

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 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 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 mat-  
erial.

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.

In my view, there is only one reason they did it. It is because if their candidate for President wins the election, they did not want their candidate for President to have to take the public heat that would come from reversing that rule.

The language in the compromise gives the new President, whoever he is, the right to suspend and then reverse that rule through the Administrative Procedures Act. I do not like that. But that was the deal. But they do not even want to do that on that side of the aisle. If their candidate gets elected, they are afraid to have their candidate for President have to take the public heat from repealing this rule to help these people.

□ 1845

They want him to be able to do it on the sly. That is what is at stake.

So my suggestion to our friends on the majority side of the aisle, and I am not speaking about the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), he negotiated in good faith. My suggestion to the House leadership is, if you have the courage of your convictions, then let us do this straight and clean. Stick to the agreement that was negotiated. Each side will have to take a chance and see who is elected President, and the public will know in either case what side we are on. That is the only question that is before us tonight. Whose side are you on?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the front page of the Washington Post has a headline today. It says: "Budget Deal is Torpedoed by House GOP. Move by Leadership Angers Negotiators on Both Sides."

On the front page of the Los Angeles Times, quote, "GOP Leaders Scuttle Deal in Budget Battle."

Now, these and other stories tell how a team of Republican legislators was empowered by the Republican leadership to negotiate a budget agreement with congressional Democrats and the White House. And that is exactly what they did. Neither side got everything that they wanted, but the American people were well served with this agreement. The compromise would have provided one of the largest educational increases in the history of this government. And perhaps that was one of the reasons why it did not pass muster once it reached the leaders. It would have modernized and repaired 5,000 schools. It would have provided 12,000 new teachers to reduce class size. It would have created after-school programs for 850,000 new students in this country. And as we heard from the gentleman from Wisconsin, when the negotiators wrapped up their discussions at 1:30 in the morning, they toasted, they shook hands, and then not 12 hours later, the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle decided to totally re-

pu diate the agreement that their team negotiated.

One of their reasons besides the education issue, as we heard, was the question of repetitive stress motion, which takes a terrible toll on our workers. We have been battling this issue for 14 years. Libby Dole when she was the head of the Labor Department, a Republican, put these regulations forward because she saw the need to deal with the question of repetitive illnesses that we can cure with some reasonable, sensible, rational regulations that will help people be able to hold their child when they get home from work, or open a jar of peanut butter at lunchtime, which they cannot do now as a result of these terrible musculoskeletal diseases.

Now where are we? Well, this Republican Congress, from George Bush all the way on down, have talked a very good game about bipartisanship and bringing people together. But this week the Republican leadership gave the American people a sneak preview of their bipartisanship and how it is really going to work and their passionate conservatism. It is something those of us who have worked in this Congress have seen over and over again.

Opportunities for bipartisan cooperation on prescription drug coverage, on campaign finance reform, on curbing the powers of the HMOs, and overcrowding in schools, all vetoed by the Republican leadership, either in this body or in the other body. They play this game where one body passes it, but the leaders in the other body make sure that it does not reach the President's desk. Torpedoed by men who are more committed to their partisan Republican agenda than the American agenda, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a Member of this House once said, "You earn trust by saying what you mean and meaning what you say." That Congressman who said that was the past Republican leader, a man named Gerald Ford. Today's House Republican leaders would do well to heed his words.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the gentleman from Florida, does he intend to yield time?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of yielding at this point. If I do, before the time is expired, I would advise the gentleman in advance.

Mr. OBEY. I want to take 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker, to simply say that the gentleman from Florida was absolutely honorable in these negotiations. We disagreed vehemently on a number of these issues. But I know him to be a man of his word. I am uncomfortable that we have to say what we have to say in his presence, because if anyone blew up the deal, it was certainly not his fault.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this

time and for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, at the turn of the century, the last century, 100 years ago, Ida Tarbell and Upton Sinclair shocked this Nation with their accounts of dangers in the workplace to American workers. The exploitation of American workers challenged the conscience of our country.

Here we are 100 years later, and we have scientific evidence of that same kind of exploitation, that same kind of danger to American workers. Yet the Republican majority is opposing any opportunity to correct that. If you use a computer, if you drive a truck for a living, if you are in the health care industry and lift patients, if you are in the food processing industry, if you have to chop off the leg of a chicken for 8 hours a day with very little interruption and rest, there are so many occupations that are affected by this. In fact, Mr. Speaker, women who are prevalent in occupations that are mostly for women have a disproportionate share of these musculoskeletal injuries.

Every year 600,000 workers in America lose time from work because of repetitive motion, back, and other disabling injuries. These injuries are often extremely painful and disabling. Sometimes they are permanent. The gentleman from Michigan pointed out the cost to our economy of this, the cost to the personal quality of life for workers because of this. By the way, not all businesses are so unenlightened. Those who have instituted voluntary guidelines have a payback on their bottom line of greater productivity from their workers, much higher morale from their workers, and lower cost for health care for these workers.

This is not just about everybody in business, painting them all with the same brush; but it is about some that the Republican majority cannot say "no" to. In order not to say "no" to their special interest friends, they will not say "yes" to the Democrats who have bipartisan support for the prescription drug benefit, we have bipartisan support for the Patients' Bill of Rights, we have bipartisan support for the minimum wage bill, and now they have blown up the Labor-HHS bill, which has so much in it for education for America's children.

We do a lot of talking around here about family values. But what is more of a family value? The economic security of America's families has an impact on children and their education and the pension security and the health security of their seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the support for these repetitive motion injuries guidelines has bipartisan support. It has been referenced that Secretary Elizabeth Dole, Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole has stated, and these are her words, quote, "By reducing repetitive motion injuries, we will increase both the safety and productivity of America's workforce." She

said, "I have no higher priority than accomplishing just that."

Secretary of Labor Lynn Martin said, "OSHA agrees that ergonomic hazards are well recognized occupational hazards and OSHA's review of the available data has persuaded the agency." She also supported that. Chairman Livingston did, too. There is bipartisan support.

I say to our colleagues, take "yes" for an answer.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great plea for bipartisan behavior on behalf of the Republicans and Democrats. Yet as we see the Congress respond where we have a bipartisan agreement on a Patients' Bill of Rights, to control the HMOs, to guarantee people the health care they need, on the minimum wage to make sure the hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Americans who are working at that wage will have the ability to provide for their family, on campaign finance reform, on common sense gun safety provisions, and now on workplace safety, each and every time we achieve that bipartisan agreement, we have the Republican leadership coming in and blowing up those agreements. They come in the back door, they come in the middle of the night, they come after everybody has left and they blow up these agreements. They find some way to kill it even though a bipartisan majority in the House and Senate support these measures. They blow them up.

They are our legislative terrorists. They do not play by the rules. They do not accept the will of the majority. They do not accept bipartisan agreements. They do not accept written agreements that have been entered into the record. They do not accept any of that. Because they are terrorists. They are legislative terrorists. They have made a decision. It will be their way or no way. They could have chosen to side with the American public and protect the workers, the 1,500 workers a day that are disabled because of injuries, because of repetitive motion, workers who will not be able to pick up their children at the end of the day, workers who will lose their earning capacity to provide for their families, whether or not Halloween is as nice as it could have been or whether Christmas will be as nice or whether or not they will be able to buy school supplies for their children because their hours have been diminished because of that kind of injury.

And each and every time we have reached an agreement to protect these workers in the workplace, they come in in the middle of the night and blow those agreements up. They disenfranchise Members of the House, they dis-

enfranchise their own committee chairmen, they disenfranchise their committee members, because they apparently have the right, the supreme right to overrule any decision, any agreement that is democratically arrived at in the House or in the Senate.

The time has come for the American people to understand that these Republican leaders could have chosen to stand with Americans against the HMOs so they could get health care, to stand with low wage earners so they could provide for their families, to stand with those workers who are threatened by this illness every day. Every day 1,500 workers. They could have stood with the public interest in campaign finance reform. But when they had a chance to choose, each and every time the Republican leadership has chosen the narrowest of special interests, the narrowest of special interests against that of the public interest of American workers, American families, and American children.

This is a sad day for this Congress. It is a sad day for the legislative process. But I guess it is a healthy day for Republican legislative terrorists.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I advised the gentleman that I would tell him if I had another speaker, and I would like to yield to another speaker now if the gentleman does not want to yield time now. I do so because the accusation of legislative terrorists cannot go unanswered. That is so far out of the realm of what is right, it is just not even something we should consider. But it was said. We did not demand that the words be taken down because we are trying to keep some comity here. We are trying to keep this on a basis that we are doing the people's business and not out here accusing and calling names. But legislative terrorists? That goes pretty far. I do not think that we can allow it to go unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do take exception to the statement of legislative terrorism. Obviously, we have recently experienced terrorism very real and very hurtful to citizens of our country on the U.S.S. *Cole*, and to link deliberation on very important issues before the American public to a terrorist-type activity, I think, is regrettable and it is shameful.

□ 1900

There are differences of opinion that are arising today in this Chamber about the direction of this country, and as one who has voted on so many issues that the minority has supported I would like to stand up and say I am always looking for common ground. When it was hate crimes, I signed on to the bill. When it was patients' bill of rights, I signed on and actively supported it, one of 27 Republicans. When it was campaign finance reform Shays-Meehan, I was there 100 percent, voting for no amendments but the Shays-Meehan legislation.

Now we come to a point where we do have some disagreements. We have heard a lot of discussion about immigration, blanket amnesties. My grandmother came from Poland so I deeply, deeply respect the fact that this country gave our family a chance to escape from Communism and tyranny, but she came to Ellis Island and she was processed. She learned to speak English. She became a registered voter, worked at a Travelodge motel all of her life to raise her daughters. Her husband had died. This country has been awfully good to our family, Irish-Polish immigrants, but I do have to question when we talk blanket amnesty because it does cause some consternation for the thousands of immigrants that are trying to be processed through INS in my office in Florida. The phone is ringing off the hook saying, does that include me? Am I allowed to come in as well? What are the rules for me to be allowed into this country since they have waited 2, 3, and 5 years being fingerprinted, being run around in circles trying to figure out how to be legal citizens of this country.

Then the topic of ergonomics, yes, there is a difference of opinion; but I still do not understand how the President left town to go campaign for his wife in New York when we have so many pressing issues here before the American public. He vetoed a bill last night for no apparent reason.

Now I am not an appropriator. I am on the Committee on Ways and Means. I understood, at least from the Speaker's letter today, that there was a certain agreement on that bill, but to throw a monkey wrench or a wrench into the works, the President chose to veto and skidaddle out of town so he can try to lift the sails for his wife who is campaigning for a seat in a State she does not reside in.

Nonetheless, we are here today to hopefully get the people's work done. I voted for minimum wage, and it is in the bill. I voted for Medicare increases, and it is in the bill. Now, I did not bring in HMOs. I do not like them. HMOs, to me, stands for "healthy members only," but yet our citizens in every district in America cry for satisfaction and want their managed care plans because they have prescription drugs and eyeglasses. That is in the bill.

Marriage penalty has been vetoed. So many other things have been vetoed I cannot even keep score any longer. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the harsh rhetoric needs to stop. Members do, in fact, want to be home with their families tonight and certainly through the weekend and on to November 7; but control of the House is not that important on either side of the aisle to make words like legislative terrorism part of the demeanor and discourse tonight. So I hope in the waning hours tonight that those who are negotiating, and I commend again our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), whose wife, Beverly, and their two sons

have gone without their daddy for many, many a week trying to bring some comity to this process, he has negotiated in, I think, very genuine good faith; and so we remain at gridlock over two or three remaining issues.

I think it is sad. I think it is sad that grown men and women who have been sent from their districts around America cannot sit around the table and craft something that would make sense to everyone and not tie it up over one or two issues.

There will be an election November 7. There will be a new President. There will be a new Congress, be it Republican or Democratic, and some of these issues will get resolved then; but to sit here and think you are winning some strategy by creating these types of arguments I think is a sad day, and I again urge every person listening to our voices to come together in a spirit that I think is in this Chamber, a spirit of patriotism that we can lead, that we can move, that we can resolve and that we can establish the principle of good government here tonight for future generations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) intend to yield to any further speakers?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would advise the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that if there are any more suggestions of legislative terrorists or anything of that nature, I very likely will; but as far as the issues, we have debated them at least 69 times in the last month; and I do not intend to get back into that debate again. If there are some other outbursts like we heard here on legislative terrorists, which is just not acceptable, we would definitely respond to that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the gentleman will define as outbursts. I would suggest since he has much more time remaining than I do, if he intends to yield to any other speakers that he do so.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the sad fact is that the Republican leadership of this Congress refuses to protect American workers. They do not identify with America's workers, with their economic well-being, or with their health concerns. They have been opposed to raising the minimum wage, and they are opposed to sensible work safety standards. Twenty-four hours ago, we had a deal. This was the White House, Democrats, Republicans. They came to an agreement on the issue of worker safety standards and a variety of other issues, but then the Republican leadership ran the agreement by the United States Chamber of Commerce, who I might add, let me say what they are doing today, the Cham-

ber of Commerce. They have shifted millions of dollars of funds to the pharmaceutical industries to keep us from bringing the cost of prescription drugs down with a television ad campaign. Do not take my word for it. You are seeing it every day on TV. They do not want to bring the costs of prescription drugs down. This is what the U.S. Chamber is doing. They ran the bill by these folks, and they are funding their campaigns so all bets were off. So we are back at square one. That is what is at issue here.

Repetitive motion hazards are the biggest safety and health problem in the workforce today. They account for nearly a third of all serious job-related injuries. More than 600,000 workers suffered serious workplace injuries. Women workers are particularly affected. Women make up 46 percent of the overall workforce. Women accounted for 63 percent of all repetitive motion injuries. Seventy percent have reported carpal tunnel cases in 1997. These injuries are expensive. They cost our economy \$15 billion to \$20 billion a year in medical costs. We do not need any more studies. We do not need to delay.

People deserve the same kind of protections as machinery. Good business practice shows us this makes no sense to overwork, overstress equipment, causing it to break down. We need to treat our workers the same way. But the issue is, the Republican leadership has hijacked patients' bill of rights, campaign finance reform, gun safety, minimum wage, now worker protections, because they do not support workers or want to protect them.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), talked about immigrants; but the bill the Republicans blew up had nothing to do with immigrants. And I would hope that we would stop using immigrants on this floor as a scapegoat for Republican inability to get their business done.

You spoke about the President. John Podesta, his chief of staff is here, Jack Lew, the people who negotiate directly are here; and they have the authority to make a deal. And they are ready to do it and they made a deal and you broke it.

Now, after 3 days of no negotiations with Democrats on education, Republicans and Democrats met Sunday night and they worked out a landmark education bill that included full funding towards 100,000 new teachers, teacher training, after-school programs, a \$1.3 billion school construction and school modernization program and, yes, safety for workers on the job.

It was a package Democrats could be proud of because it addressed the most pressing needs of local communities; and it promised to help our public schools lift them up, help our parents

and our children. And less than 12 hours later, as we heard, you blew up the bipartisan agreement out of the water. Apparently you rejected the worker safety provisions because business lobbyists told you they would not have it that way, and maybe you did not like the increased education funding that we had finally agreed on together when it went to your leadership.

Bipartisanship requires keeping your word, and it starts with a majority that controls the agenda of this House, and I would remind Governor Bush that if he wants to have some bipartisanship call the majority, pick up the phone, we can get this business done, and tell your party's leaders, here in the House and in the other body, to start getting to work on behalf of the American people. You have produced the most dysfunctional Congress in memory.

The New York Times just reported that this is the latest the Congress has ever met since post World War II for the latest adjournment date, and on Halloween. This is the ultimate trick on the American people and it is the ultimate treat to big business.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that remarks in the Chamber are to be addressed to the Chair and not to persons outside the Chamber.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I find it very sad when I listen to the dialogue from my colleagues on the Republican side because when I listen to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), and also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I think that they really do want to come to an agreement and they would like to see this agreement on the Labor HHS bill come to fruition. The problem is they cannot because of the special interests.

They negotiated on the other side in good faith and they came to an agreement that would allow these worker safety rules to go into effect, but then they go back and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the business interest, says no we cannot do it because we do not want you to protect the workers. We are giving you the money for the campaigns. We are the special interests. You cannot do it for the average person. We saw the same thing. My colleague, the gentleman from Florida, talked about the patients' bill of rights and how we supported the Norwood-Dingell bill; but after it passed, the HMOs said, no, we cannot have that because that is going to help the people and we cannot make any money. So you cannot do it. You forget it even if you care about the people.

We saw the same thing with Medicare prescription drugs. Maybe some of them would like to see a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. I have no doubt that some of my colleagues on

the Republican side would love to see that, but they cannot do it because the pharmaceutical industry says, no, no, no, no, we cannot make any money. That is going to hurt us. We are not going to be able to finance your campaigns. We are not going to be able to run the ads. So what does it say? Oh, sure, you may want to help. Maybe even the leadership wants to help, but you cannot because you are in the pockets of the special interests, the corporate interests, the pharmaceuticals, whoever it happens to be, the insurance companies.

Well, it says a lot about what you can accomplish here in the majority party. You cannot accomplish anything for the little guy. You cannot help the senior who wants prescription drugs. You cannot help the person who is suffering from HMO abuses. You cannot help the individual that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) showed that is having problem with their hands and cannot work because of this repetition. You cannot do it. Be honest. Explain to the American people that you cannot help the little guy. You cannot help us with the problems that the American people face because you are in the pocket of the special interests, and they say what to do even after you have negotiated the agreement.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for a closing statement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes and 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the issue here tonight is legislative terrorism. I think it is legislative obstructionism by the leadership of this House. The fact is that on prescription drugs, on the patients' bill of rights, on campaign finance reform, and on several other issues we have a bipartisan majority, but in each of those cases the will of that majority has been obstructed by the leadership that has prevented us from coming to closure on any of those issues.

Now we have one more. We had an opportunity to close the appropriations cycle with one of the best bipartisan legislative agreements of the year, and instead the leadership decided to pull the rug out from under a bipartisan negotiated agreement. They decided to say to Wanda Jackson, whose fingers have almost turned into claws and cannot lift anything heavier than a milk carton because of hours of punching numbers in a computer, "Sorry, you are not important." They said to Walt Frasier, who had to lift one chicken every two seconds, 10,000 birds over an 8-hour shift every day, who now has had three operations on his hands and cannot work anymore, they have had to say, "Sorry, you are not as important as big business."

They say to Ursula Stafford, a 24-year-old para professional who was told by her doctor she may never be able to support a pregnancy because of a herniated disk that she suffered from lifting

patients; they have said to her, "Sorry, you are not important enough." We are not going to protect you." They have said that to many other workers.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, this is pure and simple another bipartisan agreement which had been reached after much hard slogging, which is now being arbitrarily tossed overboard because the leadership says "no." That is unfortunate; and that, unfortunately, defines this session.

So I feel great regret about this, but until the majority leadership decides to practice the bipartisan cooperation that it preaches, we are stuck here with a blown-up agreement that could have been, in fact, a landmark piece of legislation for this session.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I would say to our colleagues that it is interesting to negotiate with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations. He negotiates in good faith. We have some very strong differences which have been established throughout the years, but he does negotiate in good faith and he keeps his word. But to suggest that all of those negotiations have been useless and have gone to naught is just not accurate. When we do negotiate at our level, then obviously, I take what the product is to my leadership. That is the way the system works.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that at the beginning of the negotiations 2 nights ago, our side asked both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and Senator STEVENS if you had full authority to negotiate all remaining issues, and the answer was yes? Is that not true?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I would say to the gentleman that we did just that, and we negotiated a settlement that we thought was a fair settlement. It did not provide everything that I wanted, and I know it did not provide everything that the gentleman from Wisconsin wanted; but it was a compromise, it was a negotiated settlement.

But as I started to say, under our process, then I take that product to my leadership, the same as the gentleman from Wisconsin takes to his leadership. Also, he communicates with the White House, and we do that as well. We have spent a lot of time with White House representatives during this negotiating period. But to say that we are both satisfied with everything is just not true.

But here is where the rub comes. So much has been said tonight about the fact that the GOP torpedoed the deal,

or "budget deal torpedoed by the GOP." That is not true. That is a headline. That headline was not written in any conference meeting that I was in. And I think what it does is it just proves once again that we should communicate with each other, not through the media. Whoever wrote that headline, I guarantee my colleagues, was not in that negotiating session that we had until 1 o'clock Sunday night. They were not there. The deal was not torpedoed.

Let me explain. Everybody pay attention to this. I want my colleagues to know exactly what it was that supposedly torpedoed the deal. We have heard so much talk about the language on the ergonomics that postpones the implementation.

Now, in our negotiations, we agreed that we would allow time for the new President, whoever that new President might be, to make a decision on these rules; and we also at one point gave him until June of next year to implement or not implement.

Now, we agreed on that; and we still agree on that. That is still our position. Now, where we had a bit of a problem is when the labor lawyers took a look at the language. They said, wait a minute, that is not what it does. So we thought maybe we better consult with our lawyers and find out how to write this language to make sure it does what we agreed to do.

So that is where we are. The deal is not torpedoed. This issue is out there; and, of course, there are still some outstanding issues that have not been resolved yet that the gentleman from Wisconsin and I did not resolve during our negotiating session. But the deal is not torpedoed, I will say that again.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that both sides spent almost 4 hours negotiating the language of that one item; and that many times, both negotiators left the room to consult with the lawyers? And is it not further true that after we had the Merlot and toasted the agreement, is it not true that the only two remaining issues were two language issues, one on snowmobiles and one on Alaska seals?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman that I do not think that is accurate. I did not leave the room to consult with any lawyer. There were two lawyers on our negotiating side. Senator STEVENS is a lawyer, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the chairman of the subcommittee, is a lawyer. And as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has suggested, we wrote that language for 3 or 4 hours, and we wrote the language, I think, at least seven times; but we all wrote the language trying to get us to the point that the law would say that the new President who is elected next week would be able to make the decision

whether or not to implement these rules, and that this could take as long as until June of next year.

Now, apparently some other lawyers decided the agreement was okay; and our leadership decided, hey, that agreement is fine, but the language as it was written in the view of the labor lawyers did not accomplish what we intended to accomplish.

So on that, we have a little work yet; but we are working on it.

It was also suggested that we ought not to be so partisan, and I really enjoy hearing the speakers on that side of the aisle talk about partisanship. I do not think we have raised any partisan issues. I have not attacked the Democrats; that is just not my style. I have worked all year, and last year as chairman, to have as fair and responsible relationship with both sides as I could possibly accomplish, and I think we have done a pretty good job there.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues who else thinks we did a pretty good job. The President of the United States yesterday in his press conference said: "Again, we have accomplished so much in this session of Congress in a bipartisan fashion. It has been one of the most productive sessions." That was President Clinton who said that. Did everybody hear that? Just in case my colleagues did not hear it, let me read it again. He said, "Again, we have accomplished so much in this session of Congress in a bipartisan fashion. It has been one of the most productive sessions."

Well, I do not agree with everything the President says, but I tend to agree with that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman believe everything the President says?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I think I just answered that question.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that I believe that about as often as the gentleman from Wisconsin does, and I do not think that is news to anybody.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we should all be very thankful that this political season is about over, because once the election is behind us, then we are going to find that we can get back to the business of doing the people's business. We will not need to use the floor of the House of Representatives for campaigning. We will put the people above the politics, and that is good. We need to get back to that.

Somebody mentioned the other day that this was like a scene from the movie "Groundhog Day." If my colleagues saw the movie "Groundhog Day," Bill Murray is the main character and he is a weather reporter for a Pittsburgh news station, and he travels to Punxsutawney to do a story on Punxsutawney Phil coming out of his cave and giving a prediction on the weather, but something happens, and

day after day after day he wakes up to the very same day over and over and over again. But, the way the movie ended, he went on to a new day and continued life after those many, many days of just repeating over and over again, by falling in love, and then he woke up the next day and everything was like it should be.

If we can show a little more love and compassion, a little more spirit of determination to work together for the people that we represent, it is amazing how much we could get accomplished here. Just as President Clinton said: "Again, we have accomplished so much in this session of Congress in a bipartisan fashion. It has been one of the most productive sessions." President Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote on the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 662, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 361, nays 13, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]

YEAS—361

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Andrews  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Bass  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley

Blumenauer  
Boehler  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Boswell  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Cannon  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth-Hage  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn

Coble  
Coburn  
Combest  
Condit  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Doolittle  
Doyle

Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Fossella  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill (IN)  
Hilleary  
Hinche  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoefel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inlee  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Klecza  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
Kuykendall  
LaHood

Lampson  
Largent  
Larson  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reyes  
Reynolds

Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Spence  
Stabenow  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—13

Baird  
Barton  
Capuano

Costello  
DeFazio  
Dingell

Ford

Hilliard	Miller, George	Stupak
LaFale	Phelps	Visclosky

NOT VOTING—58

Archer	Forbes	Ose
Billbray	Fowler	Pickering
Blagojevich	Franks (NJ)	Portman
Blunt	Gephardt	Ros-Lehtinen
Borski	Greenwood	Salmon
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Sanford
Brown (FL)	Hill (MT)	Scarborough
Brown (OH)	Hostettler	Shaw
Camp	Isakson	Spratt
Campbell	Kennedy	Stark
Canady	Kingston	Talent
Collins	Klink	Taylor (NC)
Conyers	Lantos	Tiahrt
Danner	Lazio	Towns
DeGette	McCollum	Waters
DeMint	McCrery	Waxman
Dickey	McIntosh	Wise
Dooley	Meeks (NY)	Wynn
Dunn	Metcalfe	
Etheridge	Mollohan	

□ 1948

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

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:

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

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,

*The Speaker, 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, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, October 30, 2000 at 11:20 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he returns without his approval, H.R. 4516, The Legislative Branch and The Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001.

Sincerely yours,

JEFF TRANDAHL,  
*Clerk of the House.*

□

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5410. An act to establish revolving funds for the operation of certain programs and activities of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 121. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2346. An act to authorize the enforcement by State and local governments of certain Federal Communications Commission regulations regarding use of citizens band radio equipment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of

the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1550) "An Act to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2924. An act to strengthen the enforcement of Federal statutes relating to false identification, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding appropriate actions of the United States Government to facilitate the settlement of claims of former members of the Armed Forces against Japanese companies that profited from the slave labor that those personnel were forced to perform for those companies as prisoners of war of Japan during World War II.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2796) "An Act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes."

□

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 106-306)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States.

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval, H.R. 4516, the Legislative Branch and the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001. This bill provides funds for the legislative branch and the White House at a time when the business of the American people remains unfinished.

The Congress' continued refusal to focus on the priorities of the American people leaves me no alternative but to veto this bill. I cannot in good conscience sign a bill that funds the operations of the Congress and the White House before funding our classrooms, fixing our schools, and protecting our workers.

With the largest student enrollment in history, we need a budget that will allow us to repair and modernize crumbling schools, reduce class size, hire more and better trained teachers, expand after-school programs, and strengthen accountability to turn around failing schools.

I would sign this legislation in the context of a budget that puts the interests of the American people before self interest or special interests. I urge the Congress to get its priorities in order

and send me, without further delay, balanced legislation I can sign.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 30, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

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 the veto message of the President to the bill H.R. 4516, 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.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for the purpose of debate only on the consideration of this motion, pending which I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute just to suggest that if we want to expedite the consideration and if we want to conclude the negotiations on all of these final appropriations bills, and there was only one left, but now there are two because the President sent us this veto, we would like to expedite it and we do so by referring this veto message and the bill back to the Committee on Appropriations. I think it is as simple as that. I do not think we need to take a lot of time on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, in the event that we do require additional time, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations, that he be permitted to control the time on our side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the gentleman from Florida that we do not need to use too much time. However, I do think we need to use some time to talk a little bit about this veto, which comes as a stunning surprise to some of us. And also so that the American public and the Members of this body understand what is in this bill that has been vetoed, so that, as we consider this again, we will be able to consider those provisions very carefully.

Mr. Speaker, last night, when the President vetoed the Legislative and Treasury-Postal and General Government Appropriations bill, he did more,