

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, 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.

**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.

**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 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 7½ 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