

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. VISCOSKY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. VISCOSKY. 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 sub-committee 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 De-

partment 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. VISCOSKY) 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. VISCOSKY. 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. VISCOSKY).

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, VISCOSKY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, FORBES, and Mr. 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. KAPUR) 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, VISCOSKY, 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 po-

sition 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 that point demanded that the administration support a higher level of funding for embassy security. The administration requested an additional \$314 million in this bill, and the House committee approved \$314 million. But then when it got to the Senate, the Senate cut back that number to \$110 million.

In my view, the House number is correct. The purpose of this motion is to send a clear signal that the House would prefer to fund the highest level possible given what the spread of the difference is between the House and the Senate on this issue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. This is a motion that we can agree to. It is not controversial, at least on this side of the Capitol. It may be when we reach the other body.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is correct. After the embassy bombings in Africa, the administration made announcements that they were going to pursue embassy security around the world in a much more vigorous way, something that we agree with here in this subcommittee and I think the full Congress.

□ 1715

But then when the administration sent their budget to the Hill, we looked very quickly to the section dealing with embassy security and maintenance of U.S. missions abroad, and found that there was an absolutely inadequate request. When the Secretary came to testify before the subcommittee, the request, I think, was for \$36 million. We told the Secretary that the request was absolutely inadequate, that we had to pay attention to the problems that were being presented to us around the world in the way of threats to our personnel, and we asked her to go back to the White House and to come up with an amended request.

In due course of time, they did just that. And so the request, then, from the administration was amended. They requested an additional \$264 million, for a total of \$300 million for a security capital construction program. And that is exactly the dollar figure that the subcommittee, the full committee and now the full House included in this appropriation bill. The Senate bill is at \$36 million for this program. That is the original request level. The Crowe Commission, named for Admiral Crowe who headed it up, dealing with embassy security, had called for a major investment in new secure embassy facilities. That followed on the heels of many other requests by various commissions down through the years. And so we stand ready to pursue the full House figure. We hope we can convince our

colleagues across the Capitol that this level of funding is necessary.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for bringing the matter to the attention of the body, and it is a matter that we can fully agree upon. I urge the adoption of the motion.

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

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

I would simply say in closing that I think this is one point on which there is no difference of opinion between the administration and the House on either side of the aisle in the House. I do think if I were the administration, I would be hard-pressed to follow the conflicting instructions that seem to be coming from the two congressional bodies, with the Senate going in one direction and the House in another, but I think they are going in the right direction on this item with their amended request. I think the House agrees with that. I think this motion to instruct will make it clear to the Senate that we believe they ought to back off and accept the higher number now contained in the administration request.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). 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 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. ROGERS, KOLBE, TAYLOR of North Carolina, REGULA, LATHAM, MILLER of Florida, WAMP, YOUNG of Florida, SERRANO, DIXON, MOLLOHAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

---

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on 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: Messrs. SKEEN, WALSH, DICKEY, KINGSTON, NETHERCUTT, BONILLA, LATHAM, Mrs. EMERSON, MR. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DELAURO, and Messrs. HINCHY, FARR, BOYD and OBEY.

There was no objection.