OFFICE OF THE CLERK.

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

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington. DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 30, 2000, at 7:40 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.J. Res. 120.

With best wishes, I am Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL.

П

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

House Joint Resolution 121, joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 121, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

П

APPRO-FURTHER CONTINUING PRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 662, I call up the joint resolution (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 Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled That Public Law 106-275 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting "November 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 consume.

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 operate until midnight tomorrow night, while we continue to work away in a friendly, cooperative, bipartisan way to resolve the final outstanding issues before 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 balance 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 myself 71/2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am wearing this wrist band in solidarity with the over 300,000 workers who will suffer repetitive motion injuries, some of them career-ending, 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 Members 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 repetitive motion injury that most Members of Congress are likely to get is to their knees from the repetitive genuflecting to the big business lobbyists who persuaded the Republican leadership 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 motion injury rule that would protect workers like this. That was delay number one.

On July 27, 1995, the House Committee on Appropriations again reported 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 Subcommittee 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 implementation 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 committee will refrain from any further restrictions with regard to the development, 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 committee, Bob Livingston, our former colleague, 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 promulgate 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 conference than a toast of Merlot. But nonetheless, after there was an agreement, then we walk out of there and the next morning what do we get? We get "Operation Blow Up" by the Republican 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