

SEC. 556. RELEASE OF USE RESTRICTION

House §582. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

TITLE VI—COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION

SEC. 601. COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN

Senate Title VI, House Title VI.—House recedes, with an amendment.

601(a) Definitions. House §601(a), Senate §601(a).—Same.

601(b) Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan. House §601(b), Senate §601(b).—Same.

601(c) Additional Program Authority. House §601(c), Senate §601(c).—Same.

601(d) Authorization of Future Projects. House §601(d), Senate §601(d).—Same.

601(e) Cost Sharing. House §601(e), Senate §601(e).—Senate recedes.

601(f) Evaluation of Projects. House §601(f), Senate §601(f).—Same.

601(g) Exclusions and Limitations. House §601(g), Senate §601(g).—Same.

601(h) Assurance of Project Benefits. House §601(h), Senate §601(h).—Senate recedes.

601(i) Dispute Resolution. House §601(i), Senate §601(i).—Same.

601(j) Independent Scientific Review. House §601(j), Senate §601(j).—Same.

601(k) Outreach and Assistance. House §601(k), Senate §601(k).—Same.

601(l) Report to Congress. House §601(l), Senate §601(l).—Same.

601(m) Report on Aquifer Storage and Recovery Project. House §601(m), No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

601(n) Full Disclosure of Proposed Funding. House §601(m), No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

601(o) Surplus Federal Lands. House §601(o), No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

601(p) Severability. House §601(p), Senate §601(m).—Same.

SEC. 602. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING HOMESTEAD AIR FORCE BASE

602(a) Findings. House §602(a), Senate §602(a).—Senate recedes.

602(b) Sense of Congress. House §602(b), Senate §602(b).—Senate recedes.

TITLE VII—MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, NORTH DAKOTA

Senate Title VII. No comparable House title.—House recedes, with an amendment.

The Managers encourage the Secretary to include the Vision Group of the Missouri River Coordinated Resource Management Program as members of the Missouri River Trust.

TITLE VIII—WILDLIFE REFUGE ENHANCEMENT

Senate Title VIII. No comparable House title.—House recedes, with an amendment.

TITLE IX—MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SOUTH DAKOTA

Senate Title IX, House Title VII.—House recedes, with an amendment.

BUD SHUSTER,
DON YOUNG,
SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,
E. CLAY SHAW,
JIM OBERSTAR,
BOB BORSKI,
ROBERT MENENDEZ,

Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB SMITH,
JOHN WARNER,
MAX BAUCUS,
BOB GRAHAM,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of House rule XXII, I hereby notify the House of my intention to-morrow to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses of the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on disagreeing with provisions in the Senate amendment which denies the President's request for dedicated resources for local school construction and, instead, broadly expands the title VI Education Block Grant with limited accountability in the use of the funds.

□

□ 1830

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of House rule XXII, I hereby serve notice to the House of my intention tomorrow to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. WU moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on disagreeing with provisions in the Senate amendment which denies the President's request for dedicated resources to reduce class size in the early grades and instead, broadly expands the Title VI Education Block Grant with limited accountability in the use of funds.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same motion which I noticed on Sunday evening for debate on Monday and it is made necessary by the fact that we had an agreement on Monday morning funding this at the full \$1.75 billion amount, and that agreement was broken by noon. I must renotice this motion at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded it is not appropriate

to debate the motions, which only are being noticed at the present time.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby notice the House of my intention to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HOEKSTRA moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4577 be instructed to choose a level of funding for the Inspector General of the Department of Education that reflects a requirement on the Inspector General of the Department of Education, as authorized by section 211 of the Department of Education Organization Act, to use all funds appropriated to the Office of Inspector General of such Department to comply with the Inspector General Act of 1978, with priority given to section 4 of such Act.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby notice the House of my intention tomorrow to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SCHAFFER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4577 be instructed to insist on those provisions that—

(1) maintain the utmost flexibility possible for the grant program under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and

(2) provide local educational agencies the maximum discretion within the scope of conference to spend Federal education funds to improve the education of their students.

□

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 31, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the per-
mission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of
the rules of the U.S. House of Representa-
tives, the Clerk received the following mes-
sage from the Secretary of the Senate on Oc-
tober 30, 2000, at 7:40 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amend-
ment H.J. Res. 120.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHLL.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to clause 1 of rule I, the Speaker
signed the following enrolled joint res-
olution on Monday, October 30, 2000.

House Joint Resolution 121, joint res-
olution making further continuing ap-
propriations for fiscal year 2001, and for
other purposes.

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker,
I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-
bers may have 5 legislative days within
which to revise and extend their re-
marks on H.J. Res. 121, and that I may
include tabular and extraneous mate-
rial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker,
pursuant to the provisions of House
Resolution 662, I call up the joint res-
olution (H.J. Res. 121), making further
continuing appropriations for the fiscal
year 2001, and for other purposes, and
ask for its immediate consideration in
the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint
resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution
121 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 121

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Rep-
resentatives of the United States of America in
Congress assembled, That Public Law 106-275,
is further amended by striking the date spec-
ified in section 106(c) and inserting "Novem-
ber 1, 2000".*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to House Joint Resolution 662, the
gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG)
and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.
OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker,
I yield myself such time as I may con-
sume.

Mr. Speaker, I advise our colleagues
in the House that this is another 1-day

continuing resolution to make sure
that the government continues to oper-
ate until midnight tomorrow night,
while we continue to work away in a
friendly, cooperative, bipartisan way to
resolve the final outstanding issues be-
fore this Congress can adjourn.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I announce
to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.
OBEY), my friend, that I do not intend
to have a lengthy debate on our side.
And so I am going to reserve the bal-
ance of my time, probably until I get
to my closing statement, depending on
what issues might come up in the
meantime.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield my-
self 7½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am wearing this wrist
band in solidarity with the over 300,000
workers who will suffer repetitive mo-
tion injuries, some of them career-end-
ing, because of the gutlessness of this
Congress in refusing, for over a 10-year
period, to put some protection for
those folks into the law.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone into plant
after plant in my district and I have
seen especially women at computer
terminals, at shoe-stitching machines,
wearing things like this or even worse.

Look at this picture and tell me what
is different. What separates us as Mem-
bers of Congress from this woman?
What separates us is that when we have
a repetitive motion injury, like I had
for several weeks last year when I was
wearing one of these, we can stop doing
what we were doing until we recover.
People like this woman cannot. They
have to keep going until they cannot
go any more.

That is the difference. The only re-
petitive motion injury that most Mem-
bers of Congress are likely to get is to
their knees from the repetitive genu-
flecting to the big business lobbyists
who persuaded the Republican leader-
ship to blow up the agreement on the
Labor, Health, and Education bill by
denying some protection to people like
this.

That is a fact. That is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recite to my
colleagues the history of the repetitive
motion struggle that we have had. On
June 29 of 1995, the House for the first
time took action to prohibit OSHA
from putting in place a repetitive mo-
tion injury rule that would protect
workers like this. That was delay num-
ber one.

On July 27, 1995, the House Com-
mittee on Appropriations again re-
ported language to do the same thing.

When it was finally adopted, it again
said that none of the funds in the bill
would be used to enforce or implement
an OSHA rule protecting workers like
this from repetitive motion injury.
That was delay number two.

Then, on July of 1996, the Sub-
committee on Labor, Health and
Human Services, and Education again
tried to delay action for another year.
That time the House had guts enough

to stand up and say no and they were
defeated on the House floor. But they
came back; and on July 25 of 1997, they
again adopted new language which for
another year delayed the implementa-
tion of the rule to protect workers like
this. And they won. And so, we had
delay number three that delayed yet
another year.

The only difference was that that
time the House said it would be the
last time. This is a copy of the front
page of the committee report dated
July 25, 1997, which outlines the fact
that yet another year's delay was being
undertaken to prevent these repetitive
motion injuries. But it said "the com-
mittee will refrain from any further re-
strictions with regard to the develop-
ment, promulgation, or issuance of an
ergonomics standard following fiscal
year 1998."

And you know what? For a year the
Congress abided by that. It is true that
the Congress did provide additional
funding to do yet an additional study
by the National Academy of Sciences
of the issue. But at the same time that
was done, the chairman of the com-
mittee, Bob Livingston, our former col-
league, in good faith signed a letter
with me which indicated that even
though that money was being provided
that nonetheless "we understand that
OSHA intends to issue a proposed rule
on ergonomics late in the summer of
1999. We are writing to make clear by
funding of the NAS study it is in no
way our intent to block or delay
issuance by OSHA of a proposed rule on
ergonomics."

And yet this year, here is the rollcall
if you want to look at it, some of the
same people who were here when the
Congress made the agreement not to
delay this any further voted once again
to genuflect to the interests of big
business and forget the interests of
workers and they signed on to another
year delay.

Now, in conference, finally, against
my wishes, the White House 2 days ago
agreed to yet another 6-month delay in
the implementation of the standards to
protect these workers. But what we got
in return for that additional 6-month
delay in implementation was the right
of this President to at least promul-
gate the rule.

Now, in my view, there is only one
reason why the majority leadership
blew up that agreement. Because that
agreement was understood, we had an
agreement to the entire bill! It was
even sealed with toasts of Merlot at
1:30 in the morning. And I do not know
of anything more "sacred" in con-
ference than a toast of Merlot. But
nonetheless, after there was an agree-
ment, then we walk out of there and
the next morning what do we get? We
get "Operation Blow Up" by the Re-
publican leadership because apparently
the Chamber of Commerce lobbyists
got to them and said, "Boys, we do not
want it." So they blew it up. They blew
it up.