And I want to say a word of praise for this organization and its constant work to use the opportunity of former parliamentarians here to meet with parliamentarians in other countries and in other regions. The study group for Germany and Japan and the one soon to be established for China, the parliamentary exchanges with Mexico and with Canada, with Eastern Europe and elsewhere have allowed the United States Congress and the United States former Members to share their experiences with parliamentarians, distinguished parliamentarians in other parts of the world, and I think together we advance the cause of democracy by that effort. I do not think there is any higher calling that a former Member of Congress can aspire to than to use whatever experience he or she has in the service of our constituents and in parliamentary democracy to advance it throughout the world.

Again, with great thanks to all of you for the honor you have given me today.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and I leave the floor. But before I do, let me say one final thing of appreciation to one other Member here today, Bob Michel, with whom I had the great honor of serving all the time I was here and especially when I was Speaker during the time when he was the distinguished Republican leader of the House. If circumstances had been a little different and the electoral cycle a little different, Bob Michel would have been one of the great Speakers of this House, and I am proud to know him. Thank you very much.

Mr. LAROCCO. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. ERLENBORN. You may be wondering, since I missed a line in my introduction of Tom Foley, what he was doing here today, and that was he was receiving the Statesmanship award. The Distinguished Service Award is being given to Tom Foley. I did not want him to hold the award during his speech, but I have a copy of it here and here is what it says: ''Presented by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress to the Honorable Thomas S. Foley for his many years of distinguished service to the Nation as U.S. Ambassador to Japan and as a Member of United States Congress for 30 years, including his extraordinary leadership as Democratic Whip, Majority Leader and Speaker of the House of Representative. Washington, D.C., May 9, 2002.''

So now you know.

Thank you again, Tom, for your leadership and service.

Mr. Speaker and members of the Association, we are honored and proud to serve in the U.S. Congress. We are continuing our service to our Nation in other ways now, but hopefully ones that are equally as effective. Again, thank you for letting us return today to this Chamber.

This concludes our 32nd annual report by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, and thank you all.

Mr. LAROCCO. The Chair would like to recognize the gentleman from Illinois for the following purpose: If the former Members would join me in giving our President, John Erlenborn, an expression of appreciation for his service. Thank you, John.

The Chair again wishes to thank the former Members of the House for their presence here today. Before terminating these proceedings, the Chair would like to invite those former Members who cannot respond when the roll was called to give their names to the Reading Clerk for inclusion on the roll. The Chair wishes to thank the other Members of the House for their presence here today. Good luck to all.

The Chair announces that the House will reconvene at 10:40 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.) the House continued in recess.

□ 1041

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, 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 Senate to the bill (H.R. 2646) ''An Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011.''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed without amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 347. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of he Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4546, BOB STUMP NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 415 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 415

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4546) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military activities of the Department of Defense, and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Except as specified in section 4 of this resolution, each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Unless otherwise specified in the report, each amendment printed in the report shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment (except as specified in the report and except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment).

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier disposed of or germane modifications of any such amendment. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read (except that modifications shall be reported), shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. For the purpose of inclusion in such amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken. The original proponent of an

amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules out of the order printed, but not sooner than one hour after the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a structured rule for H.R. 4546, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. It is a traditional structured rule for defense authorization and it provides for debate on a number of pertinent issues, including nuclear policy, missile defense, quality-of-life issues for our servicemen and women, and a number of noncontroversial concerns.

H.R. 4546 is a good bill. This legislation firmly shows our commitment to restoring the strength of our Nation's military. This is the fifth straight year of real increases to defense spending after 13 consecutive years of real cuts to defense budgets, and the largest increase in military manpower since 1986.

With U.S. personnel risking their lives on the front lines of the war on terrorism, H.R. 4546 is more than just a signal to our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines that this is a Nation that recognizes their sacrifices. It is the means by which we meet our commitment to providing them a decent quality of life, by providing an across-the-board 4.1 percent pay increase for military personnel, as well as improving benefits and continuing to build new housing and working facilities. The housing conditions have been deplorable, and certainly they deserve better.

I commend my colleagues, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for crafting legislation that will make America a safe place. It improves our defense against terrorists, rogue nations, against chemical and biological warfare and nuclear weapons.

However, there is one amendment the Committee on Rules made in order that I strongly oppose, the Sanchez amendment. It would allow abortions on our military bases overseas. Military treatment centers, which are dedicated to healing and nurturing life, should not be forced to facilitate the taking of the most innocent human life, the child in the womb. For the past 5 years, the House has voted to keep abortion on demand out of military medical facilities. I urge my colleagues to stay on this course and vote against this amendment.

That said, this is a fair rule. So let us pass this rule and pass the underlying defense authorization bill. At the end of the day, we will be making our homeland safer and we will be supporting our sons and daughters who are serving us in the military. We will be preparing for war, if necessary, thereby ensuring victory. At this crucial time in our history, this bill is most important.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, after September 11, the world saw something that we have known for a long time: Ensuring the security and liberty of the American people is not a partisan issue. Regardless of our differences on domestic issues, like Social Security and education, Democrats and Republicans are united behind our troops and committed to providing them the resources to defend the people of this great country. We are all Americans, we are all patriotic, and we are all here to promote the best interests of this great Nation. A strong national defense stands as one of the great pillars of the might of our country, and this bill largely reflects America's bipartisan support for national defense, the war on terrorism, and our men and women in uniform.

In light of this bipartisan cooperation in the war on terrorism, it is particularly outrageous that the Republican majority has given us such an unfair and one-sided rule on this important bill. Mr. Speaker, the ranking minority member and the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), respectively, deserve real credit for this bill. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) in particular has fought very hard to keep this process bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell, this bill provides the resources to win the war on terrorism and to ensure America's military remains the world's finest. It meets the President's overall defense request, which is a large increase over current spending, and it provides substantial resources to fight terrorism.

Additionally, Democrats and Republicans have again worked together to make significant improvements in the troops' quality of life.

The bill provides for another substantial military pay raise, at least 4.1 percent for all servicemen and women, and up to 6.5 percent for mid-grade and senior noncommissioned officers. It authorizes $10 billion for military construction and family housing because our troops and their families should not have to live in substandard conditions. And for military retirees, the bill ends the current practice of reducing veterans' retirement pay when they seek disability compensation.

I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Rules rejected my amendment to remove some of the obstacles faced by more than 15,000 legal immigrants in the armed services who want to become citizens. Their service reflects the tremendous pride and patriotism of our immigrant communities, particularly among Hispanic immigrants, and I will keep working to make sure this becomes law.

I am also disappointed Republican leaders did not make in order the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), one of the strongest supporters of the military in this Congress, to allow the House a clean vote on another round of base closures, something we have not yet had. And the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS), another pro-defense Democrat, had a worthy amendment to allow military retirees the same health coverage as Federal employees, but Republican leaders refused to allow it.

This bill does, however, continue our bipartisan approach to ensuring America's military superiority throughout the world, providing $3.7 billion more than the President requested for important weapons programs. In particular, it authorizes over $5.2 billion for the F–22 Raptor, the Air Force's next generation air dominance fighter. It includes $1.6 billion for the services' various versions of the Osprey aircraft. It provides $562.3 million for the Global Hawk UAV. And the bill provides $3.4 million for the Joint Strike Fighter, the high tech multi-role fighter of the future.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the majority of this bill reflects the bipartisan support our armed forces enjoy in this Congress. So I am frankly mystified that Republican leaders are insisting on using the war on terrorism as an excuse to continue their long-time attack on the environment. It verges on ideological war profiteering, and they should be ashamed of themselves.

Some Republicans have squirreled away in this bill provisions to exempt the Pentagon from landmark environmental protections that have been on

the books for decades. America has fought and won numerous wars while respecting the Endangered Species Act, for instance, but now some Republicans insist on undercutting it. Since Republican leaders know they cannot defend in the light of day their attack on the environment, the Committee on Rules last night refused to allow the House to even vote on Democratic amendments to strike these environmental rollbacks, as well as many other amendments offered by Democratic Members.

Additionally, there are several very important issues in the bill that the Committee on Rules majority has given short shrift to by limiting debate to 10 or 15 minutes. Given the magnitude of nuclear weapons testing, missile defense, and other matters of global reach, it seems irresponsible to give Members of this body so little time to debate. In years past, the defense authorization bill has taken several days, if not a full work week of floor time. So I am disappointed the Republican leaders are rushing through this bill in one day so they can get out of town.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to oppose the previous question so that this bill can be improved in a way that will make it truly bipartisan. If the previous question is defeated, it is my intention to offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider amendments addressing the environmental issues in this bill as well as the other issues proposed by Democratic Members.

I urge Members of both political parties to join me in opposing the previous question when it is ordered. In that way we can protect the environment and preserve the bipartisanship that has been so important to the war on terrorism. Then we can overwhelmingly pass this bipartisan bill for the troops.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I congratulate her on her management of this rule.

Let me say that as I listened to my friend from Dallas describe this rule, it is not quite the one that I recall our having crafted late last night. In years past, we have had 150-plus amendments filed to the Committee on Rules on this legislation. The success of passage of this Bob Stump Defense Authorization Act, which is very appropriately titled for our colleague who is going to be retiring at the end of the 107th Congress, in fact brought a total of 83 amendments, the lowest number that I can ever remember. And I am very pleased that of those 83 amendments filed, we have made in order 25 amendments. There are 10 amendments authored by Democrats, there are 12 amendments authored by Republicans, and there are 3 bipartisan amendments that have been made in order. So we are clearly going to have the opportunity to have a full debate on this issue.

In years past, Mr. Speaker, we have had sometimes 2 weeks of consideration of this measure because it has been so contentious. This is probably the least contentious, the least divisive defense authorization bill that we have had, again, in a long period of time, in large part due to the fact that we have come together as a Nation to win the war on terrorism and to make sure that we have a defense capability second to none so that we do not face the kinds of tragedies that our country has faced in the past.

So I believe that we have a very good rule here that allows for a full debate on a wide range of issues. This rule, I am happy to say, is going to enjoy bipartisan support. I know there are concerns that have been raised by a number of people, but one of the things we know in this institution is that we are never going to make everyone happy when it comes to the process of amending legislation. But I do believe that this measure is a very appropriate one.

The structure for this rule was in fact designed by our late former colleague, Les Aspin, who put into place this procedure that we are using right now, the former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the former Secretary of Defense Mr. Aspin. So I believe that we have done this in a very fair and a very balanced way.

I want to congratulate, along with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my home State of Missouri as well, who has made a number of proposals to us. And I know he has some concerns, but I am very pleased that we will, as I said, enjoy bipartisan support for this rule and will have very strong bipartisan support for this measure at the end of the day.

□ 1100

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the strength of a democracy is to be able to have full public debate on important national issues such as national defense. We stand for a strong national defense. Many of us in this caucus have a long history in that regard; but we also stand for the proposition that the American people can be trusted with the facts, and that there should be a full discussion on important issues of national defense.

The majority has ignored that and ignored the past practices of this House of having a full airing of national defense issues, and having a bill that would be on the floor for several days, perhaps even a week. That is in the best tradition of this country. We stand for a strong America, and we stand for a strong and complete discussion of the issues that make America strong, not the kind of rule which has been presented today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express some concern that I have; and as Members know, I had an opportunity to testify yesterday before the Committee on Rules. I intend to vote against the previous question. However, should the previous question pass, it is my intention to vote for the rule. But let me first tell Members of my serious concerns.

A number of key Democratic amendments and proposals were not made in order. They include, but are not limited to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) requiring 12 months notice to Congress before nuclear testing. It makes sense to debate that. Or another amendment by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) on cooperative threat reduction. What is more important than that issue?

It makes sense to debate the Allen amendment prohibiting nuclear-tipped interceptors. That was put to bed back in 1982. It makes sense to debate the amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) on the Colombian troop cap, or the gentleman's amendment of last year repealing last year's base closure law; the Rahall amendment on the environmental provisions; the Hinchey amendment on environmental provisions; as well as the Hooley amendment. These are items which should have been, in my opinion, made in order because we are in favor of a full and fair debate. Nevertheless, we forge ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I stated that I would vote against the previous question because of the fact that these amendments were not made in order, that we seem to be rushing to judgment without a full and fair debate that the country is entitled to have.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation. The legislation before us today will have a tremendous positive impact on improving the environment in our country and ensuring the safety of all Americans.

But first, today's legislation authorizes $382.8 billion for national defense, which is consistent with the House budget resolution. It includes $7.3 billion for programs to combat terrorism, and it also includes an increase of 4.1 percent for our men and women in uniform.

Further, this legislation keeps our commitment to our military retirees by completing eliminating the unfair

practice of reducing retirement pay based on disability payments, and this will be done by the year 2007.

I am very pleased that the legislation also includes the administration's proposal to accelerate cleanup of former nuclear weapon production sites throughout the country. This year the Bush administration has made a strong commitment to our environment through the environmental management, or EM, program at the Department of Defense. As the chairman of the House Nuclear Cleanup Caucus, I appreciate the commitment of the committee to ensure that our Nation's commitment to cleaning up these sites, which represent the greatest environmental challenges in the country, will continue on track.

The legislation provides at least $800 million to a new cleanup account to accelerate and reform cleanup of the highest risk environmental threats in the U.S. in a new and profoundly different manner. This new account will implement the results of the Department's year long, top-to-bottom review of the EM program. The account will direct dollars to accelerate cleanup throughout the Nation without compromising safety and embracing reforms to ensure that the best commercial practices and technology drive the program in the future.

Most important, however, is the commitment to drive more program dollars directly to cleanup and risk reduction, which will accelerate cleanup by decades at these sites throughout the country and save the American taxpayers tens of billions of dollars in the future.

I am convinced that this program will be successful, and I am proud that the Hanford site in my district has led the Nation in reaching the first agreement under the new cleanup account. This agreement, which was agreed to by the Bush administration, the Governor of the State of Washington and the EPA, will direct $433 million out of this new account to Hanford. This historic agreement, when fully implemented, will result in cost savings of $33 billion and will accelerate cleanup by 35 to 45 years. This is truly a remarkable commitment to our environment, and I look forward to additional sites reaching similar agreements in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement will provide a 5-year funding commitment instead of the year-to-year hassle that we go through every year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H.R. 4546, the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. It is noteworthy that it is named for the chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), and it will be a tremendous legacy once finalized.

The bill has flaws, however, and there were numerous amendments that were offered by Members on both sides of the aisle which were not made part of this rule.

However, I do feel overall that the rule will allow for support for our fighting men and women as they wage war against terrorism. It equips them with the technology, training and personnel that they need to attain victory, and also demonstrates our commitment to providing an improved quality of life in granting of funds for military living and working facilities.

However, due to the structured rule, we have been denied the opportunity to debate several amendments, including one I introduced. The amendment I introduced would have increased funding currently authorized for military health care by $2.5 million, with the necessary offsets that would not have affected the Pentagon at all. Not $25 million, not $250 million, but just $2.5 million specifically for retirees and their dependents.

In addition to serving active duty, the military and their families, the military health system provides services to military retirees and their dependents. While the number of people on active duty is not projected to increase dramatically over the next few years, the number of retirees and their dependents, especially over the age of 65, will. We face immense challenges in this regard.

I regret that the structured rule has denied me and other Members the opportunity to provide a much-needed boost to the military health care system. Be assured that my support, as my colleagues, for our military extends to support for veterans and their families, and I will continue to support them however, wherever, and whenever I can.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 4546, the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. This bill shows the nation's unwavering support for our fighting men and women as they wage war against terrorism. It equips them with the technology, training and personnel they need to attain victory. It also demonstrates our commitment to providing an improved quality of life in the granting of funds for upgrades to military living and working facilities.

However, due to the structured rule, we have been denied the opportunity to debate the amendment I introduced.

My amendment would have increased funding currently authorized for military health care by $2.5 million, specifically for retires and their dependents.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to serving active duty military and their families, the military health system provides services to military retirees and their dependents. While the number of people on active duty is not projected to increase dramatically over the next few years, the number of retirees and their dependents, especially those over the age of 65, will.

The greatest challenge facing the military health care system is caring for retirees—especially those over the age of 65.

Again, I regret that the structured rule has denied me the opportunity to provide a much needed boost to the military health care system. Be assured that my support for our military extends to support for veterans and their families and I will continue to support them however, wherever, and whenever I can.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few other aspects of this bill that remain troublesome—one concerns our environment and the other concerns the deployment of American troops in Colombia. Regrettably, this structured rule has denied us the opportunity for further debate on these two important issues.

This bill grants special exemptions to the Department of Defense environmental programs. This provision is, and I quote, ''intended to restore a balance between environmental responsibilities and military readiness.'' It relieves DoD, when conducting training exercises, from observing the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Act, and the Marine Mammal Act.

The ESA already contains a provision that permits DoD to request a waiver from compliance with the Endangered Species Act if that compliance poses a threat to national security. I question the necessity of granting the Department of Defense with a blanket exclusion from the laws that the rest of us must adhere to.

An amendment, offered by Mr. MALONEY sought to strike this language from the bill, and another from Ms. SANCHEZ required annual reports from DoD on its stewardship of the environmentally sensitive areas on military bases. Both of these amendments would have initiated a much needed debate on this issue, but we have denied that right by the rule that has been invoked.

Secondly, Mr. TAYLOR offered an amendment to limit the number of U.S. troops in Colombia to not more than 500. Mr. Speaker, I have some grave concerns about the necessity of increasing the number of American troops currently in Colombia and would have welcomed the opportunity to debate this issue with my colleagues.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. 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 44, nays 366, not voting 24, as follows: