jerry Falwell on "Nightline," what if John Adams had told Abigail that he was going to have independence without the declaration. Suppose Abe Lincoln had told Harriet Taubman, we're going to emancipate the slaves but we're going to do it one plantation at a time.

If we have to get our equal rights one issue at a time, we're prepared to do it. The first issue we're going to deal with is the wage gap that exists between men and women.

We want equal pay for work of equal value. We want that money in our checkbooks and in the lawbooks. Working women today earn 63 cents for every dollar a man makes. But when we go to the grocery store or the shoe store, we don't get to pay only 63 cents of the prices.

We must move head on issues of economic equity for women. We must do so not because it's chic or trendy. We must do so because it is a matter of survival.

Women remain concentrated in low-paying jobs, not because we are afraid of pressure—as any nurse can tell you.

Not because we fear responsibility—as any teacher can tell you.

And not because we dread new technology—as any computer programmer can demonstrate to you.

Our salaries remain low because sexism still exists. One of our first targets for eliminating this sexism is the Federal Government.

As the largest employer in the Nation, the Federal Government has an obligation to set an example. It shoud take immediate steps to ensure that it's pay system is free of bias.

I am one of the Members of Congress who has introduced the "Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985." This bill will establish a bipartisan

commisison that will study the Federal Government's pay and classification systems.

One of the most important ways to lead women out of poverty is to pay them. Money is the secret to ending poverty for women who've been abandoned by their husbands and abandoned in the marketplace.

Joining us in the fight for pay equity has been our good friends at organized labor. Especially the folks at AFSCME. They have been the collective bargaining agents for women in the private sector who need help.

We in Congress have to, now, be the collective bargainers with our own Federal Government, on behalf of our own Federal employees. We have to set the benchmark legislation, for all those women who don't have the opportunity to be represented by the American labor movement.

The steps we're taking are small steps. They are modest steps. But at least they are first steps. And they're steps in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. STENHOLM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio is she wishes me to yield.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he desires to conclude in his 2 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] will state her point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order at this time. I appreciate the work that the gentleman and I have done together on this issue, and we were happy to meet some of his concerns, but the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] proposed to amend the committee amendment to section 7 previously agreed to.

Accordingly, it is not in order. I call to the Chair's attention section 27.1 of chapter 27 of Deschler's Procedure which provides, quote:

"It is fundamental that it is not in order to amend an amendment already agreed to."

Mr. Chairman, at this time, although I do look forward to working with the gentleman before we have final passage, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that when I was out of the Chamber working on some budget matters, the committee revised their original committee amendment, and I was instructed as to this fact just prior to the offering of my amendment.

□ 1645

I assume that the gentleman cites the correct rules, and if that is the case we have been effectively shut out from offering what I believe to be some very helpful and constructive words on this issue.

Other than that, I can make no further comment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair then would be prepared to rule.

According to precedents, chapter 27, section 28.1 it is not in order to offer an amendment merely striking out an amendment previously agreed to.

Therefore the Chair would rule that the amendment of the gentleman is out of order.

Are there further amendments to section 7?

The Clerk will designate section 8.

The text of section 8 is as follows:

SEC. 8. CONSTRUCTION

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit any of the rights or remedies provided under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any other provision of law relating to discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, handicap, or age.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 8?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIKORSKI

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered By Mr. SIKORSKI: Page 13, strike out line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 8. CONSTRUCTION: ADVISORY NATURE OF STUDY.

Page 13, line 23, insert "(a)" before "Nothing".

Page 14, after line 3, add the following:

(b) ADVISORY NATURE.—The consultant's study and any findings, conclusions, recommendations, or comments by the consultant or the Commission under this Act with respect to such study shall be considered to be of an advisory nature only.

Mr. SIKORSKI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKORSKI. This amendment simply reaffirms the intent of the legislation by stating that the consultant's study and any findings, conclusion, recommendations, or comments by the consultant or the commission shall be considered to be of an advisory nature only.

There has been much discussion even a little bit indirectly relevant on the possibility that this study would subject the Government to potential litigation, in fact, an avalanche of litigation and liability under the current civil rights laws of this country.

In fact, the study will have the opposite effect, demonstrating to the courts that the Government is acting in good faith to examine its own policies and practices for discrimination.

It is absolutely the intention of the sponsors of the bill that the President and the Congress have sufficient time to review the consultant's study and the Commission's recommendations in order to formulate appropriate policy if, in fact, discrimination is found to exist.

Mr. Chairman, my own State of Minnesota conducted a similar study a number of years ago. The Governor and the legislature reviewed the study, agreed upon implementation policies and changes in the State personnel program, and, with a great deal of support, these changes have been implemented without litigation, without lowering the wages of any men, in fact, some men's wages were raised; without great cost, and in the collective bargaining structure without all the hypothetical horribles that we hear about.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment, and I hope my colleagues are really paying attention to this one, because what we are trying to do is relieve anyone's anxiety about a possible lawsuit, or that the intent is to create lawsuits. I feel we have a responsibility as Members of Congress who have jurisdiction over the classification system of our employees that we deal with it. I would never abrogate my responsibility to the courts and never have.

So to reaffirm that that is not our intent, in case there is any misunderstanding, the intent of the Sikorski amendment is that the legislation be a study that is advisory, and advisory only, in nature.

It simply sets forth the recommendations for the President and the Congress to serve as a basis for whatever action we may or may not deem necessary.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that we would act responsibly, and that is all we are trying to do with this study. So I hope we support Congressman SIKORSKI's amendment. It is meant specifically to reaffirm the fact that this is only advisory, nothing is binding, and we are the ones that will be called upon to act or not act, and that is all there is to the study. It was never intended to be pursued by courts and all

that other business. So I hope we can accept this on both sides.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I had a similar amendment drafted and decided not to offer it. The reason I did not was that I really do not, I am not confident that the amendment will achieve what it sets out to achieve. Nevertheless, I think it is a good amendment, and I would be happy to accept it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished minority Member.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we on the minority side accept this amendment. The intent, of course, of the amendment is to preclude any lawsuits, which really you cannot do. There is no way possible this Congress or anyone else, short of absolute prohibition, can stop someone from litigation if they feel they have a case. However, the intent here of the author is that anything in the report itself should not be the basis of a lawsuit. They can bring action under title VII of the Civil Rights Act, any individual who feels aggrieved. We cannot touch that, nor should we. Certainly the intent here is an admirable one, one that is desirable, I think we all support, and that is that nothing in this report shall be used as a basis for a lawsuit, and it is to advise the Congress of any need for future legislation, if there is a problem.

Mr. Chairman, I do support the amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI].

The amendment was agreed to.

the CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to section 8?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to finish the point that I was trying to make on the amendment that I was offering and would announce to the House that it is my intent when we go into the House that I will ask for a separate amendment on the committee amendment to achieve the purpose which I was attempting to do with the amendment before we were effectively precluded from doing that through a legitimate parliamentary move.

I will do that when we go into the House.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any other amendments to section 8? If not, the Clerk will designate section 9.

The text of section 9 is as follows:

SEC. 9. FUNDING.

Sums appropriated to the Office of Personnel Management for general operating expenses shall be available to carry out this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 9?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 10.

The text of section 10 is as follows:

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

For the purpose of this Act—

(1) "job-content analysis", as applied with respect to occupations, means an objective, quantitative method of rating representative entry-level positions within such occupations in order that—

(A) composite values may be established with respect to such occupations based on factors such as the skill, effort, responsibilities, qualification requirements, and working conditions involved; and

(B) comparisons may be made with respect to the positions and occupations involved;

(2) "economic analysis", as applied with respect to 2 or more occupations, means an objective method for analyzing differentials in pay between or among those occupations in order to determine if, and the extent to which, those differentials are attributable to—

(A) job-related factors such as seniority, merit, productivity, education, work experience, or veteran status;

(B) geographic factors; and

(C) other factors, exclusive of sec, race, and ethnicity;

(3) "occupation" means any grouping of positions within an agency, as identified or defined under chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, or subchapter IV of chapter 53 of such title;

(4) "position" means the work, consisting of the duties and responsibilities, assignable to an individual;

(5) "ethnicity" refers to the quality of being, or not being, of Hispanic origin;

(6) "ethnic group" refers to a grouping based on ethnicity;

(7) an individual shall be considered to be of Hispanic origin if such individual is of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central American, South American, or other Spanish orign;

(8) "consultant" includes an organization which provides consultant services;

(9) "Commission" means the Commission on Equitable Pay Practices established under section 3;

(10) "labor organization" has the meaning provided by section 7103(a)(4) of title 5, United States Codes;

(11) "exclusive representative" has the meaning provided by section 7103(a)(16) of title 5, United States Code;

(12) "agency" means an executive agency within the meaning of section 105 of title 5, United States Code (other than the General Accounting Office); and

(13) "Government" means the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 10?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered By Mr. GEKAS: Page 15, strike out lines 13 and 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(5) "ethnicity" refers to the country where a person was born or the country from which his or her ancestors came;

Mr. GEKAS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. For purposes of this amendment I would ask the gentlewoman from Ohio to engage in a colloquy so that I may place certain remarks in the RECORD.

I had intended, and want to make it clear, that this amendment goes to the definition of ethnicity which I wanted to make sure was broader than just to include those of Hispanic origin. In my judgment, that constituted an insult to the Hispanic community and did not cater to the requirements of all the other people who can say that they have ethnicity as part of their work theme.

So I have been informed by the gentlewoman from Ohio that in the previous actions on the floor through an amendment and through a colloquy that was placed in the RECORD that my concerns have been met. To that end, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio so that she can explain to me how that was accomplished. And, Mr. Chairman, if I am satisfied I will withdraw the amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to try to satisfy the gentleman's concerns. There was an amendment offered by Mr. SIKORSKI that dealt with the applicable provisions of the law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex, race, or national origin.

Mr. LIPINSKI and I engaged in a colloquy, and here is what he said, and here is my response:

It is the understanding of the chairwoman that the meaning of the term "national origin" in this amendment includes individuals of all ethnic backgrounds that have historically suffered discrimination such as Italians, Poles, Germans, Irish, Lithuanians, Ukranians, Yugoslavians, Czechoslovakians and so forth, of ethnic background.

My answer was, "Yes."

Then we proceeded to go into a further discussion of that.

So that I think the gentleman's concern has been met by the Sikorski amendment as reaffirmed by the Chair that indeed all origins will be looked at because, the gentleman is right, there are some custom workers

and other workers who are classified, they believe, indiscriminately, and they are not classified properly, and they would not necessarily be female, minority, or Hispanic.

Mr. GEKAS. Is the gentlewoman from Ohio telling me that that amendment was adopted?

Ms. OAKAR. Yes, yes, it was adopted.

Mr. GEKAS. It was a voice vote?

Ms. OAKAR. Yes, that is right.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentleman's concern, and I think his concern has been met.

Mr. GEKAS. I will recapture my time and say that, based on the colloquy that I have now conducted with the gentlewoman from Ohio, I am satisfied my concerns have been met.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments to section 10?

The Clerk will designate section 11.

The text of section 11 is as follows:

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 11?

Are there any further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Anti-Discrimination Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be established a commission to be known as the Commission on Equitable Pay Practices.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of—

(1) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

(2) the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission;

(3) 8 members appointed by the President, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(B) 1 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(C) 1 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the majority leader of the Senate;

(D) 1 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate; and

(E) 2 shall be appointed to represent the interests of taxpayers; and

(4) 5 members appointed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, of whom—

(A) 2 shall be appointed to represent the respective labor organizations representing (as exclusive representatives) the largest and the second largest numbers of individuals in Government service;

(B) 1 shall be appointed to represent employee organizations having as a purpose promoting the interests of women in Government service and composed primarily of women holding positions covered by the provisions of chapter 51, or subchapter IV of chapter 53, of title 5, United States Code;

(C) 1 shall be appointed to represent employee organizations having as a purpose promoting the civil rights of individuals in Government service and composed primarily of minority group members holding positions covered by any of the provisions referred to in subparagraph (B); and

(D) 1 shall be appointed from among individuals with expertise in Federal personnel management. To the extent practicable, appointments under this section shall be made with a view towards maintaining a fair balance in the interests represented and the functions to be performed by the Commission.

(c) TIMING OF APPOINTMENTS; QUALIFICATIONS.—All appointments under paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b) shall be made within 20 days after the effective date of this Act and shall be made from among individuals who are especially qualified to serve on the Commission by virtue of their expertise and experience.

(d) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.—The Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

(f) QUORUM.—Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(g) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair or a majority of its members.

(h) NONAPPLICABILITY OF LIMITATION.—Appointments under this section shall not be considered for purposes of section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. CONDUCT OF STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Commission shall provide for the conduct of a study under which the following shall be examined:

(1) Whether the Government's position-classification system under chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, and compensation systems under subchapters III and IV of chapter 53 of such title, are in compliance with section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938., relating to equal pay for substantially equal work.

(2) Whether the Government is in compliance with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in matters relating to hirings and promotions of Federal employees.

(3) The effectiveness of any policies or programs of the Government (including those involving education or the dissemination of information) designed to encourage—

(A) the integration of individuals into occupations in which persons of a particular sex, race, or ethnic group have been traditionally underrepresented; or

(B) the promotion or other advancement of such individuals in Federal employment.

(4) Any trends or patterns relating to promotions or other advancement in Federal employment with respect to individuals belonging to any underrepresented group referred to in paragraph (3).

(b) METHODOLOGY.—In carrying out the study under this Act—

(1) the methodology to be used shall be subject to Commission determination or approval, as the case may be; and

(2) particular consideration shall be given to matters relating to women in Government.

SEC. 4. RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT.

(a) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall develop recommendations (including proposals for legislation or administrative action) for enhancing Government efforts to achieve equality of opportunity in Federal employment with respect to sex, race, and ethnicity and to improve the efficiency of Government compensation practices under subchapters III and IV of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code. Included with such recommendations shall be an estimate of the cost anticipated in carrying out those recommendations.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall submit its report and recommendations under this Act to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of the establishment of the Commission.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall receive no pay on account of their service on the Commission, but while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) DETAILS FROM OTHER AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of an agency may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act.

(c) OBTAINING INFORMATION.—The Commission may secure directly from any agency any information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Commission, the head of such an agency shall, to the extent permitted by law, furnish the information requested by the Commission.

(d) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) MAIL AND SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails, and receive administrative support services from the Administrator of General Services, in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies.

SEC. 6. TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submitting its report under section 4(b).

SEC. 7. CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit or expand any of the rights or remedies provided under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any other provision of law relating to discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, handicap, or age.

SEC. 8. FUNDING.

Sums appropriated to the Office of Personnel Management for general operating expenses shall be available to carry out this Act.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

(1) "agency" means an executive agency within the meaning of section 105 of title 5, United States Code (other than the General Accounting Office);

(2) "employee" and "Federal employee" each means an individual employed in or under an agency;

(3) "ethnicity" refers to the quality of being, or not being, of Hispanic origin;

(4) "ethnic group" refers to a grouping based on ethnicity;

(5) an individual shall be considered to be of Hispanic origin if such individual is of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central American, South American, of other Spanish origin;

(6) "Commission" means the Commission on Equitable Pay Practices established under section 2;

(7) "occupation" means any grouping of positions within an agency, as identified or defined under chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, or subchapter IV of chapter 53 of such title;

(8) "position" means the work, consisting of the duties and responsibilities, assignable to an individual;

(9) "labor organization" has the meaning provided by section 7103(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code;

(10) "exclusive representative" has the meaning provided by section 7103(a)(16) of title 5, United States Code; and

(11) "Government" means the Government of the United States.

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote equitable personnel practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal civil service.".

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this substitute.

As many of you already know, I do not support the comparable worth theory which holds that wage disparities between male and female workers and the heavy concentration of women in certain jobs is proof of discrimination. I do support equal pay for equal work, and this substitute sets up a study based on that theory. We want a Society that is gender-blind for employment purposes, not gender-conscious. Comparable worth is a direct attack on an economic system which values individual opportunity and individual liberty. This substitute will focus on employment and pay discrimination in a manner which is consistent with current law.

This substitute has the objective of eliminating discrimination, and promoting fair personnel practices for women, blacks, and Hispanics in the Federal Government. This substitute is similar to H.R. 3008 in that it would establish a study commission known as the commission on equitable pay practices. And, as with H.R. 3008, the purpose of the study is to determine whether Federal practices are in compliance with existing law. However, this substitute uses a methodology which is completely in line with existing law. Thus the substitute does not seek to discover discrimination by using the comparable worth methodology which, as numerous courts have observed, is not a formula for proving discrimination.

The study in H.R. 3008 is one which asks a consultant to make subjective assessments of the relative worth of different jobs, and to then compare the wage rates paid for these different jobs. Regardless on one's personal view of the usefulness of such comparisons, the fact is that such comparisons do not provide a means for determining whether a particular pay system is in compliance with existing law. Existing law—that is title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Pay Act of 1963—does not require an employer to pay equal wages to different jobs. Courts have made this clear in a variety of decisions, including the case of Spaulding versus University of Washington and the recent and much publicized case of AFSCME v. State of Washington, decided by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on September 4, 1985.

What needs to be understood about comparable worth studies of the type done in Washington State and of the type being proposed by H.R. 3008 is that, as the ninth circuit court recognized in the State of Washington decision, the results of such studies "will vary depending on the number and types of factors measured and the maximum number of points alloted to each factor." Thus, even in ideal circumstances, such studies can be of only limited use in determining whether a particular wage structure is discriminatory or not.

This substitute, however, is directed at precisly those practices which can produce discrimination under existing law, and those practices which can result in women being treated differently from men in the Federal workforce. The results of the study set forth in this substitute will give us a meaningful picture of Federal employment and compensation practices and whether those practices are fully in line with the requirements of existing law. Such a study will indeed be more useful than the H.R. 3008 proposal in assuring us that the Federal Government is a leader in eliminating discriminatory employment practices.

In conclusion, if we have to do a study of wages in the Federal workforce, I believe this substitute is the best means to ensure that current law is upheld. I do not believe comparable worth is the answer to alleviating the problem of discrimination in the Federal Government. The Equal Pay Act and title VII of the Civil Rights Act currently provides broad and effective remedies to gender-based discrimination occurring in the labor market. Advocates of comparable worth, and H.R. 3008, would change all that and impose a radical new definition of discrimination which would have far-reaching ramifications for public and private sector employers alike.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this substitute.

□ 1700

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

I have sat very patiently today and listened to all of the debate on both sides. I would be remiss if I did not say that I am disappointed not only in the way that we have presented our communications on the floor today but disappointed in the way this whole issue has evolved, starting with the many misrepresentations, even starting back in Little Rock, AR, with one of my newspapers, the Arkansas Gazette, the oldest newspaper west of the Mississippi, that wrote an article that this was comparable worth. This is not comparable worth. But going on from there, I have had numerous "Dear Colleague" letters misquoting the Washington State case. I even had a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers, which really disappoints me, in that this is more than a study.

Earlier on today, when I objected to the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] for more time, I objected in a symbolic way because I think 62 years is long enough in not looking at the way we treat our Federal employees. Yes; it has been 62 years since we studied pay equity. Yes; we have passed other bills that some thought would look at that; for example, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and subsequently the Civil Rights Act of 1964. But none of these studies called for a real pay equity study.

Now, in the Burton amendment, he and others would have you believe that he is adding to this. Well, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI] has already added what the gentleman from Indiana wants in this amendment.

The truth of the matter is simply this: The gentleman is attempting to gut this bill.

Aside from my responsibilities as a legislator for the Second District of Arkansas, representing Federal employees, females and minorities who are not being paid the same as some of their male counterparts, I am also a father. I have three daughters and three sons. I can unequivocally tell you today that my three daughters will not be treated the same as my three sons if they go to work for my Government, the one government worldwide that is supposedly setting the proper example for all others to follow.

I could go on and on and on about the debate. I am sorry that I do not have a Ph.D. I only went as high as the Masters level. But I am beginning to understand what a Ph.D. stands for. It is piled higher and deeper as we debate this issue.

I would just like to close by saying this: We owe it to our females who work for the Federal Government, we owe it to our blacks, we owe it to our Hispanics, we owe it to all workers who are employed by the U.S. Federal Government to treat them fairly. And that is what this issue is all about. It is not about Democratic versus Republican ideals and concepts. It is not being a conservative versus a liberal. It is about fairness. It is about justice.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I will yield in just a minute.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It was brought to my attention some time ago that the Democrat-controlled House of Representatives pays their employees on an improper basis.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] wish to yield time?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. There is discrimination in employment in this Chamber by the Democrat majority. And for somebody to stand here and say that we are talking about fairness and equality, I think the gentleman ought to start in this Chamber, in his majority party and deal with the problem of fairness.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will reclaim my time. I know the females in my office are watching. Louise, I pay you $47,000 a year. I do not discriminate in my office. I do not know about the rest of my Democratic colleagues. But I pay my employees based on their ability to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend for a moment.

In accordance with the procedure of the House, the gentleman should not refer to any television audience.

Mr. ROBINSON. I was referring to the in-house audience, Mr. Chairman, and not the larger audience. Just the in-house audience.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. All of you know that I am a conservative, and some have questioned why I would be down here today talking for such a liberal concept. Let me just say this: I am proud to be a conservative. I am also proud to be an American. I am proud to be a father. But most importantly, I have enough sense to realize that we have to treat people fairly. I can look you in the eye and tell you: I treat my employees fairly, I always have.

Something was mentioned today by my colleague from Texas saying that he once supervised 30 employees. Well, I was in Governor Clinton's first administration in Arkansas, as his director of public safety, and I had 1,100 employees under my control, and I can tell you that when you have an operation as large as a State agency and/or as large as the Federal Government, we need a study to determine whether or not we are paying our employees fairly. There is no way that I can decide whether or not we are doing that. I can do it in my own office. There is no way any of us have the ability, whether we have a Ph. D. or not, to make that determination.

I urge the Members to vote down the Burton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has expired.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given additional time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] for his eloquent words.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to my colleagues—with no disrespect to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]—I like you, I respect you—I think the gentleman is wrong. I think the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] and the committee are right. I ask the Members to vote your conscience, vote your convictions, do what is right for our working females and working minorities who, in my opinion—and I do not know what the study will show—are not being treated fairly.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I vigorously oppose this amendment.

Essentially, what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]—not the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], but the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]—is attempting to do is gut the bill. Part of what he is trying to do we already included in the bill by the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI].

Let me just go over what we are trying to do. I chair a subcommittee that relates to Federal employees' compensation and benefits. We have jurisdiction over their benefits, their retirement plan, their health benefits. It is a classification system that has people in classifications from GS-18 to GS-1, the GS-1 being the person who makes about $9,000 a year as a minimum.

The problem that we have is that we have not looked at the classification system with respect to the issues in this bill since 1923. What the gentleman would have us do is remain at the status quo, do not look at the classification system, do not do what 45 States are doing with respect to their own State employees, what many fine corporations have done, like United States Steel and AT&T and J. Byron and Son, in conducting their own study.

We are told by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] that, no, we have jurisdiction, but leave the system the way it is, because what was right in 1923 is right in 1985.

Now, I say that is wrong, that is negating our responsibilities. We are trying to take the responsible approach. The responsible approach is to not implement a new pay system. The responsible approach is to take a look at the system comprehensively and study it over an 18-month period by objective individuals in a bipartisan spirit, and that is the spirit in which we are trying to pass this legislation.

There has been absolutely, positively gross misrepresentation of this legislation. I think it has been very, very unfortunate, because the groups that oppose it, in my judgment, do a great disservice to the business community. I want to submit for the RECORD some letters that I have received from various corporations who do not want to associate with the misinformation that has been given out by members of the national organizations that are supposed to be worrying about the trade deficit; they are supposed to be worrying about the deficit of this country and enhancing our great businesses, and instead, they have focused on misrepresenting what this bill does.

This bill only relates to classified Federal employees. It relates to a study that we have not done since 1923 when less than 5 percent of the Federal work force were minorities and women.

Now, my friends, if we cannot support a study that we have a handle on—they have to advise Congress, and my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], can choose

whether to hear the recommendations of the study or not to hear the recommendations of the study—we dealt with this issue, we have had countless hearings for 4 years, and I want to tell the Members of this Congress something, because I feel deeply about it: If we cannot pass a simple study on how we treat classified Federal employees, then we will never do anything that relates to fairness in this Congress because that is an easy step to undertake.

I think it is extraordinarily unfortunate that this has been made into a huge political issue that it was not last year when we passed this bill, with only six people voting against it. I personally think it is unfortunate that it has been so distorted and that it has caused Members on both sides of the aisle the kind of anguish that some people who do not know what is in this study and do not know what we are trying to do and in good faith have written to them, I think it is very, very unfortunate that Members have had to explain what this is in simple English, when in fact the issue has been terribly distorted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. OAKAR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. OAKAR. Frankly, I think the National Chamber of Commerce ought to be absolutely ashamed of itself for distorting this issue. That is what they have chosen to do in a fundraising effort. I think it is a shame.

My business community, I am proud to say, in Cleveland, OH, took great issue with what they were trying to do, and, in a letter from the director of my chamber, said, "Congresswoman OAKAR, I think you not only should do a study; you have an obligation to do a study, because we have jurisdiction over these employees."

So I hope we can pass this bill and I hope we can go on to bigger and better things, frankly. I always believe, as my mother said, that the truth will win out. I think it will win out today.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Akron, OH.

□ 1715

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman has made a very fine statement. When I started hearing some of the rhetoric that we have heard on this bill, I did what is a good rule: When all else fails, read the bill. It just blows my mind that anybody would even oppose this bill. This is an extremely modest, reasonable effort to find out if indeed there are some areas where there is no rational basis for differentials in pay. It does not require any action, but merely factfinding. I cannot imagine anybody opposing such a study.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude by thanking the minority leader of the subcommittee, Mr. MYERS of Indiana. We worked together in a spirit of compromise. That was the way I wanted the bill to come out, and I think it did come out as a bill that had some compromises, and I want to thank my friend from Indiana, Mr. MYERS, for hanging tight. It showed a lot of courage.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the substitute. I must say I have listened to most of this debate, too, and for people who are on the floor propounding a point of view, the proponents of this bill have been the most defensive group I have ever heard. The entire case has been defensive and negative out here today with very little positive said about their bill.

I have got to guess that there must be something awfully wrong in a bill that they simply pound upon the opponents who have raised points of view. It seems to me that all of this talk that the opponents are somehow engaging in distortion and so on is simply an attempt to raise a smokescreen about this bill. What we have is we have an honest difference of opinion about the potential impact of this legislation. It seems to me that that is entirely legitimate for people to have a difference of opinion about legislation that encompasses this kind of scope. That is precisely what we have here.

We have heard an awful lot of talk here today that somehow there is something rather sinister about people who may have changed their mind in the last year about this particular approach. Well, I would suggest that there is nothing sinister in it; there is just a little bit of education that has taken place in the last year or so.

There have been three separate events since we last voted that some of us focused on a little bit. For example, there was the court of appeals that said that comparable worth is an invalid concept. It seemed to some of us, having looked at that particular opinion, that that made some sense and we ought to look at that in terms of what we were doing in the House of Representatives.

You had the Civil Rights Commission that did a study of the comparable worth, and they came to the conclusion, and they said, that this is the looniest idea since "Looney Tunes." That made somewhat of an impression at least on this gentleman that maybe we ought to take a look at what we are doing in this House.

We also have, I would say to the people who tell us that we have had no studies in the last 62 years, we have had a study by the Office of Personnel Management. Right here is the study. It evidently cost us a lot of money because there is an awful lot of paper there, and you can bet that bureaucrats that generate that kind of paper cost us a little bit of money to do this study. What is the study called? It is called "Equal Worth, Comparable Worth, and the Market Worth of Federal Jobs." It is precisely what we are talking about here has already been done by the Office of Personnel Management. They came to the conclusion that the comparable worth idea is illogical, imprudent, and injust.

In other words, there are some people who have studied this thing and studied it within the last year since we last voted, that have come to the conclusion that this is a pretty whacko scheme that we are dealing with here. Some of us think that maybe that is not what we ought to be voting for in this House.

Now, it seems to me what we have is that kind of opposition that is distorted through a compaign of negativism here on the floor. As far as I am concerned, this is a bill that says something in particular to young people. It says to young people who are about to graduate from high school and college, young people, both young men and young women, that the politicians and the bureaucrats are now going to decide their worth in the job market. Their talent, their education, their skills, their enthusiasm and their dreams all become secondary because what we have is the politicians and the bureaucrats determining their worth.

I do not think that is the way we want to go in the future. I do not think that we ought to be endorsing that even in a study in this particular House of Representatives.

The substitute by the gentleman from Indiana gets us to a concept that I think we can all endorse. The substitute gets us to the concept of equal pay for equal work for everyone. It seems to me that if we are going to have a study, that is what we ought to be doing; we ought not be doing what the bill purports to do.

I ask for a vote "yes" on the substitute.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we are for equal pay for equal work. Make no mistake about that. That is what my substitute is all about. The bottom line in this ar-

gument is do you want comparable worth? Do you want some commission established that will sit down and compare one job with another and decide whether or not they should be paid the same?

You are talking about, that is the argument. The legislation that was passed, the study that was passed in the State of Washington resulted in a $1.1 billion lawsuit. We have 30 times the number of employees as the State of Washington. The Justice Department has told me personally that there is no doubt in their minds there will be a lawsuit filed if we pass this study as it is written right now. That could result in a $30 billion lawsuit and the taxpayers of the United States are going to have to pay for the legal expenses in that suit, and may end up having to pay $30 billion. I do not think they will, because I think the same conclusion will be reached on an appeal that was reached in the appeal in the Washington suit. Nevertheless, this mischief is going to end up in the courts.

Now, my substitute really studies whether or not there are inequities as far as equal pay for equal work is involved in the U.S. Government and the Federal Government. Now, I think the one thing that has not been stated clearly enough here today is something that we should state right now and that is this is going to be the catalyst for going into the private sector. The people who want this study at the Federal level in the Federal Government want the same principles to apply in the private sector of our economy. My friends, make no mistake about it, that heads us in the direction of socialism.

Are we going to have bureaucrats, commissions deciding who get paid what salary and what jobs are equal to other jobs? That will end up in endless litigation in the private sector as well, and that is why the National Chamber of Commerce opposes this legislation as well as probably 200 or 300 other national organizations.

They have studied this issue, they have studied this legislation and they think it is bad. Now, if you really want to look at the Federal pay system to make sure there is equal pay for equal work, then I submit to you support my substitute because that is exactly what it is intended to do.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana. The bill in chief offered by my dear friend from Ohio, the gentlewoman, is labeled a pay equity bill. My admiration for the gentlewoman is increased as I stand in awe of her ability to coin euphemisms, because what we are talking about is comparable worth. Calling it pay equity does not change the reality. It is something that we indulge in these euphemisms a lot. We call illegal aliens "undocumented workers," and I often have thought that was like calling a drug peddler an "unlicensed pharmacist," or a bank robber a "holder not in due course."

We are talking about comparable worth so let us not indulge in any self-deception.

□ 1725

I also think it is important to remember that the history of freedom is the history of resisting excessive governmental intrusion. That is what freedom is all about. It is resisting the leviathan government which is so intrusive in so many aspects of our lives where it really does not belong. And I think if comparable worth ever gets a foothold in the economy and the politics of this country, you will have a massive intrusion in what was once a successful, albeit not perfect, free enterprise system.

The courts are already clogged. They will be congealed once this becomes the law, and there will not be such a thing as a poor lawyer left in this land. You may search far and wide, you may ransack the poorhouses, you will never find a lawyer who is this side of being considerably wealthy once this enforcement mechanism takes effect. And that will be something to behold. I suggest that Monty Python draw up the plans for the enforcement mechanism for comparable worth.

Now, I do not want to suggest that there is not discrimination. I do not know, there probably is. Wherever human nature exists, discrimination is going to be a part of it. And should we avert our eyes from this discrimination? Absolutely not. The gentlewoman from Ohio has raised our consciousness on this issue, and I applaud her for that. But having gone that far with her, I beg to take another direction as we search for ways to educate ourselves on this issue.

I suggest that the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana is a far more workmanlike and sensible, if I may use such a word, approach to this problem. It establishes a commission that is, in my judgment, much more likely to be objective than the Commission that the gentlewoman suggests in her bill.

And, by the way, I want to throw this in parenthetically. Since male longevity is much shorter than female longevity, if this Commission ever looks at this problem, I hope the stress factor that we males have to undergo on jobs can be cranked into whatever marvelous formula emerges so that the fact that men die a lot sooner than women on the average will give us a few more points in this comparable pay schedule.

The gentleman from Indiana has a study that seems to me to be much more objective. It does not require a list of occupations demanding equivalent skills and responsibilities, because those are subjective and different people will have different approaches on this. But the approach of the gentleman from Indiana wants to know whether the Federal pay and classification systems are in compliance with the existing law, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

And not as an afterthought, I am sure, what about an estimate of the cost of these recommendations in their implementation? There is such a thing as voluntary ignorance, somebody saying, "I don't want to know what this will cost." It seems to me that the gentlewoman, I am sure through an omission, has neglected that in her study.

What will the recommendations cost this poor taxpayer that we bleed through every pore about every day in 1-minute speeches?

So, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that wisdom, prudence, and common sense dictate that we support the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana, which I intend to do enthusiastically.

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor this subject, but I do think that a few more points need to be made.

I have listened to the complete proceedings today, and it has been very educational, but it has also been disappointing at times. To be accused of being a racist when I oppose this bill is something that I have never been accused of before, and I do not appreciate that accusation. But I think there are some things that still need to be brought out, so I choose to take this time now.

I think I can best bring these things out by reading from an article by Robert J. Samuelson that appeared in Newsweek magazine on April 22, 1985.

He said in this article:

> Comparable worth's illusion is that the relative worth of different skills, working conditions and responsibilities can be distilled into formula. They can't. So comparable worth leads to the wrong questions about jobs. In Wisconsin state government, where the ideas is being studied, a legal secretary is paid $14,800 and a public-defender investigator (level 3) $20,600. The experimental job-evaluation system rates the jobs almost equal; 92 percent of the investigators are men and 100 percent of the secretaries are women. To eliminate "sex bias," the recommendation is to raise the legal secretary 33 percent to $19,600.

Mr. Chairman, continuing the quote:

If I lived in Wisconsin, I would want to know whether the legal secretaries are competent. If so, why isn't $14,800 adequate? If not, I would not reward them with a $4,800 raise without first assuring their competence. I would ask the same question of investigators. The right question is not: do we pay women's (or men's) jobs enough? But do we pay enough for specific jobs—say teachers, men or women—to get qualified workers. And, if not what combination of higher salaries and qualifications is needed?

Mr. Chairman, I think that is what the issue boils down to. We need to make sure that we are asking the right questions. When we approach this based totally on our assumption that if there is a difference in pay between a job that is normally occupied by women and a job that is normally occupied by men, that is based strictly on discrimination, then we are asking the wrong questions. We need to ask the right questions.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will adopt this substitute, because I believe that better asks the right questions than the bill before us.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, because I know we are all anxious to complete this matter. The gentleman from Utah did raise a good point, and indeed I had my name raised by the gentleman from Arkansas. I understand that folks in Arkansas are not always crazy about folks from Texas, and I understood, when I decided after the July recess that I would have to come into this body and work very hard and provide a great deal of information, that that information may be characterized, as it has been so often today, as misinformation.

I understood that the question of race might be raised, and that a finger might be pointed either directly or indirectly. I suspected that maybe some of us might be called "sexist," and yesterday in the New York Times I was referred to by one of the Members of this body as a sexist operating outside the fringe.

It is for that reason that I perhaps did the deplorable thing and emphasized that I am an economist and even indeed that I have a Ph.D. in economics, not that I am so proud of my Ph.D. but because from the outset I realized that I had to make it clear that as a professional economist I was addressing an economic issue, not an issue of race or not an issue of sex, and that I was trying to get information out.

Yes, we are concerned. We are not unrealistic in our concerns. We do not have a free-floating anxiety. Our concerns are reality based. Take the Washington State case or the Illinois State case, take any case, the lawsuits follow when these things are passed. We are concerned about those things. We tried today to offer amendments, and by rejection of our amendments the majority has demonstrated that they do not want a fair commission. They want one stacked 6 to 5. They do not want a fair study. They want a single consultant with a single methodology that has been proven faulty already.

There is a question of fairness. Will we stamp out discrimination? Some of us honestly believe implementing this kind of study, with the policy changes that could be recommended, will create more discrimination, and particularly discrimination toward blue-collar workers. Numerous studies have been done, and they have been discounted. It is not a question so much of misinformation—and indeed, if there were a question of misinformation, that is on both sides—but what information has never been taken into consideration, that has been left totally out of the hearings, out of the study, and out of the discussion.

□ 1735

The bill still risks judicial implementation. We have seen it in every case where a study has been authorized by a legislative body, before that body could act to legislate implementation suits have been filed and countersuits have been filed by those people against whom discrimination is found by the implementation of these kinds of procedures.

I think it is only fair that there be some recognition of the fact that those of us on this side of the issue are serious in our consideration of the impact of this on the American economy, on the American working man and the American working woman, in the interest of fairness and in the interest of trying to save this Nation's governing body from moving in the direction of a Government administered system of wages in this country. That has been characterized by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] as socialism. I know of no other way to characterize the government administration of prices in any nation.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with an agreement we had with the minority and the desire to rise at 6 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that we conclude debate, after the minority Member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] speaks, in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman requesting that on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and all amendments thereto?

Ms. OAKAR. All amendments thereto, yes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have a question that I would like to ask.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I was speaking specifically of the Burton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has reserved the right to object.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, my question is if we limit the time on this amendment and all subsequent amendments thereto, after the Committee rises, does the gentlewoman not have a substitute or an amendment? Will this affect that?

Ms. OAKAR. No; if the gentleman will yield, I was not really referring to anything else.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there shall be 5 minutes on this side and then 10 minutes on that side; in effect, we are talking about 15 minutes from now the Committee will rise. Is that correct?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say yes to my minority Member.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Members standing at the time of the request by the gentlewoman from Ohio will be recognized for 2 minutes each. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I regret taking this 5 minutes at this late hour for a number of reasons. First, we have an agreement that we will be out of here by 6 o'clock and I think everyone has heard enough about this; but I am concerned about this issue because there have been so many misstatements made about what is in this act.

I have been around here for a number of years and I do not remember any legislation, even major legislation, and I do not consider this major legislation, that has been as poorly talked about, as poorly presented throughout the country.

I know I have been threatened. I have been intimidated. I have been impugned by I guess some serious people back home.

I asked them, "Have you read the bill?"

And they say, "Well, no, but we have heard about it and we have heard it is comparable worth."

Now, my name is not on here as a cosponsor to the bill. You may wonder why I am up here. I do not have to take my credentials as a conservative second to anyone here, but I am in support of this legislation for several reasons.

First, I thank my chairperson for making concessions. I say concessions, because the gentlewoman did not have to. She had the votes in the committee and probably on this floor to come forth with a comparable worth bill, but it did cause me problems, as it did many of you, so we have taken out the comparable worth concept in this bill.

Now, I was at a point a few years ago when I did not call a coin by its first name. It was a lot more popular calling it high tax. I always referred to it as a high tax because it got more votes.

Calling this comparable worth, it gets some opposition, but that does not change the bill or the concept here.

What we are talking about, is there gender-based wage discrimination within the Federal Government, is there? Can anyone today say there is or is not a wage discrimination because a person happens to be a female instead of a male? I do not know, but that is all this bill does is to cause a study.

Now, we have an amendment here in the form of a substitute that is another study. I regret to have to oppose my friend, the gentleman from Indiana. He and I most often vote together, but I think the gentleman is ill-advised on this and I do not agree with him.

Now, some of the opponents here today have brought up a number of ideals or suggestions, talking about this is a new area, and then the same people come back later in the debate and say, "Well, we have studied this for years in the Federal Government." Is it or is it not a new idea? I do not know, not until we examine it further.

Others have said it is a cause of litigation. They have been advised, my friend says he has been advised by the Justice Department that this for certain will cause lawsuits.

There is nothing, nothing in this bill that would give any sanction, any reason whatsoever for a lawsuit. Lawsuits can be brought now, and are, under title 7 of the Civil Rights Act, but nothing in this act provides for any lawsuit, not in the least.

Then they talk about the cost to the taxpayers. It may be, but what is the cost to the taxpayer who happens to be a female today, and there are female taxpayers, too, because they do not get paid as much for doing the same job? How about the single parent?

I talked to one just today who is looking for a better job. She said she has three children to support. She is looking for a better job, but if she cannot get the same pay, she is not paying Federal taxes. She is not supporting her children.

This is what we are talking about here. It is not the issue of liberal versus conservative or sexist, racist, and all the other suggestions that have been thrown around here. It is too bad to give that kind of a tag to this needed legislation.

Now, title 7 of the Civil Rights Act provides that the private sector of our country, the business out there, cannot discriminate because of a number of things, including because of the gender of the employee.

Should we in the Federal Government not live within the same rules? We passed title 7.

This is what this says. Is the Federal Government living within the same rules and laws that every taxpayer out there has to live with? This is what we are saying here. It does not write new legislation. It is an examination if the Federal Government, the one that we run here, is doing the same thing that it is requiring everyone else in this country to live with. Should they not be held to that?

Last and most importantly, I am supporting this legislation because I believe in justice. To use a personal experience, my wife came to our little town in Indiana a number of years ago as a teacher. That little town hired four new teachers that year, two women and two men, both of equal education, both first-year teachers, both men made more than either one of the women made. Each of them made more money.

Do you say that is justice?

My wife and I have two daughters. Because they were born female, should they go through life not earning as much because they were born female? They are both professionals now. I do not think so.

We are not talking about racist or sexism or anything else. We are talking about justice and you have a chance to vote for it today.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] on the stand the gentlewoman has taken here and brought forward, the legislation that would produce the justice that people are concerned about.

Mr. Chairman, we have had talk of economics. This is not an economic matter. The greatest work of free men was the Constitution and in 1964 it had to be updated to provide in fact rights for people in America, the greatest nation of all.

We are in a constant state of flux and there are changes that have to be made. This is certainly one of those particular changes.

I want to talk just a minute about the economic discussions that seem to abound on the floor. Are we saying here today that cost and dollars should preclude fairness and justice? If in fact, what are we afraid of with this study?

I think the comments of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JOHN SEIBERLING, were right to the point. He said all you need to do is read the bill and it will allay those particular fears.

But do we have fears that in fact this study will document that sex discrimination, yes; does exist, and if it does, that there may in fact be lawsuits that may cause an economic situation in our country? Yes; that is true; but are we to say because of that factor that we should leave matters as they are, with possible discrimination still in existence? Do economics and cost preclude justice?

I think the Founding Fathers would turn over in their graves if they would in fact hear the discussion that has taken place here on the House floor here today. We have belabored this for many hours. This is a matter of justice.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the commitment of the previous speakers to that particular concept. I think all Members of the House should vote their conscience on justice today, not economics and dollar costs.

So again, I commend the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for her stand, and to all the Members of the House who look at it as it exists, a consideration of justice.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I speak because I am from a State that has had some experience with this, Washington State.

Because of the lack of time, however, I have asked to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I want to again make the point that I have been trying to make and I want to ask the gentlewoman from Ohio if she would respond to my question.

In light of the committee amendment that was stricken at the urging of those of us who are concerned about the comparable worth issue, does the gentlewoman also agree to strike all references in the committee report that refer to that same problem?

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. OAKAR. I do not have a problem with that, as I told the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Well, it is very important to those of us who are concerned about the wording of this legislation. I do not, and I want to make it clear, I do not intend to vote for the substitute, because I felt that we were getting extremely close to settling the comparable worth issue. Unfortunately, we were not able to resolve it yet, but we will attempt to do it when we go into the House, when we rise.

To complete what I had hoped to do, and that is to strike all references to that which some of us believe refer to comparable worth, all the other speeches, and I certainly would like to associate myself with the gentlewoman's fine remarks as far as the intent of what the gentlewoman has consistently said to me and I have heard the gentlewoman say in the floor of the House today. I do not believe we are that far apart.

What we are talking about is what some of us believe is extremely important wording of the intent because of the court case that has arisen and that is creating some enormous economic problems and potential future problems; so it is very important to me, and I understand the gentlewoman's reluctance to answer, but the committee report language is extremely specific in doing that which the gentlewoman has contended and has stricken with the committee amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman knows, we struck that section out through an amendment that I offered, in effect. It was a committee amendment, and that is what is really binding; but I said that I would take out the report language that refers to that section.

Mr. STENHOLM. The report language, that is what I wanted, the report language that deals with that section, and I would encourage support for my amendment to strike the remaining one-third of this issue and that takes comparable worth completely out of the debate and will make this particular bill worthy of support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think I will just sum up by saying we are all for equal pay for equal work. I think my substitute will provide a study mechanism to make sure that equal pay for equal work prevails throughout the Federal employment system of the United States and I hope everybody will see fit to support it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote against the substitute. The reason is that the substitute effectively guts this study and the reason for passing this bill. It calls for a completely different kind of study. That study may be worth doing at another time and another place, but it is not a real substitute for what is being asked for in this bill. It is a study of affirmative action. It is not a substitute for a study of pay practices.

□ 1750

If Members are concerned about the basic facts, if they are concerned about whether or not there is discrimination and they do not know, listen to these facts:

While women comprise 46 percent of the Federal work force, 85.5 percent of women are concentrated in just the lower civil service job classes and make 63 percent of what their male counterparts make. My colleagues may not accept those facts, the facts may not be right, but the point is that we need this study. We need to know what the facts are, and if the facts are anything like that, we need to take action.

I was interested that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] said that the Government should not be involved. That same gentleman makes eloquent arguments about why the Government should be involved in the question of abortion, but yet he makes the argument today that it is not appropriate for the Government to be involved in standing for and worrying about this basic, basic human right, the right of all people in this country to be able to participate in this economy in an equal way.

It is time for this commission, it is time not to vote for a substitute that guts it, and I hope Members will stand strong against the substitute and for the bill for equal rights.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 277, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—142

Archer
Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Billey
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Campbell
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Franklin
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gregg
Grotberg
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Hunter
Hyde
Ireland
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McMillan
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Monson
Moore
Moorhead
Nielson
O'Brien
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Porter
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOES—277

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Daschle
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (PA)
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hertel
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Madigan
Markey
Martin (IL)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
Meyers
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari

Mollohan	Robinson	Studds
Montgomery	Rodino	Swift
Moody	Roe	Synar
Morrison (CT)	Roemer	Tallon
Morrison (WA)	Rose	Tauke
Mrazek	Rostenkowski	Tauzin
Murphy	Roukema	Thomas (GA)
Murtha	Rowland (GA)	Torres
Myers	Roybal	Torricelli
Natcher	Russo	Towns
Neal	Sabo	Traficant
Nelson	Savage	Traxler
Nichols	Scheuer	Udall
Nowak	Schneider	Valentine
Oakar	Schroeder	Vento
Oberstar	Schumer	Visclosky
Obey	Seiberling	Volkmer
Olin	Sharp	Walgren
Ortiz	Shelby	Watkins
Owens	Sikorski	Waxman
Panetta	Sisisky	Weaver
Pease	Skelton	Weiss
Penny	Slattery	Wheat
Pepper	Smith (FL)	Whitehurst
Perkins	Smith (IA)	Whitley
Petri	Smith (NJ)	Whitten
Pickle	Snowe	Wilson
Price	Solarz	Wirth
Pursell	Spratt	Wise
Quillen	St Germain	Wolpe
Rahall	Staggers	Wyden
Rangel	Stallings	Yates
Ray	Stark	Yatron
Regula	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Reid	Stokes	Young (MO)
Richardson	Strang	
Rinaldo	Stratton	

NOT VOTING—15

Addabbo	Fowler	Manton
Brown (CA)	Gray (IL)	McKinney
Carney	Green	Rudd
Conyers	Kildee	Williams
Early	Lungren	Wright

□ 1800

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lungren for, with Mr. Kildee against.

Mr. Carney for, with Mr. Green against.

Messrs. JENKINS, FRENZEL, and LENT changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3008; legislation which calls for a study of the Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether discrimination based on sex, race, or national origin exists.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, specifically prohibits wage discrimination. Section 703 of that act (42 U.S.C. Section 2000e-2(a)(1)) states that "It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer (1) to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation * * * because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin * * *."

The discrimination which we seek to eradicate through this proposed study is a direct by-product of occupational segregation. The issue raised concerns whether work done primarily by women and minorities is systematically undervalued primarily, if not solely, because that work continues to be done for the most part by women and minorities. There is strong evidence that wages paid to women and men engaged in historically female or minority work are artificially depressed relative to what those wages would be if the jobs were being performed by white males.

Data which describes and, indeed, supports the fact of job segregation is compelling. For example, 80 percent of all women work in 25 of the 420 census occupational categories. Women constituted 44 percent of all workers in 1980, but filled 81 percent of clerical jobs, 97 percent of private household jobs, and 61 percent of other service jobs. 59.5 percent of black women and 53 percent of white women are concentrated in only 2 of the 12 major occupations.

Of equal importance is the combined presence of a significant wage gap within occupations. In sales jobs, for example, women earned 42 percent of men's salaries. In general, while the proportion of women in managerial positions has increased since 1960, their earnings relative to men declined from 58 to 55 percent. To ignore the role of discrimination in producing these disparities is to ignore reality.

During hearings held in 1980, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission explored the issue of whether wages for jobs historically segregated on racial, sex or other unlawful basis have been discriminatorily depressed because those jobs were held by minorities and women. This remains one of the most significant and most difficult issues left unresolved under title VII today. While a constructive dialog has ensued for several years, little progress has been made toward any meaningful conclusions. The most often cited reason for this lack of progress is the complexity of the issue. We must ensure that this valid concern does not become an excuse for unwarranted and unwise delay. For notwithstanding the complexity of the issue, its resolution has major ramifications for millions of individuals throughout the American work force. H.R. 3008 constructs a forum in which to conduct a study, assess the available evidence and proceed in a prudent and deliberate manner to understand the scope and character of the problem and, subsequently, to fashion an appropriate and effective response. It is that all important first step. For these reasons, I applaud and support the introduction of this important legislation and urge your support for its passage and enactment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, recently, allegations have been made that H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act, is fully consistent with the Ninth Circuit decision in AFSCME versus State of Washington, on the issue of comparable worth. These allegations place little importance on the appellate court's decision to reverse Judge Tanner's original decision. I call your attention to an analysis of the case and its effect upon H.R. 3008 conducted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Mr. Pendleton, the Chairman of the Commission, states that H.R. 3008 is "fundamentally inconsistent with AFSCME." Chairman Pendleton further notes that the Ninth circuit's reversal of AFSCME invalidates "the only decision to give support to the job evaluation methodology that H.R. 3008 would employ to prove discrimination." The Commission analysis centers on the inconsistency in finding that AFSCME and H.R. 3008 are in accord by noting that the bill purports to authorize "a study to determine whether the Federal Government's wage setting and position-classification practices are consistent with title VII and the Equal Pay Act." However, such a study would "authorize use as a standard which is legally insufficient as a means of proving discrimination."

Below is a copy of the Commission's analysis. I hope that it will help enlighten my colleagues as to the apparent inconsistencies between AFSCME and the proposed legislation, H.R. 3008.

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, October 7, 1985.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENSENBRENNER: This will respond to your request for a staff analysis of the claim that the Ninth Circuit decision in *AFSCME* v. *State of Washington* is consistent with H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. The opinion expressed herein is that H.R. 3008 is fundamentally inconsistent with *AFSCME*, and that claims to the contrary serve only to draw attention from the many legitimate objections to the bill.

H.R. 3008 would employ a comparable worth job evaluation for purposes of determining whether the Government's wage setting and position-classification systems are designed and administered in a manner consistent with Title VII and the Equal Pay Act, that is, whether they are discriminatory within the meaning of these statutes. *AFSCME* clearly indicates that such an inquiry is not within the scope of these statutes.

In reversing Judge Tanner's decision upholding job evaluation as a means of determining compliance with Title VII, the Ninth Circuit invalidated the only decision to give support to the job evaluation methodology that H.R. 3008 would employ to prove discrimination.

The Ninth Circuit held in that case that comparable worth theory did not afford AFSCME a basis for recovery under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. AFSCME had argued that discriminatory intent could be inferred from the Willis study, which found that the State's practice of setting wages in reliance on the market created wage disparities among jobs of comparable worth disproportionately represented in terms of gender. This argument fails, said the Court:

"Neither law nor logic deems the free market system a suspect enterprise. Economic reality is that the value of a particular job to an employer is but one factor influencing the rate of compensation for that job. Other considerations may include the availability of workers willing to do the job and the effectiveness of collective bargaining in a particular industry."

Citing its own precedent in *Spaulding* v. *University of Washington*, the Court noted that employers may be constrained by market forces to set salaries under prevailing wage rates for different job classifications. "We find nothing," said the Court, "in the language of Title VII or its legislative history to indicate Congress intended to abrogate fundamental economic principles

such as the laws of supply and demand or to prevent employers from competing in the labor market."

H.R. 3008 is thus in conflict with itself. It purports to authorize a study to determine whether the Federal Government's wage setting and position-classification practices are consistent with Title VII and the Equal Pay Act, but in doing so would authorize use of a standard which is legally insufficient as a means of proving discrimination.

The claim that the Ninth Circuit decision is consistent with H.R. 3008 is usually expressed by drawing out of context language from the Court's opinion to the effect that a comparable worth job evaluation, "like other job evaluation studies, . . . may be useful as a diagnostic tool." This language is dicta, and as such is not important to the Court's holding. The missing context, moreover, supplies its true meaning. The Court did not say that a comparable worth job evaluation is a useful diagnostic tool, but rather, *"[a]ssuming"* that it is, an employer should not be bound by its results. The Court gave reasons for this, stating:

"The results of comparable worth studies will vary depending on the number and types of factors measured and the maximum number of points allotted to each factor. A study which indicates a particular wage structure might be more equitable should not categorically bind the employer who commissioned it. The employer should also be able to take into account market conditions, bargaining demands, and the possibility that another study will yield different results."

The Ninth Circuit's reasoning reinforces the argument of opponents of H.R. 3008 that job evaluation is highly subjective. In fact, it is significant in this regard that the trial court in *AFSCME* had refused to hear testimony concerning the Jeanneret job evaluation, which arrived at findings opposite those of the Willis job evaluation even though Jeanneret used the same data and job descriptions.

The Ninth Circuit's view of the merits of a comparable worth job evaluation were similarly expressed by U.S. District Court Judge Kocoras last April in *American Nurses' Association* v. *State of Illinois.* Wrote Judge Kocoras:

"Aside from the problems inherent in the implementation and administration of a comparable worth standard by the courts, any criteria of pay equity ultimately rests on value judgments. Although some correlation between sex-segregated jobs and lower wages no doubt exists, the job characterization factor is undeniably only one among many of the determinatives of pay scales. Because jobs do not have an intrinsic value that can be scientifically measured, the limitations inherent in job evaluation techniques prohibit the proposed extension of Title VII."

The Ninth Circuit decision in *AFSCME* casts light on the question of how job evaluation studies may be done. While they may not be done to prove discrimination, as is the intent of H.R. 3008, they may of course be conducted as a means of arranging pay scales within an organization consistent with the labor market. This has been the practice of the Office of Personnel Management, and it is there that the responsibility to conduct job evaluations of Federal wage-setting and position-classification practices should remain.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE M. PENDLETON, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, in New York City, police dispatchers are paid $4,000 to $6,000 more than their counterparts in the fire department. In Montgomery County, MD, liquor clerks, who need not possess a college degree, earn the same amount as schoolteachers. In Denver, nurses make less than hospital maintenance men and gardeners.

What unites these examples of seemingly irrational variations in pay? In each case, the occupation dominated by women receives lower pay than that held largely by men. The reason for much of the disparity is not hard to identify. Historically, women have been largely segregated into a narrow band of the occupational spectrum, and the jobs where they have been concentrated have been relatively lower paying—regardless of the skills, training, or knowledge required. These jobs have been deemed by society to be "women's work" and thus the rewards attached to them have been lower than those accorded to occupations dominated by men.

Which particular jobs are identified as women's work may vary from culture to culture. But the placement of a higher value on the work of men seems to be a nearly universal phenomenon. "There are villages in which men fish and women weave and in which women fish and men weave," the anthropologist Margaret Mead observed, "but in either type of village, the work done by the men is valued higher than work done by women."

In an effort to redress the sex discrimination imbedded in occupational and wage classifications, four States and more than 15 cities have negotiated pay adjustments with their employees. Another 25 States have established commissions to determine whether this sort of discrimination persists in their civil service compensation scales.

The bill before us today, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, would bring the Federal Government into line with a majority of the States by mandating a study of lingering sex discrimination in the Federal civil service pay system.

Hardly the radical measure that its opponents depict, this bill would require a bipartisan commission to study the problem of pay equity in the Federal civil service, not dictate a particular result for that study nor specify a particular remedy.

The Federal Government is our Nation's largest employer, yet its pay structure has not been reviewed for more than 60 years. This bill would take an important first step toward the elimination of the historic inequities that plague that structure and deprive women who work for the Federal Government of a fair return for their labors.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985.

H.R. 3008 would provide for a study of the Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether they are marred by wage discrimination, based on race, sex, and ethnicity. I am an original cosponsor of this bill, as I feel it contains the most-needed ingredients to find discrimination in the Federal work force, should it exist.

Let me say loud and clear that in recent months there has been a gross misrepresentation of this legislation on the part of a number of people. We are not doing anything radical here. Keep in mind that what we are talking about is a study of where we stand in the Federal sector; what we must do to ensure equal employment treatment under the law. Alternatives have been suggested. They have not been effective. In fact, the full committee has rejected one alternative proposal that would have cut back on the Commission's effectiveness.

Let me share some facts which you—facts about the measure we are considering.

H.R. 3008 does not mention the words "comparable worth."

The study applies only to classified employees of the Federal civil service. It does not apply to any other employer in the private sector or States.

The bill does not create a new definition of discrimination. It mandates a study of all compensable factors, including, job content and market factors, to determine if Federal pay practices are consistent with title VII and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

H.R. 3008 prohibits the Commission from recommending pay or grade reductions for Federal classified employees.

H.R. 3008 does not encourage multimillion-dollar lawsuits against the Federal Government.

Women in the Federal work force earn an average of 62.8 cents for every dollar a federally employed man does. Furthermore, black women in the Federal Government earn only an average of 62.2 cents when compared to a man. In looking at all sectors—Federal, State, and local governments, as well as private—white women bring in 59.2 cents for every dollar paid to a man: black women earn 54.7, and Hispanic women earn 51.2 cents.

Despite the fact that almost half of the people in the Federal work force are women, about 70 percent of the female employees are grouped in grades 1 to 6. A full 85 percent are in grades 10 to 15.

Mr. Chairman, let me stress that opponents of this legislation have repeatedly alleged that it would presume any wage gap would be called discrimination. It would not.

Mr. Chairman, pay equity is a concrete, solid practice taking place all over this great Nation. Pay equity plans are being initiated in moderate terms at very minimal costs to State and local governments. The Federal Government should follow the example taken by these governments. This bill seeks to demonstrate that the Federal Government, as an employer, is acting responsibly in examining its own personnel policies for discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, if H.R. 3008 does not pass here today, we are putting ourselves on record in denying our daughters, granddaughter, nieces, and the women in our

constituencies a chance at equal opportunity. There are certain organizations in the last few days who shout that we are already saying there is rampant discrimination in the Federal work force. This is not true. All we are trying to do is study whether it does exist. The Federal Government cannot operate by shutting its doors to such a study. We owe it to the women and minorities of this country to find out if they are getting a fair shake. America is the land of the free and the brave and much opportunity. We must not close doors when they have not even been opened yet.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3008 without substantive amendments.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, today it seems certain that consideration of comparable worth legislation will be completed. Therefore, at this time I would like to commend the gentleman from Texas, DICK ARMEY for his leadership in mounting the opposition to this impossible bill.

Throughout all the debate and all the speeches on this issue, I have heard many fine technical and theoretical arguments raised in opposition to the concept of comparable worth. But in my view, the issue boils down to a simple case of arrogance on the part of the supporters of comparable worth.

What could be more arrogant than the belief that a commission of Government bureaucrats knows more than, and can outguess, the marketplace? If these people are as smart as all that, perhaps we should send them to the negotiating table in Geneva to outguess the Russians.

I have a little free advice for all my colleagues still determined to support this ill-advised measure. I suggest they leave Congress and take full-time jobs on Wall Street, where the ability to outguess the marketplace can result in untold fortunes. But let me also warn my colleagues who decide to take that advice that the poor house is full of people who thought they could outguess the market.

In closing, why don't we put an end to this attitude of "we know better than the people do" that so permeates this Chamber. The American people are not children and don't deserve to be treated like them. In fact, many even go so far as to enter into business arrangements—without asking Washington's permission first! I know to many of you enamored with comparable worth this is a staggering revelation, and an infuriating one at that.

So let's do the right thing and defeat the arrogant comparable worth legislation, H.R. 3008.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in firm support of H.R. 3008, the Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. This bill provides for a study of Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether they discriminate according to sex, race, or hispantic origin.

Three generations of Americans have entered the Federal work force under a wage plan implemented in 1923. The system has yet to be reviewed. It is undeniable that the composition of our Nation's work force has changed drastically since 1923. Not only has the number of women wage earners increased by 600 percent but the percentage of minorities in the work force has also increased significantly during the past 63 years. Census Bureau statistics show that the earning capacity of households headed by women and minorities has been severely restricted. Certainly careful scrutiny of the pay and classification practices of our Nation's largest employer, the Federal Government, is in order, Now.

The general schedule divides Federal positions according to difficulty, responsibility, and the qualifications necessary to perform them. H.R. 3008 would establish a bipartisan commission to determine whether pay equity is a reality in the Federal Government or whether occupations in which women and minorities are concentrated have been undervalued.

It would study only policies appecting the Federal Government's civil service: Local and private sector hiring and payment practices are not provided for in H.R. 3008 nor is a national wage scale created.

Job content and economic analysis will be carefully reviewed with full recognition of seniority and merit factors; market factors are an essential consideration in an accurate study of this nature.

Lastly, H.R. 3008 does not presume that any existing wage gap is due to discriminatory practices; it merely seeks an explanation for the wage differential evident in the income of men and women Federal employees.

The Federal Government should take a leadership role in investigating its wage setting process. Pay equity for women and minority employees in the Federal work force deserves the full support of Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3008.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3008, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985.

H.R. 3008 is an important effort which certainly warrants our strong support. We cannot deny that there is a definite gap between the average earnings of women and the average earnings of men in the Federal civil service pay classification system. As we cannot continue to ignore this, H.R. 3008 mandates that we look more closely at the factors that contribute to this gap seen too often in the lower salaries of women and minorities. It is the purpose of this study to determine whether or not discriminatory wage practices, based on gender or racial/ethnic origins, exist in Federal Government. As the Federal Government is the Nation's largest employer, I firmly believe that its wage and classification systems should not remain outside our scrutiny. This legislation simply calls for a study of this matter. What can possibly be wrong with studying an issue.

Pay equity simply means that wages and classifications are based on skill, effort, responsibility, and the working conditions of an occupation. It requires that jobs not be evaluated on the basis of sex or race. This study will address the presence or absence of pay equity in our Federal wage and classification system. It is only fair to our Federal employees that such a study be conducted.

It is clear that this legislation is an important step toward a better understanding of the wage gap in our Federal civil service pay classification system, and what we might do to correct it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3008, the Equitable Pay Practices Act of 1985. As you may recall, on August 1, H.R. 3008 was briefly debated, and an open rule was adopted.

I am concerned about the barrage of misinformation that had surrounded the pay equity study during the 2 weeks prior to the debate. Some of my colleagues, in an attempt to scare away supporters of this vital piece of legislation, sought to distort the pay equity issue by calling it a national comparable worth program. The notion that authorizing a study to examine discrimination in the Civil Service System will automatically lead to the implementation of a national comparable worth classification scheme, is as ridiculous as the notion that passing an equal rights amendment will automatically lead to coed public restrooms. Unfortunately, those who spread such misinformation are effective in their job, and the unfounded fears of comparable worth and a pay czar seem very real among certain sectors of our business community.

May we set the record straight? H.R. 3008 is not a comparable worth classification scheme, nor does it create any new legislation. Simply put, the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act mandates a study of the Federal pay and classification systems to determine whether they are affected by discrimination based on sex, race, or Hispanic origin. H.R. 3008 only applies to the Federal Government. Only Federal, classified jobs and salaries will be examined, and any resulting recommendations will be confined solely to the Federal Civil Service System.

As I have stated to you before, the Federal Government should not be afraid to examine its hiring practices to determine whether or not discrimination exists. Shunning this social responsibility indicates that the Federal Government is not truly serious in its commitment to civil rights. I would like to remind my colleagues that the Federal Government is not above the law, and should be subject to those very laws it passes to govern the rest of our society.

For the past 20 years the Federal Government has been one of the driving forces behind the advancement of civil rights in this Nation. The Supreme Court took a leading role in 1954 with its decision in Brown versus the Board of Education which ruled that segregation was unconstitutional. With this landmark ruling came a commitment on the part of the Federal Government to protect the rights of all its citizens, regardless of sex, race, or ethnicity. The Pay Equity Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are tangible exam-

ples of this commitment, and illustrate the pivotal role the Federal Government can play in eliminating discrimination from our society.

In closing let me state that as legislators, we are responsible for the rights of all our fellow citizens, regardless of their sex, race, or ethnicity. Defeating H.R. 3008 would represent an abandonment of our commitment to the civil rights, and to the trust our constituents put in us to see that they are all treated fairly and equally.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, today's working women are concentrated in low paying, unskilled to semiskilled clerical and service positions. This is true despite the fact that women have entered the work force in record numbers in recent decades and more than half of the women in the United States are now employed. The consequences of this are shocking. The 1980 census showed that women working full-time, year-round earn an average of only 59 cents for every dollar earned by men.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this injustice continues despite the fact that for two decades now the Equal Pay Act has been the law of the land. This act prohibits employers from paying female workers less than male workers performing the same job. Clearly, however, this legislation has not been successful. Clearly, enormous and unacceptable differences remain between the compensation received by male and female workers. Clearly, action to reduce those differences is essential.

Although the Federal Government has made great strides in some areas of assuring equal treatment of women, pay equity is not one. The Federal Government is the largest employer in our Nation with 2.8 million workers on its payroll. Of that number, 46 percent are women. As in so many other areas, the majority of these women held the lowest-paying positions. Last year, women employed by the Federal Government earned an average annual salary of $17,000, while male workers earned an average annual salary of $28,000—a gap of $9,000.

Mr. Chairman, I fully and enthusiastically support the Federal Equitable Pay Practices Act (H.R. 3008) being considered by the House. This legislation is an essential first step toward remedying pay inequity. The bill mandates study and review to identify discriminatory wage setting practices and discriminatory wage differentials. The study will determine to what extent discrimination on the basis of sex, race, and ethnicity is present in the Federal pay and classification systems.

Women employed by the Federal Government are paid less than men because of a classification system which is biased against the skill, responsibilities, and duties of predominantly female jobs. This trend must be reversed. The Federal Government must take the lead in establishing gender-neutral compensation.

In approving this bill, however, the Congress is doing more than mandating a study. It is also making a moral commitment to take action to deal with the inequities that are found. This bill puts the Federal Government on record in favor of action on pay equity, both the Federal Government and elsewhere throughout our economy.

Mr. Chairman, the massive increase in the number of women in the labor force over the past two decades has made the continuation of sex-based discrimination untenable. The Federal Government has the responsibility to set the pace in achieving pay equity. The Federal Government must lead the way to reduce and eliminate this unacceptable gap. I urge support of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the Chair, Mr. TORRES, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3008) to promote equitable pay practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal civil service, pursuant to House Resolution 241, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

DEBT CEILING EXTENSION

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so because I understand the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], has asked for unanimous consent to explain some action having to do, I am sure, with the extension of the debt ceiling and what action may or may not have taken place in the other body that would affect us, and only for the purposes of having the distinguished chairman explain to us what he has in mind would I make this reservation at this time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain the thinking behind our decision not to agree to the limitation on the authority of Treasury to use Federal Financing Bank Act borrowings. Members should be aware that what the other body has done does not, in our opinion, amount to an extension of the Federal debt limit.

However, it does limit the authority the Treasury Department has to borrow from the FFB.

H.R. 3453, as passed by the House of Representatives, provided a short 45-day extension of the Superfund taxes the Congress enacted in 1980. Those taxes expired on September 30, 1985. H.R. 3453 would have continued the taxes through November 14, 1985, so that the Congress would have adequate time to act on a long-term reauthorization of the Superfund Hazardous Waste Cleanup Program.

The Senate amendment deletes the Superfund tax extension and puts in its place an amendment to the Federal Financing Bank Act of 1975. The amendment decreases the authority of the FFB to borrow from $15 billion to $5,000,010,000. Earlier today, the Treasury used this authority to increase FFB borrowings by $5 billion in order to prevent default on U.S. Government obligations.

□ 1815

The Senate amendment would require that beginning October 18, all FFB borrowings be counted toward the public debt subject to limit. The effect of this amendment then is to retain the current debt limit of $1,823.8 billion but require action to increase that limit by October 18. The $5 billion borrowed by the Treasury today using the FFB authority is expected to provide the Treasury with sufficient cash only through October 17.

The present debt crisis has resulted from the failure of the other body to pass House Joint Resolution 372, the debt ceiling bill passed by this House in August when the final budget resolution was agreed to. Failure to extend the debt ceiling has denied interest earnings to various trust funds and will result in higher future interest payments when the Treasury eventually goes back into the market with larger than anticipated issues. The securities sold today undoubtedly carry a higher interest rate because of the unprecedented use of FFB authority and the uncertainties created by the current crisis.

The effect of the Senate's action in sending H.R. 3453 back to this body is to shorten the time period before a default must occur. That is because as amended H.R. 3453 would restrict the availability of FFB borrowing authority by roughly two-thirds of its current account. It would virtually insure that on or very shortly after October 18, we would face an absolute up or down decision on extending the debt. For those advocating the so-called Gramm-Rudman amendment as passed by the Senate, without much or any significant review by this body, that is a desirable end. For those in this Chamber, however, who feel that this body should have sufficient time to carefully scrutinize this major change in our budget process, it could truly mean a disaster.

By not agreeing to restricting Treasury's access to FFB authority, we effectively lengthen the time available

to this body to consider the Gramm-Rudman amendment in conference until approximately the end of this month. that is not an unreasonable amount of time given the face that Gramm-Rudman amounts to a fundamental restructuring of the Budget Act. In short, this is why the decision has been made not to accept the other body's action in this matter.

The long and short of it is that what the amendment offered by the Senate did was restrict the time available to the House on Gramm-Rudman and give us more time constraints. Effectively this shortens the opportunity for us to look into what actualy Gramm-Rudman means.

Mr. MICHEL. If I might inquire of the distinguished chairman, the chairman is saying that at this time at least, the majority side would not want to accept the proposal of the other side that we authorize the financing of further obligations under that Federal Financing Bank by some $5 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Well, what I understand the amendment to do is to restrict to $5 billion all the amounts that the Treasury could borrow.

What the gentleman from Illinois is suggesting is that there is now $15 billion in FFB authority, and that money should be available for the Treasury to continue to operate until approximately the 1st of November.

I have discussed this with the Secretary, and he has agreed that there is $15 billion there.

Mr. MICHEL. Would the gentleman be able to wager a guess as to what additional amount this is going to cost us in interest, then, to do what the gentleman suggests as distinguished from what the other body has proposed that we do?

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. I do not know exactly what in interest payments the increase would mean. I do know, however, that it would cost more; and then again when, after October 1, the Treasury was to go to the market, there will be the increased debt of $15 billion plus a higher market rates for the Treasury notes due to heavier borrowing.

Mr. MICHEL. Now, for Members' education here with respect to timing, here we are on Wednesday and we will be in session tomorrow, but we had earlier agreed that we would be off Friday, we would be off Monday and Tuesday. What does this suggest for the Members of the timing of when we would enjoin this isue?

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Well, it is actually, Mr. Leader, up to the Senate. When the Senate gets to us the measure that we will consider, I am sure that this body will go to conference as fast as possible.

Mr. MICHEL. If the gentleman could hypothesize for a moment, if what the other body has done is at odds with what this body would do, and there would be a necessity for going to conference, when would the gentleman suggest that there might be a conference on the difference between what this body might do as against what the other body might do expectedly tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Can the Chair intervene at this time? As I understand it, the Senate is still debating the legislation and will be doing so until tomorrow; we do not know a time certain.

Mr. MICHEL. I understand.

The SPEAKER. Until the matter comes to the House, you are asking something out of the question.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was just attempting to try to give Members a sense of what the timing might be beyond tomorrow.

Let me pose this question, then: Is there any possibility or prospect of the Members having to be here Friday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hope that if and when the bill gets here, at a reasonable hour tomorrow, that the gentleman from Ways and Means would come to the floor and ask for a conference on the matter; we would go forth with naming the conferees.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. And the conference would meet, Mr. Speaker, as soon as possible; but we cannot make a judgment until such time as we receive the document from the other body.

Mr. MICHEL. Let me pose just one other question to the distinguished chairman.

Does the distinguished chairman agree that it is appropriate for the Treasury to borrow from the Federal Financing Bank without our formalization?

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: As I understand the Treasury's position, it has an obligation to borrow, to meet the Treasury's warrants, and this is an unusual situation, and certainly they prefer not to, but they have an obligation.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, from what little this gentleman knows about the subject, having discussed it somewhat during the course of the past week in some degree, it was not altogether clear that there was authorizing authority for the Treasury to do that. There was some question on the part of those downtown that they really had that authority, and then would run afoul of what legislative intent and authority was.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Well, evidently that has been resolved, because the Treasury did borrow $5 billion today.

Mr. MICHEL. But I would like to have the gentleman's expression as to whether or not he thinks that is appropriate.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Whether it is or not, the other body has postured the Treasury Department into this position, and the Treasury has borrowed.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, I will not press the case any further other than that the Federal Financing Bank, of course, is under the gentleman's authority or jurisdiction in the Committee on Ways and Means, and I want to make absolutely sure that we were not running afoul of the law in doing that, and that we were on good, sound grounds if that is what the Treasury has decided to do; and the question certainly would not come after the fact that you went ahead and did something that was counter to what this Congress would like to have you do.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Well, the Treasury Department, on Thursday of last week made the observation that they had the authority; and the gentleman from Illinois would have to accept what has happened today because the Treasury went out and borrowed, of the $15 billion, $5 billion today.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, Mr. Speaker, I assume we are going to be here tomorrow and then we will probably—overnight with what takes place in the other body, probably have a little better picture on exactly where we go from there, and undoubtedly we will require another dialog at that time between whomever, the majority leader or the Speaker himself, that we might know to better advise our Members, then, what to expect in the next week or so.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The minority leader withdraws his reservation of objection.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Committee amendment inserting in section 7(c), paragraph 4.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 13, after line 9, add the following:

(4) Also included under subsection (a)(2) shall be the Commission's determination as to whether any portion of any differential identified under subsection (b)(1) which cannot be accounted for by the application of job-content and economic analyses may be inconsistent with the general policy expressed in section 2(a) that sex, race, and ethnicity should not be among the factors considered in determining any rate of pay.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

□ 1825

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if a rollcall vote is ordered on this amendment, it be a 15-minute vote to be followed by a 5-minute vote on final passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is necessary.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I am informed that the gentleman will not ask for a rollcall. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. STENHOLM) there were—ayes 181, noes 141.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 259, noes 162, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—259

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bates
Bedell
Bellenson
Bennett
Berman
Biaggi
Biliirakis
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Brown (CO)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Carper
Carr
Chappell
Chappie
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hertel
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hughes
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Manton
Markey
Martin (IL)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Richardson
Rinaldo
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

NOES—162

Archer
Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bliley
Boulter
Broomfield
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Chandler
Chapman
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Combest
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Dyson
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Franklin
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gregg
Grotberg
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Kasich
Kemp
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Nichols
Nielson
O'Brien
Olin
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Porter
Quillen
Reid
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Rudd
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snyder
Spence
Stallings
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitley
Whittaker
Wilson
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—13

Addabbo
Brown (CA)
Carney
Conyers
Early
Fowler
Green
Kildee
Lent
Lungren
McKinney
Solomon
Wright

□ 1840

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kildee for, with Mr. Lungren against.

Mr. Green for, with Mr. Carney against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on H.R. 3008, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3453. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the Superfund taxes for 45 days.

DESIGNATING A CHANNEL IN COLORADO AS THE "FRANKLIN EDDY CANAL"

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3443) to designate the Closed Basin Conveyance Channel of the Closed Basin Division, San Luis Valley Project, Colorado, as the "Franklin Eddy Canal."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I take this action to ask the gentleman to explain what is involved.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this measure simply dedicates a portion of the

Closed Basin Division of the San Luis Valley Project in Colorado to Franklin Eddy, a man who dedicated many years of his life in helping to bring this project into reality. It involves no expense to the Federal Government.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment and commend the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for their courtesy in recognizing this great public citizen of this country.

(Mr. STRANG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

The bill ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H.R. 3443

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF CLOSED BASIN CONVEYANCE CHANNEL AS THE "FRANKLIN EDDY CANAL."

The Closed Basin Conveyance Channel of the Closed Basin Division, San Luis Valley Project, Colorado, constructed, operated, and maintained under Public Law 92-514, as amended, hereafter shall be known and designated as the "Franklin Eddy Canal.".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO CHANNEL.

Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the channel referred to in Section 1 is hereby deemed to be a reference to the "Franklin Eddy Canal.".

USE AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS AWARDED TO MDEWAKANTON AND WAHPEKUTE EASTERN OR MISSISSIPPI SIOUX

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1349) to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded in docket 363 to the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute Eastern or Mississippi Sioux before the U.S. Court of Claims and Claims Court.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what is involved?

Mr. SEIBERLING. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, S. 1349 authorizes the distribution of certain funds awarded to the Mississippi or Eastern Sioux Indians by the Court of Claims in docket No. 363.

The total amount of the award in this docket exceeds $4,800,000. Funds to satisfy the award have already been appropriated by Congress and only await enactment of this legislation for their distribution.

The successors-in-interest to the historical Mississippi Sioux Tribes involved are the Santee Sioux of Nebraska, the Flandreau Santee Sioux of South Dakota, the Lower Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota, the Prairie Island Sioux of Minnesota, and the Shakopee Sioux of Minnesota.

All relevant parties support enactment of this legislation. The administration supports this bill as amended by the Senate.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1349

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

SECTION 1. (a) That notwithstanding any other law, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the funds for awards to the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute Sioux appropriated on January 30, 1981 ($800,000), on October 15, 1982 ($591,058), and one-half of the funds appropriated on March 2, 1981 ($7,500), all in docket numbered 363 before the United States Court of Claims, and the funds appropriated on August 1, 1983 ($3,468,246.48), in docket numbered 363 before the United States Claims Court, less attorney fees and litigation expenses, and including all interest and investment income accrued, shall be divided by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter the "Secretary") as follows:

	Percent
(1) Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska	58.69
(2) Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe	15.84
(3) Prairie Island Sioux, Lower Sioux, and Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Communities of Minnesota to be divided on the basis of the respective members of each of the three communities, born on or prior to and living on the date of this Act	25.47

(b) To the share of the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska in subsection (a) of this section shall be added $172,363.20, and to the share of the Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe $135,244.32, both sums appropriated on August 1, 1983, in docket numbered 363, less attorney fees and litigation expenses, and including all interest and investment income accrued.

SEC. 2. The share of the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska shall be used and distributed as follows:

(a) Eighty per centum of the funds appropriated shall be used and distributed as follows:

(1) the Secretary shall make a per capita distribution of $300 to each tribal member born on or prior to and living on the date of this Act, except that those members at least sixty years of age on that date shall be paid $900.

(2) the balance of the 80 per centum portion of the funds shall be invested by the Secretary for a tribal investment fund designed to yield periodic dividend payments to all tribal members born on or prior to and living on the dates such dividend payments are declared. Only the interest and investment income accrued shall be available for dividend payments. The amounts and payment dates shall be determined by the tribal governing body with the approval of the Secretary, and the first of such payments shall not be made earlier than five years from the date of the per capita payment in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(b)(1) Twenty per centum of the funds shall be utilized for tribal social and economic development purposes, and for the establishment of a tribal burial fund; $200,000 of such program funds shall be invested by the Secretary for the purpose of establishing a burial fund utilizing the interest and investment income accrued. Such funds shall not be available for burial services until two years after the date of initial investment. The tribal governing body, with the approval of the Secretary, shall develop criteria for the implementation of tribal burial services.

(2) The balance of the 20 per centum portion shall be invested by the Secretary and the interest and investment income accrued shall be utilized by the tribal governing body on a budgetary basis, with the approval of the Secretary, for programs designed to enhance the social and economic development of the tribe. None of the 20 per centum programming portion of the funds shall be available for per capita or dividend payments.

SEC. 3. The share of the Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe shall be used and distributed as follows:

(a) Twenty-five per centum of the funds shall be distributed in the form of per capita payments to each tribal member born on or prior to and living on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that those members at least sixty years of age as of that date shall be paid twice the amount of other per capita recipients.

(b) Seventy-five per centum of the funds (which includes funds previously advanced to the tribal governing body) shall be used by the tribal governing body on a budgetary basis, with approval of the Secretary, for programs designed to enhance the social and economic development of the tribe. None of the 75 per centum programming portion of the funds shall be available for per capita payments.

SEC. 4. The share of the Prairie Island Sioux Community shall be used and distributed as follows:

(a) Eighty per centum of the funds shall be invested by the Secretary for a Tribal Investment Fund designed to yield periodic dividend payments to all tribal members born on or prior to and living on the dates such dividend payments are declared. Only the interest and investment income accrued shall be available for dividend payments. The amounts and payments dates shall be determined by the tribal governing body with the approval of the Secretary.

(b) Twenty per centum of the funds shall be utilized by the tribal governing body on a budgetary basis, with the approval of the Secretary, for programs designed to enhance the social and economic development

of the tribe. None of the 20 per centum programming portion of the funds shall be available for per capita or dividend payments.

SEC. 5. The share of the Lower Sioux Indian Community shall be used and distributed as follows:

(a) Eighty per centum of the funds apportioned shall be used and distributed as follows:

(1) the Secretary shall make a per capita distribution of $300 to each tribal member born on or prior to and living on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) one year from the date that the per capita payments in paragraph (1) of this subsection are made, an additional per capita payment of $300 shall be made to each tribal member who is at least sixty years of age living on such date;

(3) the balance of the 80 per centum portion of the funds shall be invested by the Secretary for a Tribal Investment Fund designed to yield periodic dividend payments to all tribal members born on or prior to and living on the dates such dividend payments are declared. Only the interest and investment income accrued shall be available for dividend payments. The amounts and payment dates shall be determined by the tribal governing body with the approval of the Secretary, and the first of such payments shall not be made earlier than five years from the date of the per capita payment in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(b) Twenty per centum of the funds shall be invested by the Secretary and the interest and investment income accrued shall be utilized by the tribal governing body on a budgetary basis, with the approval of the Secretary, for programs designed to enhance the social and economic development of the tribe. None of the 20 per centum programming portion of the funds shall be available for per capita or dividend payments.

SEC. 6. The share of the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community shall be used and distributed as follows:

(a) Eighty per centum of the funds shall be invested by the Secretary for a Tribal Investment Fund designed to yield periodic dividend payments to all tribal members born on or prior to and living on the dates such dividend payments are declared. Only the interest and investment income accrued thereon shall be available for dividend payments. The amounts and payment dates shall be determined by the tribal governing body with the approval of the Secretary.

(b) Twenty per centum of the funds shall be invested by the Secretary and the interest and investment income accrued shall be utilized by the tribal governing body on a budgetary basis, with the approval of the Secretary, for programs designed to enhance the social and economic development of the tribe. None of the 20 per centum programming portion of the funds shall be available for per capita or dividend payments.

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 7. (a) No person shall receive benefit payments as a member of more than one of the tribes under this Act. An individual who is a member of more than one of the tribes under this Act must designate the tribe from which he or she will receive per capita or dividend payments prior to receiving a per capita or dividend payment under this Act.

(b) The per capita shares or dividend payments of living, competent adults shall be paid directly to them. The shares or payments of deceased individuals, legal incompetents and minors, shall be determined and distributed under regulations prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to the Act of October 19, 1973 (87 Stat. 466), as amended (96 Stat. 2512; 25 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

SEC. 8. Per capita and dividend payment distributions made pursuant to this Act shall be subject to the provisions of section 7 of the Act of October 19, 1973 (87 Stat. 466), as amended, (96 Stat. 2515; 25 U.S.C. 1407).

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the two bills just passed, H.R. 3443 and S. 1349.

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

There was no objection.

WORLD FOOD DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 72) to designate October 16, 1985, as "World Food Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who is the chief sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 172, World Food Day.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

Mr. Speaker, recent events such as the "Live Aid" Concert and the U.S.A. for Africa production of "We are the World" only in part document the incredible contribution thousands of Americans are making toward ending world hunger.

Since 1979, the National Committee for World Food Day under the leadership of its chairwoman, Patricia Young, has undertaken hundreds of projects and programs related to the world's hunger problem. Without "World Food Day" and the organizations involved with its celebration, the ground swell needed that made the recent media events possible would never have existed.

Americans can be proud of the fact that one-half of all the food committed this year to Africa has been donated by the United States. Individuals have sent over $120 million to private voluntary organizations such as "CARE" and "Save the Children."

Additionally, the U.S. Government has sent a total of $125 billion for the drought since the emergency first came to national attention last October. This is in addition to $1 billion the U.S. Government is spending on nonemergency projects in Africa this year.

Yet, despite this impressive outpouring of support, the problem of world hunger persists. Some 17 countries in Africa are still being impacted by drought—150 million people. And 13 million are at immediate risk of dying. Every 24 hours, 42,000 children under the age of 5 die as a result of hunger and related diseases.

These grim statistics make a strong case for a continued commitment of private and Government funds to ending hunger. But emergency relief aid is not enough. A concerted effort must be made to improve the deteriorating conditions that result in tragedy after tragedy—the same conditions that allow famine and starvation to persist and remain a reality in a world with more than enough resources to feed its population. It is time to work to prevent disasters from occurring—to solve the problems which face Africa now.

Recently, I introduced H.R. 2782, legislation to prevent famine in Africa. H.R. 2782 responds to the root of the problem that faces a continent whose population is growing at the fastest rate in the world—3 percent per year—while at the same time the productivity of the land is declining rapidly. Since 1967, Africa's grain output per person has dropped by nearly one-third and 40 percent of the continent's people live in countries where grain yields are lower than a generation ago.

In order to help Africa become self-sufficient and economically independent, there must be a global effort made to restore and preserve its own productive resources.

Reversing Africa's decline will involve immediate response to the crisis of desertification—that is, degeneration of land's productivity—which results from overly intensive and exploitative use of land in response to the needs of the growing population. At this point in time, 77.2 percent of the 4,500 million hectares of dryland in the world are already affected by desertification and 21 million of these per year are reduced to near or total

uselessness. If this trend is not reversed, there will be no end to Africa's dependency on more developed countries for food and economic assistance.

A major cause of Africa's current problems is the lack of a renewable energy supply. Firewood, the most widely used source of fuel, is becoming increasingly scarce due to the overharvesting of trees. Forests in coastal west Africa were being cleared at a rate of 5 percent per year in the early 1980's; at that rate, in 13 years those forests will be half of their original size. The scarcity of trees also has implications for soil and crop quality. Trees help to prevent soil erosion caused by damaging winds and floods. Without any protection, soil ceases to be fertile enough to produce significant quantities for food.

Simply to maintain Africa's present per capita food consumption, agricultural output will have to grow 50 to 60 percent between the years 1980-2000. Considering the monumental suffering that exists with the present level of food consumption, it is clear that drastic measures must be undertaken to revive Africa's capacity to produce.

The time has come to begin to turn back the tide of the degradation of Africa's agricultural resource base that should be providing food for that continent's people. The desertification and deforestation which have played a major role in causing the present catastrophe in Africa needs our immediate attention if we are to put an end to this cycle of famine.

□ 1855

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND].

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] for his expediting this legislation in the manner in which he did.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 172, a resolution to designate October 16 as World Food Day. I have worked for many years with the sponsor of this resolution, my esteemed colleague from New York, Representative BEN GILMAN. Together we supported the establishment of the House Select Committee on Hunger to provide a congressional forum for the important issues of world food and world hunger. This resolution, by calling attention to these critically important matters every year on October 16, serves as a unique opportunity to join hundreds of organizations around the world in focusing attention on world food and hunger issues.

There are already over 240 cosponsors of this resolution. I appreciate the leadership and support of Representative BEN GILMAN in this effort, and encourage all of my colleagues to join in support of designating October 16 as World Food Day. Together we can be effective in the struggle to provide food and alleviate hunger in our world.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with Mr. LELAND and Mr. GILMAN. I have worked with Mr. LELAND many, many times on this hunger problem around the world. I want to commend the gentleman.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 72

Whereas hunger and chronic malnutrition remain daily facts of life for hundreds of millions of people thoughout the world and famine is again afflicting so many of the countries of Africa;

Whereas the children of the world suffer the most serious effects of hunger and malnutrition, with millions of children dying each year from hunger-related illness and disease, and many others suffering permanent physical or mental impairment, including blindness, because of vitamin and protein deficiencies;

Whereas Congress is particularly concerned by the rise of hunger, recurring natural catastrophes, and inadequate food production and distribution now affecting a large number of African countries and the need for an appropriate United States response to emergency and long-term food needs of that continent;

Whereas there is growing recognition that improved agricultural policies, including farmer incentives, are necessary in many developing countries to increase food production and national economic growth;

Whereas there is a need to increase the involvement of the private voluntary and business sectors, working with governments and the international community, in the search for solutions to food and hunger problems;

Whereas although progress has been made in reducing the incidence of hunger and malnutrition in the United States, certain groups, notably Native, Americans, migrant workers, the elderly, and children, remain vulnerable to malnutrition and related diseases;

Whereas national policies concerning food, farmland, and nutrition require continuing evaluation and should consider and strive for the well-being and protection of all residents of the United States and particularly those most at health risk;

Whereas there is widespread concern that the use and conservation of land and water resources required for food production throughout the United States ensure care for the national patrimony we bequeath to future generations;

Whereas the United States has always supported the principle that the health of a nation depends on a strong agriculture based on private enterprise and the primacy of the independent family farm;

Whereas the United States, as the world's largest producer and trader of food, has a key role to play in efforts to assist countries and people to improve their ability to feed themselves;

Whereas the United States has a long tradition of demonstrating its humanitarian concern for helping the hungry and malnourished;

Whereas efforts to resolve the world hunger problem are critical to the maintenance of world peace and therefore to the security of the United States;

Whereas Congress is acutely aware of the paradox of immense farm surpluses and rising farm foreclosures in the United States despite the desperate need for food by hundreds of millions of people around the world;

Whereas a key recommendation contained in the 1980 report of the Presidential Commission on World Hunger is that efforts be undertaken to increase public awareness of the world hunger problem;

Whereas the member nations of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations designated October 16 of each year as World Food Day because of the need to alert the public to the increasingly dangerous world food situation;

Whereas the Food and Agriculture Organization was conceived at a conference in Hot Springs, Virginia, with a goal of freedom from hunger and 1985 marks the fortieth anniversary of the organization's existence;

Whereas past observances of World Food Day have been supported by proclamations of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States, by resolutions of Congress, by Presidential proclamations, by programs of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Government departments and agencies, and by the governments and peoples of many other nations; and

Whereas more than three hundred and thirty private and voluntary organizations and many thousands of community leaders are participating in the planning of World Food Day observances for 1985: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 16, 1985, is hereby designated as "World Food Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate activities to explore ways in which our Nation can further contribute to the elimination of hunger in the world.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HOSPICE MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 155), to designate the month of November 1985, as "National Hospice Month," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 288, designating November 1985, as "National Hospice Month." As a cosponsor of this bill, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], for bringing this bill before us today. November is a particularly appropriate month to be "National Hospice Month" since November 1, 1985, marks the second anniversary of the creation of the Medicare hospice option. Adoption of this bill will also provide deserved recognition to the increasing role of hospices in the care of our Nation's elderly and terminally ill.

As you may know, the percentage of our population over the age of 65 is steadily growing. The average age to which Americans are living is also growing. Most of the credit for these encouraging trends is owed to our medical professions. I would like especially to draw your attention to the credit and praise due the medical professions for their increased attention and sympathy toward the plight of the dying. Despite all of the advances made in prolonging life, it is only relatively recently that we have fully appreciated the importance of treating death with concern and dignity. Hospices have evolved and rapidly increased in numbers because the medical community has become more acutely aware of the need to give specialized care to the terminally ill.

Hospice care allows the dying to spend the remainder of their lives at home with loved ones, or at least in comfortable inpatient facilities which are not nearly as sterile or forlorn as hospital settings. Hospices allow our elderly and terminally ill to be attended to by a staff that is specially trained to meet their unique emotional and physical needs.

Yet hospices not only console the dying, but they also provide immeasurable emotional relief to the families and friends of the hospice patients. There are roughly 1,400 hospices in our Nation, and each one is staffed with a skilled team of professionals and dedicated volunteers trained to help the dying and their loved ones cope with the traumatic experience of death.

Clearly, hospices are offering valuable and needed services, and the Medicare hospice option permits people who previously could not afford treatment in a hospice to receive those services. Both the concept of the hospice and the able people who staff them have greatly advanced medical care for the dying, and these contributions truly deserve our recognition. Accordingly, in order to better educate the American public and draw national attention to the merits of hospices, I urge my colleagues to adopt House Joint Resolution 288, designating the month of November, 1985, as "National Hospice Month."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 155

Whereas hospice care has been demonstrated to be a humanitarian way for terminally ill patients to approach the end of their lives in comfort with appropriate, competent, and compassionate care in an environment of personal individuality and dignity;

Whereas the hospice concept of care advocates care of the patient and family by attending to their physical, emotional, and spiritual needs, and specifically the pain and grief they experience;

Whereas hospice care is provided by an interdisciplinary team of physicians, nurses, social workers, pharmacists, psychological and spiritual counselors, and other community volunteers trained in the hospice concept of care;

Whereas hospice care is rapidly becoming a full partner in the Nation's health care system;

Whereas the recent enactment of the medicare hospice benefit makes it possible for many more elderly Americans to have the opportunity to elect to receive hospice care;

Whereas private insurance carriers and employers have recognized the value of hospice care by the inclusion of hospice benefits in health care coverage packages; and

Whereas there remains a great need to increase public awareness of the benefits of hospice care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of November 1985 is designated "National Hospice Month".

SEC. 2. The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all Government agencies, the health care community, appropriate private organizations, and the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate forums, programs, and activities designed to encourage national recognition of and support for hospice care as a humane response to the needs of the terminally ill and a viable component of the health care system in this country.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 322) to provide for the designation of the week beginning October 6, 1985, as "National Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, sudden infant death syndrome [SIDS] is the leading killer of infants between 1 week and 1 year in this country. This devastating disease comes on suddenly, without warning, striking its victims indiscriminately—whether they are black, white, Hispanic, or Asian. I know because last December I lost a grandson to SIDS.

There is nothing more tragic than to see an otherwise healthy, happy baby die. An increased awareness of SIDS will stimulate interest and support for research on its causes and eventually its cure. Hopefully, this resolution will bring attention to SIDS and its victims.

I want to thank my colleague from California for his efforts in introducing this resolution and seeing that this terrible disease is brought to the attention of the public. I would like to add that on November 14 at 10 a.m. in room 304 Cannon, my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Census and Population, and GEORGE MILLER's Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families will be holding a joint hearing on SIDS. I hope some of you will have the time to attend.

As part of my statement, I would like to include an essay from the May 20, 1985, edition of People magazine by another grandfather, Mr. Jess Birnabaum, who also lost a grandson to SIDS.

The article follows:

[From People magazine, May 20, 1985]

ELEGY FOR A LOST BABY

(By Jesse Barnbaum)

I had intended to write a humorous piece about first grandfatherhood. My son David and his wife, Nancy, had just produced a

healthy baby boy, and suddenly I was embarked on a rite of passage. I imagined myself a kindly sage, baiting a hook for a freckle-faced tyke—but I didn't know anything about fishing. Perhaps he could watch me whittle a stick—but I couldn't whittle, either. I'd go on in this vein, striking just the right self-deprecating tone, peppering my conceits with sly satire. Finally I'd conclude that these Norman Rockwell images were out of character. I'd be myself, take my grandson to the zoo, buy him Cracker Jacks. I'd bring him to the office, where he'd make paper-clip chains and send silly messages through the pneumatic tubes. I'd build him a darkroom and teach him to make pictures.

My funny piece would also tease the new grandmothers, who were seriously engaged in a ritual of their own, trying to find suitable names for themselves—Nana, Nanny, Mimi, Mumu, Baba, Mama, anything but Grandma—but, by gosh, I'd stick to good old Gramps, or Grandpa. No big deal. Twenty years from now my grandson would read this piece, and maybe he'd say, "Good old Gramps, rest his soul. He didn't know anything about fishing or whittling, but we sure had some fine times."

I was still ruminating when the news came. This little baby was gone, dead at 46 days of age. Sudden infant Death Syndrome—SIDS—crib death. No cry, no gasp. He lay asleep one moment, stopped breathing the next. Born on St. Valentine's Day, died on April Fool's Day, buried on Good Friday. A precious promise wiped out by a wanton prank. In America, as many as 8,000 babies die of SIDS every year, and nobody really knows why.

He was called Benjamin after my dad, William after Nancy's, and he was nicknamed Jamie. I'd seen the red, funny little thing in his first week, looking grumpy, like a tiny Churchill. Seen him again the fifth week, showing a bit of personality, the hint of a smile. Watched the happy, hovering parents delighting in the new nursery, the little electric swing, the high-tech car seat, all the latest in the best equipment, all the best in a sturdy strong-lunged baby. Born, mind you, on the 14th of February! Such timing, such a blessing! Such fun we were going to have, making paper-clip chains, going to the zoo.

Such devastation, now, such tears. Friends and family descending into the gloom. The clergyman appearing swiftly, serious and consoling, helping the bereft parents find their courage. The flowers, the calls, the gifts of food, the wordless embraces. The mourners shifting to and fro, angry and helpless, dabbing eyes, trying to understand. We prepare for the death of contemporaries and parents; even a sickly child sends us a red alert. But how can you accept the death of a sleeping infant? There are parents who wired the nursery and carried a receiver into the garden, their nerves and ears engaged, ready to spring at a cry. How can a child be denied his life? One afflicted parent tells me you never get over it. It's easy to believe.

There would be an autopsy, then cremation. David and Nancy, grieving all the while, make the "arrangements," choosing a burial place beneath a live oak tree in the children's graveyard at the cemetery. The gravediggers are on strike; supervisors will dig the hole. Not a major job, after all; a small hole, perhaps two feet deep, for a canister, scarcely bigger than a flowerpot, that will hold a plain, little paper box with a few ounces of ashes.

We drive through the cemetery gate, ignoring the glum faces of the picketers. At the graveside David kneels and places the ashes in the canister, the clergyman leads the prayers and reads a few lines from Blake. We set flowers in fresh water. Retreating, we pause to read the markers at graves nearby. This baby, 1 day old. That one, 2 weeks old. Here, a baby a month old. There, siblings, born two years apart, each living only a few days. Another baby, gone 20 years, has fresh flowers on his marker. On and on, you study the stones, intoxicated by the sorrow of parents who wept here, wondering for an instant if you aren't witnessing the end of the whole world. All those babies, those lives, all those infants' graveyards.

At the memorial service we hear spare, comforting words from the minister. He reads from the Old Testament and the New. He finds thoughtful passages from Thoreau, William James, John Muir, and we are lofted mercifully beyond mundane concerns, but only briefly. The organist plays Sheep May Safely Graze.

At the house later, when the visitors have gone, we pass photographs among ourselves. A strange little thing, at the moment of delivery. Here he is at 2 days, 5 days of life. Look: There he is, his eyes focused at last, at 5 weeks or so. Smiling, would you believe, at 6 weeks! A person at 6½ weeks. A chronicle complete in 46 days.

Next day the two grandmothers, an uncle and the parents go to work in the garden, planting flowers everywhere, igniting life into the soil, hope to the heart. David and Nancy, strong and determined, will join a group of other parents who have lost babies, sharing their sadness, consoling one another. Like those parents, they will return to their jobs, pick up their lives and start soon to have another baby. This time, we know, things will be better. Nancy's widowed mother and my wife and I will be grandparents again, making all our plans afresh—the zoo, the Cracker Jacks, everything once more, only more so. It will be my second grandchild, by gosh.

You know how a melody sometimes gets stuck in your head? A bit of a jingle, a pop tune, a snatch of a symphony,—and you can't get rid of it? Sheep May Safely Graze has that sort of tune, a simple, repetitive melody. Try as you will, you can't get it out of your mind.

(Reprinted from the May 20, 1985 issue of People Weekly magazine by special permission, © 1985, Time, Inc. All rights reserved.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objections to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 322

Whereas Sudden Infant Death Syndrome is a recognized disease entity which kills thousands of infants each year in the United States;

Whereas Sudden Infant Death Syndrome is the leading killer of infants between the age of one week and one year.

Whereas Sudden Infant Death Syndrome knows no boundaries of race, ethnic group, region, class, or country;

Whereas the victims of Infant Sudden Death Syndrome are babies who appear healthy but who nonetheless die without warning during sleep and nap time;

Whereas the parents and siblings of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome often suffer anguish because many people are unaware of the existence of the pernicious killer;

Whereas research is underway throughout the world to identify the causes and process of the syndrome and to treat infants who can be identified as potential victims; and

Whereas an increase in the national awareness of the problem of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome may ease the burden of the families of victims and may stimulate interest in increased research into the causes and the cure of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning October 6, 1985, is designated as "National Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Amend line 3 so as to read: "That the month of October 1985 is designated as".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Amend title so as to read: Joint resolution to provide for the designation of October 1985 as "National Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Awareness Month"."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) to designate the week beginning October 6, 1985, as "National Children's Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

51-059 O-86-46 (Pt. 19)

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 79

Whereas there are approximately 65 million children in the Nation;

Whereas the children of the Nation are its most precious resource and its greatest hope for the future; and

Whereas a week designated for the purpose of focusing on the needs of children and the community services available to them will be beneficial both to children and to the future of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning October 6, 1985, hereby is designated "National Children's Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HOUSING WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 197) to designate the week of October 6, 1985, through October 13, 1985, as "National Housing Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 197, designating the week of October 6, 1985, as "National Housing Week." As a cosponsor of the House companion bill, House Joint Resolution 350, I thank the gentleman from Oregon, [Mr. AUCOIN] for bringing this bill before us today. Adoption of this resolution will help bring the housing industry, which is the backbone of both the American economy and the American dream, the recognition it justly deserves.

The desire for a comfortable yet affordable home is at the core of the American dream—a home to raise a family in, a home to be proud of, a home in a strong and caring community. The housing industry provides the homes Americans strive for, it helps to build the communities which together form this great Nation, and it helps millions to realize the American dream.

For most Americans, purchasing a home is the single biggest and most important investment of their lives. Even for those who never actually own their own homes, housing costs represent a significant portion of their income. These investments and expenditures are a proven stimulus of the economy. Indeed, the housing industry is a major driving force of the economy and is vital to our national economic health. Since World War II, the housing industry has lead the recovery from each economic recession we have suffered. Housing industry growth produces tremendous benefits for the lumber and construction industries, and it creates demands in many markets, such as the furniture, appliance and real estate markets, to name but a few.

This year's figures for the housing industry are illustrative of this very point; and 1.7 million houses and apartments are expected to be started this year. These figures translate into 2.4 million jobs, $95.2 billion in wages, and $20.7 billion in Federal, State, and local tax revenues. Clearly, the housing industry is a leading and essential component to our continued economic recovery and growth.

During my 13 years in the House of Representatives, and previously as a New York State assemblyman, I have paid special attention to the housing needs of my constituents. Just recently I was able to secure a rental rehabilitation grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for my constituents in Westchester County. These funds will be used to make much needed improvements in housing units that have, with the passage of time, deteriorated and are in substandard conditions. These funds will also be used to make the housing accessible to the handicapped and will create jobs. The housing industry plays an integral role in our communities as well as in the national economy.

A week of recognition is a fitting appreciation for an industry that so positively affects both the economy and the quality of life in America. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to adopt Senate Joint Resolution 197, establishing the week of October 5, 1985, as "National Housing Week."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 197

Whereas the combined commitment of the Federal Government with the strength and ingenuity of private enterprise has brought decent housing to an overwhelming majority of all Americans;

Whereas the opportunity to own a home and live on decent housing strengthens the family, the community, and the Nation, giving individual Americans a stake in the local community and stimulating political involvement;

Whereas the housing industry has led the Nation to economic recovery following every recession since World War II by creating millions of productive jobs for the unemployed, generating billions of dollars worth of tax revenue, and creating demand for goods and services;

Whereas shelter is one of the basic needs for all individuals, and the production of affordable housing is an important concern at all levels of government; and

Whereas it is appropriate to reaffirm the national historical commitment to housing and homeownership and to recognize the economic opportunities created by the present housing recovery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the week of October 6, 1985, through October 13, 1985, is designated as "National Housing Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYASTHENIA GRAVIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 183) to provide for the designation of the week of October 6 through October 12, 1985, as "Myasthenia Gravis Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who is the chief sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. GARCIA and Mr. HANSON from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution designates the week of October 6-12 as Myasthenia Gravis Awareness Week. This disease—also known as Erb-Goldflam disease—is a neuromuscular disease affecting men and women of all ages and races. Currently there are over 100,000 victims in America.

The disease weakens the victim to the extent that some have to use both

hands just to brush their teeth. MG can strike any area of the body at any time—and because of the small amount that is known about this disease, it is often mistakenly diagnosed as chronic fatigue. Until very recently, the disease has been fatal for 85 percent of its victims. There is still no prevention or cure, but there has been progress.

This resolution, in the past, has played a major role in alerting the public to the symptoms and the problems connected with the disease. This increased awareness has not only made potential victims more sensitive to the dangers, but has served to further research in a quest for the cure.

Resolutions such as these play an important role in the search for a solution to the problems of many debilitating diseases. I have been proud—over the years—to have been the sponsor of this commemorative resolution to focus increased awarness on Myasthenia Gravis. I urge my colleagues' support for the resolution.

□ 1905

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 183

Whereas the incidence and prevalence of myasthenia gravis present a significant health problem in the United States;

Whereas myasthenia gravis is a severe neuromuscular disorder, characterized by weakness of the voluntary muscles of the body;

Whereas an estimated one hundred thousand to two hundred thousand diagnosed, and over one hundred thousand undiagnosed, Americans of both sexes, and all races and ages, are afflicted with the disease;

Whereas the Nation faces a continuing need to support innovative research into the causes, treatment, and cure of myasthenia gravis; and

Whereas it is appropriate to focus the Nation's attention upon the problem of myasthenia gravis; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of October 6 through October 12, 1985, is designated as "Myasthenia Gravis Awareness Week" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all government agencies and the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL STAFF CLUB

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 195) commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Congressional Staff Club, and ask for it immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution commending the Congressional Staff Club for a half century of service to the U.S. Congress, its Members, and its staff.

It is a particular pleasure for me because during my service as an administrative assistant to Representative Velde of Illinois, I was a member of this great organization, then called the Congressional Secretaries Club.

Through the past 50 years the club has provided many services and benefits to us all. The Daily Digest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for example was an innovation by the club. So was the development of staff ID cards and better bus service to the Hill.

The club, of course, is bipartisan in nature and its executive board is always closely balanced between staffers of each party. The club president must rotate each year between the two parties.

The club also engaged in many social and charitable activities which include parties, trips, sports activities, and blood and charity drives.

All in all, I would say the club has done real well for its first half century, so it is indeed my pleasure today to wish the CSC a happy birthday.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 195

Whereas the effective, efficient, and contructive operation of the offices of Members of Congress, Committees of the Congress and related offices relies heavily upon their able and dedicated employees;

Whereas the Congressional Staff Club encourages and promotes high ideals in Government and individual self-improvement, professionalism, and responsibility among all employees of the United States Congress;

Whereas the Congressional Staff Club fosters and promotes educational opportunities, charitable programs, and social events for employees of the Congress; and

Whereas the Congressional Staff Club is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization which is composed of active and retired employees of the United States Congress and which for fifty years has been dedicated to improving the quality of life for all those persons who are, and who have been, employed by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the Congress of the United States recognizes the special contributions of the Congressional Staff Club to cooperation, professionalism, and community spirit among employees of the Congress; and

(2) the Congress of the United States commends the Congressional Staff Club for fifty years of dedicated service to the legislative branch of the Government of the United States and encourages and supports the continued contributions of the Congressional Staff Club as a nonpartisan, nonprofit charitable organization created by and for the benefit of, the employees of the Congress.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL BUY AMERICAN WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 194) to designate the week of October 1, 1985, as "National Buy American Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 194

Whereas the Nation accumulated record merchandise trade deficits in 1982, 1983, and 1984, and a record deficit is predicted for 1985;

Whereas we have become a debtor nation for the first time since the onset of World War I;

Whereas in many cases the prices of imported goods are artificially low because of illegal subsidies by foreign governments; and

Whereas record merchandise trade deficits cause loss of jobs, loss of productivity, loss of tax revenues, and a decline in the

American standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning October 1, 1985, hereby is designated "National Buy American Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LESSONS OF GRENADA WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged for further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 313) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning October 20, 1985, as "The Lessons of Grenada Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 313.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] and I are very appreciative of their action in bringing this legislation to the floor. We think that taking this third week of October and studying "The Lessons of Grenada" document and looking at the lessons Americans can learn about the nature of Leninism and of Communism will be very helpful to the country. We appreciate the efforts of these gentlemen in bringing it to the floor.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 313

Whereas following the October 1983 invasion of the island of Grenada, the United States captured 35,000 pounds of documents relating to the Communist Party and the Communist government of Grenada and to Grenada's relations with Cuba, the Soviet Union, and Nicaragua;

Whereas it is appropriate for the American people to learn the lessons of actual Communist behavior as revealed in the Grenadian documents;

Whereas the Department of State has published a collection of key documents entitled "Grenada Documents: An Overview and Selection"; and

Whereas the week of the anniversary of the events in Grenada is an appropriate time for the American people to focus on the dangers of Leninism and the lessons of Communist behavior; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning October 20, 1985, as "The Lessons of Grenada Week" and to urge the Governors of the several States and the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MARK TWAIN DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 259) to designate November 30, 1985, as "National Mark Twain Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 259, National Mark Twain Day.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first I wish to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], and all the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing this joint resolution before the House.

As we all know, Mark Twain, also known by many by his original name of Sam Clemens, had his boyhood home in my hometown of Hannibal, MO. Many of his writings which are read throughout the world were based upon his boyhood experiences and the things he learned while being raised in Hannibal, MO. This joint resolution will bring the attention of the people of the United States to the fact that this is the 150th anniversary of the birth of Samuel Clemens, better known as Mark Twain, who has brought enjoyment not only to this country but throughout the world with his writings.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] for his excellent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 259

Whereas American journalist and author Mark Twain was born Samuel Langhorne Clemens in Florida, Missouri, and Hannibal, Missouri, was his boyhood home;

Whereas Mark Twain is recognized as one of America's greatest authors;

Whereas Mark Twain achieved international fame and his works have been translated into more than fifty languages;

Whereas Mark Twain is also widely recognized as a humorist of extraordinary wit and as a social critic of rare perception;

Whereas the experiences of Mark Twain in Hannibal became the basis of two novels, The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn;

Whereas Mark Twain's travels and experiences in other regions of the United States became the basis of many of his other works, including The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County, A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court, Life on the Mississippi, and Roughing It;

Whereas Mark Twain succeeded in portraying the American spirit in a way which no other author has been able to duplicate;

Whereas the city of Hannibal maintains the Mark Twain Home and Museum as a historic site;

Whereas the city of Hannibal will be the site of special events and entertainment, beginning in May 1985 and culminating in November 1985, to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Mark Twain; and

Whereas November 30, 1985, is the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Mark Twain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That November 30, 1985, hereby is designated "National Mark Twain Day", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 158) designating February 1986 as "National Community College Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 158

Whereas, in the fall of 1981, there were over one thousand two hundred and nineteen community, technical, and junior college students in which 40 per centum of all undergraduate college students in the United States were enrolled;

Whereas such colleges prepare people for employment in over one thousand four hundred different occupations or for transfer to four-year colleges and universities;

Whereas such colleges are within reasonable commuting distance for more than 90 per centum of all Americans;

Whereas such colleges provide an opportunity to obtain a post-secondary education at low cost for many people who could not otherwise afford one; and

Whereas such colleges are community-based institutions which provide flexible and diverse programs and services tailored to fit the needs of their local populations and industries: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February 1986 is designated as "National Community College Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTENNIAL YEAR OF LIBERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 407) designating the 12-month period ending on October 28, 1986, as the "Centennial Year of Liberty in the United States," and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I simple would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 407

Whereas the Statue of Liberty (originally called "Liberty Enlightening the World") was a generous gift from the people of France to the people of the United States;

Whereas the Statue of Liberty has, since its dedication on October 26, 1886, held high the beacon of freedom, hope and opportunity to welcome millions of immigrants and visitors from foreign lands;

Whereas the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island are in the process of being restored from the ravages of time and weather by the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Centennial Foundation, Incorporated; and

Whereas this Nation will celebrate the Statue of Liberty's one hundredth anniversary through commemorative events scheduled to take place during the Fourth of July weekend in 1986 and on October 28, 1986: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the twelve-month period ending on October 28, 1986, is designated as the "Centennial Year of Liberty in the United States", and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that year with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

NATIONAL CPR AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 175) to designate the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, as "National CPR Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 175

Whereas, heart attacks are the leading cause of death in the United States;

Whereas as many as 1,500,000 Americans may be stricken by a heart attack during 1985;

Whereas cardio-pulmonary resuscitation, commonly referred to as CPR, is a first aid procedure which significantly reduces the incidence of sudden death due to a heart attack; and

Whereas the death rate due to heart attacks would be reduced if more Americans received training in CPR: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, is designated as "National CPR Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DAY OF FASTING TO RAISE FUNDS TO COMBAT HUNGER

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 386) to designate November 24, 1985, as "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger," and ask for its immdiate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object. I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], who is the chief sponsor of this very worthy piece of legislation, H.J. Res. 386, National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to use this time to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA], for expediting this piece of legislation. Certainly I also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], and the 219 cosponsors who have joined with me in moving this piece of legislation through.

I am excited about the possibilities offered in this bipartisan joint resolution which will call upon the President to declare the Sunday before Thanksgiving of this year, the 24th of November, as a national day of fasting to raise funds to combat hunger. It encourages the people of the United States to skip one or more meals on that day and to contribute the value of those meals to hunger programs and hunger relief organizations of their own choice.

What better way do we have to celebrate the Thanksgiving period of time than to celebrate our own blessings by going without a meal or two and contributing to someone in the world who is going without food?

□ 1915

I hope that the Members of this House will unanimously join me in passing this resolution and declare November 24 as a national day of fasting for the purpose of raising funds to combat hunger.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman GARCIA, my colleague Mr. HANSEN, the 219 Members who cosponsored this resolution, and others who so expeditiously moved House Joint Resolution 386 through the House and to the floor for consideration. I am excited about the possibilities offered in this bipartisan resolution which requests the President to issue a proclamation delcaring November 24, the Sunday before Thanksgiving 1985, as the "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger." It encourages the people of the United States to skip one or more meals—if they can—on that day, and to contribute the money saved from those meals to a hunger relief organization of their choice.

This resolution is designed to encourage people from all income levels to give, since the money contributed to feed the victims of famine would have been spent on meals for the giver's own table. The idea is "Skip a meal, give a meal." If each American gives an average of $1, over $250 million will be raised to combat hunger. I fully anticipate that many people will give more than is saved from the forfeited meals—generosity has proven to be "the American way."

What better way is there to celebrate our blessings in the season of Thanksgiving than to voluntarily share with those less fortunate? I hope the Members of this House will join me in unanimously passing the resolution to declare November 24 the "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may say to the gentleman from California, do I understand this correctly that the people called upon would actually take the cost of those two meals that it would cost them and their families and fast and donate that money to these worthy causes?

Mr. PACKARD. The whole purpose is to ask people to first experience the feeling of going without food. That will certainly give them a feeling of what people in the world experience who are starving.

Second, it should not cost them anything, unless they choose to pay more, because they are already foregoing the cost of the meal. They are simply contributing the cost of that meal or two for hunger throughout the world. That is a very simple way of assisting people that go without food.

Now, we hope that there will be many people who will contribute far and above the cost of two meals; but it does allow us to get to those small contributors in this country that would like to join with all of us in helping the hungry around the world, but at the same time feel that it is left to the big contributors. The cost of the two meals may be only $10 or $15 and if every citizen in this country would do that, you can imagine how many hundreds of millions of dollars we could raise toward hunger programs.

It is a worthy cause and at the same time allows the American people to experience hunger that might let them empathize with some of the starving in the world.

Mr. HANSEN. It seems like an excellent principle. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to take 30 seconds to say that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has been so gosh darn persistent on this matter, getting this resolution to the floor, that I think the gentleman deserves a round of appreciation from all of us, because this is a very important item. I think that gentleman deserves that consideration.

Mr. PACKARD. Well, again, if the gentleman from Utah will yield just so I may respond, I want the chairman to know how grateful I am that they have expedited this, because it will now allow us enough time to get the message out through the media and the President and others to give emphasis to this special day of fasting. It is not just a commemorative day. It is a day to raise money for hunger around the world and it will give us a chance to do the appropriate advertising.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the excellent remarks of the chairman and also the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 386

Whereas the famine in Africa has caused the death of hundreds of thousands of people and has endangered the lives of millions;

Whereas the solution to such famine involves not only rushing emergency food and medical supplies to the areas stricken, but also improving agricultural policies and instituting more sophisticated famine prevention practices in such areas;

Whereas people from all walks of life and every part of the United States have responded quickly and effectively to every famine which has occurred since World War II and have already raised more than $120,000,000 for emergency relief of the famine in Africa;

Whereas the generosity and compassion of the people of the United States should be recognized and commended;

Whereas in Africa, 24 people die of starvation each minute;

Whereas more remains to be done to fight starvation in Africa and in other parts of the world;

Whereas our Nation has enough resources to save many lives;

Whereas hunger in the United States is a pressing domestic problem that must be addressed through food relief and economic development for those in need; and

Whereas fasting is one of the strongest symbolic acts by which solidarity with the plight of fellow human beings may be demonstrated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That November 24, 1985, is designated as "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to fast, to contribute generously to relief organizations fighting hunger, and to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING THIRD READING AND PASSAGE OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 313, THE LESSONS OF GRENADA WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the third reading and passage of the joint reso-

lution (H.J. Res. 313) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning October 20, 1985, as "The Lessons of Grenada Week."

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Page 2, amend the first clause of the preamble to read as follows:

Whereas, following the October 1983 liberation of the island of Grenada, the United States and six Caribbean nations (Antiqua, Barbados, Dominica, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) captured 35,000 pounds of documents relating to the Communist government of Grenada and to Grenada's relations with Cuba, the Soviet Union, and Nicaragua;

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise their remarks on the various resolutions just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE NORMAN D. SHUMWAY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Norman D. Shumway, Member of Congress:

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House, I am notifying you of the receipt of a subpoena issued by the Municipal Court of California, County of San Joaquin, to Mr. Jack Sieglock of my district office staff and myself. After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk of the House, I will reach the determinations required by Rule L(50) and will notify you of those determinations.

Sincerely,

NORMAN D. SHUMWAY,
Member of Congress.

DRILLING FOR OIL MONEY IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues yesterday's lead editorial in the New York Times. It is entitled "Drilling for Oil Money in Congress." Recent action in the House Interior and Merchant Marine Committees indicates some coastal State Members believe they have found a "gusher." The budget reconciliation package we will be considering shortly contains one of the worst distortions of the budget process I have witnessed. In the name of deficit reduction and budget savings, we transfer $4 to $6 billion from the Federal Treasury to those of seven relatively well off coastal States. This is money derived from activity in Federal waters, water belonging to all the people of this Nation, which should go to benefit all the people. Instead, if the reconciliation package is not changed, it will go to benefit only those of our citizens fortunate enough to live in one of the seven priviledged States. I am joining with my colleagues Mr. UDALL and Mr. SHARP in an attempt to prevent this mockery of the budget process. I hope the Members of the House will take the time to read this editorial and join us in our efforts. I have included a copy of it for your review.

DRILLING FOR OIL MONEY IN CONGRESS

Congress: Please reduce the deficit by raising it. That's the solemn urging of a handful of states with offshore oil wells. They greedily propose an accounting trick that would credit the Treasury with $4 billion it has already received in return for a commitment to give away as much as $6 billion. They should be quickly rebuffed by the House.

In 1953 Congress assigned to the states all the royalties earned from oil and gas production within three miles of the coast. Then came complaints that producers were draining oil and gas from reservoirs beneath the state-Federal boundary. So in 1978 Congress created another three-mile band as a buffer, the royalties to be held in escrow till a distribution formula could be devised.

About $6 billion has now accumulated in this fund. According to the Interior Department, about 4 percent of that, at most, represents earnings from state properties. But as long as the fair division is in dispute, the Federal share cannot legally be counted as belonging to Washington.

This year, in their haste to raise revenue to narrow the budget deficit, the Administration and Senate and House budget committees agreed to give the states involved a whopping 27 percent of the $6 billion—about $1.6 billion, instead of $240 million. That would allow applying about $4.4 billion against the Federal deficit.

But only on paper. Since the money is already in the Treasury, the transaction would not reduce private purchasing power or Federal borrowing needs by even a nickel. The only money to change hands is the $1.6 billion the Treasury would have to hand over to the states. That would actually increase Government spending—precisely the opposite of the advertised effect.

There is apparently no hope of reversing the initial deal. Dumb as it is, Congress bought it and that would have been the end of the story—but for the exceptional greed of the oil-producing states. They persuaded the House Interior Committee and the Senate Energy Committee to sweeten the deal further by adding $500 million more to the promised $1.6 billion, and obligating the Treasury to pay them 27 percent of all future royalties from the buffer zone. According to Interior, the total cost to the Treasury would exceed $6 billion.

Democrats Morris Udall of Arizona and Philip Sharp of Indiana are asking the House to limit the loss to the original $1.6 billion. A sense of decency should be their strongest ally against giving away any more.

WE FROM MINNESOTA ARE PROUD OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

(Mr. PENNY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased this morning to read in the Washington Post an editorial commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Peace Corps. In that editorial, they gave mention and credit to Minnesota's Senator Hubert Humphrey.

In part, the editorial reads:

The late Democratic Senator from Minnesota introduced the Kennedy administration Peace Corps bill in the Senate in 1961 because President Kennedy asked him to. President Kennedy asked him to because Mr. Humphrey had in fact proposed the Peace Corps idea 3 years before JFK espoused it in the 1960 campaign speech whose silver anniversary is now being commemorated.

We think JFK would not mind us calling this to your attention or even sharing the credit with his friend Hubert.

On the wall here in the House Chamber is a quote from Daniel Webster:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps is just one contribution to this Nation for which we remember Senator Hubert Humphrey. We from Minnesota are proud that he was our Senator. We miss him, just as this Nation misses his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I include, for the Members' attention, this editorial:

REMEMBERING

We have something to add to the celebrations now under way of the 25th anniversary of John F. Kennedy's proposal to establish the Peace Corps. A great deal has been said and done in recent days to honor the extraordinary—and sometimes heroic—

achievements of Peace Corps volunteers all over the world in the decades since the agency came into being.

To all of this we say amen, and we also join in commending President Kennedy himself for having espoused the idea and helped push it into law. The Peace Corps, with its youthfulness, its energy and excitement and commitment, became a kind of symbol of the Kennedy administration at its early best, and this was fitting. The agency got its momentum and its enduring personality in those years, and it reflected what was most innovative and idealistic about the Kennedy administration.

But something is missing here. The something is Hubert Humphrey. It is always a wise idea, when celebrating a proposal of this kind, to check out the Humphrey record. The late Democratic senator (and vice president) from Minnesota introduced the Kennedy administration Peace Corps bill in the Senate in 1961 because President Kennedy asked him to. President Kennedy asked him to because Mr. Humphrey had in fact proposed the Peace Corps idea three years before JFK espoused it in the 1960 campaign speech whose silver anniversary is now being commemorated. We think JFK wouldn't mind our calling this to your attention or even sharing the credit with his friend Hubert—and to this end we will let Mr. Humphrey have what he always loved best: the last couple of hundred words. They are from his memoir, "The Education of a Public Man":

"I introduced the first Peace Corps bill in 1957. It did not meet with much enthusiasm. Some traditional diplomats quaked at the thought of thousands of young Americans scattered across their world. Many senators, including liberal ones, thought it a silly and unworkable idea. Now, with a young President urging its passage, it became possible and we pushed it rapidly through the Senate. It is fashionable now to suggest that Peace Corps volunteers gained as much, or more, from their experience as the countries where they worked. That may be true, but it ought not to demean their work. They touched many lives and made them better. Critics ask what visible, lasting effects there are, as if care, concern, love, help can be measured in concrete and steel or dollars or ergs. Education, whether in mathematics, language, health, nutrition, farm techniques, or peaceful coexistence may not always be visible, but the effects endure."

Again, amen.

WE NEED THE BOLAND AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to everyone's attention a story written by Robert Parry, the award-winning reporter for the Associated Press. The AP story reports that last year, when the Boland amendment was U.S. law, the President approved a secret fund to replace CIA funds with assistance from U.S. citizens and U.S. allies.

Mr. Speaker, what this story means is that the President of the United States apparently OK'd nothing less than an international plumbers group. With a wink and a nod, he turned over U.S. Central American policy to a group of extremist right wing organizations, and apparently encouraged U.S. allies to become their arms merchants.

This is why we need the Boland amendment, and this is why we need a similar provision again to become a part of U.S. law. I hope the story of this duplicitous action on behalf of the White House will awaken our colleagues in the House to the need for strong laws in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks the AP story to be inserted in the RECORD.

[From the Associated Press, Oct. 8, 1985]

PRESIDENT LINKED TO SECRET AID—PLAN TO HELP CONTRAS REPORTED APPROVED

(By Robert Parry)

Facing a congressional cutoff of military aid to Nicaraguan rebels early last year, President Reagan approved a secret plan to replace CIA funds with assistance from American citizens and U.S. allies, according to current and former administration officials.

White House officials picked retired Army Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub as the chief fund-raising contact and advised him how to structure the campaign within the confines of neutrality and other laws that bar U.S. citizens from supporting foreign wars, said the sources who insisted on anonymity.

White House spokesman Edward P. Djerejian refused to comment on Reagan's reported approval of the plan to go outside U.S. government channels to continue supplying the rebels fighting to overthrow Nicaragua's leftist government.

In the past, the White House has insisted that it "neither encourages nor discourages" the private fund-raising that sprang up after Congress, angered by the mining of Nicaragua's harbors by the Central Intelligence Agency, refused to continue military aid to the contras, or counterrevolutionaries, in the spring of 1984.

But government sources, including one senior administration official, described the behind-the-scenes White House role in organizing and advising the aid network as much more extensive than has been acknowledged.

The aid network, particularly a recent surge of arms and money from allied countries, has allowed the rebels to continue operations during the 15-month cutoff of direct U.S. aid and, thus, circumvent congressional efforts to shut down the CIA-sponsored war. Rebel leaders now say they have enough weapons to arm a 30,000-man force, roughly double their current number.

Three congressional committees are reviewing whether White House National Security Council (NSC) officials violated a year-old ban against "directly or indirectly" aiding the rebels militarily.

But officials interviewed by The Associated Press maintained that the White House role in establishing the aid network had ended by Oct. 1, 1984, when that ban was enacted. Last July, Congress voted $27 million in nonlethal aid to the rebels but maintained the ban on lethal U.S. assistance.

One source, familiar with the earlier program, said the "big three" countries that were expected to help the rebels were Israel, South Korea and Taiwan.

Representatives of those governments denied they helped the rebels. Other U.S. sources said Israel ultimately agreed only to sell the rebels captured Palestine Liberation Organization weapons, and aid from South Korea and Taiwan came from private businessmen and an anticommunist organization with close ties to those governments.

National security affairs adviser Robert C. McFarlane has denied that his staff violated the ban but has ignored a congressional request for documents on NSC contacts with the rebels. As for White House actions before October 1984, McFarlane said, "We did not solicit funds or other support for military or paramilitary activities either from Americans or third parties."

Several sources said McFarlane's statement is technically correct because private citizens in this country and "third parties" in allied countries "volunteered" help supply the rebels.

One source who was close to the program said the plan for accepting the offers was prepared by Lt. Col. Oliver L. North, a deputy director for political-military affairs on the NSC staff. The cource said North presented a brief memo that was backed by related correspondence and biographies of some private individuals.

According to this account, which was supported by two administration officials:

McFarlane reviewed the plan with top NSC officers and White House legal counsel who concluded that creation of the outside aid network violated no laws, if done carefully.

But fearing the plan's disclosure, McFarlane chose to outline it to the president orally at a regular morning briefing. Reagan approved the plan. North was to implement it.

All three sources said creation of the aid network came at about the time of congressional protest in April 1984 over the CIA's mining of Nicaragua's harbors. They did not offer precise dates.

Singlaub, who resigned from the Army in 1978, was selected as the chief "authorized" contract for private fund-raising because of his military background and international connections, the sources said.

THE GOOD NEWS ABOUT CRIME IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have to remind any of my colleagues here in Congress that we live in a great nation—blessed with an abundance of resources and destined to serve as an example for the rest of the world. But, unfortunately, too often we hear reports that the quality of life in America is declining—that our economy is stagnant—our values are eroding—and our political process is for sale to the highest bidder.

Sure, there are plenty of bad news stories on any given day—but at the same time there are bigger—more prominent—more important good news stories that are having a far greater impact in our daily lives. I would like to take a few moments to examine some of this good news.

Let's talk about crime in America.

The crime rate explosion of the 1960's and 1970's has often been attributed to an erosion of public values. It has been said that there is a cause and effect relationship—eroding public values yield eroding public behavior.

But what do we really know about crime in America and its connection to our system of values?

As the first step in addressing this question, I offer you the evidence released by the Justice Department this week in its National Crime Survey. According to these statistics, crime in America is down 4.1 percent from 1984.

And that's not all—this year we have achieved the lowest level of crime since 1973—the year the survey was begun. By category the statistics are even more promising—violent crime is down 12 percent since its high peak in 1981—personal theft is down 7 percent last year and 26 percent from its peak in 1974—burglaries have dropped 8 percent from 1984 and an incredible 31 percent since their peak in 1974.

I think it is obvious that the 1980's reflect a declining trend in crime rates in America. But again—how does this relate to change in our personal and private values as American citizens facing the 1980's?

Why then is crime declining?

The most immediate answer is one of demographics—crime in America is age and sex specific. Crimes are most commonly committed by young males. As the baby boom generation of the 1950's and 1960's matures, the percentage of criminal-age males declines.

But there is more to it than just demographics. Society has responded.

While soft public attitudes toward crime and criminals triggered the crime wave of the 1970's, the tougher public values of the 1980's have played a major role in curbing crime.

And the statistics are there to prove it.

More money is being spent to combat crime, both public and private; neighborhood crime watch associations are on the increase; more individuals are employed in the criminal justice system; convictions are at an all time high; and more Americans than ever before favor the death penalty for murder.

Public attitude is a great deterrent. As the American people get tougher on crime, the risk-reward ratio changes—making the crime business less profitable.

In addition, with more individuals in jail there are fewer criminals and repeat offenders on the street—fewer crimes are committed.

What we have is evidence that our public law enforcement institutions have responded to tougher public values triggered by the soft on crime attitudes of the 1960's and 1970's. When the public responds, local, State, and Federal officials also respond.

Last year we passed the most comprehensive anticrime package since 1968—we increased penalties for drug offenders—placed restrictions on the insanity plea—reduced disparities in punishments for similar crimes—and approved grants for State anticrime projects.

Tougher legal penalties—reflecting tougher public attitudes.

Although the perception of high crime may continue no matter what the statistics reveal and must continue to take note of them—there is a bright side. Increased public perception of crime toughens public attitudes toward criminals—and this leads to results.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we can feel good about America.

We have renewed our commitment to traditional American values—I commend my constituents in the 10th District of Florida and Americans across our Nation for bringing about these changes.

CHICAGO'S 1985 COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 14, Chicagoans will celebrate the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus 493 years ago with a gigantic parade through the city sponsored by the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans.

The voyage of Christopher Columbus marked one of history's most challenging and rewarding explorations in the history of mankind, and this parade commemorates this daring accomplishment, as well as the numerous achievements of those courageous men and women who followed Columbus to the New World. Italians who emigrated to America helped make our Nation the strongest and greatest the world has ever known.

This year, leading the proud parade processional will be my good friend, Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America and former assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson, who has worked tirelessly on behalf of the Italian American community. Other participants in the parade will include Mayor Harold Washington; Gov. James Thompson; Charles Porcelli, president of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans; Congressman Martin Russo; Dr. Claudio Ferrari, Consul General of Italy; and many other civic and political dignitaries, as well as myself.

The President of the United States, the Honorable Ronald Reagan; the Governor of the State of Illinois, the Honorable James R. Thompson; and the mayor of the City of Chicago, the Honorable Harold Washington, have issued proclamations commemorating the discovery of America by Columbus, and copies of these proclamations follow:

COLUMBUS DAY, 1985—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

We are privileged each year to pay honor to the great explorer whose epic voyages of discovery led to the development of the Western Hemisphere. Christopher Columbus won an imperishable place in history and in the hearts of all Americans by challenging the unknown and defying the doubters. In doing so he set in motion a chain of events which transformed the world and led to the birth of the great country in which we live.

Columbus' achievement lies not only in his daring navigational exploits but also in the practical outgrowth of his efforts. More than a great seaman, he was a man of vision who could see the opportunities that lay beyond the horizon. Indeed, the results of his quest were far grander than he could have envisioned. Those who followed in the path he had opened built a new world whose economic, political, and social development have been marvels of human energy and ingenuity. People from across the globe have come to America to find freedom, justice, and economic opportunity.

Columbus exemplified a spirit which still inspires all Americans—a spirit of reaching out, expanding the frontiers of knowledge, a spirit of undaunted hope. In the words of Joaquin Miller, "He gained a world; he gave that world its grandest lesson: 'On! Sail on!'" Like Columbus, we Americans are ready to take risks in pursuit of our goals. We understand that boundless opportunities await those who dare to strive.

Our tribute to Columbus has special meaning to Americans of Italian descent. This son of Genoa was the first of many great Italian travelers to the New World. Millions of his countrymen would later settle in the new land, adding their precious contribution to the developments that stemmed from Columbus' voyages. Columbus was the first link in a chain which today binds the United States to Italy in a special relationship.

This remembrance is also particularly important for those of Spanish descent. Columbus' achievement depended on the vision and energy of a newly united Spain. This was only the first of Spain's many cultural and economic contributions to the New World. We share with our Spanish-speaking neighbors this heritage and our debt of gratitude to Spain.

In the coming years this commemoration of the voyage of 1492 will take on heightened significance, because we are approaching the 500th anniversary of that great event. The Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission, a distinguished group of Americans assisted by representatives from Spain and Italy, will plan, encourage, and carry forward the commemoration of Columbus' great voyages of discovery. The Committee held its initial meeting on September 12, and will report within two years its recommendations for observance of the celebration.

In tribute to Columbus' achievement, the Congress of the United States, by joint resolution approved April 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 657), as modified by the Act of June 28, 1968 (82 Stat. 250), has requested the President to proclaim the second Monday in October of each year as Columbus Day.

Now, therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Monday, October 14, as Columbus Day. I invite the people of this Nation to observe that day in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies in honor of this great explorer. I also direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all public buildings on the appointed day in honor of Christopher Columbus.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and tenth.

RONALD REAGAN.

STATE OF ILLINOIS: PROCLAMATION

Every American knows what historic event occurred in 1492, for in that year the history of the world took a dramatic leap. The voyage of Columbus, which spurred further exploration of the New World, is celebrated annually throughout the land.

Columbus and many other distinguished Italians have contributed to the growth of civilization. The Italian community is joined by Americans of every ethnic background in recognizing Columbus Day.

Italian-American residents in Illinois will be sponsoring their 29th annual Columbus Day Parade to honor their native hero.

Therefore, I, James R. Thompson, Governor of the State of Illinois, proclaim October 14, 1985, as Columbus Day in Illinois.

James R. Thompson.

CITY OF CHICAGO: PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans (JCCIA), is sponsoring its annual Columbus Day Parade on October 14, 1985; and

Whereas, the courage and visionary wisdom displayed by Christopher Columbus in his intrepid voyage of discovery is exemplary of the Italian-American community; and

Whereas, those qualities of our Italian-American brothers and sisters are evident in the many contributions to the arts, politics, sports and socio-economic life of Chicago; and

Whereas, this year's parade honoring the great navigator is dedicated to Italian-American sports heroes:

Now, therefore, I, Harold Washington, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim October 14, 1985, to be Columbus Day in Chicago and urge citizens to be cognizant of the events held in connection with this historical observance in honor of the great navigator, Christopher Columbus.

Dated this 8th day of October, 1985.

HAROLD WASHINGTON,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, Chicago's Columbus Day celebration begins with a concelebrated Mass at Our Lady of Pompeii Church at 9 a.m. Before the Mass begins, an introduction will be given by Theresa Petrone, theme coordinator of this year's parade. Anthony Pope will serve as commentator, and the lectors will include Jeannine Riotto and Libby Hannigan. Norman Boccio will offer the prayer of the faithful, and members of the Offertory Procession will be Lisa Ann Taranto, queen of the Columbus Day Parade; Fred Serpe, Christopher Columbus in this year's parade; Marie Palello, JCCIA secretary; and Ann Sorrentino, costume chairperson. Music will be provided by the Italian Cultural Center Choir with Josephine LiPuma as director; and the organists will be Lawrence Salvador and Frank Pugno. Nick Bianco, John DeBella, Anthony Lanzito, Michael Palello, Anthony Pilas, and Lawrence Spallitta will serve as ushers.

The principal celebrant will be the Most Rev. Nevin W. Hayes, auxiliary bishop of Chicago. The homily will be given by Rev. Angelo Garbin and Rev. Angelo Carbone, pastor of Our Lady of Pompeii Church, will host the Mass. Other concelebrants will include Rev. John Bonelli, Deacon Giulio Camerini, Rev. Don Craig, Deacon Frank De Vita, Rev. Charles Fanelli, Rev. Nicholas Marro, Rev. Lawrence Cozzi, Rev. Leonard Mattei, Rev. Pat Murphy, Rev. Ronald Scarlata, and Rev. Kenneth Velo, who recently was elevated to the position of administrative assistant to His Excellency, Joseph Cardinal Bernardin.

As in past years, the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus will serve as the colorful honor guard, and following the Mass, breakfast will be prepared and served by the Mothers Club of Our Lady of Pompeii Church, with Josephine Messina as chairperson.

Following the Mass, there will be a wreath-laying ceremony at the Columbus statue in Arrigo Park. Thomas Baratta and Sam Garnello of the Order Sons of Italy in America will coordinate this event, aided by the color guard of the Italian American War Veterans.

The parade will step off from the corner of Dearborn and Wacker Drive at 1 p.m. and will include over 200 floats, bands, and marching units depiciting the theme of this year's parade, "Italian American Sports Heroes," as well as demonstrating the many contributions of Italian Americans to our country's greatness. Dr. Franco Colombo, who has the title of "Mr. World," will be riding on the float of the National Italian American Sports Hall of Fame, whose executive director is George Randazzo. This year, the Gruppo Folklorico "Marsala Antica" from Marsala, Sicily, a group of 25 young men and women sponsored by the Sicilian government dressed in historic costumes, will sing and play in the parade. Also, the Gruppo Storico Fizizzano from the city of Tuscana, will display their musical talents, as well as demonstrate their unique skills of flag-throwing and twirling. Fred Serpe of Elmwood Park will portray Christopher Columbus in this year's event. In addition, colorful floats especially designed for the occasion will carry members of the Italian American community wearing authentic costumes from the 19 regions of Italy.

The parade will be televised locally by WGN-TV in Chicago from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m., and with its cable capabilities, reaching more than 30 States, millions of people are expected to watch this year's event. The sponsors for this year's parade include Dominick DiMatteo of Dominick's Finer Foods, Anthony Fornelli of Festa Italiana, Nello Ferrara of Ferrara Pan Candy Co., the Chicagoland Chrysler Dealers Association, Statistical Tabulating Co., Alitalia Airlines, Contadina Foods, True Value Hardware Stores, and Anheuser Busch.

One of the highlights of Chicago's Columbus Day celebration is the selection of the queen of the parade. This year, judged on her beauty, poise, and personality, Lisa Ann Taranto, of Lockport, IL, and a student at Northern Illinois University, was chosen to reign as queen of the parade. She won $1,000 from the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans; $100 from Dr. Claudio Ferrari, Consul General of Italy; two dinners at the Como Inn Restaurant, courtesy of Joseph Marchetti; two dinners at Sicily Restaurant courtesy of John Incandela; and two dinners at Stefani's Restaurant, courtesy of Phil Stefani.

The members of the queen's court include Donna M. Varzino, 7836 West Farragut, Chicago, IL; Gina Marie Forcucci, 1616 North Sayre, Chicago, IL; Melissa M. Esposito, 2125 North 74th Avenue, Elmwood Park, IL; and Rosemarie Andolino, 1444 James Court, Elk Grove, IL.

The chairman of the Queen's Contest was Fred Mazzei; the cochairperson was Josephine Bianco, and the judges for the contest included Joseph M. Caliendo, fur fashion coordinator and co-owner of Bruno & Joseph Furs; Gilbert J. Cataldo, executive director of the Chicago Regional Port District; John T. Coli, vice president of Teamsters Local 727; State Representative James A. DeLeo; Paul A. Fosco, executive vice president of Consultants & Administrators, Inc.; James M. Hogan, recording secretary for Teamsters Local 714; Joseph Lizzadro, chairman of Meade Electric Co.; Laura Spingola, president of Trade Resources Ltd.; Dr. Carl Tintari, specialist in cosmetic dentistry; Rose Farina, manager of Daley Center Events in the Chicago Office of Fine Arts; and Dr, John Drammis, cosmetic surgeon and owner of Cosmetic Surgery Center of Chicago, Inc.

The Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, comprised of more than 40 Italo-American civic organizations in the Chicagoland area, sponsors the Columbus Day parade and other related activities. Many local groups are cooperating with the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans in this community-wide tribute to Columbus, and Anthony Sorrentino, consultant for the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, is again helping to coordinate the various activities of the parade as he has done so energetically over the years.

Our grand Columbus Day celebration will close with a reception at 3:30 p.m. at the Como Inn Restaurant, 546 North Milwaukee Avenue, in Chicago, in honor of our guests, all officers, subcommittee chairmen, and members who are participating in making the 1985 Columbus Day Parade a memorable event. Leaders of the Italo-American organization from Illinois will also be present as well as officials from our State and city government.

As honorary cochairman of this 16th celebration of Columbus Day as a national holiday, I commend the members and officers of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian

Americans for their dedication, careful planning, and hard work that goes into the creation of this annual grand event. Our city and our people are proud of these outstanding citizens and their untiring efforts to make this special occasion another great success.

Mr. Speaker, the officers and members of the 1985 Chicago Columbus Day Parade Committee are as follows:

LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF CHICAGO'S COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

COLUMBUS DAY PARADE COMMITTEE

James Coli, General Chairman 1985.
Joseph Tolitano, Grand Marshall.

HONORARY CHAIRMEN

Congressman Frank Annunzio.
Congressman Martin Russo.
Dr. Claudio Ferrari, Consul General of Italy.

JCCIA OFFICERS

Charles C. Porcelli, President.
Carl De Moon, 1st Vice President.
Leonard Giampietro, 2nd Vice President.
Anthony Terlato, 3rd Vice President.
Fred Bartoli, 4th Vice President.
Fred Mazzei, 5th Vice President.
John de Bella, Treasurer.
Josephine L. Ortale, Secretary.
Joseph Mollica, Sgt.-at-Arms.
Jerome N. Zurla, Special Counselor.
Anthony Sorrentino, Executive Director.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Richard Parrillo, Chairman.
Congressman Frank Annunzio, Vice Chairman.
Michael Annecca, Fred Bartoli, Anthony Bertuca, Victor Cacciatore, Jerry Campagna, Representative Ralph Capparelli, Micheal Cardilli, Gilbert Cataldo, Michael Coccia, James L. Coli, Senator John D'Arco, Jr., Representative James De Leo, Pat De Leo, Dominick Di Matteo, Representative Marco Domico, Nello Ferrara, Anthony J. Fornelli, Paul Fosco.
Fire Commissioner Louis Galante, Leonard Giampietro, Dr. James F. Greco, Ernie Kumerow, Joseph Lizzardro, Jr., Steve Lombardo, Charles LoVerde, Joseph Mazza, Joseph Marchetti, Pat Marcy, Jr., Michael R. Notaro, Charles C. Porcelli, Mayor John C. Porcelli, Nunzio Raimondi, Ciro Rossini, Dr. Salvatore Rotella, Dr. Mario O. Rubinelli, John Serpico, Dr. Raffaele Suriano, Anthony Terlato, Joseph Tolitano, Lester Trilla, Phillip Zinni, Jerome N. Zurla, Anthonly Fratto.

CHAPLAIN

Rev. Armando Pierini, C.S.

THEME COORDINATION

Theresa Petrone.

RELIGIOUS PROGRAM & ORGANIZATIONS

Rev. Lawrence Cozzi, C.S., Chairman.
Rev. Leonard Mattei, Co-Chairman.
Rev. Armando Pierini, C.S., Advisor.
Nick Bianco, John De Bella, Michael Fortino, Michael Palello, Elvira Panarese, Chief Anthony Pilas, Anthony Pope, Lawrence Spallitta.

AUTHENTIC ITALIAN COSTUMES

Ann Sorrentino, Chairperson; Elena Frigoletti, Mary Spallitta, Pauline Jo Cusimano.

FINANCE AND SOUVENIR BOOK

Leonard Giampietro, Chairman; Ann Sorrentino, Angeline Annunzio.

LABOR COMMITTEE

Ernie Kumerow, Chairman; James Coli, Robert LoVerde, Angelo Fosco, Charles LoVerde, Tony Judge, Armando Fosco, Chuck Spranzo, John Serpico, Bruno Caruso.

BANDS, MARCHERS, TRANSPORTATION & FLOATS

Marie Palello.

PROGRAM & ARRANGEMENTS

Domenick Di Frisco, Co-Chairman; Theresa Petrone, Co-Chairperson; Jerry Zurla, Gilbert Cataldo, Anthony Fornelli, James De Leo, Charles C. Porcelli.

QUEEN CONTEST

Fred Mazzei, Chairman; Josephine Bianco, Co-Chairperson; Anita Louise Bianco, Norma Battisti, Sam Bruno, Ange Tufano, Marie Palello, Mike Palello, Joseph Mollica, Hugo Panarese.

FLOAT PERSONNEL

Lawrence Spallitta, Chairman.

PARADE MARSHALS

Marco De Stefano, Chairman; Larry Battisti, Rocco Bellino, John De Bella, Nick Bianco, Pasquale Caputo, Ettore Di Vito, Neil Francis, Joe Mollica, Mike Palello, Joseph Pantaleo, Anthony Pilas, Louis Rago, Ron Onesti.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Congressman Frank Annunzio, Congressman Martin A. Russo, Senator John D'Arco, Jr., Hon. William J.P. Banks, Frank S. Belmonte, Hon. Phillip Bianco, Jr., Hon. Ralph C. Capparelli, Hon. Frank W. Chesrow, Hon. Elmer Conti, Hon. Jerome A. Cosentino, Hon. John D'Arco, Sr., Hon. Pat De Leo, Hon. Marco Domico, Mayor William J. Francione, Hon. Frank Giglio, Hon. Anthony C. Laurino, Hon. William J. Laurino, Hon. John A. Maloni, Hon. Vito Marzullo, Hon. John Merlo, Hon. Michael Nardulli, Mayor Charles Panici, Hon. Fred B. Roti, Hon. Salvatore Ruffolo, Mayor Alfred Stramaglia, Mayor C. August Taddeo, Mayor Anthony Vacco, Hon. Louis Viverito, Hon. Greg Zito.

STAFF PHOTOGRAPHER

Sam Bruno.

WOMEN'S DIVISION

Jeannine Riotto.

WEST SUBURBAN WOMEN'S DIVISION

Libby Hannigan.

YOUNG ADULT DIVISION

Norman Boccio.

COORDINATOR

Anthony Sorrentino.
Marie Palello.

OFFICE VOLUNTEERS

Russell Anderson, William Travers, Joan Piraino, Rose Ann Rabiola, Nancy Savino, Ann Sorrentino, Ann Yelmini, Josephine Ortale, Rose Ortale.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business on Tuesday, October 8, and missed rollcall vote No. 342 on the amendment offered to H.R. 2100 by Mr. PETRI.

Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on this amendment to terminate the tobacco price support program.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I have again taken out a special order this evening to talk about an issue that has in just the last several weeks had totally new life bred into it and, of course, that is the issue of a balanced budget for our U.S. Government. For some time a good many Members in this body and the body across the Rotunda have worked very hard to achieve through the constitutional method a balanced-budget amendment that we could send forth to the American public for ratification, that would say to this body that in their budgeting process on an annual basis that they would have to bring receipts and revenues into balance and that the Government could not in fact spend out of balance.

Of course, the American public time and time again has said in polls for the last 10 years that I know of, some 80 percent of them have said that, of course, the Congress of the United States should balance the Government's budget and it should be forced to live within its means, much like every American household, every American business, certainly every American must do or they find themselves at some point in their lives in ultimate bankruptcy.

Over the years, we have tried a variety of methods to force this Congress to be fiscally responsible and in almost all instances those methods have failed. It was for that reason that several years ago I and now nearly 190 Members of this body came together to organize a group called Club Congressional Leaders United for a Balanced Budget in a Bipartisan Way, to issue forth to this Congress a resolution, this year's resolution, House Joint Resolution 27, which is a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget.

□ 1930

We now, today, have well over 200 cosponsors. But as our effort worked to bring about the necessary support so that the Committee on the Judiciary here in the House would recognize and hold the proper hearings and allow that legislation to come to the floor for fair and open debate that the American public could witness, and then to send forth the resolution to the American public for its consideration and ratification, on every occasion we have been stopped. We have been stopped in large part because of a faction in this body who simply will not recognize nor do they support nor do they in fact believe in the need for this Government to balance its

budget, to respond in a fiscal way that will send our country the kinds of economic signals that a balanced budget could ultimately send.

So what do we find today? We find ourselves in a situation of attempting to be able to deal with a $200 billion deficit. But more importantly than that, as it has its impact on our economy, we here in this body now and the body across the Rotunda are having to consider something that none of us like, and that is to raise the debt ceiling of our Nation; in other words, its ability to borrow and to spend money to the $2 trillion level.

Throughout the history of this country, since we were a Union, it has taken all of that time except for the last 7 years to arrive at a national debt of $1 trillion, and just in the last 7 years we have now been put in a situation where we must ask the American public to allow us to raise the debt ceiling to $2 trillion.

As a result of that, Members of the Senate and Members here in the House, having been blocked by leadership in the House, because the Senate just 2 years ago sent forth a constitutional amendment to balance the budget which failed in this House, both Members of good will, Republican and Democrat alike, have said if we cannot pass the balanced-budget amendment we must at least try in some way to bring forth an issue, and in this case a form of law, a statute, tied to the debt ceiling that would put into process a system by which we could move toward a balanced budget in a systematic way over a period of years to get to a point of a balanced budget without major disruption in our economy.

The Senate is now deadlocked in trying to debate and vote on an issue that has become known as the Gramm-Rudman amendment, the Emergency Deficit Control Act, or a Balanced Budget Act. To my disappointment, the news media of this country has called it the Balanced Budget Act. Although it would arrive at a balanced budget by 1991, it is not a constitutional amendment to our Constitution which would, in fact, by constitutional law, mandate a balanced budget.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I have with me some of my colleagues who have been directly involved in this issue, and I would certainly be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and in doing so I would like to wish him "happy birthday."

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for that, I guess.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and for those good wishes on my birthday, but I rise to extend my congratulations and appreciation, and I think the appreciation of the American people, for his efforts in support of getting a vote here in the House of Representatives on a balanced budget constitutional amendment. I think it is absolutely essential that we do it. I am convinced that we will succeed in getting that issue forced to a vote in a timely fashion, and hopefully very soon, and I hope that the House of Representatives will show the courage to provide the necessary two-thirds vote when it comes up for a vote here in the House.

I doubt that it is going to happen, based on the record that the House of Representatives has over the years of not voting for this constitutional amendment for a balanced budget and not voting to get spending under control, but it is a very important effort that the gentleman is working on and I join with him in that. I have signed the necessary discharge petition and I urge the gentleman to continue doing that.

Regardless if that happens, in our other effort for our statutory process to set up a procedure to move toward a balanced budget by fiscal year 1991, we need this constitutional amendment. We need this binding process that would force us to have a balanced budget and stick with it, like so many of the States have. I know the gentleman will go into some details about how that works, but I wanted to congratulate him and urge our colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join him in that effort to get a vote on that most important issue of a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget.

But I also want to rise to speak for a moment about what I refer to as the Gramm-Mack amendment to the debt ceiling that is being considered now by the other body and hopefully will be here in the House for a straight up-or-down vote very soon. We each year have these continuing votes that come up to raise the debt ceiling, a very difficult vote for a lot of Members to cast and it will be again this year.

One of the reasons why Members on this side of the aisle and why I am hesitant to vote for this rise in the debt ceiling is because I see no end out there in the future to having to vote to raise it again and again and again. We must have a process to move toward a more balanced budget. It is fraud to say that we are going to balance the budget next week or next month or next year. There must be some orderly process to move in that direction, to force us to do it.

The Budget and Impoundment Act that we now have to work with here in the House of Representatives that was passed in 1974 is in shambles. The House makes a mockery of the process by its own reconciliation bill that will be coming to the floor of the House of Representatives soon. In a bill that is supposed to cut spending, that is supposed to make us comply with our own budget resolution, our friends on the other side of the aisle use it to authorize other bills and, in fact, to raise spending. They are absolutely making a mockery of the process and seem to be saying, "We just cannot get spending under control."

This Gramm-Mack proposal is an orderly process. It will force the President to produce these budget recommendations on a declining basis to a balanced budget in 1991. The Congress must then act, perhaps with a different set of priorities, but to comply with this systematic reduction.

If, though, at the end of the fiscal year in October, the Congress has not lived up to its commitments and the President and the Congress cannot fulfill that commitment of the $35 or $36 billion reduction each year over this period up to fiscal year 1991, then there would be the action-forcing mechanism, a fair mechanism, across the board, equal percentage, 50-50 between the appropriated and nonappropriated accounts.

We need it desperately. I believe the American people are excited about the prospect that we would establish some system to move toward a more balanced budget, and yet our friends, the Democrats, in the Senate and in the House, delay. They say, "We need more time." They start asking questions. They even make the point that we took 15 months to pass the Budget and Impoundment Act. Yes, we did, and maybe that is what is wrong with it and why it is in a heap of ashes now on the floor of this Chamber, because we nickeled and dimed it and picked it to death. We found every possible little loophole that we could dream of so that we could slither through it and avoid facing the issue of cutting spending.

So I think the Gramm-Mack proposal, known in the other body as the Gramm-Rudman proposal, is the most exciting thing we have going right now for the American people, for the taxpayer, for those who pay attention to what we do in spending the people's money here in Washington, DC.

So I would urge my colleagues to look at it closely. Approach it from a positive standpoint. Do not start saying, "What if? What if?" It is a statute that sets up just a procedure to move toward a balanced budget. It does not say how we are going to do it, but it just says that over a period of these years we will have to rein ourselves in.

I am supporting it, and I have a question for the leaders on the other side of the aisle who today refused to take up the issue, even in a minor way, by bringing up the proposal that was passed by the Senate to cap the use of the Federal Financing Bank. They do not want a vote on this issue.

It is clear that the Republicans here in the House of Representatives want a straight up or-down vote on this issue of the Gramm-Rudman-Mack balanced budget procedure. I believe the American people want that effort, that opportunity, and we are going to get it one way or the other here in the House of Representatives and then we can have this type of fiscal responsibility we really should have.

I thank the gentleman for his efforts. I do not think that the two conflict at all; they complement each other. Let us set up a process, but let us also put it in the Constitution. That is where it should be, and then hopefully in future generations they will not be going through this chaos and this mockery that we have now of the budget process.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Let me ask the gentleman a question. I find it unique that in the number of States which by constitution are required to balance their budgets that they have a mechanism in place that monitors the spending of the different agencies of their States so that if at a point during the fiscal year they find themselves spending beyond their limitation that there is a mechanism by which they can cut back and level their spending to maintain a balance with their revenues.

I am told that the Gramm-Mack proposal, the proposal that is currently being debated in the Senate, is in some part not unlike the kind of mechanisms that literally a number of States have across this country, well over 30. Is that true?

□ 1940

Mr. LOTT. It is true. In fact, my own State right now is going through that very process. It is a painful one.

But the revenue coming into the State of Mississippi is below what was anticipated and the State must take action now to begin to make sure that they can have a balanced budget. Here it is, the poorest State in the Nation, and yet our State legislators and our leaders have faced the issue year in and year out, and they have a balanced budget. And yet they look to us and they see our inability to control our insatiable appetite to spend more of the peoples' tax dollars, dollars frankly that should be staying in my own State so that my State of Mississippi and my own hometown would have that opportunity for revenue themselves.

But in the Gramm/Rudman package, there is a requirement that there must be a report to Congress about how the process is working, and the President must also report to Congress what he is doing to carry out his ministerial role, not his role of impoundment in complying with the automatic sequestering if that is forced by Congress' inability to act, but even before that there is the requirement that the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office report to the Congress about what is being done to comply with our own budget resolution while the process is going on.

Mr. CRAIG. Would the gentleman say that his State of Mississippi would be complying or working to comply at this moment if, in fact, they did not have a constitutional amendment that required a balanced budget and had the ability to borrow, in other words, kind of nonstop ad infinitum?

Mr. LOTT. If we had that credit card, and people seem to think the chickens will never come home to roost, then I am sure we would spend much more money trying to provide more things that the people need, trying to create jobs in the State sector, or in the Government sector, which are not the kind of jobs that they need. There is no question that if they could just print the money and continue to raise the debt ceiling without paying any attention to where this money really is going to eventually come from—from our children as a matter of fact—why I think the States would do that.

But the people are closer sometimes to those State legislatures and the government and they would not tolerate it, and they have had the foresight to put that requirement in their State constitutions. There is no question that it keeps the pressure on them.

I think there are only, what, four or five States in the Nation that did not have a balanced budget or a surplus during the past fiscal year, and I think maybe only a couple that actually went into the red. I think there is no question of the fact that having these constitutional amendments that required them to have a balanced budget forces them to do that.

Mr. CRAIG. I certainly thank my colleague for his insight. He took time away from his family tonight to be with us. He must rush home, I am told, to a birthday dinner, and I certainly once again wish you a happy birthday.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. CRAIG. I think the point my colleague from Mississippi has just brought up dramatizes why we are here, why we consistently work toward a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution, and why we have looked at the Gramm-Mack proposal as a tool, a device, a mechanism, if you will, to begin to move the Congress of the United States, in other words, the budget of our Government, toward a balance by the year 1991.

My colleague from Mississippi made a very, very important point. Today in the other body, they are debating lifting the debt ceiling, the ability of our Government to spend into debt to the point of some $2 trillion.

Now what does that really mean? My colleague from Mississippi mentioned that it is an unwillingness to be fiscally responsible. In other words, to go ahead and spend now and pass that expense for that debt forward into the future generations.

At our current rate of deficit spending that ultimately becomes part of the national debt what we are really telling the young people of this country is that we are now willingly, without their permission, at least, us here in the U.S. Congress are willingly extending to them a responsibility of an increased debt of nearly $1,000 a year at these kinds of expenditure levels. In other words, this Congress, this Government is saying we do not want to pay for it now, we do not want to take the responsibility to have to pay for the kinds of services that we want to offer to the American people, so we will simply extend that debt forward, and we will say to all of the young people of this country, we are just going to saddle you with the burden, and somewhere down the road, as is typical of all debts, you ultimately will have the responsibility of paying for it. And, of course, as we do that, we constantly add to the budget a requirement to service the debt.

In the 1986 budget as proposed, I know that that debt service, or interest to be paid on the debt is now well over $140 billion annually. It is becoming one of the single largest items in the Federal budget. And of course, that is why so many of us here have worked for so long to bring about a constitutional requirement through the Constitution, through the amendment process to force a balanced budget, and then put into motion the kind of mechanism that is devised and proposed in the Gramm-Mack proposal that will bring us in a progressive way, over a period of time, to that balanced budget.

I am pleased to have my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] join with me this evening in this special order. He has been a stalwart here on the floor reminding us of our fiscal responsibility, a strong advocate of a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget, a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 27, the Constitutional Amendment Resolution, and a member of the CLUBB organization.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I am pleased to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. I, too, join with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], our minority whip, in congratulating the gentleman for all of his work and for helping to drive home the point of how badly we need to move on this

51-059 O-86-47 (Pt. 19)

balanced-budget approach. Because the gentleman has been in the forefront, I know that he understands that what we get on this issue is a lot of rhetoric. There is an intuitive understanding among politicians here that the American people have had it with our spending, that they want something done about deficits, they want something done about our budget overspending, and they are demanding that action be taken.

So as a result, we have Members of Congress parading out to the country telling their constituents exactly what they think their constituents want to hear, that I am down in Washington fighting budget deficits, that I am out there working for you. The fact is that what we have is a lot of flim, and a lot of flam, and a lot of smoke, and a lot of mirrors, but very little action.

The gentleman has been one of those who has been subjected to that process in his work to try to get a balanced-budget amendment out to this floor and passed. We hear all of these people who want to talk about balanced-budget amendments, but when it comes time to actually move toward the vote, move it out of committee, get it to the floor, do something real, well, all of a sudden all of those people fade. They run to the cloakrooms, they run to their offices, they run home, they do something, but let us not vote on it.

Now all of a sudden they are presented with a very, very tough dilemma. There is something moving in the other body that has a chance of coming here that might actually force them to vote on something with teeth in it to balance the budget. And what is happening? We are seeing the flim and we are seeing the flam and we are seeing the smoke and we are seeing the mirrors. We saw it out here on the floor this evening.

The other body sent the bill over here, a House-passed bill in which what they were attempting to do was to put a deadline on the amount of money or the amount of time in which we can borrow from the Federal Financing Bank. In other words, put us up against the wall as of next Friday that we would have to meet. And what did we hear? Well, we heard then, we heard them say, well, no, they did not want that process to go forward. They did not want that kind of deadline. They want more time to study this proposal.

Why do they want more time to study? They want more time to round up all of the special-interest groups out in the country to come pounding on the doors saying, oh, no, do not touch the Federal budget, do not touch the process that keeps these $200 billion deficits in place. Do not do anything that is real. They want a couple of weeks in order to bring those people to this town yelling and screaming again so that they hope that they can avoid a vote. They do not want a vote on that. They do not want to go back to the American people and explain why they voted against a constitutional amendment.

They are even now trying to come up with alternatives, those that are trying to squirm out from underneath, and I was fascinated, I would say to the gentleman, by a "Dear Colleague" letter. I will not mention the name of the colleague. I have not informed him that I was going to mention this. But I happened to come across it as I was reading today.

We have a "Dear Colleague" letter that is headlined "Alternative to Gramm-Rudman," and guess what it is proposing, I would say? A constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

Now where has he heard that before? You know, all of a sudden now we have this constitutional amendment, and I would say to him, having worked on the language for years, it is very, very interesting. This constitutional amendment says, and I read, "Expenditures of the United States Government in any fiscal year shall not exceed its revenues for that fiscal year."

Now where have we heard that before? I will tell you where we have heard that before. That is now the law of the land. We passed that into law almost 10 years ago. That is exactly what the law now says, and we violate it all of the time.

Mr. CRAIG. If my colleague will yield back for a moment, he mentioned the law of the land. We actually have laws now on the books of the Federal Government that mandate a balanced budget.

Let me cite those laws because you bring up a very, very interesting point, and I would like to have you expand on it.

In October 1978, we passed Public Law 95-435 which said that beginning with fiscal year 1981, the total budget outlays of the Federal Government shall not exceed receipts.

Is that not what that "Dear Colleague" letter says?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, it is. It is almost precisely the same language that we are now hearing that is the alternative to Gramm-Rudman that is already the law of the land. We violate it every day and we do it knowingly.

Mr. CRAIG. And again I understand that in April 1979, Public Law 96-5 provided that Congress shall balance the Federal budget. "Pursuant to this mandate, the Budget Committees shall report by April 15, 1979, a fiscal-year budget for 1981 that shall be in balance, and also a fiscal-year budget for 1982 that shall be in balance, and that by April 15, 1980, the fiscal-year budget for 1981 shall be in balance. And the Budget Committee shall show the consequences of each budget on each budget function and on the economy, setting forth its effects on revenues, spending, employment, inflation and national security."

That is the law of the land, and I think I just heard the gentleman say that in reflection to this law of the land that we have consistently violated that. That is obvious or we would not have a $200 billion debt.

Mr. WALKER. That is right, or we would not have a $200 billion debt.

But let me tell the gentleman what has happened out here a couple of times, and he is well familiar with it too. On a couple of occasions I personally have carried amendments to the floor suggesting some new spending program we are putting in place ought not go forward in violation of that public law, and I have brought it out a number of times. Do you know that every single time, when confronted with the reality of the law of the land that required a balanced budget, and confronted with the reality of a new spending program, every single time Congress has voted in favor of the new spending program and against implementing the law of the land, which is the balanced budget, every single time. On one occasion, it was even we were going to build a new memorial here in the city. I felt that was a low-enough priority that maybe we ought to at least obey the balanced-budget law when it came to building a new memorial in the city. No. By about 100 votes, this body decided it was more important to build the memorial than to enforce the balance-budget law.

And so, this kind of language that our colleagues now suggest as an alternative to Gramm/Rudman is no alternative. We have already tried it.

You know, you can put that language into the Constitution, but the fact is that we still need an enforcement mechanism, and that is what the gentleman has been working on.

If these people want to go the constitutional amendment route, all they have to do is join the gentleman in cosponsoring H.R. 27, and go up and sign the discharge petition, because his balanced-budget amendment accomplishes the same thing, except it has teeth. Instead of being a toothless-tiger approach to a balanced budget, which so many on that side want, they want to vote for budget acts like we had in 1974, they want to vote for balanced-budget amendments to the Constitution that are meaningless, they want to vote for language around here that is meaningless because it has no real discipline in it, and they are toothless tigers when it comes to balanced budgets. The only time they want to become real tigers is when it comes to spending, and then they run down onto this floor, roaring like the devil about the spending that they want to do.

I think that it is clear that what happened on the floor here today is one more example of the Democratic leadership making a conscious decision to try to delay, to try to negate, to try to undercut, to try in some way to subterfuge the whole policy of moving toward a balanced budget, and we are going to see more of that in the next several days, and we are going to see the Democratic majority of this body support their leadership. And we are going to see them line up time and time again trying to tell the American people, well, look, we are really for balanced budgets, but this is simply the wrong approach.

Everything to them is the wrong approach. There is no right approach. Every time you bring up something that has any kind of discipline involved in it at all, they figure out a way to get around it.

□ 1955

They figured out a way around the Budget Act; we waive the Budget Act all the time out here; there is always some reason for getting around the idea that we ought to save money rather than spend money.

I thank the gentleman for taking this special order. I hope the American people are finally becoming aware that it is the Republican Party that is the party of balanced budgets; it is the Democratic Party that is the party of spending, and that until they rid themselves, in this body, of big spenders, we are going to continue to have a balanced budget problem in this country; we are going to continue to have a deficit problem in this country, and we are going to continue to pass the bill, as the gentleman has said earlier, along to our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren.

That is the shame of this; we are spending the money today; we are enjoying the benefits of deficits, and we are passing the bill on to people who did not even have a chance to vote on paying that bill.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague for joining me in this special order, and pointing out some of the problems that we currently face; some of the problems we have faced in the past; and the tremendous reluctance that we see on almost a daily basis on this floor for our colleagues to respond to what the American public has now said is the number one issue in this Nation, and that is the Federal deficit.

That we must control it; they have told us in almost every possible way they can, and yet, here, on this floor on a day-to-day basis we deny them that response. We do so in a variety of ways including failure to bring out a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and failure to respond, as my colleague from Pennsylvania mentioned, to respond as we should have responded this evening.

To not only authorize and react, allow the Federal Government to have some flexibility while we continue to debate what is now in my opinion one of the most critical issues, one of the most important issues to come before this session of the United States Congress.

What is that? Well, we have talked about it briefly, and I am now pleased to see my colleague from Florida [Mr. MACK] who has done a yeoman's job in working with Senator GRAMM in putting together the Gramm-Mack proposal that is probably No. 1 in the minds of most legislators at this moment, both here in the House and the other body—some of us in strong support of it, others trying to find out how to get around it, and that of course is that particular piece of legislation that has become known as the Emergency Deficit Control Act, the Balanced Budget Emergency Deficit Control Act.

That would put in motion the very kind of thing that we think is necessary is a responsible, kind of sequential move that brings about the process that would bring us to a balanced budget by the year 1991 and would allow the American public to see that you can balance the budget; that the constitutional amendment mandating a balanced budget is a responsible act; that you do not create some strange, crazy gyration in the Government; that you do not somehow overnight have to be forced to raise taxes by $200 billion or to cut programs by $200 billion, but in a responsible, programmed way, over a period of several years you can arrive at it in large part without changing much of the method by which the Government spends or many of the priorities that the Government has.

I would like to now yield some time to my colleague from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Several points came to my mind as the gentleman was talking. One of the things I think we need to concentrate on before we get into maybe the specifics of the proposal is that, why are we talking about it now, and what are the questions that we should be asking.

To put that into context, what I am saying is that the Congress, both the Senate and the House, are being asked to, at some point, deal with the debt ceiling of this Nation; that is, the ability of our Government to borrow funds to pay for the programs that have been authorized in the 1986 budget.

Here we have a situation where we are being asked to go out and borrow additional funds, and I am going to put this, as I did last evening in a special order, in the context of having come from 16 years in the banking business.

Typically, if a family or a business, or for that matter a government, whether that was a city or State, came to a lending institution to borrow funds, depending on what the circumstances were, we would want to find out from them what they were going to do to correct the situation that had caused the problems of that particular business.

If, for example, they wanted to borrow let us say $100,000 for the purpose of working capital for several weeks, I would want to know what it was that happened to create the necessity for borrowing that money. Was there something wrong with the management of the company? Just exactly what was going on?

Once I determined what the problem was, what created the need for the borrowing, I then asked them, "What changes were you going to make in order to put yourself back on the proper direction? In other words, how are your going to be able to repay the loan?"

Very straightforward. I mean, I think if even those of you who have not been in the banking business probably would ask those kinds of questions. In fact, I am sure we have all had the opportunity to have someone come up to us and ask if they could borrow a certain amount of money for a short period of time, and the natural question is: How are you going to pay it back?

All I am saying here is that it seems that we ought to have the same common sense, that when we are being asked to increase the debt ceiling to allow the Government to go out and borrow more money, we ought to be saying, "Under what conditions are you going to provide us with to make us feel comfortable that you have the ability to handle this credit and to be able to eventually reduce and repay that loan?"

So I think that what we are doing with the Mack-Gramm or the Gramm-Mack proposal is we are basically saying, all right, we will increase the debt ceiling of this Nation, but we are going to do it under these conditions, and the conditions are very simple:

You do not borrow any more than $180 billion in the first year; no more than $144 billion in the second year; and right on down until it is zero in 1991. What we are saying is that if you do not put budget proposals together that live within those targets, that there is an automatic sequestering of funds that takes place, that brings the amount of the deficit back down to those targets.

So for the first time what we have really done is we have shifted the emphasis. What we have said is that in the past, why you fellows were arguing whether that was this side of the aisle arguing with that side of the aisle, or

this body arguing with that body, or we were in debate with the executive branch, spending just kept right on growing, requiring more and more taxes.

Mr. CRAIG. Just a moment ago, our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and I were talking about passed law; that this body and the other body made public law, that said that this Government would have to balance its expenditures and its receipts by a given year; in other words, a balanced budget.

Now, in the Gramm-Mack proposal, you are saying that from now through 1991 there would be a reduction in deficit to a point that at that time the budget would come into balance.

In 1979, Public Law 96-5 said that, that by 1981 we would have to have a balanced budget.

What is uniquely different about what you are proposing today that has not already been proposed and is in fact now residing in the law of this land?

Mr. MACK. If the gentleman will yield further, there are several points that I would make here. One very specifically is that this legislation has within it an enforcement mechanism that in essence, that cannot be waived by the Congress; waived in the same manner that we waive things out here on the floor of the House on a day-to-day basis.

Second is the power of the Budget Act really is in the rules of the House; and because the power is in the rules of the House, we can come out here—and we see it happen every day, probably every appropriations bill that we have dealt with, many of the authorization bills that we have dealt with, have asked for waivers in the Budget Act—we waive the Budget Act, just the thing that we said we put together to protect ourselves; we waive that, and off we go. Spend more money, send it over to the Senate, have an agreement, and the spending goes on up.

In this particular piece of legislation that we are putting forward, we are saying if those targets are broken, there is an automatic feature that takes place that you and I cannot stop unless there is separate legislation that is passed that changes the targets or changes the sequestering law and allows for the increase.

It would have to be passed by the House, passed by the other body, and signed by the President. Now that is quite a different situation than the previous law that just basically mandated a balanced budget but had no enforcement mechanism in those previous laws.

Mr. CRAIG. In other words, you are saying that you are unique in your approach in that you would require a separate act of Congress to change the process, and that there is an enforcement mechanism?

Mr. MACK. That is correct.

Mr. CRAIG. In other words, you are telling me that all of the consternation that the other body has gone through that we see now building here in reaction to your proposal is over a law or a bill that could become law, an amendment that could become law, that is going to make this body act budgetarily at least responsible, and I guess what the gentleman might also be telling me is that if you had merely proposed as an amendment to the debt ceiling legislation that the budget of the United States or the Government be in balance by 1991, we probably would not be having the battle.

□ 2005

Because there would not be any teeth in it and this body would know, as they have known from at least 1979 and before, in 1978, that you can pass the laws and tell the people that you are going to balance the budget, but knowingly, knowingly at the time you are telling the American public, that you can also break the law and you can break it by getting around it with House rules, by waiving the Budget Act, as the gentleman mentioned, and simply going right on down the road of spending while being able to go home and say, "I voted for a balanced budget amendment, and I am all for fiscal responsibility."

In other words, the bill of the gentleman, his amendment is uniquely different.

Mr. MACK. That is right. The gentleman is right on the point. Again, let me run through some examples, if I could. Let us say that this proposal is passed and becomes law, signed by the President, and in 1987, the next fiscal year budget that we are going to be working on, which will have a target of $144 billion, and let us say that once again the Congress says, "We cannot live with those targets, we are going to waive this provision, and we are going to come out with a budget that is $164 billion." This might shock you. The Congress could do that. They could end up passing a budget for $164 billion even though the law required $144 billion. But you see, there is one mechanism that they cannot change, and that is on October 1 when the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office make their projections for what the deficit is going to be for the forthcoming fiscal year and they state that it is going to be $164 billion, guess what? There is a $20 billion breach of the target. The President has no choice. The law says that he must sign and order sequestering funds across the board. So while the Congress may find a way to waive it in their internal operations, come October 1 when the report is handed out by OMB and CBO, the President will have no choice but to sign this sequester order. That is why people are concerned because it has real teeth in it. It cannot be, other than by passing a piece of legislation to suspend or void or change those targets, passed by both Houses and signed by the President, and that is the kicker, the President could veto that piece of legislation to again mandate those targets.

Mr. CRAIG. Let me get this clear in my mind. Under the current law, two laws on the books of this land, right now, statutes that say that this Congress, this body, must balance its budget on an annual basis, this House, the body on the other side, can amend the Budget Act or by waiving the Budget Act get around it. They bypass the process, in other words, and the President can do literally nothing about it or does nothing, practically, about it simply because it is within the House rules at least in this body. But the gentleman is saying that under Mack-Gramm or Gramm-Mack that the President would have to act by agreeing or concurring with both the House and the Senate in legislation that would, in other words, change the law or a new law that would bypass the law or the amendment that the gentleman is proposing. That is one of the real unique differences.

Mr. MACK. That is right. Again, the President would have a veto over any provision that would change the law that we are talking about passing.

Mr. CRAIG. So that would be a safety net or a check process that currently does not exist in the law.

Mr. MACK. That is right.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It seems to me what the important thing about that mechanism is that Congress would have to affirmatively stand up and say, "We are willing to change the law in order to spend the money." In other words, instead of having some procedural vote out on the floor that people would go back home and say, "Oh, that waiver of the Budget Act, that was just a procedural kind of thing, it didn't mean anything, you can't really say I am a big spender because I voted for that." They would have to define themselves as big spenders who were willing to violate the budget targets in order to spend the money. In other words, they would have to literally enact a law that says we are going to go ahead and spend the money.

Mr. CRAIG. In other words, the gentleman is saying that on an up or down vote you would be able to say, "Yes, I am a budget buster," or, "No, I am not."

Mr. WALKER. Surely. At that point it becomes a budget buster act, and it becomes then something that you can be held accountable for. And account-

ability is the clear thing here. Nobody, nobody around here who has been spending money like a drunken sailor over all these years, wants to be held accountable for it. That is the reason why they are scared to death of the proposal.

Mr. CRAIG. Yes, I am beginning to understand why all the violent opposition from some of our liberal colleagues then.

You mean that for the first time they are going to have to be on record by voting "yes" or "no" as to whether they are willing to break the budget, spend more money than the Congress through this law had agreed was a judicious and responsible way to bring the budget under control. That is why all the reaction.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MACK. Let me, if I could, move this to another aspect of this particular proposal because I think there is more to it than just the merit of being able to get spending under control.

Again, my motivation for this is that I do feel that it is something that will mandate the reduction in spending that takes the pressure off of those of us who want to keep revenues at a low level but do not want to see increases in tax rates that usually become higher marginal tax rates that destroy incentive and so forth.

So I think, again, the motivation is to be able to control spending and to take the pressure off of revenues and taxes.

But on the other side, I think there is something of value, especially to those of us who have been in support of the concept of a balanced budget constitutional amendment.

I have heard the argument raised many times, in essence, people say, "Well, that balanced budget idea is a great one, but, you know, how would you get there? You don't have any plan for getting there. You just want to wish that in. Suppose it was passed, what would you do?"

Well, I think what we have here is a very systematic approach to get there. I guess there is also—I ought to make another point here—we all of us, as we get into the discussion about this particular proposal, seem to spend a lot of time on the enforcement mechanism, or the triggering mechanism, or the sequestering order. Let me remind you that that only takes place, that only is triggered, if Congress fails to take its responsibility. I mean, it is not that it is taking any authority away from the House or the other body. We still are going to be coming forward with a budget resolution each year. The President will have a budget proposal to make. All of them will have to live within the targets. But you and I will get involved in the discussion about what the priorities are going to be. That is an interesting point. Won't it be fun to finally talk about priorities around here? I mean to really have to make decisions about what priorities are instead of basically allowing every special interest group in the country to get some form of financial assistance from the Federal Government.

Mr. CRAIG. On that point, I have heard the last several days from several of my friends on the other side of the aisle that this just gives massive powers to the Presidency and that for some reason it is taking away from the Congress their constitutional responsibility to budget for this country, to appropriate moneys, and that is not the responsibility of a President, and that, by voting for the Gramm-Mack amendment, you would give all of these. And yet the gentleman is saying something entirely different. The gentleman is the author of the bill, I trust he knows what he is talking about. He spent a good amount of time crafting this and putting it together. I would like to have the gentleman explain in more detail, if he can, just exactly what he means.

Mr. MACK. There are several other factors that maintain the balance between the legislative and executive branches. That is an issue that all of us are interested in. It is certainly an issue that is raised every time we talk about the line item veto, where people say, "No, we can't have that, it gives too much authority to the President." So we were trying to come up with a way to keep the balance between the executive and legislative branches. I already mentioned to you that even if the sequester order—in fact, I did not mention it. So let me start at the beginning again. Under this proposal, the President and the Congress are required to submit budgets just as we are now, with one difference. Those budgets cannot break the targets. It does not say we are giving our right away to someone else to do that. We are still going to submit the budget within the targets and make the decisions about how those dollars should be allocated. But if we should, if we should fail and the OMB and CBO make the projections that indicate a breaching of the targets significant enough to require the President to sign a sequester order, there is another point; the President has no choice. He must sign it, and he has no discretion. He cannot pick and choose which particular programs are going to be hit and which ones are not.

Defense is going to be treated just like any other program. And I must say that that does cause some problem with some of our colleagues. But our feeling was that what we really ought to try to do, as closely as possible mirror the policy decisions that have been made over the last several years. While many of us disagree with those policy decisions, our feeling was to maintain that balance, that we ought to, in essence, whatever reductions that were going to take place would be even and across the board.

So the second point is that the President has no discretion in that sequestering order. The third point I would make is, even after the sequestering order takes place, if the President or the House or the Senate disagree with what happens as a result of that sequestering order, guess what? We can offer different alternatives, different solutions. We can come back with a different proposal. But, again, the key thing in this is, while we are arguing and debating, spending will be reduced. The sequester order stays in place until we come up with another plan, until there is another idea about how to solve the problem.

If I could, I want to move to one other subject, and then I am also going to be leaving for the evening.

The subject I want to touch on, as it relates to the second question that I think is most often asked, that is the question of, "If you had a balanced budget, how would you keep it?" I mean, once you are there, this idea of having a balanced budget, suppose you made an error in your economic assumptions and all of a sudden you were projecting a deficit, or suppose you miscalculated the spend-out rate on some particular spending program, and all of a sudden you had a larger expenditure than you anticipated, and you have a deficit. This, again, gives you a mechanism to get back down into the range of targets that were set up.

Last point: You said, "Unique," or something like that, "You have a unique idea." This is not a unique idea. Guess where it came from? Roughly 43 States in the country have mechanisms just exactly like this, to deal with a question of how do you live with a balanced budget?

So there are a lot of other things that we get out of this particular piece of legislation other than just setting targets and getting spending down.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman [Mr. CRAIG] for allowing me to participate in his special order.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Florida [Mr. MACK] not for just the phenomenal work that he has done on this particular amendment now pending in the Senate because I used the word "unique" a minute ago; it is unique to this body, without question. We have tried time and time again over the years, through the passage of law, to mandate a balanced budget only to find that every time we passed it we would violate it by the mechanism of the rules of the House. What my colleague from Florida, Mr. MACK, has done in the crafting of this legislation with his colleague from the Senate, Senator GRAMM of Texas, is to build a mechanism that does not allow

in an automatic way Members of this House to violate the targets that are involved.

One of the reasons I, as a major author of the constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and others have become cosponsors in the Gramm-Mack approach is because it does just exactly what Mr. MACK said a few minutes ago. It provides us with the tool, the process by which we can show and demonstrate to the American public that you can, in fact, move toward a balanced budget, and therefore it makes the constitutional amendment to balance the budget even more real in the mind of those who wish for it to be true.

As I say, it makes it more real because when that question is asked, "How do you get there? How do you move a Government that is now $200 billion in deficit to balance?" Well, of course, I have said time and time again that it could not be done overnight, that it could not be done in the course of 1 year or 2, but it would take a concerned, programmed effort on the part of the U.S. Congress, following a plan, following a procedure that in an orderly fashion could move us toward a balanced budget without major cuts or shifts in Government priorities, the kinds of programs that serve people, the kinds of programs that defend us, the kinds of programs that in large part help the American people to achieve that which they have asked of their Government.

I believe that the Mack-Gramm proposal has done just that. It has said that over a period of years from 1986 to 1991 we would move in that fashion; we would move in 1986 in the budget to reduce the deficit to $180 billion.

□ 2020

By 1987, we would ask that that reduction drop from $180 to $144 billion; in the 1988 budget, that reduction would drop from the $144 to the $108 billion; and so on, until 1991, when we would arrive at balance.

Of course, that, also does not even address the question of while that is going on, it does not mean that the Government's budget would get progressively smaller. Our economy is expanding, and as our economy expands, new revenues come into the Government based on the current tax laws of this land, and what it is only talking about is a reduction in deficit, not a reduction in overall spending per se, because as we reduce the deficit, many of us, including a lot of America's fine economists, say you begin to get a corresponding growth in the American economy that offsets, in a large part, the kind of deficit reductions that we are talking about.

So those of us who support the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution believe that this is not an alternative approach, that the Gramm-Mack approach is not the alternative to a constitutional amendment, but it is in fact the mechanism that can bring us to a balanced budget, and then with a constitutional amendment, ratified by the citizens of this country and placed into the Constitution of this great Nation, we will be at a point where never again, except in those unique cases of war, or in less dire need of this country, we would choose to bring our budget in an unbalanced way for a short period of time, but that we would in fact have a balanced budget, that we would continue to take less and less of the gross national product of this country, that we would continue to indebt in a less way the people of this country to the ever growing Federal debt and the ever growing Federal deficit.

This is what the American people have asked for time and time again. This is what many of us in the House in a bipartisan sense are trying to do at this moment, is to not only put in place the mechanism by which to arrive at a balanced budget but a constitutional mandate in the form of a constitutional amendment that would require a balanced budget on an annual basis and then be able to say, for once and for all, that we are acting fiscally responsible, that it is the responsibility of this Congress to determine what the priorities of government are and in which direction we ought to be spending for the good of the country, but that at no time, except for those unique and special cases, could we go off spending in the mad way we have for the some 20 years that we have been building this phenomenal deficit, to now arrive at historic levels of a nearly $2 trillion national debt and a $200 billion deficit and a Congress that simply wrings their hands and say, in a large part on a day-to-day basis, "We don't know how to control it. The only thing we know how to do is spend money, but we don't know how to cut money or to save money."

That is really the issue that is before this session of Congress. It is the issue that the American public have demanded of us, and I hope we are responsible in our will and in our willingness to address it.

THE UNWISE TEXTILE QUOTA BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1562, a bill to institute drastic, unilateral rollbacks in imports of textile and apparel products. Contrary to the claims of the bill's proponents, H.R. 1562 does not enforce the Multifiber Arrangement [MFA]. Instead, this legislation strikes at the fundamental principles of multilateral cooperation and agreement which allow us to do business and expand our markets the world over.

Supporting this bill means agreeing that the most protected industry in America, textiles and apparel, deserves further protection at the expense of a wide range of other U.S. industries as well as our national economic and strategic interests.

Proponents of H.R. 1562 say that dramatic rollbacks in the current textile import quota program are necessary to forestall further job losses which they blame entirely on import competition. A closer look indicates that economic conditions in this sector, while severe, are neither critical nor unusual. The proponents of the bill, and their constituents, are undeniably distressed, but imports are neither the only, nor the most important problem.

First of all, the 1982–84 import surge was not limited to the textile sector. Many U.S. industries faced rising import levels due to the strong dollar and recessions abroad. Furthermore, during the latter half of 1983 and first half of 1984, the textile and apparel industry participated in the overall U.S. economic recovery with consumption of textiles rising 18 percent over 1982 levels. This brought higher employment and increased profitability. While imports increased in 1983, domestic manufacturers garnered 80 percent of the increase in aggregate consumption.

Textile imports rose again in 1984 but much of this increase, ironically, was due to a general panic in the retailing industry incited by some of the draconian measures taken by the Commerce Department during 1983–84 to control imports. Over 100 "calls" were made in 1984 alone, most of which resulted in further import restraints. Importers and retailers rushed to step up overseas purchases in order to avoid the quotas they knew were forthcoming as a result of administrative directives issued by the Commerce Department. Now that overly high inventories have been drawn down, import levels for 1985 are moderating significantly.

Recent ups and downs in the domestic demand for textile products camouflages the fact that domestic production has steadily increased during the past 10 years. Producers' shipments of apparel and textile mill products have increased from $6.3 billion in 1974 to $109 billion in 1984, even though the ratio of imports to consumption rose from 6 to 14 percent over the same period. Textile mill products and apparel imports in 1984 were still only about 14 percent of domestic consumption. For the first 6 months of 1985, the total was 15 percent. The following tables demonstrate this trend over the last 10 years.

TABLE 1.—APPAREL AND TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS: U.S. PRODUCERS' SHIPMENTS, EXPORTS, GENERAL IMPORTS, AND APPARENT CONSUMPTION, 1974–84 and JANUARY-JUNE 1985

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Producers' shipments	Exports	Imports	Apparent consumption	Ratio (percent) of imports to consumption
	Apparel (SIC 23) [1]				
1974	30,632	593	2,465	32,504	7.6
1975	31,430	603	2,775	33,602	8.3
1976	34,759	740	3,912	37,931	10.3
1977	40,245	859	4,393	47,779	10.0
1978	42,742	1,035	5,722	47,429	12.1
1979	43,030	1,387	5,902	47,545	12.4
1980	45,782	1,604	6,543	50,721	12.9
1981	49,823	1,628	7,750	55,945	13.9
1982	49,830	1,236	8,432	57,026	14.8
1983	55,179	1,049	9,897	64,027	15.5
1984	54,933	1,099	14,000	67,834	20.6
Jan.—June 1985	26,839	498	7,224	33,565	21.5
	Textile mill products (SIC 22) [2]				
1974	32,789	1,284	1,407	32,912	4.3
1975	31,064	1,157	1,107	31,014	3.6
1976	36,389	1,399	1,392	36,382	3.8
1977	40,550	1,345	1,489	40,694	3.7
1978	42,281	1,466	1,855	42,670	4.3
1979	45,053	2,130	1,834	44,757	4.1
1980	47,160	2,488	2,034	46,706	4.4
1981	50,120	2,326	2,482	50,276	4.9
1982	47,217	1,766	2,225	47,676	4.7
1983	52,203	1,560	2,557	53,200	4.8
1984	55,054	1,583	3,519	56,990	6.2
Jan.—June 1985	25,625	736	1,795	26,684	6.7
	Total, apparel and textile mill products				
1974	63,421	1,877	3,872	65,416	5.9
1975	62,494	1,760	3,882	64,616	6.0
1976	71,148	2,139	5,304	74,313	7.1
1977	80,795	2,204	5,882	84,473	7.0
1978	85,023	2,501	7,577	90,099	8.4
1979	88,083	3,517	7,736	92,302	8.4
1980	92,942	4,092	8,577	97,427	8.8
1981	99,943	3,954	10,232	106,221	9.6
1982	97,047	3,002	10,657	104,702	10.2
1983	107,382	2,609	12,454	117,227	10.6
1984	109,987	2,682	17,519	124,824	14.0
Jan.—June 1985	52,464	1,234	9,019	60,249	15.0

[1] Apparel as reported in SIC 23 includes home furnishings other than floor coverings, and some miscellaneous fabricated textile products.
[2] Textile mill products as reported in SIC 22 includes some underwear, hosiery, sweaters, and other garments wholly manufactured in knitting mills.
Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Employment of production workers since 1974 has dropped about 17 percent not a dramatic job loss over a 10-year period, especially for an industry in a modernization and consolidation phase. It must be pointed out that declines in employment during this time are more fairly attributed to painful, but very necessary, technological improvements and gains in productivity, than to imports. For example, industry management suffered a much higher percentage job loss than production workers over the past decade.

More adjustment is ahead, however, since only 30 percent of the looms in America are of the modern shuttleless variety. It is certainly unfortunate, but probably accurate, to predict further job loss, whether or not imports rise or fall, as the industry continues its modernization.

In my view, if imports were the fundamental problem in the textile and apparel industry, a turnaround in its fortunes would have been witnessed some time ago. For the past 30 years this sector has been amassing an expansive bulwark of protection, culminating in a system of bilateral quotas which today covers two-thirds of U.S. imports.

Furthermore, duties on these goods are generally between two and three times those levied on any other manufactured products. U.S. textiles and apparel tariffs average about 20 percent. All U.S. tariffs average under 4 percent. The United States has the highest textile quotas in the industrialized world. Under the MFA, however, the United States can restrict textile imports to extraordinary levels without suffering retaliation in our export markets.

Designed as a temporary trade measure, and vigorously promoted by the textile and apparel industry, the MFA entered into force in 1974 for 4 years. For this transitional period, the MFA established a balanced framework for managed trade in textiles and apparel which: First, ensures continued trade expansion and the gradual removal of trade restrictions; second, promotes the economic development of textile and apparel industries, and third, affords industries in developed nations the time to restructure and adjust on a gradual basis to the competitive realities in the world marketplace.

The MFA has been extended twice, each time with new provisions that have allowed importing nations to impose ever-increasing restraints. Through its extension, interpretation, and administration the MFA has evolved into a permanent system of expanded protection for the textile and apparel industries of developed nations. Far from achieving its objectives, the MFA and its myriad of quotas have impeded both orderly growth of textile trade and economic development and the process of economic adjustment leading to an open international market for textile and apparel products.

The sponsors of this bill say its intent is to make MFA work. My judgment is that its intent is to subvert the operation of MFA by establishing new stricter quotas which repudiate the provisions of MFA. As we concentrate our attention on H.R. 1562, a bill that provides expanded protection for the domestic textile and apparel industry, a little historical perspective on the Mult-Fiber Agreement may prove helpful. I do not think we fully appreciate the long history of protection already given to this industry and the costly subsidy we will be perpetuating if we pass this bill. The crutch will just become more extensively used. If we don't revise our policies soon, we may never see a textile industry that is a tough international competitor rather than a severe drain on our Nation's economic resources.

Notwithstanding their espoused commitment to free trade principles, successive administrations have agreed to restrictions on international trade in textiles and apparel. Those principles were memorialized in 1947, when the United States and other

major trading nations entered into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], a multilateral agreement designed to liberalize and govern world trade.

Since then, international trading under the GATT has been governed by two basic principles: First, the imposition of tariffs as well as extension of trade concessions must be made on a most-favored-nation basis; that is, nations must treat all of their trading partners in the same nondiscriminatory manner. Second, contracting nations may impose only temporary quotas to limit trade, and only in cases where increased imports of a particular item are causing or threatening to cause serious injury to a contracting nation's domestic industry. Unfortunately, the regulation of world trade in textiles and apparel—though accomplished under GATT auspices—is inconsistent with these guiding principles.

The initial departure from GATT principles was prompted by a belief that trade in textiles and apparel was a special case and thus deserved preferential treatment. There no longer exists any feature unique to world textile and apparel trade which warrants continuation of discriminatory treatment. In fact, it may now be said that the textile and apparel industries are not unique in their structure or in their foreign competition—only in the unprecedented protection they continue to enjoy.

The origins of the existing U.S. regulatory framework limiting trade in textiles and apparel can be traced to the 1930's when Japan, in response to protectionist sentiments in the United States, began to limit its exports to the United States. In the mid-1950's, calls for new policies to deal with foreign competition increased. In 1956, Japan, once again under pressure, agreed to "voluntarily" restrain exports to the United States. In that same year, Congress gave the President the authority to negotiate limits with exporting countries, as well as to take unilateral action, in order to limit textile and apparel imports.

Early in 1961, the United States proposed that a conference between exporters and importers of cotton textiles and products be convened to find a way to encourage trade without causing undue disruption to the established industries of the importing countries. As a result of this initiative, premised on the assumption that these industries should be accorded special treatment, two forerunners to the MFA were negotiated: the Short-Term Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles (STA) in 1961 and the Long-Term Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles (LTA) in 1962. These two arrangements established the right of importing countries to negotiate restrictions on low-cost cotton textile imports. Under the LTA, the United States negotiated bilateral cotton textile and apparel restraint agreements with 31 leading export countries and unilaterally imposed limits on imports from countries with which it had not negotiated such comprehensive agreements.

In 1968, presidential candidate Richard Nixon made a campaign promise to "promptly take the steps necessary to extend the concept of international agreements to all other textile articles involving wool, man-made fibers, and blends." By October 1971, the United States had concluded bilateral agreements covering trade in wool and man-made fiber textile and apparel products with the four largest exporters—Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and South Korea—and also Malaysia, a small supplier. The U.S. Government then sought international acceptance for these new agreements. In July 1972, the GATT Working Party on Textiles called for a new international arrangement covering cotton, man-made fibers, and wool textile and apparel products. This led to the negotiation of the Multifiber Arrangement (MFA), which went into effect on January 1, 1974.

The original purpose of the MFA was to give developing countries guaranteed and growing access to markets in Western Europe and North America but to arrange the growth so as not to disrupt the established textile industries in those markets. Exporting countries were assured of at least a 6 percent annual growth rate. However, exceptions to the 6 percent limit provided a means of restricting particular categories in extraordinary cases, for example, wool.

The special treatment of textiles and apparel initiated earlier—in particular the concept of "market disruption"—was further emphasized in the first MFA. The effects of this concept were far-reaching because it introduced fundamental changes to generally accepted trade principles. Imports from a particular country could be singled out as the source of market disruption, which, in effect, provided a basis for applying additional restrictions in a discriminatory manner. Moreover, price differentials between particular imports and goods of comparable quality sold domestically could be invoked as a cause of market disruption. Having been given the right to invoke the market disruption mechanism, importing countries in return were obligated to pursue appropriate policies to encourage structural adjustment.

After more than a year of difficult negotiations, the MFA was extended in late December 1977 with certain "understandings" included in the protocol of extension. The protocol of the second MFA contained a "reasonable departures" provision, allowing for "jointly agreed reasonable departures from particular elements [of the Arrangement] in particular cases." In essence, the provision allowed the European Community to discriminate between suppliers and to renegotiate downward the basic 6 percent quota level through separate bilateral agreements. The United States did not formally invoke this provision, but nevertheless, held growth below 6 percent for some overseas suppliers. The second MFA resulted in a significant tightening of restrictions on imports from developing countries.

Notwithstanding the additional restrictions, successful efforts were undertaken to further restrict imports into the United States. In 1978, when the Carter administration was prepared to make tariff concessions on textiles and apparel as part of the Tokyo Round of Mutilateral Trade Negotiations, Congress was persuaded to enact legislation that not only would have blocked implementation of these proposed concessions, but threatened the status of the negotiations as they were moving toward a successful conclusion. President Carter vetoed the legislation, but agreed to provide relief administratively in the form of aggressive controls over import surges and tighter controls under bilateral agreements overall. Moreover, the MTN implementing legislation included a "snapback" clause, which provided for the restoration of pre-Tokyo Round textile and apparel tariffs in the event the MFA was not renewed.

Nine days before the second MFA was to expire, negotiators reached agreement on the protocol further extending the arrangement to July 31, 1986. The basic agreement remained unchanged, but the new protocol eliminated the "reasonable departures" provisions, while acknowledging "the good will" expressed by large exporters in bilaterally solving problems related to "particularly large restraint levels." The new protocol provided among other things, for latitude in negotiating bilateral textile agreements to set lower growth rates for the largest suppliers.

Notwithstanding the substantial regulatory mechanisms that continued to be erected under the MFA, the Reagan administration was encouraged to further tighten restrictions on import growth. On December 16, 1983, the Reagan administration expanded the "call" mechanism to take effect if there existed a presumption—rather than proof—of market disruption. A "call" is a governmental action to restrict imports on a category not already under quota restraints. Under these new provisions, calls can be made when total growth in imports in a specific category is greater than 30 percent in the most recent year or the import/domestic production ratio is 20 percent or greater in a specific category, as well as when imports from a supplier equal 1 percent or more of the total U.S. production in that category. By establishing these arbitrary percentage guidelines, the Reagan administration further expanded the scope of protection available to the textile and apparel industries.

In the most recent imposition of restrictions designed to impede trade in textiles and apparel, the Reagan administration issued new country-of-origin regulations on March 5, 1985. The rules changed longstanding regulations governing the standards for determining the country of origin of textile and apparel imports, and were purportedly designed to prevent evasion of existing quotas. In application, however, they will effectively hamper all trade in imported textiles and apparel and further protect the domestic industries from foreign competition.

As is apparent from the foregoing discussion, successive administrations have agreed to further restrictions beyond those initially contemplated by the first negotiated temporary set of ground rules governing

trade in textile products. Although originally intended to help the less developed countries, the MFA has been used to place the greatest relative burden on their exports. Under the MFA, the U.S. Government has imposed quotas on imports of textiles and apparel on a selective, bilateral basis. In addition, the U.S. Government has imposed and negotiated quotas on imports of cotton, wool, and man-made fiber textiles and apparel without proof that imports of these products have caused or threaten to cause serious injury or market disruption to the Nation's domestic producers of textiles and apparel.

Successive administrations have used the MFA to constrain trade in textiles and apparel to the significant detriment of retailers and their customers. Rather than help domestic producing industries to adjust to worldwide competition, however, the MFA and other trade restrictions have merely perpetuated protectionism and distorted investment and consumer spending in the United States.

We must reverse this downward spiral that has layered subsidy upon subsidy for the textile industry at a tremendous cost to consumers and other American producers.

Because this bill is in flagrant violation of the MFA due to its unilateral, discriminatory import restrictions and expanded coverage, all benefits our exporters receive under the MFA will be forfeited if H.R. 1562 becomes law. The 12 major textile exporting nations last year bought $33 billion in U.S. goods, including American soybeans, wheat, aircraft, semiconductor and aircraft parts, cotton, and tobacco. That is three times as much as the value of the textiles they sold us. The following table clearly demonstrates the adverse effects of this bill on U.S. exports.

MAJOR EXPORTING COUNTRIES UNDER H.R. 1562

Country	Percent of total U.S. imports of MFA products	Percent exports currently controlled [1]	1984 MFA exports to United States		Percent reduction under H.R. 1562	1984 purchases of U.S. exports (millions of dollars)
			Millions of dollars [2]	Millions SYE		
Taiwan	13.64	89.80	$2,583	1,335	47.9	$4,658
Korea	11.16	82.39	2,553	1,092	35.1	5,786
Hong Kong	10.55	91.10	3,132	1,033	14.7	2,407
PRC	9.88	84.00	1,272	967	59.1	2,988
Japan	7.53	38.09	1,147	737	20.1	22,692
Pakistan	3.11	91.55	(120T)	305	41.3	666
Indonesia	2.74	74.11	216	268	89.7	1,187
India	2.59	52.82	462	253	22.2	1,544
Philippines	2.47	100.00	435	242	21.1	1,696
Thailand	2.16	75.02	272	211	64.4	1,036
Brazil	1.99	25.44	241	195	80.5	2,585
Singapore	1.43	100.00	300	140	3.2	3,559

[1] (DOC data).
[2] (ITC data).

At the very least, this bill would cripple efforts by many debt-ridden LDC's to increase export earnings and purchase farm and manufactured goods from the United States. On a broader level, we will be compromising our efforts to foster stability and free-market policies in many Asian and South American countries with a direct impact on our national security.

Four special cases stand out. Hong Kong, which has no restrictions on imports, would have a 15-percent rollback. China, with which we have a positive balance, which has already retaliated against us in the past, and which has no other way to earn money to buy our products, takes a 60-percent hit. Thailand, a front-line state and ally in three wars, takes a 65-percent hit. Brazil, a fiscal basket case, takes an 80-percent cut. There is no equity and no sense in these cuts.

Ninety percent of the bill's impact falls on a dozen Asian countries, most of whom have little else to sell us except textiles. It is no wonder that Asians believe the bill is discriminatory. Canada and the European Community, both exempt from H.R. 1562, had textile increases into the United States in 1984 of 85 and 71 percent. The big three Asian exporters, Hong Kong, Korea, and Taiwan, increased only 11 percent. The bill is discriminatory on its face.

Such costs of MFA import restrictions for the U.S. economy are not offset by the small number of low-salaried textile and apparel jobs saved by the textile relief program. In this regard, the evidence shows that the costs of saving these jobs are astronomical. According to a recent Federal Trade Commission study, quotas on nine apparel categories from Hong Kong saved approximately 8,891 United States textile and apparel jobs at a cost of $34,500 per job a year. The jobs which were protected paid, on average, slightly less than $10,000.

The administration has estimated the overall cost per job, if H.R. 1562 were enacted, to be $140,000 per job. That means American consumers, who are already paying $25 billion for textile protection, will, according to the Council of Economic Advisors, pay $28 billion more if this bill is passed. Consumers will then be paying $50 billion more than the normal market value for textiles and apparel in order to protect a few thousand jobs.

Seldom have so many been compelled to sacrifice so much for so few. Also, the domestic industry seeks to expand coverage to currently unregulated products, including silk, linen, and ramie. Since domestic industries do not generally manufacture products with these fibers, there are no U.S. companies, factories, or jobs to protect from extinction. To keep goods which America does not even produce out of the country is a reckless exercise of Federal power that most Americans have regularly and vigorously opposed. It has no legitimate place in American law.

The fact that this outrageous legislation has actually reached the floor, with the MFA up for renegotiation only months from now, reflects the ability of this body to concentrate on any issue except the budget deficit, which should be its highest priority. H.R. 1562 is scapegoating in its worst form. It should be defeated.

H.R. 1562 cannot be justified in terms of the health of the industry, our economic interests, our export interests or our foreign policy interests. It is a further crutch for an industry that has had intensive physical therapy and should by now be learning to walk on its own. I urge my colleagues to resist enacting this additional, unjustified protection for the most protected industry in America. H.R. 1562 richly deserves a "no" vote.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2959

Mr. BEVILL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2959) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 99-307)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2959) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 7, 9, 10, 28, 29, 30, 39, and 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 14, 19, 21, 27, 33, 36, 37, and 38, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$128,972,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$795,865,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$314,760,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,319,973,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$34,035,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$521,700,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$144,950,000;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,989,671,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

of which $200,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities provided in prior years, and of which $17,400,000 shall be derived by transfer from Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration; and of which $25,000,000 shall be available only for construction of the Advanced Science Center, the Center for Science and Technology, the Center for Energy and Biomedical Technology, the Energy and Mineral Research Center, and the Demonstration Center for Information Technologies as described in the report accompanying this Act; together with not to exceed $6,000,000, to be derived from revenues from activities of the Technical Information Services, which shall be credited to this account and used for necessary expenses and shall remain available until expended

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$7,604,615,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$95,568,000,*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$130,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$85,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,200,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$418,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$113,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 13, 15, 20, 22, 23, 24, 32, 34, and 46.

TOM BEVILL,
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS,
BILL CHAPPELL Jr.,
VIC FAZIO,
WES WATKINS,
BILL BONER,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN T. MYERS,
VIRGINIA SMITH,
ELDON RUDD,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
JAMES A. MCCLURE,
THAD COCHRAN,
JAKE GARN,
JAMES ABDNOR,
ROBERT W. KASTEN, Jr.,
MACK MATTINGLY,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
JIM SASSER,
DENNIS DECONCINI,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2959) making appropriations for energy and water development for fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $128,972,000 for general investigations instead of $133,189,000 as proposed by the House and $120,697,000 as proposed by the Senate.

As part of the ongoing Osage River Basin Study, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to study the feasibility of a potential crossing of the lake of the Ozarks in the vicinity of Osage Beach, Missouri.

The conferees have provided the funding to continue detailed design activities in fiscal year 1986 on all elements of the Santa Ana River flood control project, and direct the Corps to include the locally acceptable upstream project element upon submittal of the Upper Santa Ana River Flood Storage Alternatives Study to the South Pacific Division, leading to completion of the Phase II design memorandum. The conferees urge the Corps to expedite that report consistent with procedural requirements so that all components of this project proceed in carefully coordinated fashion.

The conferees share concerns that this project be designed and operated in ways to maximize its contribution to water conservation. They also note the stipulated judgement of the Superior Court of Orange County in the case of the Orange County Water District v. the City of Chino, et al, 1969, and that the Orange County (Ca.) Water District has signed agreements to reimburse the Counties of San Bernardino and Riverside and the City of Corona for any costs associated with operating the Prado Dam at elevation 514, all to facilitate the conservation of water with the project in its present configuration. In furtherance of these efforts, the conferees direct the Corps on its ongoing operation and maintenance of Prado Dam to achieve a reasonable level of water conservation consistent with the flood control purposes of the Dam, provided that any incidental costs of such water conservation storage over and above the ordinary operation and maintenance of Prado Dam shall be reimbursed to the Corps by the Orange County Water District.

The conferees agree with the allocations contained in the House and Senate reports for Coordination Studies with other Agencies except that the allocation for the State of New Mexico for Section 22 technical assistance to States is $5,000, the same as the budget request.

The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to continue planning and engineering studies for the Atlantic Coast of Maryland and Assateague Island, Virginia, hurricane protection project. The studies are to be accomplished within available funds.

The conferees have provided sufficient funds from the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Erosion Study, Maryland and Virginia, for the Corps of Engineers to begin low-cost erosion control work incorporating the techniques gathered from section 54 of the 1976 Water Resource Development Act.

The conference agreement includes $500,000 for continued planning and engineering design of a replacement facility for Locks and Dam 52 and 53 on the Ohio River and to advance such critical activities as geotechnical investigations and hydraulic modeling.

The conferees understand that the Wabash River is shifting at Grayville, Illinois, and threatens the City's water supply and sanitary facilities. Therefore, within the amount recommended for General Investigations, funds are provided under the authority of the Wabash River Comprehensive study to investigate the serious problems at Grayville, Illinois.

The conferees direct that the $300,000 included for the Chesapeake Bay-Susquehanna River Drought Management and Low Fresh Water Inflow Study, be used to study all major tributaries entering the Bay due

to their potential impact and importance to the Bay ecosystem.

The conference agreement includes $250,000 under Research and Development for technology transfer to allow the Corps of Engineers to continue and extend its existing demonstration program, and $150,000 to continue the demonstration of economic development planning technology in Southeastern Oklahoma.

The funds are to be allocated as shown in the following table:

Type of project	General investigations—State and project	Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
		Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	ALABAMA				
(N)	Bayou La Batre	66,000		104,000	
(FDP)	Valley Creek, Warrior River and tributaries	200,000		200,000	
(N)	William Bacon Oliver lock and dam (CP&E)	600,000		600,000	
	ALASKA				
(FC)	Bethel bank stabilization (CP&E)	215,000		215,000	
(FDP)	Galena bank stabilization	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	Homer spit erosion	150,000		150,000	
(FDP)	Rivers and harbors	1,096,000		1,096,000	
(N)	Southcentral deep-draft navigation	200,000		200,000	
	ARIZONA				
(FDP)	Gila River and tributaries, AZ&NM	225,000		375,000	
(FDP)	Gila River and tributaries, Nogales Wash	235,000		235,000	
(FDP)	Phoenix metro area (Old Cross Cut Canal)	175,000		175,000	
	ARKANSAS				
(FDP)	Arkansas River Basin, AR&OK	200,000		200,000	
(FDP)	Clarksville	267,000		267,000	
(FC)	Fourche Bayou in the vicinity of Little Rock (CP&E)	314,000		314,000	
(FDP)	Ouachita River Basin, AR&LA	736,000		736,000	
(COMP)	White River Basin authorization report, AR&MO	250,000		250,000	
	CALIFORNIA				
(FDP)	Antelope Valley	140,000		260,000	
(FC)	Cache Creek Basin (CP&E)	600,000		600,000	
(FDP)	Caliente Creek stream group	140,000		200,000	
(FDP)	Calleguas Creek	240,000		240,000	
(SPEC)	Coast of California, storm and tidal waves	750,000		1,350,000	
(FC)	Guadalupe River and adjacent streams (CP&E)	135,000		400,000	
(FDP)	Los Angeles County drainage area review	370,000		370,000	
(N)	Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors (including San Pedro Model) (CP&E)			500,000	
(FC)	Mojave River Dam (CP&E)			200,000	
(FDP)	Northern California streams, dry creek	150,000		150,000	
(N)	Oakland Inner Harbor (CP&E)	380,000		380,000	
(N)	Oakland Outer Harbor (CP&E)	155,000		155,000	
(FD)	Redbank and Fancher Creeks (CP&E)	700,000		700,000	
(N)	Redondo Beach (King Harbor)			200,000	
(N)	Richmond Harbor (CP&E)	525,000		525,000	
(N)	San Francisco Bay area (indepth)	132,000		132,000	
(FDP)	San Francisco Bay shoreline	520,000		520,000	
(FDP)	San Joaquin River Basin (comp.)	110,000			
(FDP)	San Joaquin River Basin, Kaweah River Basin			200,000	
(FDP)	San Joaquin River Basin, Tule River Basin			250,000	
(FDP)	San Luis Obispo County	255,000		255,000	
(FDP)	Santa Ana River Basin and Orange County	350,000		650,000	
(FC)	Santa Ana River (phase 1) (CP&E)	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(SP)	Santa Barbara County (Beach Erosion)			79,000	
(N)	Sunset Harbor			250,000	
(N)	Ventura Marina	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	Walnut Creek Basin	185,000		185,000	
	COLORADO				
(FDP)	Arkansas River above John Martin Dam	450,000		450,000	
(FDP)	Fountain Creek and tribs.—North of Pueblo	185,000		185,000	
(FDP)	Platte River Basin, CO, NE, WY			200,000	
(FC)	Westerly Creek (CP&E)			250,000	
	COMM N. MARIANAS				
(N)	Northern Marianas Islands (comprehensive)	250,000		250,000	
	CONNECTICUT				
(COMP)	Conn RVR BSN, auth reports, CT, MA, NH, and VT	200,000		200,000	
(COMP)	Long Island Sound—Authorization reports, CT & RI	150,000		150,000	
	DIST OF COLUMBIA				
(FC)	Washington, DC and vicinity (AE&D)				180,000
	FLORIDA				
(FDP)	Central and Southern Florida water supply	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Clearwater spoil disposal			100,000	
(FDP)	Coast of Florida erosion and storm effects study	550,000		550,000	
(N)	Escambia River	83,000		83,000	
(N)	Ft. Pierce Harbor (CP&E)			90,000	
(N)	Hudson River (Review of Deferred project)			75,000	
(N)	Jacksonville Harbor, St. Johns River, and intracoastal waterway mod			70,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor channel, FL	179,000		179,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor			200,000	
(N)	Port Everglades			45,000	
(BE)	Monroe County beaches			100,000	
(FDP)	St. John's river			220,000	
(FDP)	St. Marys River Basin, FL and GA	100,000		100,000	
(N)	Tampa Harbor Branch Channels (AE&D)		465,000		465,000
	GEORGIA				
(COMP)	Metro Altanta water resources mgt. (CP&E)			650,000	
(N)	Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, Flint Rivers, GA, AL & FL	479,000		479,000	
(N)	Brunswick Harbor	210,000		305,000	
(FDP)	Dalton Lake (phase I)	500,000		500,000	
(FDP)	Northeast Georgia region	250,000		250,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor Comprehensive	200,000		300,000	
(FDP)	Savannah River Basin, GA, SC & NC	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Savannah River Basin at Dates Creek (CP&E)	250,000		250,000	
(FDP)	South Metropolitan Atlanta Region	157,000		157,000	
(FDP)	Turkey Creek			150,000	

Type of project	General investigations—State and project	Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
		Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	GUAM				
(N)	Harbors and rivers in territory of Guam	196,000		196,000	
	HAWAII				
(FDP)	Harbors and rivers in Hawaii—So. Kohala water supply	73,000		73,000	
(FDP)	Harbors and rivers in Hawaii	98,000		98,000	
(FDP)	Wailuku—Honolii Hydro	75,000		75,000	
	IDAHO				
(FDP)	Columbia River and tributaries, ID, MT, OR, WA & WY	1,752,000		1,752,000	
(FDP)	Upper Snake River and tributaries, ID & WY	1,147,000		1,147,000	
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	Chicago—South end of Lake Michigan IN & IL	120,000		120,000	
(FDP)	Chicagoland underflow plan, phase 1 GDM	371,000		371,000	
(FDP)	Illinois River between Henry and Naples	140,000		140,000	
(SP)	Illinois shoreline erosion	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Loves Park (CP&E)	325,000		325,000	
(FDP)	Mackinaw River	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	North branch Chicago River, phase I (CP&E)	380,000		380,000	
(FC)	South Quincy (CP&E)	320,000		320,000	
(FDP)	Vermilion River	75,000		75,000	
	INDIANA				
(FDP)	Fort Wayne Metropolitan Area	220,000		220,000	
(FC)	Little Calumet River, phase I (CP&E)	450,000		450,000	
(COMP)	Wasbash River Basin comprehensive			150,000	
	IOWA				
(FC)	Perry Creek (CP&E)	135,000		135,000	
	KANSAS				
(FDP)	Ark River and tributaries, Great Bend, Kansas to Tulsa (remaining)	535,000		535,000	
(FDP)	Blue River Basin, KS & MO	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Douglass Lake (AE&D)		250,000		250,000
(FDP)	Grand Neosho River, KS & OK	276,000		276,000	
(FDP)	Great Bend, KS				500,000
(FDP)	Kansas and Osage Rivers	285,000		285,000	
(FDP)	Verdigris River, KS & OK (remaining)	70,000		70,000	
(FDP)	Winfield (review)	200,000		200,000	
	KENTUCKY				
(N)	Big Sandy River, KY, WV & VA	325,000		325,000	
(N)	Cumberland-Tennessee Rivers, KY, GA, AL, MS, NC, TN & VA	800,000		800,000	
(FDP)	Kentucky River and tributaries	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Locks and Dams 52 and 53			500,000	
(FDP)	Ohio River main stem, PA, IL, IN, OH, & WV	2,575,000		2,575,000	
(FDP)	Tradewater River Basin	250,000		250,000	
(FDP)	Upper Cumberland River Basin, KY & TN	150,000		150,000	
	LOUISIANA				
(FDP)	Amite River and tributaries	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche—Jump waterway	80,000		80,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, LA & TX section	550,000		550,000	
(FDP)	Lake Pontchartrain—West shore	250,000		250,000	
(SPEC)	Louisiana coastal area—water supply	262,000		262,000	
(SP)	Louisiana coastal area shore and barrier island erosion	200,000		200,000	
(FDP)	Louisiana coastal area—land loss and marsh creation	150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Merm, Verm and Calcasieu Rivers and Bayou Teche	160,000		280,000	
(N)	Mississippi River ship channel, gulf to Baton Rouge (CP&E)	1,255,000		1,255,000	
(FC)	Pearl River, Slidell (CP&E)			1,470,000	
(COMP)	Red River below Denison Dam, LA, AR, OK & TX (auth RPTS)	221,000		221,000	
	MAINE				
(N)	Fore River channel, Portland Harbor	73,000		73,000	
(FDP)	Saint John River	200,000		200,000	
	MARYLAND				
(SP)	Chesapeake Bay (shoreline erosion) MD & VA	300,000		600,000	
(FDP)	Monongahela-Youghiogheny River Basin, MD, PA & WV	250,000		250,000	
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(N)	Boston Harbor	150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Massachusetts coastal, Roughans Point, Revere (CP&E)	400,000		400,000	
(COMP)	Southeastern New England Auth. Reports, MA, RI, and CT	228,000		228,000	
	MICHIGAN				
(FDP)	Great Lakes particularly Lake Ontario and Lake Erie	320,000		320,000	
(N)	Monroe Harbor (CP&E)	800,000		800,000	
(FDP)	Saginaw River	158,000		218,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River, Vasser Unit (AE&D)				150,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	East Grand Forks (AE&D)		300,000		300,000
(FDP)	Minnesota River Valley	450,000		450,000	
(FDP)	Red River of the North, MN and ND	560,000		560,000	
(FDP)	St. Croix River, MN and WI	199,000		199,000	
(FC)	Twin Valley Lake, Wild Rice River (AE&D)		100,000		100,000
	MISSISSIPPI				
(FDP)	Mississippi Gulf Coastal areas	200,000		200,000	
(FDP)	Pearl River Basin, MS and LA	1,170,000		1,920,000	
(SPEC)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway special study, MS, AL, TN, and KY			250,000	
(FDP)	Tombigbee River and tributaries, MS and AL	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Yazoo River (AE&D)		100,000		100,000
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	Brush Creek, Kansas City (CP&E)			350,000	
(FDP)	Creve Coeur Creek (interim—St. Louis Metro)			200,000	
(FC)	Hannibal (AE&D)		130,000		130,000
(FC)	Maline Creek (CP&E)	250,000		325,000	
(SPEC)	Meramec River Basin, MO—Water supply study			100,000	
(FDP)	Osage River Basin above Harry S Truman Dam	325,000		325,000	
(FDP)	St. Louis Metropolitan Area, MO and IL	864,000		864,000	
(N)	St. Louis Harbor, MO and IL (CP&E)	250,000		425,000	

Type of project	General investigations—State and project	Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
		Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	NEBRASKA				
(FDP)	Republican River, Harlan County Dam to Milford Lake, NE and KS	100,000		200,000	
	NEVADA				
(FDP)	Las Vegas Wash and tributaries	375,000		375,000	
(FDP)	Virgin River and tributaries (Moapa Valley)	200,000		200,000	
	NEW JERSEY				
(N)	Delaware River comprehensive navigation study, NJ, PA, and DE	950,000		950,000	
(N)	New York Harbor and adjacent channels, NJ & NY	400,000		400,000	
(FDP)	Passaic River Basin study, NJ & NY (Phase 1)	1,700,000		1,700,000	
(FC)	Rahway River Basin, Robinson's branch, at Rahway, (CP&E)	260,000		260,000	
(FC)	Ramapo and Mahwah Rivers at Mahwah, NJ and Suffern, NY (PH-1) (CP&E)	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Raritan River Basin, Green Brook subbasin (CP&E)	445,000		445,000	
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	Alamogordo, NM				450,000
(FC)	Mid Rio Grande Bernalillo to Belen (CP&E)	450,000		450,000	
(FDP)	Pecos River and tribs—Carlsbad	220,000		220,000	
(FC)	Puerco River and tribs, Gallup (CP&E)	260,000		260,000	
(FDP)	Rio Grande and tributaries, NM & CO	450,000		450,000	
(FC)	Rio Grande Floodway—Truth or Consequences Unit (AE&D)		383,000		383,000
	NEW YORK				
(N)	Arthur Kill channel, Howland Hook Marine Terminal (CP&E)			200,000	
(BE)	Atlantic coast of New York City, Rockaway Inlet to Norton Point (CP&E)			250,000	
(FDP)	Cattaraugus Creek	180,000		180,000	
(COMP)	Genesee River Basin Auth report	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay channel (deepening), NY & NJ (CP&E)	600,000		600,000	
(N)	Reynolds Channel, Jamaica Bay to NY			150,000	
(FC)	Saw Mill River at Elmsford and Greenburgh (AE&D)		200,000		200,000
(N)	Shinnecock Inlet (AE&D)		200,000		200,000
(N)	St. Lawrence Seaway additional locks	375,000		375,000	
(FC)	Westchester Co. streams—Mamaronick and Sheldrake Rivers (CP&E)	600,000		800,000	
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FDP)	Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout	355,000		355,000	
(FDP)	Little Pee Dee and Pee Dee Rivers, NC & SC	450,000		450,000	
(N)	Morehead City Harbor			100,000	
(FDP)	Neuse River NC	225,000		225,000	
(FDP)	Roanoke River South Boston and Vicinity, NC & VA	255,000		255,000	
(SP)	West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet			100,000	
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	Mott, ND			55,000	
(FC)	Sheyenne River flood control project (AE&D)		800,000		800,000
(FDP)	Souris River Basin	150,000		300,000	
	OHIO				
(SPEC)	Central Ohio comprehensive			200,000	
(FDP)	Central Ohio survey, Grandview Heights interim	200,000		200,000	
(FDP)	Central Ohio survey	375,000		375,000	
(FC)	Central Ohio survey at Nelsonville (CP&E)	120,000		120,000	
(FDP)	Cuyahoga River Basin	99,000		99,000	
(FC)	Fairfield (CP&E)	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Holes Creek at W. Carrollton and Moraine (CP&E)	150,000		150,000	
(FDP)	Miami River, Little Miami River and Mill Cr Basins	300,000		300,000	
(FDP)	Muskingum River (Wolf Cr and Tuscarawas Rv interim study)	200,000		200,000	
(SPEC)	Ohio River between river miles 40–491 (waterfront improvement)			150,000	
(FDP)	Vermilion River	180,000		180,000	
	OKLAHOMA				
(COMP)	Ark Riv and tribs, South Central and Southeast areas of OK (comp)	300,000		450,000	
(FDP)	Canadian River and tribs, OK, TX, and NM (remaining)	250,000		400,000	
(N)	Central Oklahoma project	90,000		90,000	
(FDP)	Hugo Lake (hydropower study) (review)	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	Lukfata Lake (hydropower study) (review)			50,000	
(FC)	Mingo Creek (CP&E)	500,000		900,000	
(FC)	Parker Lake (CP&E)	600,000		600,000	
(SPEC)	Pine Creek Lake (hydropower study) (review)			40,000	
(COMP)	Red River Basin, OK, AR, LA and TX (comprehensive study)	350,000		350,000	
	OREGON				
(N)	Columbia River coal export channel, Astoria	508,000		508,000	
(FDP)	Malheur Lake	165,000		330,000	
(FDP)	Umpqua River and tribs	480,000		480,000	
(COMP)	Willamette River Basin	475,000		475,000	
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FDP)	Chesapeake Bay-Susquehanna River drought management, PA, NY, and MD			300,000	
(FC)	Francis E. Walter Dam (modification) (AE&D)		1,556,000		1,556,000
(FDP)	Kiskiminetas River Basin	300,000		300,000	
(FDP)	Lehigh River Basin study	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Lock Haven, PA (PH-I) (CP&E)	725,000		725,000	
(N)	Locks and dams 7 and 8, Monongahela River, PA and WV (CP&E)	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(BE)	Presque Isle phase II (CP&E)	115,000		115,000	
(FC)	Prompton Lake (modification) (AE&D)				400,000
(FC)	Susquehanna Basin at Harrisburg (CP&E)	550,000		550,000	
(FC)	Wyoming Valley (levee rasing) (PH-1) (CP&E)	500,000		500,000	
	PUERTO RICO				
(FDP)	Guanajibo River	185,000		185,000	
(FDP)	Rio Grande de Loiza	160,000		160,000	
	RHODE ISLAND				
(N)	Bristol Harbor (AE&D)		170,000		170,000
(FDP)	Pawcatuck River and Narragansett Bay	150,000		150,000	
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(N)	Charleston Harbor (phase 1) (CP&E)	300,000		300,000	
(FDP)	Gills Creek	410,000		410,000	
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FDP)	Eastern SD and Upper Big Sioux River SD and IA	182,000		182,000	
(FDP)	Missouri River, SD, NE, ND & MT	648,000		648,000	

Type of project	General investigations—State and project	Budget estimates		Conference allowance	
		Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(FDP)	Western Dakotas region of SD	400,000		400,000	
	TENNESSEE				
(FDP)	Metropolitan Region of Nashville	415,000		415,000	
	TEXAS				
(FDP)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	900,000		900,000	
(FDP)	Colorado River and tributaries	300,000		300,000	
(FDP)	Denison Dam—Lake Exoma Red River, TX & OK	207,000		207,000	
(FDP)	Dickinson Bayou	250,000		250,000	
(N)	Galveston Bay area navigation study	230,000		230,000	
(FDP)	Hillebrandt Bayou and tributaries			200,000	
(FDP)	Johnson Creek, Arlington	202,000		202,000	
(FDP)	Little Cypress Creek, TX & LA	165,000		165,000	
(FDP)	Red River and tribs above Denison Dam, TX, OK & NM (remaining)	210,000		210,000	
(MP)	Rockland Lake (AE&D)		250,000		250,000
(FDP)	San Jacinto River and tributaries	350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Sims Bayou at Houston (CP&E)	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Texas City channel			300,000	
(MP)	Trinity River, channel to Liberty (AE&D)		500,000		500,000
(FC)	Upper White Oak Bayou and tribs, vicinity of Houston (CP&E)	700,000		700,000	
	UTAH				
(FDP)	Colorado River and tribs, above Lee Ferry, UT, AZ, CO, NM and WY	237,000		237,000	
(FDP)	Jordan River Basin	225,000		225,000	
	VIRGINIA				
(FC)	Gathright Dam and Lake Moomaw (review)	100,000		100,000	
(N)	Norfolk Harbor and Channels (deepening) (CP&E)	2,800,000		2,800,000	
(FC)	Richmond (phase I) (CP&E) (local protection)	1,240,000		1,240,000	
(FDP)	Roanoke River Upper Basin	130,000		130,000	
	WASHINGTON				
(FDP)	Chehalis River and tributaries	160,000		160,000	
(FC)	Chehalis River at South Aberdeen and Cosmopolis (CP&E)	450,000		450,000	
(FC)	Cowlitz River and tributaries (CP&E)	500,000		500,000	
(N)	East West and Duwamish WW Seattle Harbor (CP&E)	600,000		600,000	
(N)	Grays Harbor Chehalis and Hoquiam Rivers (CP&E)	950,000		950,000	
(FDP)	Mill Creek Basin	220,000		220,000	
(COMP)	Puget Sound and adjacent waters	362,000		362,000	
(N)	Seattle Harbor—Duwamish Waterway	178,000		178,000	
(FC)	Yakima River at Union GAP (CP&E)	316,000		316,000	
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FDP)	Guyandotte River Basin, Vic Logan and Mullens	100,000		100,000	
(COMP)	Kanawha Basin comprehensive (authorization reports), WV, VA and NC	225,000		225,000	
(N)	Kanawha River navigation	400,000		400,000	
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS				
	Review for deauthorization	200,000		200,000	
	Coordination studies with other agencies	5,600,000		6,045,000	
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA				
	Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	500,000		500,000	
	Precipitation studies (National Weather Service)	300,000		300,000	
	International water studies	100,000		100,000	
	Flood plain management services	8,300,000		7,300,000	
	Hydrologic studies	250,000		235,000	
	Scientific and technical information centers	130,000		120,000	
	Coastal data collection	1,800,000		1,800,000	
	Transportation systems	500,000		500,000	
	Environmental data studies	200,000		200,000	
	Total	12,080,000		11,055,000	
	Research and development	21,500,000		19,000,000	
	Subtotal, general investigations	116,596,000	5,404,000	126,873,000	7,084,000
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippage	−3,000,000		−4,985,000	
	Pay amendment	2,660,000			
	Total, general investigations		121,660,000		128,972,000

Type of project: (N) Navigation; (FC) Flood Control; (BE) Beach Erosion Control; (MP) Multiple-Purpose, Including Power; (FDP) Flood Damage Prevention; (SP) Shoreline Protection; (SPEC) Special; (COMP) Comprehensive; (Phase I) Authorized for Phase I Stage of Advance Engineering and Design in the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 or 1976; (CP&E) Continuation of Planning and Engineering; (AE&D) Advance Engineering and Design; (REVIEW) Review of Authorized Project.

Amendment No. 2: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate relating to the Wabash River Basin Comprehensive study.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $795,865,000 for construction, general instead of $846,958,000 as proposed by the House and $715,881,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes funding for the following projects in the Continuing Authorities Program:

Section 107—Small Navigation Projects.—Mekoryuk, Alaska, $1,200,000; Sturgeon Point Marina, New York, $220,000; Lorain Harbor, Ohio, $1,880,000; Laupahoehoe Point, Hawaii, $540,000; and Larkspur Ferry navigation channel, California, $1,750,000. Within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to expedite the completion of planning and the initiation of construction of the Morgan County Port, Tennessee River, Decatur, Alabama, project.

Section 205—Small Flood Control Projects.—Salyersville, Kentucky, $300,000; Upper Gordons Creek, Mississippi, $50,000; Puerco River and tributaries at Gallup, New Mexico, $4,000,000; and Passaic River Basin Flood Warning System, New Jersey, $500,000.

Section 14—Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection.—Nazline Wash, Chinle, Arizona, $200,000; Amado Bridge, Tubac, Arizona, $150,000.

Section 111—Mitigation of Shore Damages Attributable to navigation projects.—Herring Creek, Tall Timbers, St. Mary's County, Maryland, $850,000.

The Corps of Engineers has completed an Appraisal Report on the serious erosion problem that is occurring along North Sheridan Road in an area known as Burger Park. The Corps has identified an erosion problem that threatens public facilities and is recommending implementation of a revetment alternative to correct the situation. The conferees, therefore, direct the Corps of Engineers to proceed with implementation of an erosion control project for Burger Park, Chicago, Illinois, within available funds, under the authority of Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended.

Serious erosion is also occurring at Jarvis Avenue, Fargo Alley, North Shore Avenue and Rosemont Avenue in Chicago, Illinois. This erosion situation has and will continue to threaten both public and privately owned property and cause sink holes to develop in some streets. The conferees, therefore, direct the Corps of Engineers to proceed

with an erosion control project to halt the erosion along the above named streets, using available funds.

The conference agreement includes $2,500,000 for the Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland (Connecting Channel to the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) project. It is understood that a new study is being forwarded to the Office of the Chief of Engineers and expenditure of these funds is subject to a favorable decision by the Chief of Engineers on the new report.

Recognizing the need to limit federal expenditures in the interest of the Nation's overall economic condition, the Conference Committee has deferred $660,000 of the $14,000,000 budget request for the Chief Joseph Additional Units project. This Committee action is not a reflection on the merits of the project and should not be construed to prejudice the right of the Government to collect whatever monies may be due because of the failure of the existing turbines to meet contractual requirements.

The conference agreement includes $2,800,000 to modify the existing breakwater at the Port Austin Harbor of Refuge, Michigan. The total cost of construction and maintenance shall be at full Federal expense since the entire local cash contribution was provided in previous work on the existing project.

The conferees are aware that the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project in Alabama and Mississippi is open for navigation. The remaining navigation related funding, anticipated settlement of contract claims, anticipated real estate judgments and expenses, erosion control measures, tow mooring facilities, and other authorized navigation related work must be performed to assure the integrity and proper operation of the project. In addition, the FY 1985 Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 99-88) directed completion, within available funds, of the remaining recreation facilities for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project under the same terms and conditions as those recreation facilities initiated prior to FY 1983. These needs are within the previously established cost estimate for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and consist of necessary work needed to achieve the full range of benefits anticipated from the project. Sufficient funds are available for these authorized activities from within funds available to the Corps.

Funds are available to continue construction of the new starts included in P.L. 99-88 if the criteria set forth in that Public Law are met.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $1,500,000 for construction of the Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, project and appropriates $6,000,000 for construction of the Yatesville Lake construction project as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Earmarks $5,700,000 for construction of Lock and Dam No. 3, Red River Waterway, Louisiana, project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1968, as amended (P.L. 90-483), as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $18,000,000 for construction of the Elk Creek Lake, Oregon, project as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $1,880,000 for construction of the Lorain Small Boat Harbor, Lorain, Ohio, project and appropriates $400,000 for construction of project deficiencies in the First Ward Area Front Street Levee in Binghamton, New York, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing for the construction of recreation and management facilities at the Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana, project in the vicinity of the Felsenthal National Wildlife Refuge at full Federal expense.

Amendment No. 9: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to the Clarence Cannon and Mark Twain Lake, Missouri, project.

The funds are to be allocated as shown in the following table:

Type of project	Construction, general—State and project	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
	ALASKA		
(FC)	Chena River Lakes	5,000,000	5,000,000
(MP)	Snettisham	20,000,000	20,000,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	Phoenix Arizona and vicinity (stage 2).	18,000,000	18,000,000
	ARKANSAS		
(N)	McClellan-Kerr Ark River Nav System locks and dams, AR & OK.	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, AR & LA.	1,200,000	4,700,000
(N)	Red River Emergency Bank Protection AR, LA, OK, & TX.		1,500,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek	600,000	600,000
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake	14,800,000	11,800,000
(FC)	Fairfield vicinity streams	1,200,000	
(N)	Fisherman's Wharf area	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County Drainage area (Rehab).	11,800,000	11,800,000
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River		2,900,000
(FC)	Lytle and Warm Creeks	2,354,000	2,354,000
(FC)	Merced County streams	4,000,000	
(MP)	New Melones Lake	1,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	Pajaro River	500,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection project.	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	Sacramento River flood control project.	250,000	250,000
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico landing to Red Bluff.	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries.	200,000	200,000
(N)	Sacramento River Deepwater ship channel.	1,300,000	
(N)	San Francisco Bay to Stockton	21,000,000	21,000,000
(FC)	San Luis Rey River	1,400,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor	2,230,000	2,230,000
(FC)	Sweetwater River	7,200,000	6,000,000
(FC)	Walnut Creek	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks	100,000	1,700,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	Chatfield Lake	2,700,000	2,700,000
(FC)	Fountain Creek at Pueblo	1,360,000	
	DELAWARE		
(FC)	Delaware coast protection	575,000	575,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	2,300,000	2,300,000
(FC)	Central & southern Florida	13,000,000	13,000,000
(FC)	Dade County	2,300,000	2,300,000
(BE)	Duval County	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	Four River Basins	2,500,000	2,500,000
(BE)	Pinellas County	1,300,000	1,300,000
(N)	Tampa Harbor—Main Channel	7,923,000	7,923,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, GA & SC.	23,000,000	23,000,000
(N)	Savannah Harbor widening	2,500,000	
(BE)	Tybee Island	1,100,000	1,100,000
	HAWAII		
(FC)	Kahoma stream	3,000,000	
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	Brandon Road lock and dam, Illinois River (Rehab).	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	930,000	930,000
(FC)	Kaskaskia Island drainage and levee district.	2,900,000	2,900,000
(N)	Kasaskia River navigation	7,900,000	7,900,000
(N)	Lock and dam 26, Mississippi River, Alton, IL & MO.	75,500,000	75,500,000
(N)	Locks and dam 53, IL & KY (rehab).	935,000	935,000
(FC)	Milan	1,762,000	1,762,000
(FC)	Moline	1,880,000	
(FC)	Rockford	1,600,000	1,600,000
(N)	Smithland locks and dam, Ohio River, IL, IN & KY.	2,700,000	2,700,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	Evansville	2,800,000	2,800,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	Ames Lake	150,000	150,000
(FC)	Bettendorf	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	Missouri River levee system, IA, NE, KS & MO.	850,000	850,000
(FC)	Saylorville Lake, Iowa		4,300,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	Barkley Dam and Barkley, KY & TN (dam safety assurance).	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	Big South Fork National River and recreation area, KY & TN.	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	Southwestern Jefferson County	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	Yatesville Lake		6,000,000
	LOUISIANA		
(FC)	Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity (hurricane protection).	25,000,000	25,000,000
(FC)	Larose to Golden Meadow (hurricane protection).	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	Miss River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico.	8,800,000	10,800,000
(N)	Miss River—Gulf outlet	7,200,000	7,200,000
(FC)	Morgan City and vicinity (hurricane protection).	120,000	120,000
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice (hurricane protection).	3,500,000	3,500,000
(N)	Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport.	90,000,000	95,700,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	Baltimore Harbor (connecting channel to the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal).		2,500,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(BE)	Revere Beach	700,000	
(FC)	Town Brook, Quincy	1,500,000	
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	Muskegon Harbor (rehab)	2,600,000	2,600,000
(N)	Port Austin Harbor		2,800,000
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	Bassett Creek	2,500,000	
(FC)	Chaska	1,600,000	
(FC)	Mankato and North Mankato	13,100,000	13,100,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(FC)	Tombigbee River and tributaries, MS & AL.	3,300,000	3,300,000
	MISSOURI		
(FC)	Blue River channel	5,500,000	5,500,000
(MP)	Clarence Cannon Dam and Mark Twain Lake.		1,000,000
(MP)	Harry S Truman Dam and Reservoir	5,700,000	5,700,000
(FC)	Little Blue River Lakes	9,400,000	9,400,000
(FC)	Little Blue River channel	717,000	717,000
(FC)	Meramec River Basin flood warning system.		470,000
(N)	Miss River btwn Ohio and Mo Rivers (reg works), MO & IL.	3,700,000	3,700,000
	NEBRASKA		
(FC)	Papillion Creek and tributaries lakes	1,700,000	1,700,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	Barnegat Inlet	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	Seabright to Ocean Township		1,500,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	Jemez Canyon Dam (dam safety assurance).	1,000,000	1,000,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	Ardsley	480,000	
(FC)	Binghamton (def corr)		400,000
(BE)	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay.	3,600,000	3,600,000
(FC)	Ellicott Creek	1,000,000	
(N)	NY Harbor collection and removal of drift, NY & NJ.	3,700,000	3,700,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	Aiww, replacement of Federal highway bridges.	2,176,000	2,176,000
(FC)	B. Everett Jordan Dam and Lake	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	Falls Lake	6,500,000	6,500,000
(FC)	Randleman Lake	2,700,000	
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	Lake Darling, Souris River	3,400,000	3,400,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	Mill Creek	11,000,000	11,000,000
(FC)	Muskingum River lakes (rehab)	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	Newark	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	Point Place	971,000	971,000

Type of project	Construction, general—State and project	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	Arcadia Lake	8,000,000	8,000,000
(FC)	Copan Lake		1,250,000
(MP)	Eufaula Lake (bridge replacement)		500,000
(FC)	Sardis Lake		5,000,000
	OREGON		
(MP)	Bonneville Power units, OR & WA	500,000	
(MP)	Bonneville second powerhouse, OR & WA.	7,300,000	7,300,000
(FC)	Elk Creek Lake	4,000,000	18,000,000
(MP)	John Day Lock and Dam, Lake Umatilla, OR & WA.	6,358,000	6,358,000
(FC)	Lower Columbia River Basin Bank Protection, OR & WA.	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	Siuslaw River and Bar	4,275,000	4,275,000
(MP)	Strube Lake and Cougar additional unit.	400,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection.	1,500,000	1,500,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(FC)	Cowanesque Lake (modification)	500,000	
(N)	Montgomery locks and dam, Ohio River (rehab).	9,000,000	9,000,000
(BE)	Presque Isle peninsula	1,160,00	1,160,000
(FC)	Tamaqua	2,120,000	
(FC)	Wyoming Valley (def corr)	2,395,000	2,395,000
	PUERTO RICO		
(N)	Ponce Harbor	350,000	
(FC)	Portugues and Bucana Rivers	25,000,000	25,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	Cooper River seismic modification		8,200,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tribs, TX—Addicks and Barker Dams (dam safety).	3,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	Clear Creek	2,000,000	
(FC)	Cooper Lake and channels	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	Corpus Christi ship channel (1968 Act).	9,600,000	9,600,000
(FC)	El Paso	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	Freeport Harbor (1970 Act)	2,000,000	
(N)	Freeport Harbor, TX (1970 Act) (reloc of north jetty).	2,400,000	
(FC)	Joe Pool lake	7,800,000	7,800,000
(FC)	Lake Wichita, Holliday Creek at Wichita Falls.	1,500,000	
(N)	Mouth of Colorado River	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	Ray Roberts Lake	52,000,000	52,000,000
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stab below Denison Dam, TX, AR, & LA.	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	San Antonio Channel improvement	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	San Gabriel River	200,000	200,000
(FC)	Taylors Bayou	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayou	4,000,000	4,000,000
(N)	Wallisville Lake		100,000
	UTAH		
(FC)	Little Dell Lake	3,000,000	
	VIRGINIA		
(FC)	Haysi Lake		500,000
(FC)	Virginia Beach streams, canal No. Two.	1,000,000	
(BE)	Virginia Beach (reimb)	480,000	480,000
	WASHINGTON		
(MP)	Chief Joseph additional units	14,000,000	13,340,000
(MP)	Lower Snake River fish and wildlife compensation, WA, OR & ID.	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	Mill Creek Lake (rehab)	2,502,000	2,502,000
(FC)	Mt. St. Helens and vicinity	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	Mud Mountain Dam (dam safety assurance):	1,300,000	1,300,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	Beech Fork Lake	508,000	508,000
(N)	Gallipolis locks and dam, WV & OH	1,350,000	
(FC)	Levisa/tug forks of Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rvrs, WV, VA.	17,000,000	17,000,000
(FC)	Stonewall Jackson Lake	26,700,000	26,700,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	Small navigation projects (section 107).	4,850,000	9,365,000
	Small beach erosion control projects (section 103).	2,150,000	2,150,000
	Small projects for flood control and related purposes (section 205).	27,600,000	32,100,000
	Emergency streambank and shoreline protection (section 14).	7,200,000	7,400,000
	Mitigation of shore damages attributable to navigation projects (section 111).		850,000
	Small snagging and clearing projects (section 208).	1,200,000	1,200,000
	Aquatic plant control (1965 Act)	8,000,000	10,000,000
	Employees compensation	11,200,000	11,200,000
	Dam safety assurance program	4,000,000	4,000,000
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippage.	−53,061,000	−6,901,000
	Pay amendment	6,530,000	
	Total, construction, general	848,530,000	919,345,000

Type of project: (N) navigation; (FC) flood control; (BE) beach erosion control; and (MP) multiple-purpose, including power.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $25,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI AND TENNESSEE

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $314,760,000 for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee instead of $321,685,000 as proposed by the House and $285,735,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees concur in and strongly support the House report language relating to the Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Demonstration Erosion Control, a joint program of the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service.

The funds are to be allocated as shown in the following table:

Type of project	Flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
	Surveys:		
	General studies:		
(FDP)	Boeuf-Tensas Basin, AR and LA.	500,000	800,000
(FC)	Bushley Bayou Area LA (CP&E).		350,000
(FDP)	St. Francis River Basin below Wappapello Lake, AR and MO.	270,000	270,000
(FDP)	Bayou Du Chien, KY	210,000	210,000
(FDP)	Larto Lake-Saline Lake Area, LA.		300,000
(FDP)	Atchafalaya Basin (water and land resources), LA.	311,000	311,000
(FC)	Mississippi and Louisiana Estuarine Areas, LA and MS (CP&E).	140,000	1,000,000
(FDP)	Southwest Mississippi Tributaries Basin, MS.	400,000	400,000
(FDP)	Yazoo River Basin, MS	360,000	360,000
(FDP)	Eastern Arkansas Region Comprehensive Study, AR.	300,000	300,000
(FC)	St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway (CP&E).	564,000	564,000
(FC)	Nonconnah Cr, TN and MS (CP&E).	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	Obon and Forked Deer Rivers and Tribs., TN & KY.	300,000	
(FDP)	Reelfoot Lake, TN		400,000
(FDP)	Tipionville		225,000
(FDP)	Collection and study of basic data.	270,000	270,000
	Advance engineering and design:		
(FC)	Eastern Rapides and South Central Avoyelles, LA.	130,000	130,000
(FC)	L'Anguille River Basin, AR	370,000	370,000
(FC)	Mississippi Delta Region Salinity Control Structure, LA.	845,000	845,000
	Subtotal, general investigations.	5,470,000	7,605,000
	CONSTRUCTION		
(FC)	Channel improvement, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO and IN.	68,000,000	68,000,000
(FC)	Mississippi River Levees, AR, LI, KY, LA, MS, MO and TN.	28,600,000	28,600,000
(FC)	St. Francis Basin, AR and MO	7,200,000	7,200,000
(FC)	Tensas Basin, AR and LA:	(9,300,000)	(7,810,000)
	Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, except Lake Chicot Pumping Plant.	650,000	650,000
	Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, Lake Chicot Pumping Plant.	100,000	100,000
	Red River Backwater Area, except Tensas Cocodrie Pumping Plant.	1,965,000	475,000
	Red River Backwater Area, Tensas Cocodrie Pumping Plant.	6,585,000	6,585,000
(FC)	Atchafalaya Basin, LA	26,300,000	26,300,000
(FC)	Bayou Cocodrie and Tributaries, LA.	150,000	150,000
(FC)	Old River, LA	46,000,000	46,000,000
(FC)	Sardis Lake, MS (dam safety assurance.	3,500,000	3,500,0000
(FC)	Yazoo Basin, MS:	(20,000,000)	(36,500,000)
	Big Sunflower River	3,100,000	3,100,000
	Main stem	1,300,000	5,300,000
	Tributaries:		
	Except Ascalmore-Tiepo and Oppossum Bayous.	3,700,000	3,700,000
	Upper Yazoo projects (formerly auxiliary channel).	9,200,000	,9,200,000
	Yazoo backwater	2,700,000	7,700,000
	Demonstration erosion control.		7,500,000
(FC)	West Tennessee Tributaries, TN	3,100,000	3,100,000
	Funding derived from proposed inland waterways trust fund.	−18,500,000	
	Subtotal, construction	193,650,000	227,160,000
	MAINTENANCE		
(FC)	Boeuf-Tensas Basin, AR and LA	1,408,000	1,408,000
(FC)	White River Backwater, AR	703,000	703,000
(FC)	Mapping, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO and IN.	603,000	603,000
(FC)	Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO and TN.	10,373,000	10,373,000
(FC)	North Bank, Arkansas River, AR	304,000	304,000
(FC)	South Bank, Arkansas River, AR	139,000	139,000
(FC)	St. Francis River and Tributaries, AR and MO.	4,565,000	4,565,000
(FC)	Atchafalaya Basin, LA	7,615,000	7,615,000
(FC)	Bayou Cocodrie and Tributaries, LA.	113,000	113,000
(FC)	Bonnet Carre Spillway, LA	342,000	342,000
(FC)	Lower Red River, South Bank Levees, LA.	14,000	14,000
(FC)	Old River, LA	5,360,000	5,360,000
(FC)	Red River Backwater Area, LA	733,000	733,000
(FC)	Arkabutla Lake, MS	2,362,000	2,362,000
(FC)	Big Sunflower River, MS	198,000	198,000
(FC)	Enid Lake, MS	2,445,000	2,445,000
(FC)	Greenwood, MS	566,000	566,000
(FC)	Grenada Lake, MS	3,463,000	3,463,000
(FC)	Yazoo Basin, Main Stem, MS	1,244,000	1,244,000
(FC)	Sardis Lake, MS	2,858,000	2,858,000
(FC)	Yazoo Basin, tributaries, MS	2,786,000	2,786,000
(FC)	Whittington Auxiliary Channel, MS.	1,237,000	1,237,000
(FC)	Yazoo Backwater, MS	3,776,000	3,776,000
(FC)	Yazoo City, MS	1,217,000	1,217,000
(FC)	Wappapello Lake, MO	2,779,000	2,779,000
(FC)	Revetment and dikes	28,752,000	28,752,000
(FC)	Dredging	18,000,000	18,000,000
(FC)	Inspection of completed works	1,040,000	1,040,000
	Funding derived from proposed inland waterways trust fund.	−14,500,000	
	Subtotal, maintenance	90,495,000	104,995,000
	Reduction for anticipated savings, slippage, and prior year unobligated balances.	−20,615,000	−25,000,000
	Pay amendment	2,440,000	
	Total, flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.	271,440,000	314,760,000

Type of study or project: (FC) Flood control; (FDP) Flood damage prevention.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $1,319,973,000 for operation and maintenance, general instead of $1,325,195,000 as proposed by the House and $1,302,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are aware of the serious shoaling problem which has developed at Marina del Rey, California. The Corps of Engineers is directed to perform the necessary maintenance dredging to provide access in and out of the harbor.

The conferees agree with the House report language relating to the Columbia River Fish Passage Facilities.

The conferees are aware of a heavy shoaling condition which exists in the navigation channel to the turning basin at Port Orford, Oregon, and direct the Corps of Engineers to use available funds to provide additional

dredging for the existing port and marine facilities.

The conference agreement includes $3,000,000 for the Racine Harbor, Wisconsin, project. These funds are to be utilized by the Chief of Engineers to dredge the proposed harbor/marina area and entrance channel.

The funds are to be allocated as shown in the following table:

Type of project	Operation and maintenance—State and project	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
	ALABAMA		
(N)	Alabama-Coosa Rivers	5,204,000	6,171,000
(N)	Bayou Labatre	11,000	11,000
(N)	Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers.	8,449,000	12,400,000
(N)	Dauphim Island Bay	35,000	35,000
(N)	Dog and Fowl Rivers	119,000	119,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (Mobile district).	3,514,000	3,514,000
(MP)	Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam, Lake Seminole, FL, Al & GA.	3,513,000	3,513,000
(MP)	Millers Ferry Lock and Dam—William "Bill" Darnelly Lake.	3,257,000	3,257,000
(N)	Mobile Harbor	1,927,000	1,927,000
(N)	Perbido Pass Channel	17,000	17,000
(MP)	Robert F. Henry Lock and Dam	2,511,000	2,511,000
(N)	Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway, AL & MS.	12,632,000	13,000,000
(MP)	Walter F. George Lock and Dam, AL & GA.	4,253,000	4,253,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	Anchorage Harbor	1,265,000	1,265,000
(FC)	Chena River Lake	898,000	898,000
(N)	Dillingham Small Boat Harbor	385,000	385,000
(N)	Homer Harbor	279,000	279,000
(N)	Ninilchik Small Boat Harbor	244,000	244,000
(N)	Nome Harbor	702,000	702,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	Alamo Lake	661,000	661,000
(FC)	Painted Rock Dam	651,000	651,000
(FC)	Whitlow Ranch Dam	112,000	112,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	Beaver Lake	2,357,000	2,357,000
(MP)	Blakely Mountain Dam, Lake Ouachita.	3,065,000	3,065,000
(FC)	Blue Mountain Lake	698,000	698,000
(MP)	Bull Shoals Lake	3,539,000	3,539,000
(MP)	Dardanelle Lock and Dam	3,629,000	3,629,000
(MP)	Degray Lake	2,497,000	2,497,000
(FC)	DeQueen Lake	629,000	629,000
(FC)	Dierks Lake	714,000	714,000
(FC)	Gillham Lake	573,000	573,000
(MP)	Greers Ferry Lake	3,252,000	3,252,000
(N)	Helena Harbor	388,000	388,000
(N)	McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River nav system locks and dams.	15,680,000	15,680,000
(FC)	Millwood Lake	1,420,000	1,420,000
(MP)	Narrows Dam (Lake Greeson)	2,415,000	2,415,000
(FC)	Nimrod Lake	814,000	814,000
(MP)	Norfork Lake	2,405,000	2,405,00
(N)	Oscella Harbor	508,000	508,000
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, AR & LA.	4,817,000	4,817,000
(MP)	Ozark-Jeta Taylor Lock and Dam	2,660,000	2,660,000
(N)	White River	1,785,000	1,785,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	Black Butte Lake	1,141,000	1,141,000
(FC)	Buchanan Dam—H. V. Eastman Lake.	1,023,000	1,023,000
(FC)	Coyote Valley Dam (Lake Mendocino).	3,742,000	3,742,000
(N)	Crescent City Harbor	2,138,000	2,138,000
(N)	Drift removal (SF Harbor and Bay.	1,330,000	1,330,000
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) lake and channel.	1,772,000	1,772,000
(FC)	Farmington Dam	129,000	129,000
(FC)	Hidden Dam—Hensley Lake	999,000	999,000
(N)	Humboldt Harbor and Bay	4,625,000	4,625,000
(FC)	Isabella Lake	2,856,000	2,856,000
(N)	Los Angeles—Long Beach Harbor model.	135,000	1,268,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area.	2,881,000	2,881,000
(FC)	Merced County stream group	126,000	126,000
(FC)	Mojave River Dam	171,000	171,000
(FC)	New Hogan Lake	1,120,000	1,120,000
(MP)	New Melones Lake	569,000	569,000
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor	460,000	460,000
(N)	Oakland Harbor	1,240,000	1,240,000
(N)	Oceanside experimental sand bypass.	2,700,000	2,700,000
(N)	Oceanside Harbor	660,000	660,000
(FC)	Pine Flat Lake	1,692,000	1,692,000
(N)	Richmond Harbor	1,780,000	1,780,000
(N)	Sacramento River shallow draft channel.	84,000	84,000
(N)	Sacramento River and tribs (debris control).	674,000	674,000
(N)	Sacremento River and tribs (30 foot project).	2,037,000	2,037,000
(N)	San Francisco Bay—Delta model structure.	1,190,000	1,190,000
(N)	San Francisco Harbor	1,353,000	1,353,000
(N)	San Joaquin River	2,011,000	2,011,000
(N)	San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait.	6,790,000	6,790,000
(N)	San Rafael Creek		1,000,000
(FC)	Santa Ana River Basin	2,024,000	2,024,000
(N)	Santa Barbara Harbor	792,000	792,000
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor	709,000	1,200,000
(FC)	Success Lake	1,321,000	1,321,000
(N)	Suisun Bay Channel	725,000	725,000
(FC)	Terminus Dam (Lake Kaweah)	1,087,000	1,087,000
(N)	Ventura Marina	1,640,000	1,640,000
(N)	Yuba River	24,000	24,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	Bear Creek Lake	302,000	302,000
(FC)	Chatfield Lake	556,000	556,000
(FC)	Cherry Creek Lake	919,000	919,000
(FC)	John Martin Reservoir	1,092,000	1,092,000
(FC)	Trinidad Lake	484,000	484,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	Black Rock Lake	236,000	236,000
(FC)	Colebrook River Lake	245,000	245,000
(N)	Connecticut River below Hartford.	1,012,000	1,012,000
(FC)	Hancock Brook Lake	156,000	156,000
(FC)	Hop Brook Lake	540,000	540,000
(FC)	Mansfield Hollow Lake	385,000	385,000
(N)	New Haven Harbor	1,396,000	1,396,000
(N)	New London Harbor	699,000	699,000
(FC)	Northfield Brook Lake	264,000	264,000
(FC)	Stamford Hurricane Barrier	138,000	138,000
(FC)	Thomaston Dam	514,000	514,000
(FC)	West Thompson Lake	658,000	658,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	Intracoastal waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, DE & MD.	12,331,000	12,331,000
(N)	IWW Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay.	470,000	470,000
(N)	Wilmington Harbor	4,634,000	4,634,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(N)	Potomac and Anacostia River (drift removal).	470,000	470,000
(N)	Washington Harbor	29,000	29,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	Apalachicola Bay	17,000	17,000
(N)	Blackwater River	38,000	38,000
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	2,192,000	2,192,000
(FC)	Central and Southern Florida	4,701,000	4,701,000
(N)	Charlotte Harbor	1,260,000	1,260,000
(N)	Cross-Florida Barge Canal	1,303,000	1,645,000
(N)	East Pass Channel	375,000	375,000
(N)	Fernandina Harbor	1,312,000	1,312,000
(N)	Intracoastal water, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River.	80,000	80,000
(N)	Intracoastal waterway, Jacksonville to Miami.	1,930,000	1,930,000
(N)	Jacksonville Harbor	4,335,000	4,335,000
(N)	La Grange Bayou	22,000	22,000
(N)	Miami Harbor	1,010,000	1,010,000
(N)	Okeechobee Waterway	1,692,000	1,692,000
(N)	Oklawaha River	4,000	4,000
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor	600,000	600,000
(N)	Panama City Harbor	1,608,000	1,608,000
(N)	Pensacola Harbor	1,025,000	1,025,000
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor	549,000	549,000
(N)	Removal of aquatic growth	2,474,000	2,474,000
(N)	St. Lucie Inlet	500,000	500,000
(N)	Tampa Harbor	4,465,000	4,465,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	Allatoona Lake	4,132,000	4,132,000
(N)	Apalachicola, Chatahoochee, Flint Rivers, GA, AL & FL.	2,996,000	3,500,000
(N)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (Savannah district).	896,000	896,000
(N)	Brunswick Harbor	3,693,000	3,393,000
(MP)	Buford Dan and Lake Sidney Lanier.	5,012,000	5,012,000
(MP)	Carters Lake	2,442,000	2,442,000
(MP)	Clarks Hill Lake, GA & SC	5,629,000	5,629,000
(MP)	Hartwell Lake, GA & SC	5,281,000	5,281,000
(MP)	Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, GA & SC.	3,410,000	3,110,000
(N)	Savannah Harbor	8,113,000	8,063,000
(N)	Savannah River below Augusta	309,000	309,000
(MP)	West Point Lake, GA & AL	3,570,000	3,570,000
	HAWAII		
(N)	Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu	65,000	65,000
(N)	Nawiliwili Harbor	2,000,000	2,000,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	Albeni Falls Dam	2,470,000	2,470,000
(MP)	Dworshak Dam and Reservoir	5,529,000	5,529,000
(FC)	Lucky Peak Lake	666,000	666,000
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	Calumet Harbor and River, IL & IN.	295,000	295,000
(FC)	Carlyle Lake	2,882,000	2,882,000
(N)	Chicago Harbor	890,000	890,000
(N)	Chicago River (diked disposal)	205,000	205,000
(N)	Chicago River	2,328,000	2,328,000
(FC)	Farm Creek reservoirs	113,000	113,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway (LMVD portion).	1,079,000	1,079,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway	19,354,000	19,354,000
(N)	Kaskaskia River navigation	1,366,000	1,366,000
(FC)	Lake Shelbyville	3,684,000	3,684,000
(N)	Mill Creek and South Slough	25,000	25,000
(N)	Miss Riv Btwn Missouri Riv and Minneapolis, IL, MN, WI, & IA (NCD).	48,935,000	48,935,000
(N)	Mississippi River between MO River and Minneapolis (LMVD).	8,117,000	8,117,000
(FC)	Mouth of Sangamon River	12,000	12,000
(FC)	North Branch Chicago River		150,000
(FC)	Rend Lake	2,652,000	2,652,000
(N)	Waukegan Harbor (diked disposal).	900,000	900,000
(N)	Waukegan Harbor	409,000	409,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	Brookville Lake	439,000	439,000
(FC)	Burns Waterway Harbor	425,000	425,000
(FC)	Cagles Mill Lake	393,000	393,000
(FC)	Cecil M. Harden Lake	459,000	459,000
(FC)	Huntington Lake	447,000	447,000
(N)	Indiana Hbr	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	Mississinewa Lake	424,000	424,000
(FC)	Monroe Lake	364,000	364,000
(FC)	Patoka Lake	376,000	376,000
(FC)	Salamonie Lake	359,000	359,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	Coralville Lake	2,072,000	2,072,000
(N)	Missouri River—Sioux City to mouth, IA & NE.	8,950,000	8,950,000
(FC)	Rathbun Lake	1,868,000	1,868,000
(FC)	Red Rock Dam—Lake Red Rock.	2,313,000	2,313,000
(FC)	Saylorville Lake	2,805,000	2,805,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	Clinton Lake	1,257,000	1,257,000
(FC)	Council Grove Lake	653,000	653,000
(FC)	El Dorado Lake	380,000	380,000
(FC)	Elk City Lake	554,000	554,000
(FC)	Fall River Lake	601,000	601,000
(FC)	Hillsdale Lake	532,000	532,000
(FC)	John Redmond Dam and Reservoir.	680,000	680,000
(FC)	Kanopolis Lake	1,299,000	1,299,000
(FC)	Marion Lake	668,000	668,000
(FC)	Melvern Lake	1,321,000	1,321,000
(FC)	Milford Lake	1,175,000	1,175,000
(FC)	Pearson—Skubitz Big Hill Lake	586,000	586,000
(FC)	Perry Lake	1,883,000	1,883,000
(FC)	Pomona Lake	985,000	985,000
(FC)	Toronto Lake	237,000	237,000
(FC)	Tuttle Creek Lake	1,821,000	1,821,000
(FC)	Wilson Lake	1,027,000	1,027,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	Barkley Dam—Lake Barkley, KY & TN.	4,427,000	4,427,000
(FC)	Barren River Lake	1,054,000	1,054,000
(FC)	Buckhorn Lake	689,000	689,000
(FC)	Carr Fork Lake	727,000	727,000
(FC)	Cave Run Lake	498,000	498,000
(FC)	Dewey Lake	668,000	668,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Lake	684,000	684,000
(FC)	Grayson Lake	516,000	516,000
(N)	Green and Barren Rivers	1,591,000	1,591,000
(FC)	Green River Lake	976,000	976,000
(N)	Hickman Harbor	422,000	422,000
(N)	Kentucky River	1,294,000	1,294,000
(MP)	Laurel River Lake	777,000	777,000
(FC)	Martins Fork Lake	454,000	454,000
(FC)	Middlesboro	39,000	39,000
(FC)	Nolin Lake	989,000	989,000
(N)	Ohio River locks and dams, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN, & IL.	32,942,000	32,942,000
(N)	Ohio River open channel work, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN, & IL.	6,899,000	6,899,000
(FC)	Paintsville Lake	452,000	452,000
(FC)	Rough River Lake	1,103,000	1,103,000
(FC)	Taylorsville Lake	535,000	535,000
(MP)	Wolf Creek Dam—Lake Cumberland.	2,873,000	2,873,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeof, Black.	4,120,000	4,120,000
(N)	Baratavia Bay waterway	3,180,000	3,180,000
(FC)	Bayou Bodcau Reservoir	371,000	371,000
(FC)	Bayou Pierre	38,000	38,000
(FC)	Bayou Rigolette	10,000	10,000
(N)	Bayou Teche	618,000	618,000
(FC)	Caddo Lake	143,000	143,000

Type of project	Operation and maintenance—State and project	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
(N)	Calcasieu River and pass	10,390,000	11,180,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	729,000	729,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal waterway	10,420,000	10,420,000
(N)	Houma navigational canal	4,865,000	4,865,000
(N)	Lake Providence Harbor	385,000	385,000
(N)	Madison Parish Part	227,000	227,000
(N)	Mermentau River	705,000	705,000
(N)	Miss River outlets at Venice	1,240,000	1,240,000
(N)	Miss River Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico.	29,330,000	30,300,000
(N)	Miss River—Gulf outlet	4,440,000	5,880,000
(N)	Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport.	1,640,000	1,640,000
(N)	Removal of aquatic growth	1,323,000	1,323,000
(FC)	Wallace Lake	124,000	124,000
	MAINE		
(N)	Kennebec River	606,000	606,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and channels	14,234,000	14,234,000
(N)	Baltimore Harbor (drift removal).	225,000	225,000
(N)	Baltimore Harbor (prevention of obstructive deposits).	81,000	81,000
(FC)	Bloomington Lake, MD & WV	981,000	981,000
(N)	Claiborne Harbor	117,000	117,000
(FC)	Cumberland, MD and Ridgeley, WV, MD & WV.	63,000	63,000
(N)	Fishing Creek	958,000	958,000
(N)	Ocean City Harbor and inlet Sinepuxent Bay.	435,000	435,000
(N)	Rhodes Point to Tylerton	690,000	690,000
(N)	Wicomico River	1,090,000	1,090,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	Barre Falls Dam	404,000	404,000
(FC)	Birch Hill Dam	259,000	259,000
(FC)	Buffumville Lake	339,000	339,000
(N)	Cape Cod Canal	4,766,000	4,766,000
(FC)	Charles River Natural valley storage areas.	339,000	339,000
(FC)	Conant Brook Lake	191,000	191,000
(FC)	East Brinfield Lake	257,000	257,000
(N)	Green Harbor	320,000	320,000
(FC)	Hodges Village Dam	349,000	349,000
(FC)	Knightville Dam	363,000	363,000
(FC)	Littleville Lake	431,000	431,000
(FC)	New Bedford, Fairhaven and Acushnet hurricane barrier.	130,000	130,000
(FC)	Tully Lake	383,000	383,000
(FC)	West Hill Dam	483,000	483,000
(FC)	Westville Lake	430,000	430,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	Channels in Lake St. Clair	1,001,000	1,001,000
(N)	Charlevoix Harbor	182,000	182,000
(N)	Detroit River	7,581,000	7,581,000
(N)	Frankfort Harbor	201,000	201,000
(N)	Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River.	915,000	915,000
(N)	Hammond Bay Harbor	30,000	30,000
(N)	Harbor Beach Harbor		300,000
(N)	Harrisville Harbor	107,000	107,000
(N)	Holland Harbor	823,000	823,000
(N)	Inland Route	41,000	101,000
(N)	Keweenaw Waterway (Diked disposal).	600,000	600,000
(N)	Keweenaw Waterway	741,000	741,000
(N)	Lexington Harbor	208,000	208,000
(N)	Ludington Harbor	268,000	268,000
(N)	Manistee Harbor	1,221,000	1,221,000
(N)	Marquette Harbor	279,000	279,000
(N)	Menominee Harbor River, MI & WI (diked disposal).	105,000	105,000
(N)	Monroe Harbor	2,625,000	2,625,000
(N)	Muskegon Harbor	304,000	304,000
(N)	Rouge River	1,198,000	1,198,000
(N)	Saginaw River (diked disposal)	1,900,000	1,900,000
(N)	Saginaw River	2,683,000	2,683,000
(FC)	Sebewaing River	24,000	24,000
(N)	South Haven Harbor	228,000	228,000
(N)	St. Clair River	1,514,000	1,514,000
(N)	St. Joseph Harbor	786,000	786,000
(N)	St. Joseph Harbor (diked disposal).	1,710,000	1,710,000
(MP)	St. Mary's River	11,416,000	11,416,000
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, MN & SD.	135,000	135,000
(N)	Duluth—Superior Harbor, MN & WI.	8,620,000	8,620,000
(FC)	Lac Qui Parle Lake	453,000	453,000
(N)	Minnesota River	500,000	500,000
(FC)	Orwell Lake	202,000	202,000
(FC)	Red Lake River	131,000	131,000
(N)	Reservoirs at Headwaters of Mississippi River.	1,784,000	1,784,000
(N)	St. Croix River, MN & WI	157,000	157,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(FC)	Arkabutla Lake	70,000	70,000
(N)	Biloxi Harbor	1,072,000	1,072,000
(N)	Cadet Bayou	28,000	28,000
(N)	Clairborne County Port	8,000	8,000
(FC)	East Fork, Tombigbee River	529,000	529,000
(FC)	Enid Lake	147,000	147,000
(FC)	Grenada Lake	71,000	71,000
(N)	Gulfport Harbor	2,448,000	2,448,000
(FC)	Okatibbee Lake	906,000	906,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor	3,684,000	3,684,000
(N)	Pass Christian Harbor	126,000	126,000
(N)	Pearl River	257,000	257,000
(N)	Rosedale Harbor	261,000	261,000
(FC)	Sardis Lake	71,000	71,000
(N)	Yazoo River	77,000	77,000
	MISSOURI		
(N)	Caruthersville Harbor	310,000	310,000
(MP)	Clarence Cannon Dan and Reservoir.	3,917,000	3,917,000
(FC)	Clearwater Lake	1,327,000	1,327,000
(MP)	Harry S Truman Dam and Reservoir.	4,732,000	4,732,000
(FC)	Long Branch Lake	478,000	478,000
(FC)	Meramec Park Lake	613,000	613,000
(N)	Miss. River btn Ohio and MO Rivers, MO & IL.	12,203,000	12,203,000
(FC)	Pomme de Terre Lake	1,242,000	1,242,000
(FC)	Smithville Lake	738,000	738,000
(MP)	Stockton Lake	1,816,000	1,816,000
(MP)	Table Rock Lake	3,081,000	3,081,000
(FC)	Wappapello Lake	59,000	59,000
	MONTANA		
(MP)	Fort Peck Lake	3,627,000	3,627,000
(MP)	Libby Dam, Lake Koocanusa	3,654,000	3,654,000
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	Gavins Point Dam Lewis and Clark Lake, NE and SD.	4,365,000	4,365,000
(FC)	Harlan County Lake	1,393,000	1,393,000
(FC)	Missouri National Recreational River.		200,000
(FC)	Missouri River, Kensiers Bend, NE to Sioux City, NE and IA.	45,000	45,000
(FC)	Papillion Creek and tributaries lakes.	318,000	318,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries lakes	476,000	476,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	Matis Creek Lake, NV & CA	277,000	277,000
(FC)	Pine and Mathews Canyons Lakes.	135,000	135,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	Blackwater Dam	344,000	344,000
(FC)	Edward MacDowell Lake	549,000	549,000
(FC)	Franklin Falls Dam	628,000	628,000
(FC)	Hopkinton-Everett Lakes	986,000	986,000
(FC)	Otter Brook Lake	363,000	363,000
(FC)	Surry Mountain Lake	328,000	328,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	Absecon Inlet	150,000	150,000
(N)	Barnegat Inlet	550,000	550,000
(FC)	Cold Spring Inlet		590,000
(N)	Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton, NJ and PA.	4,052,000	4,052,000
(N)	Manasquan River	255,000	255,000
(N)	New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway.	2,865,000	2,865,000
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers.	2,500,000	2,500,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	Abiquiu Dam	662,000	662,000
(FC)	Cochiti Lake	1,033,000	1,033,000
(FC)	Conchas Lake	823,000	823,000
(FC)	Galisteo Dam	118,000	118,000
(FC)	Jemez Canyon Dam	209,000	209,000
(FC)	Santa Rosa Dam and Lake	451,000	451,000
(FC)	Two Rivers Dam	374,000	374,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	Almond Lake	225,000	225,000
(FC)	Arkport Dam	121,000	121,000
(N)	Bay Ridge and Red Hook channels.	1,100,000	1,100,000
(N)	Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor.	1,835,000	1,835,000
(N)	Bronx River	1,425,000	1,425,000
(N)	Buffalo Harbor	1,329,000	1,329,000
(N)	Dunkirk Harbor	58,000	58,000
(N)	East Rockaway Inlet	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	East Sidney Lake	213,000	213,000
(N)	Great Sodus Bay Harbor	26,000	26,000
(N)	Hudson River	3,143,000	3,143,000
(N)	Jamaica Bay	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	Little Sodus Bay Harbor	27,000	27,000
(N)	Long Island Intracoastal Waterway.	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	Mt. Morris Lake	1,034,000	1,034,000
(N)	Narrows of Lake Champlain, NY & VT.	1,135,000	1,135,000
(N)	New York and New Jersey channels, NY & NJ.	4,602,000	4,602,000
(N)	New York Harbor (drift removal).	3,056,000	3,056,000
(N)	New York Harbor (prevention of obstructive deposits).	540,000	540,000
(N)	New York Harbor	6,454,000	6,454,000
(N)	Newtown Creek	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	Oak Orchard Harbor	26,000	26,000
(N)	Ogdensburg Harbor	50,000	50,000
(N)	Olcott Harbor	10,000	10,000
(N)	Rochester Harbor	960,000	960,000
(N)	Rondout Harbor	1,250,000	1,250,000
(FC)	Southern New York flood control projects.	472,000	472,000
(N)	Westchester Creek	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	Whitney Point Lake	398,000	398,000
(N)	Wilson Harbor	10,000	10,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (Wilmington district).	5,721,000	5,721,000
(FC)	B. Everett Jordan Dam and Lake.	785,000	785,000
(N)	Beaufort Harbor	340,000	340,000
(N)	Cape Fear River above Wilmington.	451,000	451,000
(N)	Channel from Back Sound to Lookout Bight.	292,000	292,000
(FC)	Falls Lake	877,000	877,000
(N)	Lockwoods Folly River	466,000	466,000
(N)	Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay	5,289,000	5,289,000
(N)	Morehead City Harbor	6,889,000	6,889,000
(N)	Ocracoke Inlet	122,000	122,000
(N)	Silver Lake Harbor	80,000	80,000
(FC)	W. Kerr Scott Dam & Reservoir	1,114,000	1,114,000
(N)	Wilmington Harbor	3,748,000	3,748,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	Bowman—Haley Lake	152,000	152,000
(MP)	Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakwea	7,602,000	7,602,000
(FC)	Homme Lake and Dam	54,000	54,000
(FC)	Lake Ashtabula & Baldhill Dam	1,730,000	1,730,000
(FC)	Pipesteam Lake	270,000	270,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	Alum Creek Lake	459,000	459,000
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor	11,566,000	11,566,000
(FC)	Berlin Lake	1,183,000	1,183,000
(FC)	Caesar Creek Lake	577,000	577,000
(FC)	Clarence J. Brown Dam	387,000	387,000
(N)	Cleveland Harbor	9,901,000	9,901,000
(N)	Conneaut Harbor	430,000	430,000
(FC)	Deer Creek Lake	397,000	397,000
(FC)	Delaware Lake	334,000	334,000
(FC)	Dillon Lake	265,000	265,000
(N)	Fairfort Harbor	506,000	506,000
(N)	Huron Harbor	797,000	797,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	1,165,000.	1,165,000
(FC)	Massillon	15,000	15,000
(FC)	Michael J. Kirwan Dam & Reservoir.	535,000	535,000
(FC)	Mosquito Creek Lake	568,000	568,000
(FC)	Muskingum River Reservoirs	4,399,000	4,399,000
(FC)	Newark	15,000	15,000
(FC)	North Branch of Kokosing River Lake.	166,000	166,000
(FC)	Paint Creek Lake	476,000	476,000
(FC)	Roseville	15,000	15,000
(N)	Sandusky Harbor	751,000	751,000
(N)	Toledo Harbor	4,594,000	4,594,000
(FC)	Tom Jerkins Dam	238,000	238,000
(N)	Vermilion Harbor	14,000	14,000
(FC)	West Fork Mill Creek Lake	281,000	281,000
(FC)	William H. Harsha Lake	496,000	496,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	Arcadia Lake	99,000	99,000
(FC)	Birch Lake	551,000	551,000
(MP)	Broken Bow Lake	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	Canton Lake	1,870,000	1,870,000
(FC)	Copan Lake	524,000	524,000
(MP)	Eufaula Lake	3,432,000	3,532,000
(MP)	Fort Gibson Lake	3,365,000	3,365,000
(FC)	Fort Supply Lake	601,000	601,000
(FC)	Great Salt Plains Lake	407,000	407,000
(FC)	Heyburn Lake	532,000	532,000
(FC)	Hugo Lake (Hydropower Study)	1,076,000	1,076,000
(FC)	Hulah Lake	557,000	557,000
(FC)	Kaw Lake	1,640,000	1,640,000
(MP)	Keystone Lake	2,383,000	2,383,000
(FC)	Oologah Lake	1,139,000	1,139,000
(FC)	Optima Lake	573,000	573,000
(FC)	Pensacola Reservoir—Lake of the Cherokees.	7,000	7,000
(FC)	Pine Creek Lake	713,000	713,000
(MP)	Robert S. Kerr Lock, Dam and Reservoir.	2,330,000	2,330,000
(FC)	Sardis Lake	498,000	798,000
(FC)	Skiatook Lake	690,000	690,000
(MP)	Tenkiller Ferry Lake	2,414,000	2,414,000
(FC)	Waurika Lake	859,000	859,000
(MP)	Webbers Falls lock and dam	1,834,000	1,834,000
(FC)	Wister Lake	536,000	536,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	Applegate Lake	455,000	455,000
(FC)	Blue River Lake	166,000	166,000
(MP)	Bonneville lock and dam, Lake Bonneville, OR and WA.	13,422,000	13,422,000
(N)	Chetko River	602,000	602,000
(N)	Columbia and lwr Willamette Rivs below Vancur and Port, OR and WA.	14,263,000	14,263,000

Type of project	Operation and maintenance—State and project	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, OR and WA.	5,295,000	5,295,000
(N)	Columbia River between Vancouver, WA and the Dalles.	429,000	429,000
(N)	Coos and Millicoma Rivers	114,000	114,000
(N)	Coos Bay	3,382,000	3,382,000
(N)	Coquille River	442,000	442,000
(FC)	Cottage Grove Lake	638,000	638,000
(MP)	Cougar Lake	1,178,000	1,178,000
(N)	Depoe Bay	27,000	27,000
(MP)	Detroit Lake	1,534,000	1,534,000
(FC)	Dorena Lake	347,000	347,000
(FC)	Fall Creek Lake	259,000	259,000
(FC)	Fern Ridge Dam and Lake	905,000	905,000
(MP)	Green Peter-Foster Lakes	2,050,000	2,050,000
(MP)	Hills Creek Lake	607,000	607,000
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, OR and WA.	13,741,000	13,741,000
(MP)	Lookout Point Lake	2,161,000	2,161,000
(MP)	Lost Creek Lake	2,104,000	2,104,000
(MP)	Menary lock and dam, Lake Wallula, OR and WA.	11,916,000	11,916,000
(N)	Port Orford	218,000	218,000
(N)	Rogue River Harbor at Gold Beach.	490,000	490,000
(N)	Siuslaw River	536,000	536,000
(N)	Skipanon Channel	332,000	332,000
(N)	Tillamook Bay and Bar	59,000	59,000
(N)	Umpqua River	865,000	865,000
(N)	Willamette River at Willamette Falls.	486,000	486,000
(FC)	Willamette River and Willamette Falls.	176,000	176,000
(FC)	Willow Creek Lake	95,000	95,000
(N)	Yaquina Bay & Harbor	757,000	757,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	Allegheny River	4,980,000	4,980,000
(FC)	Alvin R. Bush Dam	305,000	305,000
(FC)	Aylesworth Creek Lake	104,000	104,000
(FC)	Beltzville Lake	582,000	582,000
(FC)	Blue Marsh Lake	1,086,000	1,086,000
(FC)	Conemaugh River Lake	800,000	800,000
(FC)	Cowanesque Lake	893,000	893,000
(FC)	Crooked Creek Lake	750,000	750,000
(FC)	Curwensville Lake	379,000	379,000
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, PA, NJ, & DE.	19,592,000	19,592,000
(FC)	East Branch, Clarion River Lake	512,000	512,000
(N)	Erie Harbor	415,000	415,000
(FC)	Foster Joseph Sayers Dam	386,000	386,000
(FC)	Francis E. Walter Dam	468,000	468,000
(FC)	General Edgar Jadwin Dam	294,000	294,000
(FC)	Johnstown	7,000	7,000
(FC)	Kinzua Dam & Allegheny Reservoir, PA & NY.	937,000	937,000
(FC)	Loyalhanna Lake	800,000	800,000
(FC)	Mahoning Creek Lake	449,000	449,000
(N)	Monongahela River, PA & WV	13,225,000	13,225,000
(FC)	Prompton Lake	286,000	286,000
(FC)	Punxsutawney	7,000	7,000
(FC)	Raystown Lake	2,025,000	2,025,000
(N)	Schuylkill River	2,015,000	2,015,000
(FC)	Shenango River Lake, PA & OH	1,447,000	1,447,000
(FC)	Stillwater Lake	176,000	176,000
(FC)	Tioga-Hammond Lakes	1,342,000	1,342,000
(FC)	Tionesta Lake	870,000	870,000
(FC)	Union City Lake	304,000	304,000
(FC)	Woodcock Creek Lake	561,000	561,000
(FC)	York, Indian Rock Dam	296,000	296,000
(FC)	Youghiogheny River Lake, PA & MD.	1,373,000	1,373,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (Charleston District).	477,000	477,000
(N)	Charleston Harbor	4,795,000	4,795,000
(N)	Cooper River, Charleston Harbor	3,548,000	3,548,000
(N)	Folly River	236,000	236,000
(N)	Georgetown Harbor	2,501,000	2,501,000
(N)	Little River Inlet, SC & NC	23,000	23,000
(N)	Murrells Inlet	27,000	27,000
(N)	Port Royal Harbor	614,000	614,000
(N)	Shipyard River	632,000	632,000
(N)	Town Creek	288,000	288,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	Big Bend Dam—Lake Sharpe	4,607,000	4,607,000
(FC)	Cold Brook Lake	150,000	150,000
(FC)	Cottonwood Springs Lake	144,000	144,000
(MP)	Fort Randall Dam, Lake Francis Case.	6,114,000	6,114,000
(FC)	Lake Traverse and Bois de Sioux River, SD & MN.	245,000	245,000
(MP)	Oahe Dam, Lake Oahe, SD & ND.	7,286,000	7,286,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	Center Hill Lake	2,163,000	2,163,000
(MP)	Cheatham Lock & Dam	3,152,000	3,152,000
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam & Reservoir	2,213,000	2,213,000
(MP)	Dale Hollow Lake, TN & KY	2,593,000	2,593,000
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Dam & Reservoir	1,839,000	1,839,000
(MP)	Old Hickory Lock & Dam	3,042,000	3,042,000
(N)	Tennessee River, TN, AL, & KY	9,714,000	9,714,000
(N)	Wolf River Harbor	574,000	574,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	Aquilla Lake	469,000	469,000
(FC)	Arkansas-Red River Basins chloride control (Area B).	383,000	383,000
(FC)	Bardwell Lake	873,000	873,000
(FC)	Belton Lake	1,378,000	1,378,000
(FC)	Benbrook Lake	1,263,000	1,263,000
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor	1,440,000	1,440,000
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou & tributaries	729,000	729,000
(FC)	Canyon Lake	1,073,000	1,073,000
(N)	Corpus Christi ship channel (1968 act).	4,880,000	4,880,000
(MP)	Denison Dam—Lake Texoma, TX & OK.	4,044,000	4,044,000
(FC)	Ferrells Bridge Dam—Lake O' the Pines.	1,975,000	1,975,000
(N)	Freeport Harbor	2,210,000	2,210,000
(N)	Galveston Harbor & channel	6,365,000	6,365,000
(FC)	Granger Dan and Lake	708,000	708,000
(FC)	Grapevine Lake	1,372,000	1,372,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway	12,380,000	12,380,000
(FC)	Hords Creek Lake	879,000	879,000
(N)	Houston Ship Channel	6,330,000	6,330,000
(FC)	Joe Pool Lake	268,000	268,000
(FC)	Lake Kemp	154,000	154,000
(FC)	Lavon Lake	1,861,000	1,861,000
(FC)	Lewisville Dam	2,001,000	2,001,000
(N)	Matagorda ship channel	2,730,000	2,730,000
(FC)	Navarro Mills Lake	936,000	936,000
(FC)	North San Gabriel Dam and Lake Georgetown.	852,000	852,000
(FC)	D.C. Fisher Dam & Lake	584,000	584,000
(FC)	Pat Mayse Lake	642,000	642,000
(FC)	Proctor Lake	925,000	925,000
(FC)	Ray Roberts Lake	96,000	96,000
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway	6,900,000	7,850,000
(MP)	San Rayburn Dam & Reservoir	2,547,000	2,547,000
(FC)	Somerville Lake	1,675,000	1,675,000
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	1,072,000	1,072,000
(N)	Texas City Channel	2,480,000	2,480,000
(MP)	Town Bluff Dam & B.A. Steinhagen Lake.	811,000	811,000
(FC)	Waco Lake	1,673,000	1,673,000
(FC)	Wallisville project—Trinity River	245,000	245,000
(MP)	Whitney Lake	2,918,000	2,918,000
(FC)	Wright Patman Dam & Lake	1,608,000	1,608,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	Ball Mountain Lake	329,000	329,000
(FC)	North Hartand Lake	398,000	398,000
(FC)	North Springfield Lake	437,000	437,000
(FC)	Townshend Lake	478,000	478,000
(FC)	Union Village Dam	306,000	306,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway	2,245,000	2,585,000
(N)	Channel to Newport News	1,625,000	1,625,000
(N)	Chincoteague Inlet	1,243,000	1,243,000
(FC)	Gathright Dam and Lake Moomaw.	965,000	965,000
(N)	Hampton Roads, Norfolk & Newport News Harbor (drift removal).	190,000	190,000
(N)	James River	2,186,000	2,186,000
(MP)	John H. Kerr Dam & Reservoir, VA & NC.	5,009,000	5,009,000
(FC)	John W. Flannagan Dam & Reservoir.	633,000	633,000
(N)	Norfolk Harbor	6,525,000	6,525,000
(N)	Norfolk Harbor (prevention of obstructive deposits).	270,000	270,000
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Lake	258,000	258,000
(MP)	Philpott Lake	1,367,000	1,367,000
(N)	Waterway on the coast of Virginia.	1,138,000	1,138,000
(N)	York River	300,000	300,000
	WASHINGTON		
(N)	Anacortes Harbor	160,000	160,000
(MP)	Chief Joseph Dam	6,533,000	6,533,000
(N)	Columbia River at Baker Bay, WA & OR.	325,000	325,000
(N)	Columbia River between Chinook, WA. and head of Sand Island.	233,000	233,000
(N)	Ediz Hook	10,000	10,000
(N)	Everett Harbor and Snohomish River.	625,000	625,000
(N)	Grays Harbor and Chehalis River	4,490,000	4,490,000
(FC)	Howard A. Hanson Reservoir	677,000	677,000
(MP)	Ice Harbor Lock and Dam	5,248,000	6,348,000
(N)	Kenmore Navigation Channel	205,000	205,000
(N)	Lake Washington Ship Canal	3,247,000	3,247,000
(N)	Lewis River	64,000	64,000
(MP)	Little Goose Lock and Dam, Lake Bryan.	3,997,000	4,122,000
(MP)	Lower Granite Lock and Dam, WA & ID.	7,256,000	7,316,000
(MP)	Lower Monumental Lock and Dam.	3,884,000	5,134,000
(FC)	Mill Creek Lake	515,000	515,000
(FC)	Mud Mountain Dam	1,299,000	1,299,000
(N)	Puget Sound and its tributary waters.	765,000	765,000
(N)	Seattle Harbor	515,000	515,000
(FC)	Stillaguamish River	110,000	110,000
(N)	Swinomish Channel	335,000	335,000
(FC)	Tacoma—Puyallup River	40,000	40,000
(MP)	The Dalles Lock and Dam, Lake Celilo, WA & OR.	6,307,000	6,762,000
(FC)	Wynoochee Lake	1,007,000	1,007,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	Beech Fork Lake	545,000	545,000
(FC)	Bluestone Lake	734,000	734,000
(FC)	Burnsville Lake	815,000	815,000
(FC)	East Lynn Lake	755,000	755,000
(FC)	Elkins	6,000	6,000
(N)	Kanawha River	8,242,000	8,242,000
(FC)	R. D. Bailey Lake	929,000	929,000
(FC)	Summersville Lake	1,295,000	1,295,000
(FC)	Sutton Lake	1,398,000	1,398,000
(N)	Tygart River Lake	893,000	893,000
	WISCONSIN		
(N)	Ashland Harbor	349,000	349,000
(FC)	Eau Galle River	347,000	347,000
(N)	Fox River	1,008,000	1,008,000
(N)	Green Bay Harbor	1,744,000	1,744,000
(N)	Green Bay Harbor (diked disposal).	8,000,000	8,000,000
(N)	Kenosha Harbor	434,000	434,000
(N)	Kewaunee Harbor	1,613,000	1,613,000
(FC)	Lafarge Lake	203,000	203,000
(N)	Manitowoc Harbor	156,000	156,000
(N)	Milwaukee Harbor	5,772,000	5,772,000
(N)	Racine Harbor	178,000	3,178,000
(N)	Sheboygan Harbor	538,000	538,000
(N)	Sheboygan Harbor (diked disposal).	270,000	270,000
(N)	Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal.	638,000	638,000
(N)	Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal (diked disposal).	190,000	190,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	Inspection of completed works	5,291,000	5,291,000
	Inspection of non-Federal levees	910,000	910,000
	Scheduling flood control reservoir operations.	2,019,000	2,019,000
	Monitor completed coastal projects.	1,200,000	1,000,000
	River ice management	4,000,000	3,000,000
	Repair, evaluation, maintenance, and rehabilitation research (remr).	8,195,000	7,500,000
	PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION		
	Removal of sunken vessels and obstructions.	2,307,000	2,307,000
	Protection, clearing, and straightening channels (section 3).	200,000	100,000
	General regulatory functions	51,000,000	49,500,000
	Project condition surveys	7,682,000	7,682,000
	Surveillance of northern boundary waters.	2,568,000	2,000,000
	Commercial statistics	2,890,000	2,890,000
	Mobilization planning	13,300,000	9,900,000
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippage.	−9,000,000	−17,850,000
	Funding derived from proposed inland waterways and river and harbors trust funds.	−355,000,000	
	Pay amendment	15,560,000	
	Total, operation and maintenance.	976,560,000	1,319,973,000

Type of project: (N) Navigation; (FC) Flood control; and (MP) Multiple-purpose, including power.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate permitting advance maintenance of the Charleston Harbor navigation channel.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 14: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate relating to a Corps of Engineers learning facility.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate permitting the Secretary of the Army to remove obstructions and ease bends at the Jacksonville Harbor navigation channel in the vicinity of Blount Island to allow for the free and safe movement of vessels.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $34,035,000 for general investigations instead of $34,085,000 as proposed by the House and $32,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $100,000 for the Pima County Santa Cruz River Groundwater study to develop detailed plans and a specific project recommendation.

The conferees are aware that subsidence of ground surface is occurring in areas of Arizona and are equally concerned about the need to conserve water in the State. They are also aware of the successful multipurpose Indian Bend Wash Project and the 1981 Phoenix Urban Study which found that "artificial groundwater recharge appears to be a feasible method of achieving water conservation," and are interested in determining the impact of artificial groundwater recharge on ground subsidence. Therefore, the conferees direct that the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the U.S. Corps of Engineers as builders of the Indian Bend Wash Flood Control Project, include the Scottsdale, Maricopa County, Arizona area as part of its evaluation under the Phase I provisions of the Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Program authorized by Public Law 98-434, and that funds be made available for such evaluation from the General Investigations account.

The funds are to be allocated as shown in the following table:

Project title	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
ARIZONA		
Pima County/Santa Cruz ground water project		100,000
Spring Canyon pumped storage project	240,000	240,000
CALIFORNIA		
All American Canal relocation	300,000	300,000
Cental Valley:		
Delta Division, Kellogg Unit reformulation	68,000	68,000
Fish and wildlife management study	487,000	487,000
San Joaquin Valley conveyance study	743,000	743,000
Cross delta constriction investigation	250,000	250,000
Delta support studies	322,000	322,000
Imperial Irrigation District canal lining and system improvement	200,000	200,000
Lower Colorado water supply project	160,000	160,000
Offstream storage	150,000	150,000
Refuge water supply	80,000	80,,000
COLORADO		
Colorado-Big Thompson Powerplant	140,000	140,000
CRWQIP, Lower Gunnison Basin Unit	220,000	220,000
High Mountain aquifer study	100,000	100,000
Mesa-Delta M&I groundwater study	515,000	515,000
Program related engineering and scientific studies	4,900,000	4,900,000
IDAHO		
Oakley FAN groundwater & recharge investigation	150,000	150,000
Minidoka project, North Side Pumping Division exten	50,000	50,000
Minidoka project, North Side Pumping Division exten	225,000	225,000
KANSAS		
Kansas River basin water operations study	115,000	115,000
MONTANA		
Milk River Water Supply Unit (P-SMBP) (formerly Marias-MLK Unit) (P-SMBP)	140,000	140,000
NEBRASKA		
Loup River Basin study		100,000
Platte River water use options (P-SMBP)	77,000	77,000
Prairie Bend Unit (P-SMBP)	245,000	245,000
NEVADA		
Deep-carbonate aquifer	750,000	750,000
NEW MEXICO		
Alamogordo M&I water supply study	200,000	200,000
Gallup-Navajo Indian water supply project		200,000
Pojoaque Valley conjunctive ground water/surface water management study		150,000
Taos community ditch evaluation	30,000	30,000
OKLAHOMA		
East Central Oklahoma water supply study	200,000	300,000
Kiamichi hydropower study	225,000	300,000
Northwest Oklahoma water supply study	185,000	185,000
Southeast Oklahoma water supply study	240,000	300,000
OREGON		
Umatilla Basin project	125,000	250,000
Umpqua River Basin water resources management invest	170,000	170,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
Central South Dakota water supply system (CENDAK)	1,775,000	1,775,000
South Dakota water deliveries study (P-SMBP)	50,000	50,000
TEXAS		
Texas Basin, Bedias project	395,000	395,000
Texas Basin, Texas Big Sandy project	320,000	320,000
Texas Basin, Colorado coastal plains project	600,000	600,000
Texas Basin, San Jacinto project	275,000	275,000
UTAH		
CRSP power peaking capacity	50,000	50,000
Wasatch Front total water management	240,000	240,000
WASHINGTON		
Yakima River Basin water enhancement project	277,000	277,000
WYOMING		
Blue Holes Reservoir	150,000	150,000
CRWQIP, Big Sandy River Unit	1,000,000	1,000,000
Westside irrigation project	100,000	100,000
VARIOUS		
Colorado River water quality improvement program	4,195,000	4,195,000
CRWQIP, San Juan River Unit	223,000	223,000
General engineering and research: Atmospheric water resources management program	5,000,000	6,100,000
Groundwater recharge demonstration program	325,000	500,000
Special investigations:		
Environmental and interagency coord. activities	3,635,000	3,435,000
General planning studies	420,000	420,000
Investigations of existing projects	158,000	158,000
Minor work in connection with completed proj. invest	535,000	535,000
Technical assistance to States	1,500,000	1,500,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−1,175,000	−1,175,000
Pay amendment	593,000	
Total, general investigations	32,643,000	34,035,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $521,700,000 for construction program instead of $541,074,000 as proposed by the House and $512,730,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note that legislation to authorize the study program for long-term solutions to the drainage problems in the Central Valley of California for fiscal year 1986 is still awaiting enactment by the Congress. In addition, the California State Water Resources Control Board and the Secretary of the Interior have mandated strict schedules for the closure of Kesterson Reservoir. In order to respond to this immediate problem and to insure program continuity, the conferees urge that funds available to the Bureau of Reclamation be used for two purposes.

First, the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, is urged under the authority of the Act of October 15, 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1900), to execute a contract to loan up to $3,700,000 to a local government agency for the preparation of feasibility studies for alternative solutions to improve the quality of agricultural wastewater in the Central Valley of California. Such funds shall be repaid under such terms and conditions as prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. The studies should include: economic feasibility studies (including water trading and marketing opportunities); technical feasibility studies; pilot testing of selenium removal; and, economic feasibility studies and pilot testing of deep well injection and solar pond brine management. Second, funds are made available to the Bureau of Reclamation for the continuation of existing studies under the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program at the present level (FY 1985) of effort. New study initiatives are to be deferred pending enactment of necessary authorizing legislation.

Funds are available to continue construction of the new starts included in P.L. 99-88 if the criteria set forth in that Public Law are met.

The conferees recognize the extraordinary efforts made by the State of Arizona to develop an upfront cost-sharing proposal for Plan 6 of the Central Arizona Project. The Arizona proposal represents one of the largest cost-sharing plans for a major water development project under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation to date. The conferees applaud the Arizona initiative and would encourage the department to carefully review the proposal and render a decision on the proposal as quickly as possible.

Safety problems associated with existing Federal dams in Arizona have continued for much too long. The conference agreement includes funds in the bill to initiate construction activities on two Salt River Dams and the conferees urge the Department to move as quickly as possible to correct safety deficiencies on these structures.

Last year the Secretary of the Interior was directed to proceed expeditiously with safety modifications to dams on the Salt River in Arizona. The conferees understand that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has the capability to perform these essential preconstruction activities pursuant to the Federal Reclamation Safety of Dams Act, Public Law 98-404, and have provided funding for this purpose. The conferees further direct that the Secretary of the Interior give priority in reprogramming funds to bring the funding levels for dam safety up to the Bureau of Reclamation's full capability in 1986.

Amendment No. 18: Provides that $144,950,000 shall be available for transfers to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund instead of $147,200,000 as proposed by the House and $141,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate relating to the Animas-LaPlata Participating Project, Colorado and New Mexico.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that not to exceed $20,000 shall be available to initiate a rehabilitation and betterment program with the Twin Falls Canal Company.

The funds are to be allocated as shown in the following table:

Project title	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS		
ARIZONA		
Headgate Rock hydroelectric project (BIA)	1,000,000	
CALIFORNIA		
Central Valley project:		
Sacrmento River Division	5,362,000	5,362,000
San Luis Unit	12,490,000	12,490,000
Auburn-Folson South Unit	3,500,000	3,500,000
Miscellaneous project programs	1,063,000	1,063,000

Project title	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
San Felipe Division	37,597,000	37,597,000
Trinity River Division		500,000
COLORADO		
Narrows Unit (P-SMBP)	500,000	500,000
Grand Valley Unit, title II, CRBSCP	3,505,000	3,505,000
Paradox Valley Unit, title II, CRBSCP	1,782,000	1,782,000
San Luis Valley project, closed basin division	9,785,000	9,785,000
NEBRASKA		
North Loop Division, P-SMBP	21,749,000	24,249,000
O'Neill Unit, P-SMBP	240,000	240,000
NEVADA		
Las Vegas Wash Unit, title II, CRBSCP	75,000	75,000
NEW MEXICO		
Brantley project	29,536,000	29,536,000
Velarde community ditch project	3,400,000	3,400,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
Garrison Diversion Unit, P-SMBP	41,300,000	41,300,000
OKLAHOMA		
Mcgee Creek project	6,645,000	6,645,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
Web rural water development project	18,525,000	18,525,000
TEXAS		
Nueces River project	4,834,000	4,834,000
WASHINGTON		
Chief Joseph Dam project, Oroville-Tonasket Unit	7,225,000	7,225,000
Columbia Basin project:		
Irrigation facilities	6,535,000	7,035,000
Third powerplant	12,894,000	12,894,000
Yakima fish passage & protective facilities	4,353,000	4,353,000
WYOMING		
Buffalo Bill Dam modification, P-SMBP	10,000,000	
VARIOUS		
Boulder Canyon project	1,430,000	1,430,000
Measures below Imperial Dam, title I, CRBSCP	22,000,000	22,000,000
Drainage and minor construction:		
Arbuckle project, Oklahoma	230,000	430,000
Boise project, Arrowrock Division, Idaho	300,000	300,000
Boise project, Payette Division, Idaho	230,000	230,000
Chief Joseph Dam, Manson Unit, WA	15,000	15,000
Colorado River Front Work Levee System, AR., CO., NV	17,371,000	17,371,000
Cultural resources activities	327,000	327,000
Fryingpan Arkansas project, Colorado	6,034,000	6,034,000
Gila project, Arizona-Calfirnonia	1,997,000	1,977,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California	1,822,000	1,822,000
Miscellaneous engineering services, Colorado	10,000	10,000
Mountain Park project, Oklahoma	200,000	200,000
Newlands project, Nevada	553,000	553,000
Palmetto Bend project, Texas	500,000	500,000
Units or divisions, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program:		
Bostwick Division, Nebraska	40,000	40,000
Canyon Ferry Unit, Montana	1,770,000	1,770,000
East Bench Unit, Montana	50,000	50,000
Farwell Unit, Nebraska	230,000	230,000
Oahe Unit, South Dakota	65,000	65,000
Owl Creek Unit, Wyoming	50,000	50,000
Riverton Unit, Wyoming	270,000	270,000
Recreation facilities at existing reservoirs	172,000	172,000
Robert B. Griffith water project, Nevada	350,000	350,000
Washita Basin project, Foss Dam, Oklahoma	100,000	100,000
Washoe project, California-Nevada	407,000	407,000
Subtotal, drainage and minor construction	33,093,000	33,293,000
Safety of dams programs:		
Fruitgrowers dam project, Colorado	1,325,000	1,325,000
Heart Butte Unit, Heart Buttie Dam, N. Dakota (P-SMBP)	960,000	960,000
Lewiston Orchards, Soldiers Meadow, Idaho	600,000	600,000
Minidona project, Jackson Lake Dam, Idaho-Wyoming	8,200,000	8,200,000
Navajo Unit, CRSP, Colorado-New Mexico	3,536,000	3,536,000
Rapid Valley Unit, Pactola Dam, South Dakota (P-SMBP)	5,300,000	5,300,000
Salt River project, Stewart Min, Dam, Arizona	600,000	600,000
Salt River project, Theodore Roosevelt Dam, Arizona		4,000,000
Seedskadee, Frontenelle Dam, CRSP, Wyoming	500,000	500,000
W.C. Austin project, Altus Dam, Oklahoma	400,000	400,000
Department dam safety program	450,000	450,000
Modification reports and reconsideration activity	6,164,000	6,164,000
Subtotal, safety of dams	28,035,000	32,035,000
Rehabilitation and betterment:		
Crooked River, Ochoco Irrig. District, Oregon	100,000	100,000
Okanogan project, Okanogan Irrigation District, WA	1,357,000	1,357,000
Salt River project, Roosevelt Wir, Consv. Dist., AR	100,000	100,000
Shoshone project, Heart Mountain Division, Wyoming	1,000,000	1,000,000
Strawberry Valley project, Utah	2,243,000	2,243,000
Sun River project, Ft. Shaw Divison, Montana	290,000	290,000
Uncompangre project, Colorado	660,000	660,000
Yakima project, Yakima-Tieton Irrgi. Dist., WA	1,160,000	1,160,000
Subtotal, rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	6,910,000	6,910,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	335,363,000	3322,063,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT		
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND		
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS		
COLORADO		
Dallas Creek project	5,604,000	5,604,000
Dolores project	24,440,000	24,440,000
UTAH		
Central Utah project, Bonneville Unit	62,304,000	62,304,000
Central Utah project, Jensen Unit	1,516,000	1,516,000
Central Utah project, Uintah Unit	250,000	250,000
Central Utah project, Upalco Unit	2,612,000	2,612,000
VARIOUS		
Drainage and minor construction: Units: Modifications & additions to completed facilities	686,000	686,000
Recreational and fish and wildlife facilities: Recreational facilities	4,570,000	4,570,000
Fish and wildlife facilities	1,155	1,155
Total, Colorado River storage project	103,137,000	103,137,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT		
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT		
ARIZONA		
Central Arizona project, non-Indian distr. systems	38,800,000	45,050,000
Central Arizona-water development (LCRBDF)	134,700,000	144,950,000
VARIOUS		
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−79,570,000	−89,500,000
Application of unobligated funds from Teton Dam claims		−14,000,000
Pay amendment	3,684,000	
Total, construction program	536,114,000	521,700,000

LOAN PROGRAM

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $39,315,000 for the loan program as proposed by the Senate instead of $42,515,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate amended to read as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$48,315,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that not to exceed $6,000,000 may be used for alterations to existing building No. 53 at the Denver Federal Center, Lakewood, Colorado.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which establishes a Working Capital Fund for the Bureau of Reclamation.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The summary table at the end of this section sets forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Department of Energy. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $1,989,671,000 for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities, instead of $1,947,836,000 as proposed by the House and $1,989,721,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Solar Building Energy Systems.—The conferees agree to provide $8,500,000 for solar building energy systems. No funds are available for technology transfer activities, as proposed by the Senate.

Photovoltaic Energy Systems.—The conferees agree to provide $47,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds are to be used to continue operation of the residential experiment stations. Of the amounts provided, $2,000,000 is to be used for the Austin, Texas, project and $1,000,000 is for the Massachusetts Photovoltaic Center.

Ocean Energy Systems.—The conference agreement makes sufficient funds available for the Department to conduct two simultaneous 50 kW apparatus tests under the PICHTR open-cycle project.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

Of the funds provided, a total of $1,700,000 is available for the zinc bromine battery research program. The conferees agree to include additional funding for electrochemistry research which is proposed by the Senate.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH

CIVILIAN NUCLEAR RESEARCH PROGRAM

The conferees direct the Department of Energy to submit a plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate identifying within two years an approach to future civilian nuclear reactor research which identifies research priorities, establishes a process for identifying the appropriate future reactor concepts and indicates funding requirements and objectives for the civilian nuclear reactor program.

Improved LWR Development.—The conferees agree to provide $3,000,000 for the extended burn-up program to close out the Federal involvement in the program.

Advanced Light Water Reactors.—The conferees include $4,750,000 for the Department to utilize in support of the EPRI/Industry Advanced Light Water Reactor Program. This amount is available to the Department to be matched by industry on a 50% cost-shared basis for specific technical studies and component verification and analysis relating to the ALWR program.

High Temperature Gas Reactors.—The conferees agree to provide $31,000,000 for high temperature gas reactor research.

Advanced Breeder Reactor Technology.—The conferees agree to provide $159,800,000 for advanced breeder reactor technology, as follows: $6,000,000 additional for reactor operations at Hanford and $6,000,000 additional at Idaho.

Funds are provided for continuation of the test program for the integral fast reactor, including pre-prototype irradiation test bundles and exploration of reprocessing technology. Not less than 50% of additional funds are to be made available only to Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois.

Advanced Nuclear Systems.—The conferees agree to provide $23,000,000 for advanced nuclear systems, to include: $1,900,000 for thermionics research;

31-929 O-86-17 (Pt. 19)

$3,100,000 for other RTG research. Additional funds may be available for the Secure Military Power Project, contingent upon commitment by the Air Force to offset full research and development costs should a decision be made to produce SMPP units.

Defense Nuclear Energy Program.—The conferees agree to provide the budget request for the SP-100 program.

Civilian By-Products and Beneficial Uses.—The conferees agree to provide $5,000,000 as provided by the House. In addition, the Department shall continue initial planning for pork irradiation demonstration in conjunction with Iowa State University.

Remedial Actions.—The conferees agree to provide $95,000,000 for uranium mill tailings remedial action. Full funding at the requested level is included for sites and vicinity properties with completed remedial action plans including Cannonsburg, Salt Lake City, Shiprock and Lakeview.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The conferees agree to provide $383,000,000 for the magnetic fusion program. A panel reporting to the Magnetic Fusion Advisory Committee recently found that ". . . increased emphasis should be given to improving the mass power density in the various concept lines, aiming at a target of 100 kWe/Tonne." In accepting this finding, the Magnetic Fusion Advisory Committee noted that mass power density is a useful index of progress toward a practical application of fusion when combined with plasma confinement efficiency, safety and environmental considerations, and the projected cost of electricity. The conferees request the Department to provide, in conjunction with the FY 1987 budget request, a report showing the progress and potential of the major elements of the current research programs as measured by these factors. No funds are available for development of a generic test facility for compact high-density devices.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

Cooperative Programs.—The Department is directed to allocate not less than $1,500,000 to maintain and support the relationship between the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Foundation and Jackson State University, as identified in the House and Senate reports.

Materials Sciences.—The conferees agree to provide $5,000,000 for preconstruction R&D activities for both 2 GeV and 6 GeV synchrotron radiation facilities. The conferees agree that the addition of these funds does not represent a commitment to construct these facilities.

Chemical Sciences.—The conferees agree to provide an additional $3,000,000 for chemical sciences with the understanding that these funds are not available to establish a center for chemical sciences.

University Research Support.—The conferees agree with the Senate report language and provide $2,900,000 for LEU fuel assistance to universities.

USE OF AVAILABLE BALANCES

Both the House and the Senate provided for the use of prior year balances to offset the requirement for new obligational authority. The conferees agree that $17,822,000 of available funds should be applied to offset pay increases provided for by budget amendment.

The Administration's original FY 1986 budget request assumed a five percent reduction in salary expenses. As contained in House Document 99-89, the Administration has amended the FY 1986 request and increased the budget for the Department of Energy accounts contained in this bill by $17,892,000.

Of this request, $17,822,000 is included in the Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities appropriation. Using the provisions of Section 302 of this bill, the Department of Energy is directed to transfer without further notification to the Congress these funds to the following Department of energy appropriations:

Atomic Energy Defense Activities	$5,500,000
General Science and Research Activities	79,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	3,284,000
Alaska Power Administration	40,000
Southwestern Power Administration	246,000
Western Area Power Administration	1,412,000
Departmental Administration	5,415,000
Geothermal Resources Development Fund	4,000

The $70,000 required by the Southeastern Power Administration should be financed from available prior year unobligated appropriations.

Amendment No. 26: Restores House language amended by the Senate, amended to provide that $200,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from prior year balances in Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities as proposed by the House instead of $92,600,000 as proposed by the Senate and transfers $17,400,000 from Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration as proposed by the House and Senate. In addition, the following scientific research facilities are to be funded from within the Energy Supply, Research, and Development Activities account, as follows:

Center for Science and Technology	$4,500,000
Center for Energy and Biomedical Technology	6,000,000
Energy and Mineral Research Center	8,000,000
Demonstration Center for Information Technologies	5,000,000
Advanced Science Center	8,500,000

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 27: Inserts language proposed by the Senate changing the designation of statutory limitation as a technical correction to the House language.

The conferees agree that the Department should proceed as expeditiously as possible to demonstrate the economic and technical feasibility of the AVLIS uranium enrichment technology. The table that appears at the end of this section allocates funds in a manner that will permit prototype development deployment and testing in a manner that would permit early deployment of the advanced technology at such time as it has satisfactorily demonstrated its economic, scientific and technical viability.

Neither the House nor the Senate addressed the Administration proposal to repay appropriations made to the uranium enrichment program in prior years because the authorizing committees had not considered the proposal at the time the bills were considered by the respective bodies. However, sufficient funds are available within the $1,612,700,000 in budget authority provided in this Act to meet the estimated $110,000,000 first-year repayment if necessary authorization action is completed. The conferees have no obligation to the use of these funds for this purpose.

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $691,400,000 as proposed by the House instead of $685,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree that $2,000,000 is provided from within the total General Science and Research Activities appropriation for project 86-R-105, AGS proton-heavy ion booster, Brookhaven National Laboratory, to upgrade the alternating gradient synchrotron facility. The conferees agree that the addition of these funds does not represent a commitment to a larger high energy physics facility at the Brookhaven National Laboratory.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $521,460,000 as proposed by the House instead of $552,460,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are aware that the States of Washington and Oregon are interested in a joint review of the proposed Hanford high level nuclear waste facility. Because the proposed Hanford site is on the Columbia River, which borders the State of Oregon for such a long distance and has such an important impact on commerce and industry of the State, the conferees support this joint approach. The conferees support the State request for funds to contract with Oregon to study those issues which relate to the Columbia River.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 30: Deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring preparation of a report on recent development in the United States' capabilities to monitor a comprehensive nuclear test ban agreement.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $7,604,615,000 for Atomic Energy Defense Activities instead of $7,593,415,000 as proposed by the House and $7,647,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

From within the funds provided, $1,000,000 is available for engineering design of the experimental halls for the weapons neutron research-proton storage ring at Los Alamos. Any future requests for funding of this activity should be included in the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation.

INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION

The conferees recommend funding the Inertial Confinement Fusion program as a separate category with $145,000,000 for operating expenses and $10,000,000 for capital equipment.

From within the allowance, the conferees agree with the House and Senate position that $13,800,000 should be available for the KMS Fusion program and $7,800,000 for the program at the University of Rochester. Pending the completion of an ongoing review of the ICF program by the Technical Review Panel, the conferees have not provided an allocation of the remaining operating expenses among the major subprograms. The Secretary of Energy is directed to provide his plan, rationale and distribution of the ICF funds within 30 days of enactment of this legislation.

The conferees request the Technical Review Panel on ICF to review the chroma laser upgrade proposed for the KMS Fusion Facility and provide their findings to the

Department of Energy by January 1986. If this review concludes that the chroma laser upgrade is cost effective, then the conferees recommend that the Secretary of Energy fund the proposal from funds available in the Atomic Energy Defense Activities appropriation.

PRODUCTION AND SURVEILLANCE

The conferees agree to provide $5,000,000 for Project 86-D-130, Tritium loading facility. The recommendation would defer initiation of construction pending the completion of the design to provide a better estimate of scope and total cost of the facility.

The conferees agree to provide the $15,000,000 requested in the budget for facilities to produce the non-ER warhead, W82, for the 155 mm nuclear projectile in strict conformance with the restrictions imposed by Section 1635 of Public Law 98-525.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The conferees agree to $4,000,000 for design and engineering for project 86-D-148. However, prior to the obligation of funds for this project the Department should conduct a 120-day process readiness review of the competing Special Isotope Separation (SIS) processes. The process readiness review should be conducted by a competent panel of experts in the fields of production plant operations and engineering design. The process selected should be the most likely for technical success and have the lowest operating and capital costs. If upon completion of the review, the panel agrees that a technology is ready for plant scale implementation, design of the project shall commence utilizing the selected technology.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The FY 1986 funding for byproducts and beneficial use activities and Defense Nuclear Energy programs are provided in the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: , *of which $97,325,000 shall be available for verification and control technology*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 33: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate approving expenditures for the White River Falls Fish Passage Facilities.

Conservation Program.—The conferees agree to the funding and direction of the BPA conservation program as proposed by the Senate.

Borrowing authority.—In addition to the cumulative $2,003,000,000 available to BPA through fiscal year 1985, the conferees recommend an additional increment of $301,000,000 in borrowing authority in fiscal year 1986 for the construction, conservation, and fish and wildlife programs for a total of $2,304,000,000, including any unused portion from prior years.

Transmission system.—The conferees understand that scheduling difficulties may occur in relation to timely completion of the dc terminal expansion project. It may not be possible for BPA and the participating utilities to complete all fiscal year 1985 procurement actions as originally scheduled. The conferees are highly supportive of this project and wish it to proceed expeditiously.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

Notwithstanding provisions of Title 5, U.S.C., except for Sec. 5308, no funds approved for Western Area Power Administration shall be used to pay the rates of basic pay and premium pay for power system dispatchers unless such rates are based on those prevailing for similar occupations in the electric power industry.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference language restricts the House proposed language by maintaining the existing Federal salary ceiling and limiting the proposal to the Western Area Power Administration.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $95,568,000 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Salaries and Expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $93,068,000, as proposed by the House, and deletes earmarking of $2,750,000 for cumulative impact assessment studies, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Provides $29,491,000 as a final net appropriation as proposed by the Senate instead of $26,991,000 as proposed by the House.

An additional $3,284,000 related to the pay amendment is provided for and discussed in an earlier section of this Joint Explanatory Statement and shall be made available to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Amendment No. 37: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate relating to technology transfer activities.

Amendment No. 38: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate relating to purchase of extra high voltage electrical equipment.

	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Energy supply research and development		
Solar Energy		
I. Solar applications:		
A. Solar building energy systems:		
Operating expenses	9,000,000	8,000,000
Capital equipment	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, solar building energy systems	9,500,000	8,500,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems:		
Operating expenses	43,600,000	47,800,000
Capital equipment	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	44,800,000	49,000,000
C. Solar thermal energy systems:		
Operating expenses	28,100,000	26,600,000
Capital equipment	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	28,400,000	26,900,000
D. Biofuels energy systems:		
Operating expenses	27,800,000	27,800,000
Capital equipment	600,000	600,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	28,400,000	28,400,000
E. Wind energy systems:		
Operating expenses	20,000,000	13,000,000
MOD-5		12,000,000
Capital equipment	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	20,800,000	25,800,000
F. Ocean energy systems:		
Operating expenses	3,500,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	135,400,000	143,600,000
(Operating expenses)	(132,000,000)	(140,200,000)
(Plant and capital)	(3,400,000)	(3,400,000)
II. Other solar energy:		
A. International solar energy program—OE		1,000,000
B. Solar technology transfer:		
Operating expenses	3,100,000	3,100,000
D. Solar Energy Research Institute:		
Capital equipment	261,000	261,000
Construction: General plant projects	2,071,000	2,071,000
Subtotal: Solar Energy Research Institute	2,332,000	2,332,000
F. Resource assessment:		
Operating expenses	950,000	950,000
Capital equipment	50,000	50,000
Subtotal: Resource assessment	1,000,000	1,000,000
G. Program support—OE	1,300,000	1,300,000
H. Program direction—OE	4,900,000	4,900,000
Subtotal: other solar energy	12,632,000	13,632,000
Total, solar energy	148,032,000	157,232,000
(Operating expenses)	(142,250,000)	(151,450,000)
(Plant and capital)	(5,782,000)	(5,782,000)
GEOTHERMAL		
I. Hydrothermal industrialization:		
Operating expenses		2,000,000
II. Geopressured resources:		
Operating expenses	3,600,000	4,600,000
III. Geothermal technology development:		
Operating expenses	20,300,000	20,300,000
Capital equipment	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	20,800,000	20,800,000
V. Program direction—OE	800,000	800,000
Total, geothermal	25,200,000	28,200,000
(Operating expenses)	(24,700,000)	(27,700,000)
(Plant and capital)	(500,000)	(500,000)
HYDROPOWER		
I. Small scale hydropower development—OE	453,000	453,000
III. Program direction—OE	47,000	47,000
Total, hydropower	500,000	500,000
Electric Energy Systems and Storage		
I. Electric energy systems:		
A. Electric field effects research: Operating expenses	3,000,000	3,000,000
B. Reliability research: Operating expenses	3,000,000	3,000,000
C. System technology: Operating expenses	3,630,000	5,630,000
D. Program direction—OE	370,000	370,000
Subtotal, electric energy systems	10,000,000	12,000,000
II. Energy Storage Systems:		
A. Battery storage		
Operating expenses	12,500,000	14,500,000
Capital equipment	200,000	200,000
Subtotal: Battery storage	12,700,000	14,700,000
B. Thermal and mechanical storage: Operating expenses	3,060,000	3,060,000
C. Program direction—OE	340,000	340,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	16,100,000	18,100,000
Total, electric energy systems and storage	26,100,000	30,100,000
(Operating expenses)	(25,900,000)	(29,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(200,000)	(200,000)
Nuclear		
II. Improved light water reactor technology:		
A. Improved LWR Development	21,000,000	13,000,000

	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
B. Three Mile Island R&D: Operating expenses	32,300,000	32,300,000
Subtotal, Improved light water reactor tech	53,300,000	45,300,000
III. Advanced converter reactor technology:		
A. Advanced light water reactor (LWR)	8,000,000	4,750,000
B. Advanced high temperature gas reactor (HTGR):		
Operating expenses	25,000,000	31,000,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced high temperature gas reactor	26,000,000	32,000,000
C. Liquid metal converter reactor:		
Operating expenses	70,000,000	70,000,000
Capital equipment	200,000	200,000
Construction, 86-N-101 Mods to reactors	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, liquid metal converter reactor	71,200,000	71,200,000
Subtotal, advanced converter reactor tech	105,200,000	107,950,000
IV. Advanced breeder reactor technology:		
A. Breeder component technology	6,700,000	6,700,000
B. Fuel performance and supply:		
Operating expense	15,900,000	22,900,000
Capital equipment	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, fuel performance and supply	17,900,000	24,900,000
C. Reactor core technology:		
Operating expenses	4,900,000	4,900,000
Capital equipment	2,320,000	2,320,000
Subtotal, reactor core technology	7,220,000	7,220,000
D. Test facilities:		
Operating expenses	86,200,000	98,200,000
Capital equipment	4,480,000	4,480,000
Construction: 86-N-102 GPP	1,800,000	1,800,000
Subtotal, test facilities	92,480,000	104,480,000
E. Nuclear fuel cycle: Operating expenses	17,000,000	16,500,000
Subtotal, advanced breeder reactor technology:	141,300,000	159,800,000
V. Water cooled breeder reactor technology:		
A. Defueling	5,100,000	5,100,000
B. Core evaluation	14,600,000	14,600,000
Subtotal: water cooled breeder reactor tech	19,700,000	19,700,000
VI. Civilian reactor development:		
A. Reactor development generic support	11,250,000	2,625,000
B. Safeguards and security:		
Operating expenses	5,750,000	5,750,000
Construction: 85-N-602 ANL-WEST Phys. security upgrade	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, safeguards and security	6,650,000	6,650,000
C. Reduced enrichment res. and test reactors	5,200,000	5,200,000
D. Program direction	7,400,000	7,400,000
Subtotal, civilian reactor development	30,500,000	21,875,000
VII. Advanced nuclear systems:		
A. Space and special applications:		
Operating expenses	17,455,000	20,455,000
Capital equipment	1,700,000	1,700,000
Subtotal, Space and special applications	19,155,000	22,155,000
B. Program direction—OE	845,000	845,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	20,000,000	23,000,000
VIII. Defense nuclear energy program		
A. Space reactor project:		
Operating Expenses	12,610,000	12,610,000
Construction: 86-N-105 SP-100 facility modification, site undetermined	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, space reactor project	14,610,000	14,610,000
B. Terrestrial applications	2,500,000	2,500,000
C. Program direction	390,000	390,000
D. Capital equipment	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Defense nuclear energy system	19,500,000	19,500,000
(Operating expenses)	(15,500,000)	(15,500,000)
(Plant and capital)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)
IX. Nuclear waste technology:		
I. Low level waste:		
Operating expenses	4,650,000	4,650,000
Capital equipment	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Low level waste	4,750,000	4,750,000
2. Waste treatment technology:		
Operating expenses	6,000,000	6,000,000
Capital equipment	450,000	450,000
Subtotal, waste treatment technology	6,450,000	6,450,000
3. Civilian byproducts and beneficial uses		5,000,000
4. Program direction—OE	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, nuclear waste technology	11,700,000	16,700,000
X. Civilian waste R&D:		
A. Spent Fuel Storage R&D:		
Operating expenses	7,800,000	7,800,000
Capital equipment	1,100,000	1,100,000
Subtotal, spent fuel storage R&D	8,900,000	8,900,000
B. Alternative disposal concepts:		
Operating expenses	10,500,000	5,500,000
Capital equipment	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, alternative disposal concepts	12,500,000	7,500,000
C. Generic methods & supporting studies: Operating expenses	1,650,000	
E. Program direction	325,000	325,000
Subtotal, civilian waste R&D	23,375,000	16,725,000
XI. Remedial actions		
1. Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities:		
Operating expenses	38,850,000	41,350,000
Capital equipment	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, management, of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities	39,000,000	41,500,000
2. Formerly utilized sites remedial action program:		
Operating expenses	17,500,000	19,500,000
Capital Equipment	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, formerly utilized sites remedial action program	17,700,000	19,700,000
3. Grand Junction remedial action OE	900,000	900,000
4. Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program:		
Operating expenses	109,000,000	94,000,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, uranium program mill tailings remedial action program	110,000,000	95,000,000
5. West Valley: Operating expenses	64,000,000	64,000,000
7. Program direction—OE	1,400,000	1,400,000
Subtotal, remedial actions	233,000,000	222,500,000
Total, Nuclear	657,575,000	653,050,000
(Operating expenses)	(633,175,000)	(628,650,000)
(Plant and capital)	(24,400,000)	(24,400,000)
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
I. Environment, safety and health:		
Operating expenses	39,866,000	39,866,000
Capital equipment	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total, Environment safety and health	41,366,000	41,366,000
ENVIRONMENT R&D		
I. Biological and environment research:		
Operating expenses	171,700,000	174,700,000
Capital equipment	7,750,000	7,750,000
Construction:		
86-R-120 GPP	3,250,000	3,250,000
General reduction		-1,000,000
Subtotal, biological and environ, research	182,700,000	184,700,000
II. Program direction—OE:		
A. Bio and env. research—PD	3,600,000	3,600,000
Total, Environment R&D	186,300,000	188,300,000
(Operating expenses)	(175,300,000)	(178,300,000)
(Plant and capital)	(11,000,000)	(10,000,000)
FUSION		
I. Magnetic fusion:		
A. Confinement systems:		
Operating expenses	184,900,000	184,900,000
Capital equipment	15,100,000	15,100,000
Subtotal, confinement systems	200,000,000	200,000,000
B. Development and technology:		
Operating expenses	62,500,000	62,500,000
Capital equipment	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Development and technology	67,500,000	67,500,000
C. Applied plasma physics:		
Operating expenses	78,100,000	78,100,000
Capital equipment	6,400,000	6,400,000
Subtotal, Applied plasma physics	84,500,000	84,500,000
D. Planning and project:		
Operating expenses	16,900,000	16,900,000
Capital equipment	3,950,000	3,950,000
Construction:		
86-R-GPP	9,108,000	9,108,000
78-3-A Mirror fusion test facility	4,042,000	4,042,000
Subtotal, construction	13,150,000	13,150,000
Subtotal, planning and projects	34,000,000	34,000,000
F. Program direction—OE	4,000,000	4,000,000
General reduction		-8,000,000
Total, fusion	390,000,000	382,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(346,400,000)	(338,400,000)
(Plant and capital)	(43,600,000)	(43,600,000)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS		
1. Basic energy sciences:		
A. Nuclear sciences:		
Operating expenses	43,338,000	43,338,000
Capital equipment	2,754,000	2,754,000
Construction:		
86-R-401 A I P	1,200,000	1,200,000
86-R-400 GPP	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, nuclear sciences:	47,392,000	47,392,000
B. Materials sciences:		
Operating expenses	138,496,000	140,496,000
Capital equipment	15,450,000	12,450,000
Construction:		
86-R-300 Atlanta University Center for Science and Technology		4,500,000
86-R-401 GPP	1,795,000	1,795,000
85-ER-133 Advanced Science Center University of Oregon		8,500,000
84-ER-111 N S L S	7,200,000	7,200,000
84-ER-112 Center for advanced material	17,440,000	11,440,000
84-ER-113 SSRL enhancement	2,560,000	2,560,000
84-ER-115 Natl center for chemical research		8,000,000
Subtotal, construction	28,995,000	43,995,000
Subtotal, materials sciences	182,941,000	196,941,000
C. Chemical sciences:		
Operating expenses	79,495,000	81,495,000
Capital equipment	8,840,000	8,840,000
Construction:		
86-R-400 GPP	3,930,000	3,930,000
85-ER-403 Kansas State Univ	1,900,000	1,900,000
Subtotal, construction	5,830,000	5,830,000
Subtotal, chemical sciences	94,165,000	96,165,000

	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
D. Applied mathematical sciences:		
Operating expenses	28,020,000	39,520,000
Capital equipment	1,070,000	1,070,000
Construction: Information technologies		5,000,000
Subtotal, applied mathematical sciences	29,090,000	45,590,000
E. Engineering and geosciences:		
Operating expenses	26,675,000	26,675,000
Capital equipment	1,500,000	1,500,000
Construction: 86-R- Energy and mineral research center		8,000,000
Subtotal, engineering and geosciences	28,175,000	36,175,000
F. Advanced energy projects:		
Operating expenses	10,602,000	7,602,000
Capital equipment	320,000	320,000
Subtotal, advanced energy projects	10,922,000	7,922,000
G. Biological energy research:		
Operating expenses	12,455,000	12,455,000
Capital equipment	560,000	560,000
Construction: 86-R302 Center for Energy and Biomedical Technology		6,000,000
Subtotal, biological energy research	13,015,000	19,015,000
H. Program direction—OE	4,100,000	4,100,000
Subtotal, basic energy sciences	409,800,000	453,300,000
(Operating expenses)	(343,181,000)	(355,681,000)
(Plant and capital)	(66,619,000)	(97,619,000)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. and Univ support:		
A. Energy research analysis—OE: 1. Assessment projects	2,700,000	2,700,000
B. University research support—OE:		
2. University reactor fuel assistance	1,900,000	3,900,000
3. University laboratory coop. program	6,800,000	6,800,000
5. Energy manpower assessment program	450,000	450,000
6. Education and training	550,000	550,000
General reduction		−1,000,000
Subtotal, University research support—OE	9,700,000	10,700,000
C. Advisory and oversight—OE	2,900,000	2,900,000
D. University research instrumentation	4,500,000	6,500,000
Subtotal, energy oversight, res analy. and Univ sup	19,800,000	22,800,000
III. Multiprogram laboratories facilities support:		
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities:		
Construction:		
86-R-726 Fire protection improvements (BNL)	500,000	500,000
85-R-701 Central chilled water facility (BNL)	7,100,000	7,100,000
85-R-702 Replace laboratory roofs (ANL)	3,100,000	3,100,000
85-R-703 Electrical dist. system restoration	1,400,000	
85-R-706 Medical facility (LLNL)	2,800,000	2,800,000
85-R-707 Hanford site fire alarm system upgrade	3,550,000	1,775,000
85-R-709 Central chilled water plant (ANL)	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-R-711 Upgrade envir. monitoring system (OR)	2,500,000	2,500,000
85-R-712 Central chilled water system restor	2,200,000	1,100,000
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)	4,400,000	3,400,000
80-ES-11 Idaho Lab Facility (INEL)	750,000	750,000
Subtotal, construction	29,300,000	24,025,000
B. Environmental compliance:		
Operation expenses	12,900,000	10,400,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction:		
86-R-800 GPP	5,000,000	4,000,000
86-R-801 Nonradiological process waste treat	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, construction	8,000,000	7,000,000
Subtotal, Environmental compliance	21,900,000	18,400,000
Subtotal, multiprogram lab facilities support	51,200,000	42,425,000
(Operating expenses)	(12,900,000)	(10,400,000)
(Plant and capital)	(38,300,000)	(32,025,000)
Total, Supporting research and tech. analysis	480,800,000	518,525,000
(Operating expenses)	(375,881,000)	(388,881,000)
(Plant and capital)	(104,919,000)	(129,644,000)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT		
I. Policy and Management:		
A. Policy and management—OE—ER	500,000	500,000
B. Policy and management—OE-NE	1,800,000	1,800,000
D. Policy and management—CRE	1,800,000	1,800,000
E. Policy and management—PS&E	798,000	798,000
Subtotal, policy and management	4,898,000	4,898,000
ENERGY APPLICATION		
Technical Information & Management Program:		
Operating expenses	9,200,000	9,200,000
Capital equipment	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Technical Information & Management Program	10,000,000	10,000,000
II. In-house energy management: Operating expenses	2,000,000	2,000,000
Construction:		
86-A-601 Modification for energy management	15,000,000	5,000,000
86-A-602 Solid waste fired boiler (LANCL)	1,800,000	1,800,000
86-A-603 Energy monitoring and control system	1,700,000	1,700,000
86-A-604 Waste heat recovery (INL)	900,000	900,000
85-A-602 Fuel storage facility, BNL	1,500,000	1,500,000
85-A-604 Combustion air preheaters, energy tech	1,900,000	1,900,000
85-A-606 Cogeneration facility, BNL	10,600,000	5,300,000
General reduction		−5,000,000
Subtotal, construction	33,400,000	13,100,000
Subtotal, in-house energy management	35,400,000	15,100,000
(Operating expenses)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
(Plant and capital)	(33,400,000)	(13,100,000)
Subtotal, Energy applications	45,400,000	25,100,000
(Operating expenses)	(11,200,000)	(11,200,000)
(Plant and capital)	(34,200,000)	(13,900,000)
Subtotal, energy supply research and development	2,006,171,000	2,029,271,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,780,070,000)	(1,799,745,000)
(Plant and capital)	(226,101,000)	(229,526,000)
Adjustments:		
General reduction		−22,600,000
Savings from management initiatives	−17,000,000	−17,000,000
Use of prior year balances	−20,000,000	−217,400,000
Pay amendment	1,842,000	
Total, energy supply research and development	1,971,013,000	1,772,271,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,744,912,000)	(1,565,345,000)
(Plant and capital)	(226,101,000)	(229,526,000)
(General reduction)		(−22,600,000
URANIUM ENRICHMENT		
I. Uranium enrichment activities:		
A. Gaseous diffusion and operations support:		
Operating expenses	1,084,600,000	1,084,600,000
Capital equipment	14,500,000	14,500,000
Construction:		
86-N-501 General plant projects	14,000,000	14,000,000
84-N-404 Power systems protection impr	1,200,000	1,200,000
84-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase III	2,200,000	2,200,000
83-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase II, gas, dif. plant	1,800,000	1,800,000
Subtotal, Construction	19,200,000	19,200,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and support	1,118,300,000	1,118,300,000
B. Enrichment research and development:		
1. Gas centrifuge operations and support: Operating expenses	72,000,000	18,000,000
2. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation:		
Operating expenses	69,800,000	114,000,000
Capital equipment	7,700,000	15,000,000
Construction: 85-N-501 General plant projects, var. locs	500,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation	78,000,000	132,000,000
Subtotal, Enrichment R&D	150,000,000	150,000,000
C. Gas centrifuge enrichment plant:		
Operating expenses	340,000,000	
Construction: 76-8-G Enriched Uranium production facility, Portsmouth, OH		340,000,000
Subtotal, Gas centrifuge enrichment plant	340,000,000	340,000,000
D. Program direction—OE	4,400,000	4,400,000
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities	1,612,700,000	1,612,700,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,570,800,000)	(1,221,000,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(41,900,000)	(391,700,000)
III. Offsetting revenues:		
Operating expenses	−1,579,000,000	−1,579,000,000
Capital equipment	−14,500,000	−14,500,000
Construction	−19,200,000	−19,200,000
Subtotal, Total revenues	−1,612,700,000	−1,612,700,000
Total, uranium enrichment		
(Operating expenses)	(1,570,800,000)	(1,221,000,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(41,900,000)	(391,700,000)
(Gross revenues)	(−1,612,700,000)	(−1,612,700,000)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH		
I. High energy physics:		
A. Physics research: Operating expenses	111,300,000	111,300,000
B. Facility operations:		
Operating expenses	187,800,000	187,800,000
Capital equipment	59,200,000	69,200,000
Construction:		
86-R-102 AIP	10,500,000	10,500,000
86-R-103 GPP	10,400,000	10,400,000
86-R-104 Central computer (FERMI)	3,100,000	3,100,000
84-ER-133 SLAC linear collider (SLC)	22,900,000	22,900,000
81-E-218 Tevatron I	8,600,000	8,600,000
Subtotal, Construction	55,500,000	55,500,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	302,500,000	312,500,000
C. High energy technology: Operating expenses	92,400,000	92,400,000
D. Other capital equipment—CE	3,900,000	3,900,000
Subtotal, High energy physics	510,100,000	520,100,000
(Operating expenses)	(391,500,000)	(391,500,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(118,600,000)	(128,600,000)
II. Nuclear physics:		
A. Medium energy physics: Operating expense	76,450,000	76,450,000
B. Heavy ion physics: Operating expenses	52,650,000	52,650,000
C. Low energy nuclear physics: Operating expenses	13,400,000	13,400,000
D. Nuclear theory: Operating expenses	9,400,000	9,400,000
E. Capital equipment	13,200,000	13,200,000
F. Construction:		
86-R-AIP	3,500,000	3,500,000
86-R-GPP	3,500,000	3,500,000
Subtotal Construction	7,000,000	7,000,000
G. Other capital equipment—CE	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	172,900,000	172,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(151,900,000)	(151,900,000)

	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
(Plant and Capital)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)
III. General Science program direction—OE	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, general science and research	685,400,000	695,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(545,800,000)	(545,800,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(139,600,000)	(149,600,000)
Adjustments:		
Transfer of appropriation		−6,000,000
General reduction		−4,000,000
Pay amendment	79,000	
Total, Adjustments	79,000	−10,000,000
Total, general science and research	685,479,000	685,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(545,879,000)	(535,800,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(139,600,000)	(149,600,000)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
I. Weapons activities:		
A. Research and development:		
1. Research and development:		
Operating expenses	920,300,000	840,300,000
Capital equipment	91,450,000	86,450,000
Construction:		
86–D–101 general plant projects, various locations	22,200,000	20,200,000
86–D–103 decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL	1,000,000	3,700,000
86–D–104 strategic defenses facility, SNLA	8,000,000	2,000,000
86–D–105 instrumentation systems lab, SNLA		3,100,000
86–D–106 Laboratory Data Communications Center, LANL		1,000,000
85–D–102 nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facs revitalization, phase I, various locations	81,600,000	35,400,000
85–D–103 safeguards and security enhancements, LLNL and SNLL	27,900,000	16,400,000
85–D–106 hardened engineering test bldgs. LLNL	1,900,000	1,900,000
84–D–102 radiation-hardened integrated circuit lab, SNLA	15,500,000	15,500,000
84–D–104 nuclear materials storage facility, LANL, NM	12,100,000	12,100,000
84–D–105 safeguards and security upgrades, phase I, LANL, NM	7,500,000	7,500,000
84–D–106 security system upgrade, SNLA, NM	1,900,000	1,900,000
83–D–199 buffer land acquisition, LLNL and SNLL	10,000,000	10,000,000
82–D–144 simulation technology laboratory, SNLA	10,300,000	10,300,000
Subtotal, construction	199,900,000	141,000,000
Subtotal, research and development	1,211,650,000	1,067,750,000
2. Testing:		
Operating expenses	544,000,000	531,500,000
Capital equipment	50,000,000	45,000,000
Construction:		
86–D–101 general plant projects, various locations	7,700,000	7,700,000
85–D–105 combined device assembly fac, NTS, NV	40,000,000	7,000,000
84–D–107 nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations	14,900,000	12,900,000
Subtotal, construction	62,600,000	27,600,000
Subtotal, testing	656,600,000	604,100,000
Subtotal, research, development, and testing	1,868,250,000	1,671,850,000
B. Inertial confinement fusion:		
Operating expenses		145,000,000
Capital equipment		10,000,000
Subtotal, inertial confinement fusion		155,000,000
C. Production and surveillance:		
Operating expenses	1,942,400,000	1,858,000,000
Capital equipment	136,300,000	125,300,000
Construction:		
86–D–121 general plant projects, various locations	33,700,000	28,700,000
86–D–122 structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	3,000,000	3,000,000
86–D–123 environmental hazards eliminations, various locations	8,700,000	7,700,000
86–D–124 safeguards and site security upgrading, phase II, mound facility, Miamisburg, OH	3,000,000	2,000,000
86–D–125 safeguards and site security upgrade phase II, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,500,000	1,500,000
86–D–130 tritius loading facility replacement Savannah River, Aiken, SC	5,000,000	5,000,000
85–D–112 enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	15,300,000	13,300,000
85–D–113 plant power and steam dist system, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	18,500,000	13,500,000
85–D–115 renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats, CO	17,700,000	17,700,000
85–D–121 air and water pollution control facs, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	14,000,000	14,000,000
85–D–123 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	4,000,000	3,000,000
85–D–124 Safeguards and site security upgrades, Rocky Flats plant, Golden, CO	2,400,000	2,400,000
85–D–125 tactical bomb production facilities, various locations	16,000,000	9,000,000
84–D–112 Trident II warhead production facilities, various locations	60,700,000	60,700,000
84–D–113 antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead prod facs, var locations	16,000,000	5,000,000
84–D–115 electrical system expansion, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	6,300,000	6,300,000
84–D–117 inert assembly & test facility, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	5,400,000	5,400,000
84–D–118 high explosive subassembly facility, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	40,000,000	33,000,000
84–D–120 explosive component test facility, Mound plant, Miamisburg, OH	9,200,000	9,200,000
84–D–124 Environmental improvements, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	12,000,000	12,000,000
84–D–211 safeguards and site security upgrading, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	15,000,000	13,000,000
84–D–212 safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas plant, FL	5,650,000	4,650,000
82–D–107 utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, phase III, var locations	195,500,000	160,500,000
82–D–109 155mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP) prod facs, var locations	15,000,000	15,000,000
82–D–111 interactive graphics system, various locations	8,500,000	4,500,000
79–7–0 universal pilot plant, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	15,600,000	
Subtotal: construction	547,650,000	450,050,000
Subtotal: production and surveillance	2,626,350,000	2,433,350,000
D. Program direction:		
Operating expenses:		
1. Weapons program	49,855,000	49,855,000
3. Community assistance	48,845,000	48,845,000
Subtotal: program direction	98,700,000	98,700,000
Subtotal: weapons activities	4,593,300,000	4,358,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,505,400,000)	(3,473,500,000)
(Plant and capital)	(1,087,900,000)	(885,400,000)
II. Materials production:		
A. reactor operations:		
Operating expenses	586,380,000	576,380,000
Construction:		
86–D–150 in-core neutron monitoring system N–Reactor, Richland, WA	5,460,000	5,460,000
86–D–152 reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	4,000,000	3,000,000
85–D–145 fuel production facility, Savannah River, SC (TEC–TBD)	20,000,000	18,000,000
84–D–136 enriched uranium conversion facility modifications: Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	14,200,000	12,200,000
82–D–126 reactor safety and reliability: various locations	1,800,000	1,800,000
Subtotal: construction	45,460,000	40,460,000
Subtotal: reactor operations	631,840,000	616,840,000
B. Processing of nuclear materials:		
Operating expenses	493,145,000	483,145,000
Construction:		
86–D–148 special isotope separation plant (design only)		4,000,000
86–D–151 Purex electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	3,500,000	2,500,000
86–D–153 additional line III tritium furnance, Savannah River, SC	2,000,000	2,000,000
86–D–154 effluent treatment facility, Savannah River, SC	2,500,000	2,500,000
86–D–157 hydrofluorination system, FB-Line, Savannah River, SC	2,200,000	2,200,000
85–D–137 vault safety SNM inventory system, Richland, WA	1,900,000	1,900,000
84–D–135 process facility modifications, Richland, WA	15,000,000	15,000,000
82–D–201 special plutonium recovery facs, JB Line, Savannah River, SC	4,400,000	4,400,000
Subtotal, construction	31,500,000	34,500,000
Subtotal, processing of nuclear materials	524,645,000	517,645,000
C. Supporting services:		
Operating expenses	256,575,000	256,575,000
Construction:		
86–D–146 general plant projects, various locations	34,800,000	32,650,000
86–D–149 productivity retention program, Phase I, various locations	27,200,000	20,700,000
86–D–156 plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	3,000,000	3,000,000
85–D–139 fuel processing restoration, IFPF, INEL, ID	15,000,000	15,000,000
85–D–140 productivity and radiological improvements, FMPC Fernald, OH	15,000,000	15,000,000
84–D–134 safeguards and security improvements plant-wide, Savannah River, SC	7,000,000	7,000,000
84–D–137 facility security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, ID	5,000,000	5,000,000
83–D–148 non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	8,600,000	8,600,000

	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
82-D-124 restoratioin of production capabilities, Phase II, III, IV & V, various locations	44,900,000	43,900,000
Subtotal, construction	160,500,000	150,850,000
Subtotal, supporting services	417,075,000	407,425,000
D. Enriched material	258,900,000	184,000,000
E. Capital equipment	123,440,000	121,440,000
F. Program direction	21,300,000	21,300,000
Subtotal, materials production	1,977,200,000	1,868,650,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,616,300,000)	(1,521,400,000)
(Plant and capital)	(360,900,000)	(347,250,000)
III. Defense waste and byproducts management:		
A. Interim waste management:		
Operating expenses	281,085,000	271,000,000
Construction:		
86-D-171 general plant projects, various locations	26,451,000	24,451,000
86-D-172 b-plant f-filter, Richland, WA	1,000,000	1,000,000
86-D-173 central waste disposal facility, Oak Ridge, TN	1,000,000	1,000,000
86-D-174 low-level waste processing and shipping system, FMPC, Fernald, OH	2,500,000	2,500,000
86-D-175 security upgrade, ID	2,000,000	2,000,000
85-D-157 seventh calcined solids storage facility, INEL, ID	14,500,000	14,500,000
85-D-158 central warehouse upgrade, Richland, WA	5,000,000	5,000,000
85-D-159 new waste transfer facilities H-area, Savannah River, SC	9,000,000	9,000,000
85-D-160 TRA security system upgrade, INEL, ID	2,250,000	2,250,000
82-D-103 waste handling and isolation facs, Richland, WA	2,180,000	2,180,000
Subtotal, construction	65,881,000	63,881,000
Subtotal, interim waste management	346,966,000	334,881,000
B. Long-term waste management technology:		
Operating expenses	96,567,000	94,567,000
Construction: 81-T-105 defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	205,000,000	165,000,000
Subtotal, long-term waste management technology	301,567,000	259,567,000
C. Terminal storage: Operating expenses	25,070,000	25,070,000
D. Capital equipment	38,997,000	35,997,000
E. Program direction	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, defense waste and byproducts management	715,000,000	657,915,000
(Operating expenses)	(405,122,000)	(393,037,000)
(Plant and capital)	(309,878,000)	(264,878,000)
ALL OTHER		
IV. Verification and control technology:		
A. Verification and control technology:		
Operating expenses	83,475,000	87,225,000
Capital equipment	5,600,000	5,600,000
Construction: 85-D-171 space science laboratory, LANL, NM	4,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, verification and control technology	93,575,000	97,325,000
(Operating expenses)	(83,475,000)	(87,225,000)
(Plant and capital)	(10,100,000)	(10,100,000)
V. Nuclear safeguards and security:		
A. Nuclear safeguards and security:		
Operating expenses	54,325,000	54,325,000
Capital equipment	4,600,000	4,600,000
Construction: 86-D-186 Nuclear safeguards technology labs, LANL, NM	1,000,000	
Subtotal nuclear safeguards and security	59,925,000	58,925,000
VI. Security investigations—OE	33,400,000	33,400,000
Subtotal, all other	186,900,000	189,650,000
(Operating expenses)	(171,200,000)	(174,950,000)
(Plant and capital)	(15,700,000)	(14,700,000)
VII. Naval reactors development:		
A. Plant development: Operating expenses	66,000,000	66,000,000
B. Reactor development:		
Operating expenses	261,300,000	261,300,000
Construction:		
86-N-101 general plant projects	7,500,000	4,000,000
86-N-104 reactor modifications, ATR, INEL, ID	4,500,000	4,500,000
82-N-111 materials facility, Savannah River, SC	11,000,000	11,000,000
81-T-112 mods, and additions to prototype facs, various locations	27,000,000	27,000,000
Subtotal, construction	50,000,000	46,500,000
Subtotal, reactor development	311,300,000	307,800,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation: Operating expenses	150,000,000	150,000,000
E. Capital equipment	30,000,000	28,000,000
F. Program direction	11,700,000	11,700,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	569,000,000	563,500,000
(Operating expenses)	(489,000,000)	(489,000,000)
(Plant and capital)	(80,000,000)	(74,500,000)
Subtotal, atomic energy defense activities	8,041,400,000	7,638,615,000
(Operating expenses)	(6,187,022,000)	(6,051,887,000)
(Plant and capital)	(1,854,378,000)	(1,586,728,000)
Adjustments:		
Operating expenses		−20,000,000
Pay amendment	5,500,000	
Savings from management initiatives:		
Savings from management initiatives—AEDA (OE)	−14,000,000	−14,000,000
Total, adjustments	−8,500,000	−34,000,000
Total, atomic energy defense activities	8,032,900,000	7,604,615,000
(Operating expenses)	(6,178,522,000)	(6,017,887,000)
(Plant and capital)	(1,854,378,000)	(1,586,728,000)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION		
I. Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses:		
A. Office of the Secretary	1,146,000	1,146,000
B. Other expenses	497,000	497,000
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary	1,643,000	1,643,000
II. General management—salaries:		
A. Board of Contract Appeals	281,000	281,000
B. General Counsel	7,171,000	7,171,000
C. Inspector General	7,144,000	7,144,000
D. A/S Management & Administration	37,725,000	37,725,000
E. A/S Cong., Intergov. & Public Affairs	3,587,000	3,587,000
F. Operations Offices	53,917,000	53,917,000
G. Policy, Planning & Analysis	2,372,000	2,372,000
H. A/S International Affairs	2,484,000	2,484,000
I. Office of Minority Economic Impact	438,000	438,000
Subtotal, salaries	115,119,000	115,119,000
III. General management—other expenses:		
A. Other salary expenses	7,455,000	7,455,000
B. Benefits	13,153,000	13,153,000
C. Travel	4,821,000	4,821,000
D. Services	121,589,000	119,589,000
E. Workmens compensation	1,436,000	1,436,000
F. Capital equipment	10,327,000	10,327,000
Subtotal, other expenses	158,781,000	156,781,000
(Operating expenses)	(148,454,000)	(146,454,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(10,327,000)	(10,327,000)
IV. Program support:		
A. Policy analysis and system studies	4,500,000	4,500,000
B. Indian Affairs	300,000	300,000
C. Consumer Affairs	100,000	100,000
D. Public Affairs	450,000	450,000
E. Competition	100,000	100,000
F. International Policy Studies	1,500,000	1,000,000
G. Office of Minority Economic Impact	1,300,000	2,300,000
H. Cost of work for others	149,110,000	149,110,000
Subtotal Program support	157,360,000	157,860,000
V. Miscellaneous revenues	−244,228,000	−244,228,000
FTE General reduction	−3,750,000	−3,750,000
Savings from management initiatives—(MA)DA	−6,000,000	−6,000,000
Addback of proposed rescission		−2,786,000
Use of prior year balances	−8,501,000	−8,501,000
Pay amendment	5,415,000	
Total, departmental administration	175,839,000	166,138,000
(Operating expenses)	(409,740,000)	(400,039,000)
(Plant and capital)	(10,327,000)	(10,327,000)
(Miscellaneous revenue)	(−244,228,000)	(−244,228,000)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
I. Power marketing—Alaska Power Administration:		
A. Operating expenses	3,281,000	3,281,000
Pay amendment	40,000	
Total, Alaska Power Administration	3,321,000	3,281,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION		
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
Pay amendment	70,000	
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
I. Power marketing—Southwestern Power Administration:		
A. Operation and maintenance	10,974,000	10,974,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	21,800,000	21,800,000
C. Construction	5,500,000	5,500,000
Use of prior year balances	−8,774,000	−8,774,000
Pay amendment	246,000	
Total, Southwest Power Administration	29,746,000	29,500,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION—CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE		
I. Power marketing—Western Area Power Administration:		
A. Construction and rehabilitation	80,300,000	80,300,000
B. System operation and maintenance	75,000,000	75,000,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling	82,500,000	82,500,000
Unobligated balances	−30,300,000	−30,300,000
Transfer from other accounts, permanent authority	−890,000	−890,000
General reduction		−10,000,000
Pay amendment	1,412,000	
Total, Western Area Power Administration	208,022,000	196,610,000
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION		
I. Oil pipeline regulation	4,113,000	4,113,000
II. Natural gas regulation:		
A. Pipeline certificate regulation	13,232,000	13,232,000
B. Pipeline rate regulation	16,684,000	16,684,000
C. Producer certificate regulation	2,080,000	2,080,000
D. Producer rate regulation	2,050,000	2,050,000
E. Wellhead pricing	6,090,000	6,090,000
Substotal, natural gas regulation	40,136,000	40,136,000
III. Hydropower regulation	30,705,000	30,705,000
IV. Electric power regulation	20,614,000	20,614,000
Subtotal, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	95,568,000	95,568,000
Adjustments:		
Less offsetting revenues	−66,077,000	−66,077,000
Pay amendment	3,284,000	
Total, adjustments	−62,793,000	−66,077,000
Total, FERC after revenues	32,775,000	29,491,000
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND		
I. Nuclear waste disposal fund	571,460,000	521,460,000
GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND		
II. Program direction	72,000	72,000
Pay amendment	4,000	
Total, Geothermal Resources Development Fund	76,000	72,000

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Amendment No. 39: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate providing for "no-year availability" of funds for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $130,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission instead of $141,500,000 as proposed by the House and $80,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Earmarks $85,000,000 for the Appalachian Development Highway System instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $2,200,000 for administrative expenses instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree that of the funds provided for area development activities, $6,000,000 shall be available only for continuation and completion of critical economic development and educational projects that are at a stage where funding can be effectively utilized. An additional $9,000,000 shall be directed toward completion of ongoing port development projects. From the funds earmarked for the highway program $10,000,000 shall be available for continuation of Corridor X west of Jasper, $3,000,000 for continuation of Corridor V from Pontotoc to Oxford, and $7,000,000 is provided for Corridor G in West Virginia.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $418,000,000 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission instead of $403,671,000 as proposed by the House and $429,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees' recommendation includes $12,000,000 to implement and sustain the research program integration plan developed by NRC's Office of Research.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $113,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority instead of $118,000,000 provided by the House and $90,861,000 provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Restores language providing for use of prior year unobligated balances of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

The conferees agree that $250,000 from within Economic Technical Assistance is for economic and community assistance in a region of the country similar to the Tennessee Valley and the conferees agree that this is the last year of funding for this type of activity outside of the TVA region. The conferees also agree that a robotics center shall be funded at $1,300,000 in FY 1986.

In order to further refine the reporting procedures that have been followed by TVA in response to the Committees' 1984 reports as modified in 1985 regarding the transfer and reprogramming of funds, effective with the fiscal year 1986 appropriations, only transfers in excess of 20 percent or $500,000, whichever is less, need be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

The following table summarizes the conference agreement on the TVA program:

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	1985	Conference level
CAPITAL INVESTMENT		
New lock at Pickwick Landing Dam	7,000	
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	2,210	
Dam safety modifications	2,900	[1] 2,145
Additions and improvements	4,266	3,559

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1985	Conference level
Recreation facilities	232	250
Land Between The Lakes facilities	90	95
Local flood facilities	180	
Chemical facilities	7,971	5,050
Ammonia-from-coal facility	316	
North Alabama coal-to-methanol facility	4,069	
General facilities	1,907	2,052
Yellow Creek Port	28	
Total capital investment	31,169	13,151
EXPENSES		
Natural resources:		
Water resources	13,227	8,001
Reservoir system operations	21,593	23,081
Land and forest resources	5,052	4,800
Resource managment and development support	4,371	4,805
Land Between The Lakes	7,160	6,900
Total natural resources	51,403	47,587
Economic and community resources:		
Economic resources	17,556	14,010
Community resources	2,144	
Total economic and community resources	23,150	14,010
Agricultural resources development	5,797	5,184
National Fertilizer development:		
Fertilizer research and development	14,760	15,700
Fertilizer technology introduction	12,969	13,037
Ammonia-from-coal process	6,417	
Hardwood fuels	4,060	3,600
Total national fertilizer development	38,206	32,337
	1985	1986
General services	876	731
Total expenses	115,982	99,849
Jobs bill (Public Law No. 98-8)	14	
Unallocated	2,689	
Total appropriations	149,854	113,000
Carryforward	−9,000	
Total	140,854	

[1] Excludes $2,100,000 carried forward from 1985 due to financing change.

Amendment No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate amended to read as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 506. No funds appropriated in this Act may be used to pay the salary of the Administrator of a Power Marketing Administration or the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority unless they award contracts for the procurement of extra high voltage power equipment manufactured in the United States when such agency determines that there are one or more domestic manufacturers offering a product which meets the technical requirements of such agency at a price not exceeding 125 per centum of the bid or offering price of the most competitive foreign bidder. Such agency shall determine the incremental costs associated with implementing this section and defer or offset such incremental costs against otherwise existing repayment obligations. This section shall not apply to any procurement initiated before its effective date or to the acquisition of spare parts.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Language has been included regarding the procurement of extra high voltage (EHV) power equipment by the Power Marketing Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority. As defined by the Department of Commerce, the EHV power equipment industry includes, but is not limited to, transformers rated above 10,000 kVA; fuses rated 2,300 V and above; circuit breakers rated 345 kV and above; relays; capacitors; surge arrestors; AC/DC valves and controls; high voltage DC systems; and tapered tubular steel structures or structural units to support overhead electrical transmission lines.

The language adopted by the conferees would have the effect of increasing the so-called "Buy American" differential to twenty-five percent. That is, Power Marketing Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority would be required to purchase their EHV power equipment from domestic manufacturers if the domestic equipment meets the agency's technical requirements and the price of such equipment is not more than 25 percent greater than the price of the most competitive foreign bid. In addition, the provision, which would be effective for one year, would not apply to the acquisition of spare parts, or to any procurement initiated prior to the effective date of this Act.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1986 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1985 amount, the 1986 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1986 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1985	15,602,777,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	[1] 15,344,118,000
House bill, fiscal year 1986	15,272,935,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1986	15,206,922,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1986	15,251,718,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1985	−351,059,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	−92,400,000
House bill, fiscal year 1986	−21,217,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1986	+44,796,000

[1] Includes $64,108,000 of budget estimates not considered by the House.

TOM BEVILL,
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS,
BILL CHAPPELL, JR.,
VIC FAZIO,
WES WATKINS,
BILL BONER,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN T. MYERS,
VIRGINIA SMITH,
ELDON RUDD,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
JAMES A. MCCLURE,
JAKE GARN,
THAD COCHRAN,
JAMES ABDNOR,
ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.,
MACK MATTINGLY,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
JIM SASSER,

DENNIS DECONCINI,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KILDEE (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, October 9, and October 10, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HYDE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for October 10, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOLLUM, for 30 minutes, on October 10.

Mr. PASHAYAN, for 60 minutes, on October 16.

Mr. PASHAYAN, for 60 minutes, on October 17.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, October 16.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, October 17.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, October 23.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GARCIA to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBERSTAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOUCHER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes, on October 11.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and to include extraneous material, during debate on the bill (H.R. 3008) in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. GILMAN, prior to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 155.

Mr. GILMAN, prior to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 197.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHUSTER.

Ms. FIEDLER.

Mr. HARTNETT.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. GILMAN in four instances.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GARCIA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. MARKEY in two instances.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. DICKS.

Mr. SYNAR.

Mr. TOWNS in three instances.

Mr. MILLER of California in two instances.

Mrs. BOXER in two instances.

Mr. HAYES.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio.

Mr. MICA.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. WHEAT.

Mr. TORRICELLI in two instances.

Mr. BEDELL.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. WEISS.

Mrs. LLOYD.

Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mr. LUKEN.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2410. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs under title VII of that act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 10, 1985, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2118. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed leases of defense articles to France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom for a cooperative research and development project (Transmittal Numbers 6-86 through 10-86), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2119. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of GAO reports for the month of August 1985, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2120. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Science, transmitting notice of a proposed contract with the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, Gila Project, AZ, pursuant to the Act of June 13, 1956, chap. 382; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UDALL. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 463. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to insure the stockpiling and replacement of topsoil on public lands and other lands which are moved or covered by surface mining projects, reclamation projects, and other Federal and federally assisted projects, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 99-306, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BEVILL. Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2959. (Rept. 99-307). Ordered to printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 3530. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to authorize the provision of compensatory time in lieu of overtime compensation for employees of States, political subdivisions of States, and interstate governmental agencies, to clarify the application of the Act to volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI):

H.R. 3531. A bill to amend section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, with respect to the determination of the increase of amounts available for substitute highway and transit projects resulting from increased construction costs; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 3532. A bill to require emergency position indicating radio beacons on uninspected U.S. fishing, fish processing, and fish tender vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3533. A bill to amend the the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to permit the provision of flood insurance for properties constructed in unintentional violation of State and local land used requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DICKS (for himself, and Mr. BONKER):

H.R. 3534. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriate to pay a judgment in favor of the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 218 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 3535. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to authorize controls on the export of capital from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3536. A bill to repeal the War Powers Resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN (for himself, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 3537. A bill to ensure adequate verification of peaceful uses of nuclear exports from the United States to the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.R. 3538. A bill authorizing the City of Chester, Illinois, to reconstruct, repair, or improve an existing toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, IL; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 3539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income of an individual any discharge of indebtedness with respect to black lung benefits which are required to be repaid to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 3540. A bill to provide secure job opportunities to workers displaced by imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 3541. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and other laws, to make technical and other minor changes to provision[s] enacted by the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida:

H.R. 3542. A bill to provide for regional primary elections and caucuses for selection of delegates to political party presidential nominating conventions and for Federal funding of presidential primary elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 419. By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SEIBERLING): Joint resolution to Approve Public Land Order No. 6607 of July 8, 1985; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

270. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Slovak-Americans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 3543. A bill for the relief of Wilana Lerner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.R. 3544. A bill for the relief of Ernst B. Coumou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 3545. A bill for the relief of Olga Sellares Barney and her children Christian Sellares Barney, Kevin Sellares Barney, and Charles Sellares Barney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 26: Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FROST, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 362: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GROTBERG.

H.R. 380: Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FROST, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 585: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 903: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1140: Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 1156: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1219: Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 1348: Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1356: Mr. ROSE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

H.R. 1479: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1659: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1950: Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 2525: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BATES, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2527: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HENDON, and Mr. MCKERNAN.

H.R. 2620: Mr. SAVAGE and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 2854: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 2907: Mrs. LONG and Mr. RALPH M. HALL.

H.R. 2936: Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia.

H.R. 2973: Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 3006: Mr. WHITLEY.

H.R. 3041: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 3099: Mr. ECKART of Ohio and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 3181: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH.

H.R. 3232: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. STRANG, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. FISH, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. COURTER, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GROTBERG, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. HILER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROE, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. COBEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COATS, Mr. WEBER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 3263: Mr. TRAXLER and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 3319: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 3438: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 3448: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 3457: Mr. DARDEN and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3510: Mr. OWENS, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 3515: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 3520: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HENDON, Mr. HILER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, and Mr. MOLINARI.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. BARNES, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. REID, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. STARK.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. STUMP, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.J. Res. 183: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STRANG, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WIRTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 221: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOLLO-

HAN, Mr. RAY, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.J. Res. 267: Mr. COBLE, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. WALKER.

H.J. Res. 297: Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. LELAND, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ROE, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. COBEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BROOKS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. CARR, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.J. Res. 308: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YATES.

H.J. Res. 326: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CONTE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SABO, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. YATES, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 329: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.J. Res. 334: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DAVIS, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. EARLY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LEATH of Texas, and Mr. O'BRIEN.

H.J. Res. 357: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 376: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYSON, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H. Con. Res. 126: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DAUB, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. WILSON.

H. Con. Res. 193: Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COBEY, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. ECKERT of New York.

H. Res. 190: Mr. GREGG.

H. Res. 245: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H. Res. 270: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H. Res. 271: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

231. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Supporters of the National Democratic Party of Liberia (USA), Brooklyn, NY, relative to friendship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

232. Also, petition of Peter J. Cojanis, Washington, DC, relative to due process of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3248

By Mr. FRENZEL:

—On page 33, strike out line 5 and all that follows through 13.

—On page 33, strike out "$21,600,000" on line 10 and insert in lieu thereof "$10,800,000".

—On page 33, strike out "is amended—" in line 7 and all that follows through line 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

is amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and all that follows through "fiscal year 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "$21,600,000 for fiscal year 1986".

—On page 33, strike out "$21,600,000" on line 10 and insert in lieu thereof "$292,000".