

calls to introduce free-market reforms in the Indian economy. This increased trade and investment translates into additional revenues for American companies and good jobs, I believe, for American workers.

It also means the prospect of better opportunities for the people of India, a growing market for American goods and services, and a long-term stability in a strategically vital region in the world. All in all, it is a win/win situation.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the United States and India are not going to agree on every issue. There will undoubtedly be occasional diplomatic tiffs between our administration and the new BJP government. But the underlying relationship between the United States and India is based on shared values of democracy and a commitment to economic development.

The people of India have spoken through elections in which more than 300 million people participated. While no single party gained a majority in the Parliament, the BJP won a plurality and has been given this historic opportunity to form a government. As a legitimately elected head of government, Prime Minister Vajpayee deserves our respect.

Expressions of congratulations have poured in from around the world. President Clinton called the Prime Minister, and the two leaders had a 10-minute conversation that focused on continuing on the path of strong bilateral ties. I hope that those who have viewed the BJP in a critical or suspicious way in the past will join me in congratulating the Prime Minister and wishing him and his government well.

I also wanted to point out that India's Parliament has elected as its Speaker G.M.C. Balayogi, a member of the TDP party. His election shows the BJP's willingness to form coalitions with other parties and to provide key positions of leadership for members of other parties.

Mr. Speaker, many of our Members of the House, both on the Democratic and Republican side, are members of our Congressional Caucus on India. And we look forward to the new government's relations and improved relations between the United States and India, because we do believe it is very important to continue the strong ties and the closer relationships that have grown in the last few years between our two countries.

ECONOMIC EQUITY FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lead a special order on economic equity for women. I expect to be joined by other women Members of Congress,

perhaps by some men as well. They would be welcome. I have already been joined by the energetic and able gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), to whom I will yield in a few moments.

I come to the floor this evening during this special Women's History Month, Mr. Speaker. During this month, women Members, and we are proudly 50 Members strong in this House, of course, when you consider that there are 440 Members, we are the first to concede that we are proud, but not pleased, but we are proud to honor Women's History Month by participating in a number of floor speeches simply to keep before this body what I know most Members would not want to forget, and that is that women's issues increasingly dominate much of what concerns America, often as family issues.

This evening I want to devote my own time to discussion of specific aspects of economic equity, but I remind the body that this general subject covers a multitude of problems, among them old-fashioned discrimination against women in everything from sports to jobs, women's new rise in small business, women's special place as now primary in their dependence for their economic survival and benefit on a whole set of gender neutral economic programs, among them Social Security.

We say watch when you change Social Security, particularly when you talk about privatization, that you do not forget who lives the longest and who is most dependent on Social Security, and consider whether or not they will quickly and freely enter the market, particularly since it is low wage workers, among whom women are the predominant group who are most dependent on Social Security.

The earned income tax credit where many women, this very month, simply would have thousands of dollars in reduction in pay were it not for the earned income tax credit, which goes in this country predominantly to women who are, again, the low paid workers of America, minimum wage.

We got a minimum wage through, I think in no small part because this body understood it was talking about women, women vote, and women understood that that vote was a women's vote because two-thirds of those who qualify for the minimum wage, in a very real sense, to our shame, are women and women with children at that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and thank her for coming to the floor to speak on an aspect of this subject.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues from the Women's Caucus as we work to bring greater attention to the issue of economic equity for women.

I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her valuable leadership, both of the Women's Caucus and on this critical issue.

I do want to note that, in her notice for this special order on economic equity for women, she cites a quote from the United States Bureau of the Census. And I would like to read this quote into the RECORD. It says, "The median earnings of women with a strong commitment to workforce were \$23,710 while those of men were a substantially greater \$32,144."

I would like to bring notice to this, not only for the important data that is below that points out the discrepancy between the earnings between men and women, but as an example of how we use census data over and over again in our everyday lives to know where we are as a Nation, where we are going as a Nation. Without good data, we are just another opinion.

This is one example of how the census data helps us track the progress or lack thereof of women in the workforce and that we, likewise, need to work for a fair and accurate census that is coming up.

Mr. Speaker, the Women's History Month is traditionally a time to highlight women's achievements and an opportunity to increase public awareness of the unique contributions women have made throughout history.

It is true that American women have made great strides. Women break through more personal and professional barriers every day, and we all should take pride in these many accomplishments. But we cannot afford to rest on these laurels, because the facts also show that there is a great deal of work that needs to be done.

The sad reality is, almost 35 years after the Equal Pay Act was passed, there is still a huge wage gap. In fact, women earned equal pay in only two out of 90 jobs tracked by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1995.

While the wage gap has narrowed by 15 percent since 1981, white women still make just 74 cents on the dollar to a male dollar. The situation is worse for the women of color. The wage gap for African-American women is 64 cents to the male dollar. For Hispanic women, it is 53 cents. This fact should make us all angry. We should all be indignant when women are not paid the same as men for the same exact same job, comparable work.

Pay inequity is yet another example of the lingering sexism and racism that is still in our society. Most of the wage gap cannot be explained away by differences in education, experience, or other legitimate qualifications. Even among recent college graduates, women earned 15.7 percent less than male graduates. While there has been some real progress, there is still a cultural bias against, in some cases, women workers.

There are still antiquated perceptions that women possibly do not need

as much money as men, but they do. Women support their families. Their income is very much an important part of a two-wage family income. Yet, great women are supporting their families alone. As many as one in five American families are headed by women. Many two-parent families could not make it without both incomes.

Clearly, economic equality is a fundamental issue for women. It goes straight to the heart of how we care for our families and the roles we play in our communities and the security of our retirement years, which my colleague is focusing on and mentioned earlier.

Women continue to battle the glass ceiling, and virtually every profession is now open to us. But women have not yet broken the wage barrier. The notion of equal pay for equal work is so basic to the values of this country. If we genuinely want an equal society, we need to show women we value their work.

This country can do better. We must do better. And we are working to achieve it.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD "101 Facts On The Status of Working Women", which is important information that we need to look at during this Women's History Month:

101 FACTS ON THE STATUS OF WORKING WOMEN WOMEN AND THE LABOR FORCE

1. In January 1997, there were 105 million women age 16 and over in the U.S. Of that total, 62.7 million (59.7%) were in the civilian labor force (persons working or looking for work).

2. The U.S. Department of Labor is projecting that between 1994 and 2005, women's labor force participation will increase from 46 to 48%—nearly double the growth rate for men.

3. In 1995, 3.6 million women held more than one job.

4. In 1995, 60% of all employed women worked in traditionally female dominated occupations.

5. Two out of every three temporary workers are women.

6. Women comprised 44% of the total number employed in executive, administrative and managerial positions in 1996, up from 39% in 1988.

7. In 1996, 42% of women in executive, administrative and managerial positions were employed in the service industry, compared to 31% of men. Women are also much less likely than men to be employed in manufacturing, construction, transportation and public utilities.

8. Of the 1,960,000 engineers in the U.S. in 1996, only 167,000 (9%) were women, up from 2% in 1976.

PAY EQUITY

9. Since 1981, the wage gap has narrowed from 59% to 71% in 1996—a decline of less than a penny per year.

10. The wage gap for African American women is 64 cents to a white man's dollar; for Hispanic women it is 53 cents.

11. The average woman loses approximately \$420,000 over a lifetime due to unequal pay practices.

12. The total amount of wages lost due to pay inequity was over \$130 billion in 1995.

13. About 60% of the improvement in the wage gap during the last 15 years can be at-

tributed to the decline in men's real earnings.

14. According to a recent report, between one-third and one-half of the wage difference between men and women cannot be explained by differences in experience, education, or other legitimate qualifications.

15. Demonstrating that there is still not equal pay for equal work, in 1995 female sales workers earned 43.1%, female managers 32%, female college professors 22%, administrative support 22%, health technologists and technicians 18%, female elementary school teachers 12%, and female nurses 3.1% less than their male colleagues.

16. At all educational levels, women suffer from a wage gap compared to male workers. College educated women earn \$14,217 a year less than college educated white men, and only \$794 more than white men who have never taken a college course.

17. College educated African American and Hispanic women annually earn \$17,549 and \$14,779 less, respectively, than their white male colleagues, and college educated African American women earn \$2,558 less than white male high school graduates.

18. Even among recent college graduates, women earn 15.7% less than men.

19. While women constituted 46% of the work force in 1995, over 63% of all workers earning the minimum wage or below were women.

20. The median weekly earnings for all men in 1996 was \$557, compared to \$418 for all women, \$362 for African American women, and \$316 for Hispanic women.

21. Women in unions in 1995 earned weekly wages that were 35% higher than women who were not union members.

22. Poverty rates are higher at every age for women who live alone or with non-relatives than for their male counterparts.

WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES

23. According to the National Foundation for Women Business Owners, there are nearly eight million women-owned businesses in the U.S., employing over 18.5 million people and generating close to \$2.3 trillion in sales.

24. In 1996, women-owned firms accounted for over one-third (36%) of all firms in the country, and provided employment for one out of every four (26%) U.S. workers.

25. The growth of women-owned businesses is outpacing overall business growth by nearly two to one, with an average of 1,400 starting each day.

26. Between 1987 and 1996, the number of women-owned firms increased by 78% nationwide, employment by these firms increased by 183%, and sales grew by 236%.

27. Women-owned firms are more likely to remain in business than the average U.S. firm. Nearly three-fourths of women-owned firms in business in 1991 were still in business three years later, compared to two-thirds of all U.S. firms.

28. An estimated 3.5 million women-owned businesses are home-based and employ 14 million full- and part-time workers.

29. Women business owners are more likely than all business owners to offer flex-time, tuition reimbursement, and profit sharing, and are more likely than men to volunteer and to encourage their employees to volunteer.

30. Women will own 40 to 50% of all U.S. businesses by the year 2000.

WOMEN IN THE FORTUNE 500

31. According to a 1996 Catalyst study of the Fortune 500 companies, 1,302 out of 13,013 (10%) corporate officers are women, up from 8.7% in 1994.

32. A total of 394 companies (78%) have one or more women corporate officers, up from 77% in 1994, and 105 companies (21%) have no women corporate officers, down from 23% in 1994.

33. Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae) is the only company with women in more than half (57%) of corporate officer positions.

34. Women comprise 57 (2.4%) of the 3,430 highest corporate rank positions (chairman, vice chairman, CEO, president, COO, EVP).

35. The highest level of women corporate officers can be found in savings institutions (22%), while the lowest level is found in brokerage firms (4%).

36. Only 47 (1.9%) of the 2,500 top earners in the Fortune 500 are women.

37. Of all of the Fortune 500 companies, 417 have women on the board of directors, but only 177 (35%) have two or more women. Eighty-three companies (17%) have no women on their boards.

38. The rate of increase of women on boards is actually decreasing—it grew by 9% in 1994, 7% in 1995, and 3% in 1996.

39. Only 626 (10.2%) out of 6,123 of board positions are held by women.

40. A total of 53 women of color sit on boards (12.6% of women board members, 1.4% of total members).

41. The industry with highest number of women on boards is the soap/cosmetics industry with 19%, while the mail/package/freight delivery industry has the lowest number, with only 3%.

42. The industries with the highest percentage of companies with no women on boards (43%) are computers/data service, engineering and construction.

43. There is a direct correlation between the number of women on a company's board and the number of women serving as corporate officers and at the highest corporate level at that company. Companies with one woman board member have an average of 7.1% women at the highest corporate levels, whereas those with three or more women on the board have 30.4%.

WOMEN IN POLITICS

44. Four women serve in the Cabinet of the second Clinton Administration.

45. Two women occupy seats on the U.S. Supreme Court.

46. In 1997, women hold nine (9%) of the 100 seats of U.S. Senate and 51 (11.7%) of the 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. In addition, two women serve as Delegates to the House representing the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands.

47. Of the 62 women serving in the 105th Congress (including the two Delegates), 12 are African American, four are Hispanic, one is Asian American/Pacific Islander and one is Caribbean American.

48. California has sent more women to Congress than any other state—a total of 21. Seven states have never elected a woman to either the U.S. House or Senate. They are: Alaska, Delaware, Iowa, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Vermont and Wisconsin.

49. Currently, two women serve as governors of their states and 18 women serve as lieutenant governors.

50. Women hold 25.1% of the 3223 available statewide elected executive offices in 1997, an increase from 18.2% in 1992.

51. In 1997, 1,597 (21.5%) of the 7,424 state legislators are women, up from 18.3% in 1991 and 5.6% in 1973.

52. Of the 100 largest American cities, 12 have women mayors.

OLDER WOMEN'S ISSUES

53. Women on average can expect to live 19 years into retirement while men can expect to live 15 years.

54. In 1993, 48% of women employed full-time by private employers were participating in an employer-provided retirement plan.

55. Almost 12 million women work for small firms that do not offer pension plans.

56. Only 39% of all working women and fewer than 17% of part-time working women are covered by a pension plan.

57. Less than 33% of all women retirees age 55 and over receive pension benefits, compared to 55% of male retirees.

58. The median amount of women's pensions is \$250 monthly, compared to \$650 for men.

59. Two-thirds of working women are employed in sectors of the economy that have the lowest pension coverage rate, including the service and retail sectors.

60. Workers covered by union agreements are nearly twice as likely to have a pension. Women, however, are half as likely to be in these jobs.

61. Since women change jobs more frequently than men—women stay with an employer for an average of 5.8 years, compared to 7.6 years for men—many women leave jobs before they reach the required years of service to qualify for employment retirement plans, usually five to seven years.

62. Only 20% of all widows receive a survivor pension, which is usually only 50% of what their husbands benefits had been.

63. Fewer than one-fourth of divorced women age 62 and older receive any employer-sponsored pension income, whether from their own or their ex-husband's past work. Often, divorced women are left with no share of their ex-husband's pension, even after a long marriage.

64. In 1995 women comprised only 58% of the total elderly population but comprised 74% of the elderly poor. Older women are twice as likely as older men to be poor, and nearly 40% of older women living alone live in or near poverty level.

65. A widowed woman is four times more likely, and a single or divorced woman five times more likely, to live in poverty after retirement than a married woman.

66. Of all unmarried women age 65 and older, 40% rely on Social Security for 90% or more of their household income.

67. The U.S. has the greatest percentage of elderly women in poverty of all the major industrialized nations.

WORKING FAMILIES

68. The net increase in family incomes between 1973 and 1993 was driven almost entirely by the gains for married couples with working wives, the only family type for which real income increased significantly over the period.

69. Despite the fact that employed mothers and fathers work in similarly sized organizations, fewer mothers than fathers are eligible for coverage under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) because of women's higher rate of part-time employment.

70. In 1960, women were the sole support of less than 10% of all families. In 1994, this figure was 18.1%. Of these, 38.6% had incomes below poverty level.

71. Most women will spend 17 years caring for children and 18 years helping an elderly parent. Eighty-nine percent of all women over age 18 will be caregivers to children, parents or both.

72. Less than one-fourth of new mothers leave the paid labor force.

73. Women average 11.5 years out of the paid labor force, primarily because of care giving responsibilities; men average 1.3 years.

HEALTH ISSUES

74. It is estimated that 19% of women in the U.S. are uninsured. Hispanic women are 2.5 times and African Americans are 1.8 times as likely to be uninsured than white women.

75. Women and their children are disproportionately represented among the nation's uninsured population, primarily due to women's segregation in service and retail jobs, which have low rates of employer-provided insurance and low wages. In 1993, 59%

of uninsured women were from families with an annual income of less than \$25,000.

76. More than 184,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer in 1996 and 44,300 women died from the disease. Research indicates that universal access to screening mammography would reduce breast cancer mortality by 30%.

77. Many poor women and women of color do not have access to mammography screening because they lack health coverage and earn low wages. Because Medicare requires a woman to pay a share of the cost, 85% of women covered by Medicare only (without supplemental coverage) did not have a mammography screening in 1992 or 1993.

78. More than 52% of uninsured women ages 18–64 did not have a Pap Test in 1993.

79. Almost one in four women does not receive prenatal care during the critical first trimester of pregnancy. Hispanic and African American women are twice as likely as white women to receive little or no care.

80. While men have higher death rates from many diseases, women suffer more from chronic and debilitating physical and mental illnesses. Minority women disproportionately suffer from the chronic diseases of hypertension, asthma, diabetes and chronic bronchitis.

81. Older women, ages 65 to 85, frequently suffer from multiple chronic diseases: 27% suffer from two chronic diseases and 24% suffer from three or more. Half of women over 80 suffer from osteoporosis.

82. Almost half (49%) of disabled women have annual incomes below \$15,900; 19% are on Medicaid or receive public aid; and 24% live alone.

83. In 1995, 59% of Medicaid recipients and 60% of Medicare enrollees were women. Of the women on Medicaid, 61% have been on for more than two years and 37% for more than five years.

84. Only one-third of women enrolled in Medicare live with spouses compared to over half of men enrolled in Medicare.

85. Women ages 15–44 had out-of-pocket expenditures for health care services (\$573) that were 68% higher than those of men of the same age (\$342).

86. The most common reasons women give for failure to obtain clinical preventative services are cost, lack of time and lack of physician counseling.

87. One in four women report that physicians talk down to them, and one in six women have been told by a physician that a problem was "all in her head."

VIOLENCE

88. Each year about one million women become victims of violence at the hands of an intimate—a husband, ex-husband, boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend. This is seven times higher than the rate of violence committed by an intimate against male victims.

89. In 1994, there was one rape for every 270 women, one robbery for every 240 women, one assault for every 29 women, and one homicide for every 23,000 women.

90. Women in families with incomes below \$10,000 per year were more likely than other women to be violently attacked by an intimate. Geographically, however, women living in central cities, suburban areas and rural locations experienced similar rates of violence committed by intimates.

91. Each year nearly one million individuals become victims of violent crime while working or on duty. Although men were more likely to be attacked at work by a stranger, women were more likely to be attacked by someone they knew.

92. One-sixth of all workplace homicides of women are committed by a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend. Boyfriends and husbands, both current and

former, commit more than 13,000 acts of violence against women in the workplace every year.

93. Workplace violence resulted in \$42 billion in lost productivity and legal expenses for American businesses in 1992 alone.

WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

94. Women earn 54% of the B.A.s awarded in the U.S., 52% of the Masters and professional degrees, and 40% of the doctorates.

95. The number of colleges and universities headed by women increased from 5% in 1975 to 10% in 1990. Women of color made up less than 2% of these high-level administrators.

96. In 1990, 20% of college faculty were female. In 1985, women comprised only 28% of college faculty. This is only an eight percentage point increase over a 75 year period.

97. In 1995, women made up only 31% of the full-time faculty of American colleges and universities, up from 26% in 1990—a five percentage point increase in 75 years.

98. Women make up almost 40% of the full-time faculty at public junior colleges, but only 20% of positions at top-ranked public and private research institutions.

WOMEN AND CHARITABLE GIVING

99. Women direct 43% of all foundations in the U.S.

100. In 1995, women's average annual charitable contribution was \$983, up 26% from 1993. Men's average annual contribution was \$1,057, only a 6% increase since 1993.

101. 1995 was the first year that women donated a larger share of their annual income than men.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I thank her for organizing this special order and for all of her work for women, children, families, and working families in our society.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her valuable contribution. May I also thank her for her very valuable work as vice chair of the Women's Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak this evening specifically on pay equity for women. This is one of the great issues, working women say their most important issue, more important than issues which also are among their great priorities, education and choice and health care. They say pay equity.

Why should this be so, Mr. Speaker? Well, part of the reason is that women are now close to half of all the workers in the United States. Mr. Speaker, that is an enormous increase from just 1996, when not half, but only less than a third, actually 30 percent of women were in the workforce.

Why have they come in such numbers? I am not sure that all of them are like me, Mr. Speaker, born to work. I think that we all know why women are in the workforce today in such huge and increasing numbers.

□ 1930

I think we all know that wages have been stagnant since the early 1970s, that even with the splendid economy, the American family has sent everybody who could work out to work.

First and foremost, it is women and so almost half of the work force now is female. Perhaps the stagnant wages and increasing entry of women into the labor force helps us understand why pay equity now shows up in polls at the

top, the number 1, top issue for men and women; not women alone, Mr. Speaker, but men and women.

I would hypothesize that the reason that people are saying that equal pay or pay equity, traditionally a woman's issue, is at the top of their agenda, that the reason is that women's pay has now become central to family income.

When the women go out to work with the men and if there is a male in the household, he looks at her paycheck and then looks at his, and he says, how come you are not bringing home what I am bringing home, pay equity shoots to the top of the agenda, because he is talking about his family now. What we have seen is truly extraordinary. This women's issue has morphed into a family issue and into the number 1 issue according to the polls.

That is driven, Mr. Speaker, not only by the fact that women have come in such huge numbers into the work force, it is driven by their lower wages compared to men. Study hard and do your homework, girls are told, and you can grow up to be anything you desire. I was told that, even as a skinny little black girl in the segregated public schools of the District of Columbia.

And so that is exactly what good little girls do; they become good students. And today, it turns out that they have been good at everything except getting the equal pay they have earned.

They have cracked open virtually every profession, but they have yet to crack the wage barrier, Mr. Speaker. They now collect 55 percent of college degrees. Men, Mr. Speaker, get only 45 percent of college degrees today. Women get 65 percent of the 3.5 grade point averages. None of that has done it. Study hard, little girl, and you can grow up to be anything you desire, so long as you do not ask to be paid the same as men who do the same work.

I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I have been chasing fair pay for women for 20 years, since the Carter administration when I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. We had the first hearings on pay equity at the EEOC in 1980, and later commissioned the landmark study by the National Academy of Sciences that is remembered and referred to still today because it confirmed that there is comparable pay discrimination against women.

Mr. Speaker, women today have a comparable pay problem, not an equal pay problem. A comparable pay problem comes when people, mostly women, have the same skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions as men, but get paid less for jobs that are not the same, except in all the essentials of skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions.

When I came to Congress, I brought my experience at the EEOC to the only place that can do something about gender bias. My bill, H.R. 1302, the Fair Pay Act, now has more than 60 cospon-

sors; and I thank the Members of this body who have cosponsored this bill with me. It takes the pay gap head-on by barring discrimination based on section or race when jobs are comparable in skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions.

The Fair Pay Act would end the discrimination between, for example, the pay of a probation officer and the pay of his wife, a social worker. Both these people have gone to college. They may have even come out at the same time, they work every day. He hears from people who have been released from jail and may be on probation for years. She goes into some of the most troubled neighborhoods to work with disadvantaged people and their children. It is time that the Nation seriously ask whether we can expect women to continue to pursue higher education with the same vengeance only to earn close to \$800 more than men who pass up college altogether.

The budget reconciliation bill we have just passed offers tax breaks to help more women and men go to college. We should engage in some self-congratulation for that bill passed last year, Mr. Speaker. Now we must make the incentives to pursue higher education equal for women as for men. Pursuing pay discrimination will send the signal that college pays.

Over and over again we say, we need to send more young people to college. Women have heeded that call so that they can meet the global competition in greater numbers than men. We do not want to have a reverse effect after some years when they figure out that college does not matter in pay.

This signal is surely needed now to counter the danger signals of the 1990s on pay for women. The gender gap has stabilized again.

Mr. Speaker, the increase in closing the gap, or should I say the "decreasing of the gap," has stopped. It stopped at the end of the 1980s. We have seen no real movement since closing in on a man's dollar, and we keep fluctuating, all in the upper 70s, between 70 percent, sometimes getting as high as 75 percent or 76 percent, but always going back down in the ensuing year.

The country simply cannot afford another 25 years of wage gap stability, not with so many women in the work force, not with the greater call for education, not with family income increasingly dependent on women's wages. As we have seen by the gender gap retrenchment of the 1990s, the gap will not close itself, or else it would have simply continued, unabated, to close.

Congress has an obligation to eliminate the gender discrimination that sustains the gap. Good girls who go on to be good students deserve better when they go to work. I think they deserve what my Fair Pay Act would bring them.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this is not a country that will allow the rise in real wages for women that we saw dur-

ing the 1990s to simply top out, that is it, glass ceiling in wages, you have had it; go on for another 10, 15 years, and maybe you will slip up again the way you did in the 1980s. The country will not tolerate that this time. Too many women in the work force are too dependent on their income. And yet, between 1979 and 1997, we have seen increases that encouraged us. Women earned \$395 in median weekly earnings in 1979. That \$395 turned to \$431 by 1997.

Women reached their highest ratio of earnings to men in 1993 when the ratio was almost 77 percent of a man's dollar. Since 1995, and this is the bad news, Mr. Speaker, the wage gap has actually increased so that women in 1997 are showing about 74 percent of men's median earnings.

Some have asked whether or not women have caught the so-called "male wage disease." That disease is the disease, as it were, that has stalled men's wages for what seems like an eternity when they stopped rising in the 1990s. We have every reason to be concerned, Mr. Speaker, because we are now living in the best of times economically.

The fact is that over and over again we are told by everybody from the President to the nightly news that we are now living in the longest period of sustained economic growth since the end of the Second World War. How then to explain the lack of real growth in women's wages and in men's wages during the 1990s?

We explained it for men's wages by saying, well, men were in manufacturing, they were moving overseas, it would all straighten itself out. In that sense, they are in worse trouble than women, because it has been downhill all the way with no respite such as women got during the 1980s when the gap, in fact, was closed.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me most is that women's wage gap-closing is not explained by the growth in real wages. A substantial amount of the closing of the gap is not closing at all. It is because men have not, in fact, had an increase in their real wages, and that simply leaves them where they are, or declining, causing women to meet them more easily than if their wages had continued to go up since the early 1970s.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not what we had in mind when women started to close the wage gap. We do not mean to do that at the expense of men, our husbands, our fathers, our brothers; and of course, it is not at their expense that we are doing it. What these figures show is simply that they are not rising for whatever reasons women's are and, thus, there is the appearance of the closing of the gap that is in fact not the case.

Beyond the fact that much of the closing of the gap of women's wages is really nothing more than a decline in men's wages, there is also a serious problem, and that is that most of the closing of the gap is not due to an increase in women's real wages.

Mr. Speaker, 41 percent of the closing is due to an increase in women's real wages, but that leaves 59 percent which comes because of the decline in men's wages, and Mr. Speaker, the proportion of the gap that is closed due to the growth in real wages is only 19 percent; and that is in this decade, the 1990s.

□ 1945

Compare that to the 1980s, when the proportion of the closure of the gap for women due to real wage growth was 51 percent. Fifty-one percent of the gap closed because of real wage increases in the 1980s. Nineteen percent of the decrease in the gap in the 1990s is due to an increase in real wages for women. That is unsatisfactory, Mr. Speaker, and it tells us perhaps all we need to know about why pay equity has found itself at the top of the agenda for men and for women.

We are talking family business here, Mr. Speaker. It is family wages that are falling. There is no such thing as women's wages anymore. Women are single heads of households. Imagine what this slow-up in the rise in women's wages means to women who have to support children by themselves.

A third of all children in this country are born out of wedlock. Many more simply live for huge periods of time after divorce or separation with their mothers alone. These women are out here trying to make it on a woman's wage. Even when a woman is part of a two-earner household, men are so disquieted by the failure of the woman to bring home her fair pay that they have joined with women to put pay equity at the top of the list, at least according to the polls; a serious, serious problem.

Mr. Speaker, to get some sense of just how serious it is and why this body needs to pay attention to it, and I offer my Fair Pay Act as one approach at hand, an example comes out of what has happened to the pay of the women one would most expect to be ahead of the game.

Let us look at women with Bachelor's Degrees. Mr. Speaker, they earned \$28,701 in 1996. A man with a Bachelor's Degree earned \$46,702. Let us look at high school graduates. A woman with a high school education earned \$16,161, Mr. Speaker. A man with a high school education earned \$27,642.

Even if we consider that there are some reasons to discount part of this discrepancy, such as perhaps the woman has taken some time out to have children, perhaps the woman, and these are all either high school or college graduates, perhaps the woman has taken some time to have a part-time job, but can you really tell me that the difference should be almost \$20,000 between a man who graduated from college and a woman who graduated from college? That gap is simply too great to be explained away by any explanation except some degree of discrimination in wages for women.

We think that discrimination comes because, Mr. Speaker, wages in this country and throughout the world have been designed for women. When a job is a traditional women's job, throughout human time, that fact and that fact alone has depressed the wage scale. What the Fair Pay Act asks is that one eliminate that factor and that factor alone from wage-setting.

My bill respects the market system. I am not crazy. This is a free market system, and I do not want to change it one bit in that regard. But the free market system does not allow men and women who do the same work to be paid dissimilarly, and the reason is because discrimination is not a market factor, or at least it is not a legitimate market factor.

In the same way, the free market system should not allow discrimination to be a factor in the difference between what a probation officer and a social worker receive. Assuming they are measured objectively by the grade point scale widely used throughout industry, they are performing work that is comparable in skill, effort and responsibility, and working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of ways to rectify this matter. I shall be speaking about the filing of a complaint, but I would like to speak to an old-fashioned market system way to rectify this discrimination. That is through collective bargaining.

In every market system one way to legitimately raise wages is simply to bargain for increases, and the theory of bargaining for increases is that the market will keep the union from getting more of an increase than the market will bear. If it does not, workers will be laid off or other sacrifices will have to be made, and the employer's bargaining position in a market system will keep the wage from becoming higher than the market should allow.

I believe we should take a very close look at what unions have done to bring pay equity for women. It is worth noting that white union women earn \$151 more than their counterparts who are not unionized, a 38 percent difference; that black union women earn \$73 more than their counterparts who are not unionized.

Mr. Speaker, these figures are weekly earnings, of course. That figure is an 18.5 percent difference. Hispanic women earn \$24 more per week than their non-union counterparts. That is a 6 percent difference. Looked at at the bottom line, women who are in unions are about one-third closer to union white men's earnings.

Why does this occur through unionization? Why are women increasingly coming to unionization? Why are so many people of color attracted to unionization? Because it tends to standardize wages in and of itself by the way bargaining occurs, and therefore, naturally, to eliminate some of this wage disparity and to reduce wage gaps.

Of course, the fact that women and minorities have a voice in wage-setting

through their unions and the democratic practices of unions means that they can exert pressure on their unions to keep men and women's wages from getting out of line. If the difference is out of line and their consciousness is sufficiently raised, then they can in fact democratically compel their union to bring about greater equalization.

Unions themselves, frankly, have stepped to the forefront often to raise the consciousness of their own members, rather than the other way around. I would like to offer some examples, because I think that they point up what can be done using this traditional market system approach.

AFCSME, which by the way also represents many Federal workers, in the private sector has raised over \$1 billion in wage adjustments alone for women workers. This is the American Federation of State and Municipal Employees.

Their Minnesota pay equity contract is particularly noteworthy. AFCSME in fact bargained for a pay equity study in 1985, and looking at comparable skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions, AFCSME got a contract that provided \$21.7 million to reduce wage and equity in female-dominated jobs. That was an approximate increase of 9 percent, and it occurred without reducing the number of jobs for women in State government, where this landmark win took place.

That is important to note, again, because the way in which collective bargaining works, if the union finds that it is asking for an increase that the employer will make up for by laying off women or other workers, it gets nowhere. So again, the market system, using collective bargaining, disciplines how one bargains for increases in wages involving pay equity for women. It is a wonderfully neat and classic approach to improving wages for women.

Occasionally this straight-out collective bargaining will not do it. Occasionally, therefore, there have been strikes. In 1981, AFCSME Local 101, Council 57, had to go on strike. This occurred in the City of San Jose, California. What happened as a result, however, was a \$1.5 million increase in female-dominated jobs.

It says something about a union that is willing to go on strike to bring pay fairness to its women workers, because it means that the men and women went on strike. And if the strike was successful, and it was, it was a nine-day strike, by the way, and it was, then what it means is the employer in fact gave an increase, but obviously, not from his point of view, more of an increase than the market would bear.

Another union, SEIU, Service Employees International Union, has moved aggressively in the pay equity area. I am most intrigued by a settlement they won in 1987 in San Francisco.

Essentially what SEIU did was to negotiate a \$35 million settlement with the City of San Francisco. In order to

do that, the city had to put a referendum on the ballot, and the pay equity referendum passed by 60 percent. Twelve thousand workers benefited. Here we see a combination of democracy, collective bargaining, and pay equity for workers.

□ 2000

SEIU deserves a lot of credit for being among the first to raise the issue of pay equity for men of color as well as for women. SEIU has forced a study that shows that in L.A. County, 81 percent of the jobs were sex-segregated and 21 percent were segregated by race. This is the kind of study that often produces action through collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker.

More recently, in 1994, there was another pay equity victory for the SEIU. The Local 715 in Santa Clara, California won nearly \$30 million through achieving changes in job classifications of traditionally women-dominated jobs and jobs dominated by minority workers. In the end, these workers were brought to the wage levels of mixed-gender occupations.

Mr. Speaker, the National Education Association represents not only teachers, but many education support personnel who have been left behind. The NEA has had some notable success in negotiating pay equity for these support workers in various school districts. More than two dozen contracts to be exact; 14,000 personnel affected.

The estimate is that over a worker's career, their pay equity program has brought raises of a minimum of \$10,000 for most of the employees involved, and as much as \$40,000 in the career earnings for many others.

In 1991, the utility workers of America negotiated a pay equalization increase at Southern California Gas Company. Traditional female-dominated jobs saw increases of 15 percent. Typical of the occupation comparisons was the case of the female customer service representative who was equalized with the male service representative or meter reader. That is the way it is parsed out. The inside job is less, the outside job is more. Maybe it should be. But, in fact, often when we look at skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions, that should not be the case.

The Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International, Local 34, negotiated a famous contract with my own university, Yale, where I went to law school, in 1988 for its clerical and technical workers, winning for these female-dominated occupations 24 to 35 percent over 4 years, and they had to go on strike to do it. I was on the Yale Corporation at time. Yale held out for a long time. There was a 10-week strike. It was the first pay equity strike in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, if workers have to do that, they have got to do that. Hopefully, more and more employers will see that it is in their best interest to settle these matters peacefully, a strike peacefully, but a strike, of

course, is almost inherently peaceful. But I would hope that most employers would understand that it is in their best interest to raise the wages of women workers so that they do not have people doing comparable work who are paid less than men who sit beside them or who work outdoors doing comparable work.

The Newspaper Guild, perhaps some think of that as an unlikely union for pay equity, but it is no such thing. Here there have been three pay equity increases in three different newspapers. Examples of jobs that have been equalized are the female insider classified sales jobs and the historic male outside sales jobs.

Mr. Speaker, nonunion workers may also get themselves into voluntary associations of one kind or another to try to negotiate pay equity disparities, but they will be at a severe disadvantage. They may advocate, but each and every one of these cases have required technical expertise, political support and financial resources. Pay equity case or matter cannot be argued without enormous backup. It must be shown that the skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions are indeed unequal. That is not the case simply because the man in the workplace earns more than the woman in the workplace. The jobs may not be comparable. Most jobs are not comparable. Complainants have got to find in the same workplace two jobs that are comparable and then have to show by a very detailed and technical study that each and every one of these areas, when added up, should result in the same pay. Mr. Speaker, it is a very difficult thing to do, and cannot be done by getting on a PC and figuring it out. It takes lawyers, economists, statisticians, and a whole host of skills. That is why unions have proved most valuable to women and people of color in correcting pay disparity.

Tom Donahue, a good friend and former Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL-CIO, said it best in a hearing in the 1980's: Bargaining about wage rates is something, after all, that we have been doing for decades. That is what unions do.

I recognize that not everyone in this body favors unions or collective bargaining, strange as that may seem in a great democracy like ours. But that is indeed the case. It is either going to be done through that traditional market-oriented approach, collective bargaining, or my Fair Pay Act would do it for nonunion workers and, for that matter, for union workers if the union cannot or does not move forward. And one way or the other, look at the polls. We will see that the American family is demanding that we do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, this discrimination in wages results in no small part because women have only a limited number of occupations, really about six major occupations to which they have essentially been consigned. If a woman walks into a workplace and says,

"What jobs do you have open," Mr. Speaker, if we would like to do the testing, what will happen is the woman will be sent to the woman's track and the employer will not even recognize what he is doing. It is just what he has always done and the company has done for decades. And what happens results in crowding often of qualified and over-qualified people into a few job categories whose talents could take them almost anywhere in the workplace.

The way to undo this is to bring it to the employer's attention, make them undo it, make them understand that it is against the law and the law then has a deterrent effect and it begins to then undo itself, as much discrimination does today. It is discrimination that has reduced these wages.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, where these wages are unequal, and the cause is not discrimination, I do not call for equalization. I am not trying to build a command wage-setting economy. Not only do I respect the market economy, I glory in what it can do. Of course when it does not do what it is supposed to do, that is what this body is here for, to make sure that people do not unduly suffer while the economic cycle works its way out.

I am talking about pinpointing the discrimination factor in wage-setting, and only the discrimination factor, and I am talking about making the woman do that as a plaintiff if the matter were to turn out to be a discrimination suit.

Mr. Speaker, my backup on that, and perhaps my preference, is collective bargaining. Ultimately, though, we have got to take responsibility for this. We cannot keep sending the woman out to work or having her, as in most cases, go out to work on her own or having her have the responsibility for the family income on her own and saying you are on your own; if you encounter comparable pay discrimination, you are still on your own. Discrimination, and only discrimination is what I am after, Mr. Speaker.

The women of America have so many priorities that we often lose sight of what really is the priority. Is it child care? Is it osteoporosis? Is it breast cancer? Is it affirmative action? Women have spoken in unison with the men. They say it is pay equity. I am out here working every day and want the same pay that I would get if I were a man going out here on the job. If I do not get it, give me a statute that gives me a tool, and employers will begin to do it on their own.

Nobody in this body would want to say to a woman who was a 911 operator, an emergency service operator, that she is worth less than her husband who is a fire dispatcher. Can my colleagues imagine what it is like to sit at 911? I can tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, it is probably more hectic than it is to be a fire dispatcher, unless fires occur every moment. It is time we said to working women that they are on their own except when you encounter discrimination, and then the Congress of the United States is with them.

The Fair Pay Act, like the AEPA or the Equal Pay Act, the historic landmark statute that we passed in 1963, will root out the discrimination I am after without tampering with the market system. A woman may file a discrimination claim, but as in all discrimination cases, she must prove that the gap between herself and a male co-worker doing comparable work is discrimination and no other reason such as, first and foremost, legitimate market factors. Gender is not a legitimate market factor.

Mr. Speaker may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado). The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use my remaining time to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary of the Committee on Appropriations. I appeared before him to seek an increase for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I had twice sought such an increase, and have once gotten one on the floor with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) as the cosponsor. And, again, as chair of the Women's Caucus, when we sent a letter the chairman had been responsive to us.

This year I tried a different approach and said to Chairman Rogers that I sought support for the President's call for a \$37 million increase for the EEOC, which has a serious backlog and runs backlogs every year, but I sought it in a different way, in a way that would keep the EEOC from coming back for annual increases. I raise this now because the EEOC is vitally important to women. Pay equity, sexual discrimination, pregnancy discrimination, job discrimination comes through its doors and through its complaint process.

We had an extraordinary case, the Mitsubishi case here, involving virtually pornographic, outrageous actions by male co-workers, and the whole Women's Caucus got involved. Essentially what I said to the gentleman from Kentucky is that I would like to have the EEOC do something comparable to what I tried to leave in place when I was at the EEOC, which was a system of alternative dispute resolution, a way that processes cases rapidly, using settlement techniques, and a way that I found also increased the awards to women because after a woman has remained in the system for 2 years, she is likely to get no award at all because the evidence falls away. If she settles, she gets often some money, assuming the case is worthy.

Chairman Rogers was intrigued by the notion that EEOC might not come back every year if they got an increase this time, and put in place structural changes that would then last for some considerable number of years.

□ 2015

That is what happened when I was at EEOC. I said, forget this increase. You will not see me again.

I was at the EEOC for 4 years. I never came back on increase. I put in place something called rapid charge processing. We brought the average time of processing an individual charge from 2 years to 2½ months and raised the remedy rate from 14 percent to 43 percent using settlement techniques that are commonly used to resolve cases in the court system.

Chairman ROGERS said, show me a plan. And perhaps if we can tie the President's request for an increase to a plan, that would mean that the EEOC would have to show structural changes and not come back for annual increases. Perhaps he would look more closely at this substantial increase for the EEOC. I thank the chairman for looking closely at my proposal.

When I came to the EEOC, it was known primarily for a backlog of 125,000 cases. We got rid of most of that backlog before I left the agency in about 3 years' time.

I raise the case of EEOC not only because I am a former chair, but because I believe not only in quality, I believe in equity and efficiency. And I think those of us that are for equality had better stand for efficiency or we are not going to get equality. The best way to go about cases is to try and work them out. Then they deter employers and then there is a win-win for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I remind this body that I have been speaking here this evening not for myself but for 50 women in this House, some of whom will embrace some of what I have to say, all of whom who stand for fairness and equality for women during Women's History Month.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I have joining me tonight my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). We are going to talk for a good portion of our allotted time tonight about the Federal budget and principally about where we were just 3½ years ago, where we are today, and a little bit about where I think we should go.

First of all, if I could before I yield to my friend, I would like to talk a little bit about what was happening back not so many years ago. This is a chart that anybody, and any of the Members who watch us on C-SPAN from time to time, I am sure have seen. This is a chart that was put together by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN). What it shows is the

budget deficit. This actually is the debt. The accumulated debt was growing out of control.

In fact, there was a study by, I believe, the Congressional Budget Office, done just a few years ago, that said that if Congress did not get serious about this problem, by the time our children reached middle-age they could be paying a total tax rate of over 80 percent just to pay the interest on the national debt.

I tell the people back home and sometimes they have trouble believing this, which does not surprise me because I have difficulty believing this as well, that the debt has become so large. But right now the debt is \$5.5 trillion.

And one of our other colleagues has done some calculations to try and explain how much a trillion dollars is; and the way he describes it is this, and I believe his numbers are accurate, that if you spent a million dollars a day every single day, it would take you 2,700 years to spend a trillion dollars.

Previous Congresses have run up almost \$5.5 trillion worth of debt that our kids are going to be responsible for. And worse than that, we have to pay the interest on that; that is like an entitlement, and it becomes the second or third largest single entry in the Federal budget.

I tell people, as I say, back in my district that every single dollar of personal income taxes collected west of the Mississippi River now goes to pay the interest on the national debt. That is a very scary statistic. And I also remind people, and particularly where I come from back in Minnesota we still have an awful lot of farm families; in fact, many of the people who live in the cities like Rochester and Mankato and Winona and Austin and Albert Lea, they also understand that because many of them are no more than one generation removed from the farm.

But the American dream back in farm country is, very simply, to pay off the mortgage and leave the kids the farm. But, unfortunately, what has been happening over the last 30 years is that Congress has literally been selling the farm and leaving the kids the mortgage. I think we all know that there is something fundamentally improper about that.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). It is nice to have him with me today.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding. Mr. Speaker, it is good to join him coast to coast and beyond through the facilities of C-SPAN.

There are many different ways to examine this debt. Mr. Speaker, lest there are those who join us who believe this is simply a statistical argument, I would urge them to think again. Because, as my colleague from Minnesota points out, this translates to a mortgage on the future of our children.

A lot of things have changed in the 3 years since a new common-sense, conservative Congress came to town. I can