

going to have the kind of influence that we would like to see, and, as the gentleman from Ohio said, private sector initiated, advertisers pressuring, encouraging broadcasters to do the right thing, because they, that is, those advertisers, want to be associated with the right thing, with that kind of programming.

□ 1545

As the Family Friendly Forum states in their mission statement: we support a wide range of programming options, and we will continue to advertise on shows that appeal to different target audiences, but we want to ensure the existence of a family-friendly television environment, particularly in the early evening time period.

And most importantly, they are establishing a development fund to finance TV scripts, underwriting scholarships for students interested in exploring family-friendly programming, and granting awards for excellence in this area. They held their first awards ceremony just last Thursday, as the gentleman from Ohio pointed out. It is something that should be applauded and encouraged.

The WB Network has already taken up the challenge. In August, WB CEO Jamie Kellner and Andrea Alstrup, vice president of advertising for Johnson & Johnson, on behalf of the Forum agreed to identify writers to produce new scripts that will entertain and engage family audiences.

As my colleagues know, the V-Chip is an important device to have built into TV sets, and by the beginning of next year, that is, January of the year 2000, every television set that is sold in the United States will have a V-chip built into it. We sell 25 million TV sets a year in the United States. But the V-chip is really only a way by which parents, in programming it, can block out the programming they do not want their children to be exposed to. In no way can the V-Chip put good programming on the air.

What is happening here, what is being encouraged by the advertisers of the United States, is encouragement given to the networks, to the cable industry, to the satellite industry to put good programming on that parents can sit their children down in front of with the parent sitting there with them and watch as a family. It is something that should be encouraged. It is something that this resolution, I think, correctly identifies as just the kind of trend that we should be encouraging here in the Congress.

I want to again congratulate my friend from Ohio.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I rise in support of this resolution. I have long been an advocate for

more family-friendly programming on television. American children spend much of their time each week in front of a TV, and it is important that at least some of the programs available to them are devoid of the gratuitous sex and violence that so frequently pollute prime TV. I really believe the sponsors should not be allowed their advertising deduction when they sponsor programming which is clearly over the line for family audiences. We in the House should be encouraging the television industry to clean up its act, and I am happy to support this resolution today.

Again, I thank the gentleman for having yielded this time to me.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because it encourages TV networks, studios, and the production community to produce more quality family programs. In a time of extreme violence and graphic situations on television, I am proud to support this measure. We need to encourage any voluntary efforts by the entertainment industry to clean up prime time TV.

Traditionally, prime time television was concentrated in the early portion of the evening TV schedule—7 or 8 pm. During this time, families would watch television together, usually with dinner or shortly thereafter while the children were still awake. The programming that was aired during these hours focused on the family unit.

Recently, this trend has changed dramatically. Most of the networks do not air any family programming at this time, or such programming has been limited to certain nights of the week, such as Sunday. Gone are the days of an entire family sitting around the television set.

The traditional family programming has been replaced with violence, sexual situations and profanity. Thankfully, the industry's internal system of checks and balances has weighed heavily in favor of the family's return to prime time.

The Family Friendly Programming Forum, established this year by 30 advertisers, encourages the networks to develop family friendly programming for families to view together. In addition to encouraging more family friendly programming through advertising revenues, the Forum will establish a special fund to finance scripts written for such programming.

The Forum will also establish a scholarship program to encourage student interest in family friendly programming. Such efforts will send a powerful message to television producers, network executives and other advertisers that consumers deserve better programming for their families and that advertisers will be more selective in sponsoring certain programs.

I support this effort because families deserve to have a time to sit and watch television together. Parents should ultimately maintain control over the television and what programs are acceptable in the home, but the networks do have some responsibility to promote a more positive alternative to the sex and violence currently seen in prime time.

Advertisers are in the unique position to provide that internal check—advertising dollars that can send the message that parents want more programming geared for family viewing. I strongly support internal industry checks on television content and I support the efforts of

the Family Friendly Programming Forum. I urge my Colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time either, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H.Con.Res. 184.

The question was taken.

Mr. UPTON. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MES- SAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein during the calendar year 1998. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 79-264; 22 U.S.C. 287b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 13, 1999.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I do want to take this time simply to point out that the minority was not told until a very few minutes ago that these motions were going to be made at

this time today. We are in the situation where several of our ranking subcommittee members are not on the floor because they did not know this motion was going to be made. I do not think it is quite fair to them to proceed under this kind of a situation.

I recognize it is not the fault of the gentleman from New Mexico, so I will not object; and we have no interest in delaying the action of the House, but I would simply ask that in the future, action be taken to make certain that the minority is made aware in a timely fashion of the intent to make these motions at a time so that we can be prepared as quickly as possible in making the correct motions.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

□ 1600

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I share the same approach that the gentleman has because we were given the word at exactly about the same time that he had it. Thank God the word finally got here, but it certainly puts a lot of folks in a position of not knowing that it was coming on the floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would simply say to the leadership of the House, we are trying to be cooperative on this committee on both sides. It is pretty hard to cooperate if we don't have prior notice.

The gentleman has indicated he hasn't had that notice either, and I think that's equally unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House and Senate on H.R. 1906, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY 2000, be instructed to provide maximum funding, within the scope of conference, for food safety programs at the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I will not take very long. The situation is very simple. The House bill is \$15 million above the Senate bill for the Department of Agriculture's food and safety inspection service programs, and it is \$5 million above the Senate bill for FDA food

safety initiatives. We believe the public has a right to have total confidence in the safety of its food supply. It certainly, in some instances unfortunately, does not have that to date. We think that the numbers in the bill will be at least minimally affected in increasing our ability to assure a safe food supply for the American public and would urge, therefore, that the conferees be instructed to provide the higher of the two numbers in each account in order to do the maximum that is allowable under rules, given the difference in scope between the two bills, to assure that food safety is the highest priority in the bill as it comes back from conference.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the gentleman that I support his effort and have no quarrel whatever with the work. I think this is the time that we should work toward the goal of taking care of the matters attendant to the field of agriculture, and to get it done as quickly as possible because it has been sitting there fermenting for quite some time.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will name the conferees at a later time.

THE REASON FOR CONFUSION IN THE HOUSE

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in case people are wondering what is happening here, why the House looks so disorganized, it is for the following reason: Those of us on the Minority on the Appropriations Committee have been working with the Majority on the committee all today under the assumption that we would have a common understanding about what the schedule would be for the remainder of the day, and we had expected one and perhaps at most two motions would be made to go to conference on appropriation bills.

We were trying to cooperate with the Majority in making sure that that went smoothly on the matters that we understood might come before us. Then what happened is that evidently the House leadership decided it wanted to make a unilateral decision to have motions on five different appropriation

bills. The problem is that the Majority on the Committee on Appropriations did not know that that was going to happen and neither did the Minority. In my view, that is a lousy way to run a railroad. The House is running around here now looking confused because it is confused.

It just seems to me that there is no particular purpose to be served in rushing to conference on these bills when neither side even understood that we were going to be doing that. I am still trying to cooperate under these circumstances, but I would ask the House leadership that if we cannot do this in an orderly fashion for some of the remaining bills that we simply deal with it tomorrow morning, if we run out of bills that we can handle in a rational fashion, because otherwise we are simply stumbling around here. And in the process, we will be denying Members the opportunity to debate questions which I know Members wanted to debate on at least two of the bills that are coming up today.

Members did not know this would be happening before they got back, and I think the leadership has an obligation to avoid situations like that.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 5 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2605, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VISCLOSKY moves that in resolving the difference between the House and Senate, the