trade as well, including the workers who lose their job through no fault of their own. We should have a full package which includes a revamp of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program for the first time since 1962 when it was created by the Kennedy Administration. So I hope that the leadership of the House, the Republican leadership, will have the wisdom if they really want to pass a TPA bill and proceed to the Senate for a real Trade Adjustment Assistance reform package.

PREVENTING CHILD ABDUCTIONS

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been getting up every day for the last several months and talking about Ludwig Koons who has been held in Italy illegally after being taken away from the United States of America, and by now we all know the name Elizabeth Smart, the young girl who was abducted from her bedroom in Salt Lake City, Utah. In light of the tragedy of her disappearance and on behalf of the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus here in Congress, I would ask and send our prayers to Elizabeth and to her family, but I would also like to remind parents all across this country to talk to your kids about their personal safety, talk to them about the ''Know the Rules'' educational program put out by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. And I would urge every parent to log on to www.missingkids.com and learn what they can do to protect and educate their children.

Nearly 2,000 children are reported missing every day in the United States of America, and we all must be prepared as parents and grandparents to deal with the tragedy, should it occur. That means having updated quality photographs and knowing our children's height and weight. We should be aware that looking at pictures of missing kids brings them home and that we commit ourselves to looking at the photos we get in the mail or we see in a grocery store. If we all do our part, together we can prevent abductions and bring children like Elizabeth and like Ludwig Koons home where they belong.

PRIVATIZATION OF U.S. AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, A BAD IDEA

(Mr. HOLDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the idea of privatizing the United States air traffic control system has been given a renewed life. Mr. Speaker, that would be a very bad idea. A competent and reliable air traffic control system is vital to the safety of our flying public, and public safety is a responsibility of the Government. Simply put, air traffic controllers perform an inherently governmental function for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of privatizing air traffic controllers like to cite three countries they consider to be successful examples of privatization: Australia, Great Britain, and Canada. Unless we consider a walkout, a pending bankruptcy and a pending labor strike to be examples of success, I would respectfully disagree. Let us face the fact that privatization of air traffic control does not work.

On September 11 of last year, air traffic controllers proved their worth as inherently governmental employees. Our air traffic control system is the envy of the world. Let us keep it that way.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4775, 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, 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 (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

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 Senate amendment to H.R. 4775 be instructed to insist, for each item directly related to the war on terrorism or homeland security, on the higher dollar amount in either the House bill or the Senate amendment and to disagree to any item that appropriates additional funds earmarked for a specific project not related to the war on terrorism or homeland security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct conferees directs the House Members serving on the conference to convert what has been all too often merely a rhetorical assault on terrorism into a real war. It requires that we go to the higher dollar figure on any item directly related to the war on terrorism, and it also directs that we delete from the conference report funding for any item that is earmarked for a specific project or individual Member of Congress. That is to ensure that this supplemental remains focused on the job before us, fighting terrorism, and that those engaged in that war on behalf of the American people have the resources that they need to conduct that war.

I find that ordinary people are somewhat amazed when they find that, despite all the rhetoric about a war on terrorism, we often continue to decline to provide the resources needed to actually conduct that effort. One example is the fact that the Pentagon called up 80,000 Guard and Reservists following September 11.

We need those Reserves because our regular force is overwhelmed with all of the requirements being placed on them. If you do not believe me, Secretary Rumsfeld has made that statement. We do not have enough mechanics to keep all of our planes in the air, we do not have enough MPs to protect our bases and guard prisoners. But, remarkably, when the Pentagon told the White House budget office that it would cost $5.8 billion more than was contained in the regular fiscal 2003 appropriation bill to pay the cost of those Guards and Reservists called up to active duty, the White House budget office told them they could only have $4.1 billion. As a result, many of those reserves will have to be sent home early, unless we appropriate a considerable amount above the White House request. In my view, this is ludicrous. It is one of those situations that continues because it is so outrageous that nobody really believes it is going on.

The truth is that some of the same people at the other end of the avenue who give lectures about the war on terrorism, particularly in the OMB, are particularly stingy when it comes to providing cash that is actually needed to conduct the effort. As a result, the resources needed by those who are actually engaged in that effort are not getting there and will not get there unless Congress acts to reverse the request.

I would give the House another example. We have heard a lot of talk in the last several days about a dirty bomb. The President and Secretary of Energy, a former Republican Senator, a man named to that office by the President and confirmed by the Senate when it was still in Republican hands, a man respected on both sides of the aisle, Secretary Abraham, has asked that we spend some money in this bill to deny terrorists access to the radioactive materials that could be used to build a dirty bomb. He asked that we clean up sites where we used to make nuclear weapons and increase security at those sites. He asked that we relocate low level radioactive materials in a central depository. He asked that we provide more security for the movement of nuclear weapons.

This the White House Budget Director did not say no to, they said ''hell,

no.'' I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter written by the Assistant Secretary of Energy for the Budget to OMB in order to demonstrate what I just said.

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2002.

Hon. MITCHELL DANIELS, Jr.,
Director, Office of Management and Budget, Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DANIELS: This letter and accompanying enclosure transmit the Department of Energy's proposal to request supplemental funding to meet urgent and compelling requirements for safeguards and security, emergency response, and energy security and assurance activities.

The Department of Energy is entrusted with the mission of designing, developing, manufacturing, assembling, stockpiling, refurbishing, decommissioning, and most importantly protecting the Nation's critical nuclear complex. To meet the Department's critical security mission, we are storing vast amounts of materials that remain highly volatile and subject to unthinkable consequences if placed in the wrong hands. These materials permeate the Departmental complex including sites under the programmatic jurisdiction of the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Office of Environmental Management, and the Office of Science.

The events of September 11 resulted in heightened security throughout the complex. Our sites were directed to conduct vulnerability assessments based on an evaluation of potential consequences of the type of event that occurred on September 11. These security vulnerabilities were assessed on a site-by-site basis and immediate action was taken to mitigate many of the concerns. As a result, the Department issued Interim Implementing Guidance to the Design Basis Threat document that outlined the basis for initial physical security measures. In conjunction with this guidance, I directed the Departmental Elements to reassess their security requirements and associated costs with a view towards maintaining the highest level of security commensurate with the revised threat and response strategy. Although the initial supplemental and funds appropriated by Congress helped respond to the most urgent near term security needs, the Department now is unable to meet the next round of critical security mission requirements.

The funding request of $379.7 million identified in the enclosure is a critical down payment to the safety and security of our Nation and its people. Failure to support these urgent security requirements is a risk that would be unwise.

I appreciate the time your staff has spent with us in discussions about the Department's security concerns and needs. However, as you can see, we need your financial support to continue addressing the critical security requirements that face the Department and our Nation. Accordingly, if you and your senior staff need a more detailed classified briefing of our requirements, threats, and strategies, please have your staff contact Mr. Joseph Mahaley, the Department's Director of Security, at 202–586–3345.

My point of contact on the specifics of this funding supplemental request is Dr. Bruce M. Carnes, the Director of the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation/Chief Financial Officer, who can be reached on 202–586–4171.

Sincerely,

SPENCER ABRAHAM.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC.

MS. ROBIN CLEVELAND,
Program Associate Director, National Security Division, Office of Management and Budget, Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. CLEVELAND: The Department of Energy is now at a crucial juncture in executing our safeguards and security program. The Department's remaining safeguards and security budgets are not sufficient to implement the security posture requirements that appropriately respond to the September 11th attacks. On March 14, the Secretary transmitted to Director Daniels supplemental funding proposals fro safeguards and security, emergency response, and energy security. The Secretary's transmittal letter described the underlying need to increase our response capabilities for emergencies and improve the security posture of Department in order to adequately protect the public, our workers, and the environment. We appreciate your support for our $26.4 million supplemental request to increase emergency response efforts, however, we are very disappointed that we did not get your support for supplemental security funding.

We are disconcerted that OMB refused our security supplemental request. I would have much preferred to have heard this from you personally, and been given an opportunity to discuss, not to mention, appeal your decision. We were told by Energy Branch staff that the Department's security supplemental proposals were not supported because the revised Design Basis Threat, the document that outlines the basis for physical security measures, has not been completed. This isn't a tenable position for you to take, in my view. We are not operating, and cannot operate under Interim Implementing Guidance, and you have not provided resources to enable us to do so.

Given our current security funding and the physical security situation we face today, Mr. Joseph Mahaley, our Security Director, and I would like to meet with you to discuss our fiscal year 2002 and 2003 safeguards and security concerns. I can be contacted on (202) 586–4171 to arrange this discussion.

Sincerely,

BRUCE M. CARNES,
Director, Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation/CFO.

Mr. Speaker, we have much the same situation with the FBI. They have had a huge problem with respect to their computers. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I have tried to do everything possible to solve that problem, both last year and this.

The FBI is ages behind in both the overall architecture of their computer system and the security of that system. As a result, they have failed to convert massive amounts of information into a digital format so that it can be stored in a safe and remote location and so that it can be shared with agents working in other parts of the country or shared with other agencies, such as the CIA. The FBI has been asking for the resources to make that happen. But, again, there apparently are people running the Justice Department or people in OMB who think it would be too expensive.

In my view, you do not have to have a master's in public policy from Harvard or any other school to know that that is just plain nuts. Almost any person you would meet on the street would tell you that the $100 million the FBI is asking for to fix that system is cheap compared to the cost of letting one of those creeps get through the system with a dirty bomb or biological weapon or any one of the things that could bring havoc to our cities.

I would oppose spending any money that is not needed, but it is ridiculous to go down the road we are traveling now, short-sheeting some of the agencies who need more money now, not next year or the year after, in order to get the job done. You do not kill terrorists just by moving boxes on an organizational chart. You also need to back up whatever changes you make in reorganization with adequate resources. Those resources cost money, and we ought to provide it.

Now, the differences between the House and the Senate bills are not large, Mr. Speaker, at least not in relative terms. They have included earmarks for certain Members which we did not do in the House bill and which we should not do in the conference report. They have excluded several of the savings that are in our bill, and some of those we are going to disagree with. But, to me it is important to keep the Guard and Reserve funds and the other needed defense funds in this bill, and this motion would help to do that.

There are other small but important differences. The Senate is above the House by $5 million for U.S. Attorneys. I ordinarily would not be standing here asking for more money for U.S. Attorneys, but my information is that we are putting a real load on prosecutors with all of the arrests and detentions that we have engaged in, and that that money is needed.

□ 1515

They are below us on the U.S. Marshals, and I know that the marshals also need the money.

What this instruction says is take a look at the needs and go forward with the conference report that recognizes that we are, in fact, at war, and ought to be providing these higher levels.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the White House released a document calling for a new Department of Homeland Security. Perhaps the most compelling page in that document was an organization chart showing how many different portions of the government were engaged in the war on terror. I have a copy of that chart directly from the White House; but I would point out that what the White House neglected to provide to Congress, the press, or the American people, was a copy of what the organization of the war on terror would look like after that reorganization plan was adopted. What those charts will show is that most of the government activities related to homeland security will still be untouched.

Now, the debate on reorganization can wait for another day. We certainly have to have reorganization; and in some areas I think we have to go further than the administration has so far

proposed. But the point I am trying to make is that we can pass all of the reorganizations in the world, and we will still not deal with the problem, unless we adequately provide the financial resources necessary to demonstrate that we really mean business in closing the security gaps that now face this country on the homeland defense front, and that is the purpose of this motion. It simply says again, and I repeat, it says that in each instance we should adopt the higher of the two numbers between the Senate and the House in dealing with gaps in our homeland defenses, and it says that we should eliminate or not include in the conference report any dollar items that are meant for the purpose of what are known as ''Member earmarks.''

I think that is a very plain explanation, and I would ask for a ''yes'' vote on the motion.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for offering this motion to instruct, for it gives us an opportunity to remind our colleagues what it is that we are doing here. We are dealing with an emergency supplemental appropriations bill to provide for the defense of the Nation and our homeland security. What we are talking about is repaying to the military services the funds that they have expended already on the war in Afghanistan. The services have used considerable amounts of money that normally would have been reserved for their fourth quarter training activities and maintenance activities, quality-of-life activities. So in effect, we are paying back money that has already been spent because of the war in Afghanistan.

So our troops are involved, our intelligence community is involved. We are talking about paying for the safety and security of the United States, at home and abroad. We are talking about recovery in New York City; and we are talking about promoting U.S. foreign policy to prevent future terrorist attacks. In other words, we were a government mobilized after the terrible, terrible attack on September 11 to protect America, to protect Americans, and to do everything humanly possible to guarantee that those tragedies are not allowed to happen again.

So I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for giving us the opportunity to discuss this. But I cannot support his motion to instruct for a very simple reason, and it is not that I disagree with some of the items that he has spoken of and that he would like to see done. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin and I both have visited the agencies that he has mentioned and we both understand the needs that they have to bring their technology into the 21st century, for example.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin is an experienced expert negotiator; and I think because of that expertise, he understands that if we were to pass this motion to instruct, we would take away much of the flexibility of the conference committee to resolve many of the differences that exist between the House and the Senate.

The Senate bill is approximately $3 billion higher than the House bill. It does contain some special projects that were added in the other body which I would like to see taken from the bill, and I would like to have the opportunity to negotiate some of those special projects out of the bill, because from what I have seen of the bill so far, there are numerous projects that were added there that I do not think belong in this bill. But we have to have the ability and the opportunity to negotiate with our counterparts in the other body to reach a conference agreement that we can bring back to both Houses and pass quickly and get this bill to the President.

What is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that here we are in the middle of June. If the services do not have these monies replaced by July 1, their planning is already set to stand down training operations, to stand down sailing Navy ships, Navy vessels, to stand down flight hours, training hours for pilots. I do not want that to happen. So we need to expedite this, and we need to have the ability to conduct negotiations that are necessary to get this conference completed, and then passed by the House and the Senate, and then sent to the President for his approval.

So I think the gentleman's motion is well intended, but I think it really ties our hands behind our backs on the part of those of us who will be part of this conference that will be leading the negotiations with the other body.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I know my good friend from Florida, the chairman of the committee, and I do not think that he is any happier to have to fight this war on terrorism, at least in terms of resources, with one hand tied behind his back, any more than I am. And I think it is fair at this point to state what the record has been in the past on this issue.

After the tragic events of September 11, we were asked by the White House Budget Office to provide emergency funding of an unlimited nature for an unlimited number of years, a blank check. Both the chairman and I said no, we were not going to write a blank check to anybody; and we sat down and immediately worked out a compromise. Within 10 days, we had sent to the White House a bill that contained $40 billion in emergency resources to deal with those events.

We then proceeded to, as he said, visit security agencies all over town. We spent almost 5 days gathering information from the security agencies: NSA, CIA, Centers for Disease Control, FBI. You name it, we talked to them about what their emergency needs were, and we tried to meet them. In the end, over the threat of a veto from the White House, we were able to put almost $4 billion in additional funds into the appropriation bill to fight terrorism.

If we had listened to the OMB rather than our own instincts and rather than listening to the agencies who were charged with the responsibility for fighting that war, if we had done that instead of listening to those agencies, we would not have fixed the problem that the FBI had with its computer system. They had a problem under which more than 50 percent of their computers could not even send a picture of a terrorist to another FBI computer around the country. We fixed that, because we appropriated more money than was requested. We added to the security of our ports and our borders by providing more money than was requested. So we did not have to rely on traffic cones as deterrants on the U.S.-Canadian border in the unguarded checkpoints on that border. We took care of that problem.

In the supplemental which is now before us, this committee has tried to respond, even though the White House Budget Office did not. We tried to respond fully to the request of the FBI that they be given additional funds in order to hire the translators that are necessary so that some of the information which is lying on the floor in some of our security agencies can actually be reviewed. The Immigration and Naturalization Service asked for money for which they were at least partially denied; they asked for money so that they could institute a new system so that they would actually know when someone had overstayed their visa and had been asked to leave the country and had declined to do so. The Immigration and Naturalization Service wanted a system which would enable them to track those people so that we can give them the thumb and get them out of the country. Our bill corrected the oversight of OMB.

Air marshals. They still are not able to communicate directly with the ground. The House bill makes an attempt to fix that. It also made an attempt to correct the problem created by the White House Budget Office declining to approve the Pentagon request for the funds needed to reimburse them fully for the activation of the Guard and Reserves to fill in until we can train additional personnel.

So I fully admit that this motion would cost more money than the administration has asked for. I make no apology for it. I think it is needed. I think the average citizen would too, and I would urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the motion.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak briefly to the motion that is before us insofar as it relates to parts of the supplemental that are not the military branch part; specifically, the Transportation Security Administration, which our subcommittee deals with. The House-passed bill includes some $3.8 billion in the supplemental for the TSA. We have yet to receive from the TSA the justifications for those figures. Yet the Senate bill, if we go along with this motion, if this motion passes and we have to go to the higher figure in the Senate bill, some $4.7 billion, we have no justifications for it. I cannot show to my colleagues the documents that say, this is what we actually have to have.

In the House-passed bill, we already gave more than was requested for several items. For example, we said, here is $20 million. Replace all of the magnetometers in 429 airports in the country, because the new state-of-the-art magnetometers will save the need for a lot of hand wands that are now searching you as you go through. The new machines will do that work for us. It will save many of us taking our shoes off as we go through the airport and having somebody, a federally paid employee, carry your shoes to be searched.

□ 1530

Those requests were not in the administration request. Yet, we put it in there, because we think it will save money down the pike. But we have yet to receive the justifications for the monies that we included in the House-passed version of the bill, which is significantly less for TSA than the Senate figures.

If this motion should pass and we have to go to the higher levels in the Senate bill, then who knows how many employees they are going to hire. At first they said, we need 33,000 people. A few weeks later they said, no, it is going to be more like 60,000. By the time we had our hearing, they were up to 73,000.

We said, whoa, let us stand back and talk about this. So we put a level in our House-passed bill that they cannot exceed in terms of the numbers of employees of TSA during the remainder of this fiscal year, 45,000 people, max. If we have to go to the higher Senate figure, then that personnel level is out the window.

We think it is wise to have some discipline, I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), on that hiring process during the remainder of this fiscal year that is covered by the supplemental.

In addition, we also put in the bill monies to allow the air marshals that are flying in the planes to be able to communicate independently to ground stations. That was not requested, and yet we think it is a very important thing at a modest cost. So I think there are a lot of items in the House-passed bill that perhaps would be negated if we were to have to go to the higher levels on the Senate bill.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would simply like to say that I completely agree with the remarks made by the gentleman with respect to the Transportation Security Agency. There is no question that that agency so far has been without a clue, and they are out of control. I think the gentleman has played an excellent role in trying to introduce them to reality.

Let me simply say that obviously that agency needs to be straightened out, but I am sure that he understands as well that eventually that agency is going to have to receive more money than is in either bill, probably.

I would be, for instance, very interested in working out a proposal under which we would appropriate the money that is needed to that agency, but hold it in reserve until they meet the standards that the gentleman has laid out, because I think both of us want to deal with the problem. We simply want to make sure we are not throwing money at an agency that does not know what to do with it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's thoughts, and he is correct. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. We are right now, as the gentleman knows, in the process of gearing up for the 2003 appropriations bills. In fact, I just got off the phone with the Secretary of Transportation about this bill and the 2003 bills coming up. In fact, we hope to mark up the 2003 bills in a few days, even, which will give us the chance to take a second look and see what is needed down the pike in 2003 without having to address that at this particular moment in time.

So I appreciate the gentleman's idea about the need for more funds in homeland security TSA next year, but I do not think we need it now.

I would hope that we would not pass this motion and tie the hands of the gentlemen as they negotiate with the other body. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this motion up because it gives us a chance to talk about the issue, but I would hope that it would not pass, because I do not want to tie the chairman and the ranking member's hands when they go to do battle with the other body.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), another subcommittee chairman on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I believe that such a motion would prompt almost a guaranteed, if you will, veto, and would absolutely unnecessarily restrict the ability of the conferees in negotiating with the other body.

This is probably the most important bill that we will pass in this Congress, and in some respects, if we were to do this, it may very well jeopardize the passage, or if not jeopardize, certainly bog down the process.

The President has already indicated that he would veto the bill as being too costly, and if we move forward with this motion and go to all those higher levels, then the bill would go well beyond and above the funding level proposed by the Senate.

So for those reasons and the reasons that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) had covered, and the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), I would urge Members to vote no on the motion.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). 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 question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

□ 1602

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY ACT OF 2001

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for