

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 re-

maining 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 managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2605, be instructed to insist on the higher funding levels for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program included in the House-passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I bring this motion to instruct conferees to the House floor today and would argue four points on its behalf.

First of all, I again would want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the staff on both sides and members of the subcommittee because I think we in the House have put together a very good work product. I would hope that we collectively in the House could protect our prerogatives during the conference.

I would, first of all, point out as far as water projects that are important as far as the economic viability and future of this country, as well as to individual Members and their constituencies, our figure is \$454 million over the Senate figure.

Because of the misallocation between the two bodies, there is a \$1.2 billion difference between the House and Senate versions. And, essentially, if we factor that \$400 million in, the differential as far as protecting Members' interest is about 1.6. So I think it is very important that we make the point today to the other body that we want to hold firm to protect the economic infrastructure of this country and Members' prerogatives.

Secondly, since this House passed the bill to the other body, the Water Resources and Development Act has been signed into law and that has placed even more demand as far as the limited resources we have.

The third point I would make is that, even with the higher water figure in the House, we are \$320 million under what the Corps' capability is if we would fund all of the Corps' capability and projects on the boards.

Those include such important economic improvement such as harbor dredging, commercial and navigation as far as our economic infrastructure, including flood control to prevent the loss of life and property damage. It includes environmental restoration. And we have some major projects in the proposal of the beach nourishment. We recently had tropical storms and hurricanes devastate portions of the United States.

Finally, the important issue of water supply. I would close this portion of my remarks by simply saying again, given the misallocation and higher allocation with the other body, given their preponderance to oversubscribe for Department of Energy programs, I would want to protect the prerogatives of this institution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has made I think very substantive points on his motion, and I support his motion without exception to instruct conferees.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PACKARD, ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, CALLAHAN, LATHAM, BLUNT, YOUNG of Florida, VISCLOSKY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, FORBES, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2561, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense 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. 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 two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2561, be instructed to insist on:

Section 8113 of the House bill providing \$50,000,000 to enhance United States defense capabilities against domestic terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction, and on Section 8114 of the House bill providing \$150,000,000 to improve the protection of Department of Defense computer systems from non-authorized access.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) 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 did not expect to be here alone on this question today. I regret that because of the surprise nature of the consideration of these issues that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was not able to be here to deal with the agriculture bill that was brought before us.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) had no notice either of the

intention of the House to deal with the State, Justice, Commerce bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is in the same situation with respect to the Defense appropriations bill.

Let me say that this motion to instruct is very simple. It asks the Congress to think about the kind of threats that we will face in the future, not the kind of threats that we have faced in the past. We must be mindful of the latter, but we must be even more alert to the former.

It seems to me that we have to recognize the fact that one of the largest dangers to our security interests over coming years will be a threat that comes from potential terrorist attacks using chemical and biological and other different kinds of weapons that are traditionally thought of when one thinks of war.

As we move more and more into an electronics age, as we are more and more both aided by and imprisoned by computers, we need to recognize the fact that there is a substantial security risk to this country on the part of persons who can weave their way into our own computers, not just at DOD but other agencies across Government.

So this motion simply asks that the higher amounts that are within scope in the conference on these items be approved so that we do whatever it is possible to do to the maximum given the nature of the bills before us to enhance our security against terrorist attacks and to enhance our ability to defend against computer hackers.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that he is never here on the floor alone when he and I have an opportunity to work on behalf of the American public together.

In the meantime, the motion of the gentleman is a good one. It is not controversial. We are pleased to accept it on our sides.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEWIS of

California, YOUNG of Florida, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, DICKEY, FRELINGHUYSEN, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, DIXON, VISCLOSKY, MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that in resolving the difference between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2670, be instructed to insist on the higher funding levels for programs related to embassy security included in the House-passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) 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, what is at issue here is what level of funding we ought to provide to do our dead-level best to provide security arrangements for our various embassies around the world. As we very well know, we have had a number of terrorist attacks against those embassies. Many people in our society have a tendency to dismiss State Department officials as being "stripe pants boys." But the fact is that many of them have lost their lives promoting U.S. interests around the world and a number of those lives have been lost in terrorist attacks.

I find it somewhat interesting that the administration seems to be in a position where they are damned if you do and damned if they do not in terms of embassy security.

I remember earlier in the year the House committee held a hearing and at