certain personnel actions and not in others for minority men and women and White women in managerial and professional job categories compared with White men in these categories at the three laboratories. Most notably, with the exception of Asian men at Los Alamos and Sandia, and Hispanic men at Lawrence Livermore, the salaries for minority men and women and White women were lower than for White men.

GAO found statistically significant differences, with some exceptions, for disciplinary actions.

Minority staff attribute their low representation in certain jobs and management to recruiting strategies that do not extensively target colleges and universities with large minority populations.

Opportunities exist for DOE and OFCCP to work together to ensure that the labs meet EEO requirements. At the moment, DOE and OFFCP evaluations produced difference results. For example, in 1999, DOE rated Sandia as ''outstanding'' in human resources while the OFCCP cited Sandia for two affirmative action program violations. GAO recommends that the DOE and OFCCP coordinate their actions to support each other's efforts.

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

Mr. WU. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation with us. I appreciate his amendment. It is well written and well done. We support it, and I thank the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, In May of 2002, the General Accounting Office released a report that revealed an alarming disparity in salaries and rates of promotion between minorities when compared to which males in the same jobs at the Department of Energy's National Laboratories.

GAO found that salaries for minority men and women and white women were lower than for white men, with the exceptions of Asian-American men at Los Alamos and Sandia and Hispanic men at Lawrence Livermore.

Comparing men and women of the same race/ethnicity, GAO found that White, Asian, and Hispanic women earned less than their male counterparts.

The report also found that there are further areas for investigation. For example, with over 300 Asian-American professional staff at Lawrence Livermore, not one was promoted to a managerial position between 1998 and 2000.

When the report was released, I called for congressional hearings to determine the cause of these inequities so that we may remedy them to ensure that the Department of Energy can recruit and retain the highest quality ethnically diverse work force.

Unfortunately, the Science Committee took no action on this issue. The Wu/Johnson amendment would finally bring about some congressional action, by requiring the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress on DOE labs' equal employment opportunity practices in promotion, pay raise, discipline, and recruitment and retention efforts. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mrs. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of the Wu amendment. this is a simple, noncontroversial amendment that requires the Secretary of Energy to make a biennial report to Congress on DOE labs' EEO practices.

Why is such a requirement needed? This amendment's reporting requirements mirror the April 2002 GAO report's recommendations and I believe it would help safeguard our national security and help maintain America's scientific edge.

A Department of Energy internal survey demonstrates the sentiments of many minorities at the department. According to the survey, many minorities feel there are racial problems in this department.

In fact 80 percent of African Americans, 62 percent of Hispanic Americans, 26 percent of Caucasians, and 74 percent of Asian Pacific Americans working at DOE labs agreed that there is racial profiling at the labs.

Whether these are real or perceived sentiments, it is problematic that such a high percentage of lab employees have concerns about their work environment. Should this trend continue, the labs would cease to be an attractive workplace for American scientists. As a nation, we cannot afford to lose our best asset, our human resources.

This report also analyzed pay level, promotions, and management composition by race and gender at three DOE facilities: Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos, and Sandia National Laboratories. While the GAO did not prove or disprove actual discrimination, it found statistical differences in the way that minorities and women were paid, promoted, or rewarded over a 5-year period from 1995–2000. According to the report, salaries for minorities and women at these DOE facilities lagged behind the salaries for white males.

There were also discrepancies in the promotion rate of some minority groups, including a failure to promote any of the 300 Asian-American staff members at the Lawrence Livermore facility during a 2-year period. In addition, white males were found to hold a greater percentage of managerial and professional jobs, 64 percent, than their representation in the work force, about 54 percent.

The results of this report painted a disturbing picture of inconsistency in the way minorities and women are treated in certain personnel action in the national laboratories.

I have long held the belief that America's work force—at all levels and in all sectors—should reflect the faces of this Nation. This report reveals that we have much work to do to encourage diversity and equality at our Nation's weapons facilities, and I hope that, by taking a closer look at how we are treating women and people of color in the workplace, we have taken a step in the right direction. I am encouraged that DOE has pledged to address the discrepancies raised by this report, and we in Congress will continue to monitor their actions and hold them accountable.

That is why this amendment is so important. It is vital that mechanisms be put in place to hold laboratories accountable to their promises to the workplace environment for minorities. The reports provided by this amendment would aid the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs at the U.S. Department of Labor and strengthen its oversight of DOE's hiring and recruitment practices. Without these safeguards, our national labs could become hotbeds that foster an atmosphere of pervasive mistrust and fear. And this is in no one's best interest.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for his cooperation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member claim time in opposition to the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman 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. 6) to enhance energy conservation and research and development, to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–72) on the resolution (H. Res. 191) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–73) on the resolution (H. Res. 192) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 190 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows: