

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 retirees 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:

[Roll No. 134]

## YEAS—44

Allen	Holt	Payne
Andrews	Honda	Pelosi
Barton	Jefferson	Sandlin
Berry	Lampson	Schakowsky
Brady (PA)	Langevin	Shows
Capuano	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Conyers	Lee	Spratt
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Tanner
Dingell	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	Miller, George	Towns
Filner	Mink	Waters
Frank	Owens	Woolsey
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Wu
Hinchey	Pascarell	

## NAYS—366

Ackerman	Delahunt	Hunter
Aderholt	DeLauro	Hyde
Akin	DeLay	Inslée
Army	DeMint	Isakson
Baca	Deutsch	Israel
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Baird	Dicks	Istook
Baker	Dooley	Jackson (IL)
Baldacci	Doolittle	Jenkins
Baldwin	Doyle	John
Ballenger	Dreier	Johnson (CT)
Barcia	Duncan	Johnson (IL)
Barr	Dunn	Johnson, E. B.
Barrett	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett	Ehlers	Jones (NC)
Bass	Ehrlich	Jones (OH)
Becerra	Emerson	Kanjorski
Bentsen	Engel	Keller
Bereuter	English	Kelly
Berkley	Eshoo	Kennedy (MN)
Berman	Etheridge	Kennedy (RI)
Biggert	Evans	Kerns
Bilirakis	Everett	Kildee
Blagojevich	Farr	Kilpatrick
Blumenauer	Fattah	Kind (WI)
Blunt	Ferguson	King (NY)
Boehlert	Flake	Kingston
Boehner	Fletcher	Kirk
Bonilla	Foley	Klecza
Bonior	Forbes	Knollenberg
Bono	Ford	Kolbe
Boozman	Fossella	Kucinich
Borski	Frelinghuysen	LaFalce
Boswell	Frost	LaHood
Boucher	Galleghy	Lantos
Boyd	Ganske	Larsen (WA)
Brady (TX)	Gekas	Latham
Brown (FL)	Gephardt	LaTourette
Brown (OH)	Gibbons	Leach
Brown (SC)	Gilchrest	Levin
Bryant	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Gonzalez	Linder
Callahan	Goode	Lipinski
Calvert	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Camp	Gordon	Loftgren
Cannon	Goss	Lowe
Cantor	Graham	Lucas (KY)
Capito	Granger	Lucas (OK)
Capps	Graves	Luther
Cardin	Green (TX)	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Green (WI)	Maloney (NY)
Carson (OK)	Greenwood	Manzullo
Castle	Grucci	Markey
Chabot	Gutierrez	Mascara
Chambliss	Gutknecht	Matheson
Clayton	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Clement	Hansen	McCarthy (MO)
Clyburn	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Coble	Hart	McCollum
Collins	Hastings (WA)	McCrery
Combest	Hayes	McHugh
Condit	Hayworth	McInnis
Cooksey	Hefley	McIntyre
Costello	Herger	McKeon
Cox	Hill	McKinney
Coyne	Hilleary	McNulty
Cramer	Hilliard	Meek (FL)
Crenshaw	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Culberson	Hobson	Menendez
Cummings	Hoeffel	Mica
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Millender-
Davis (CA)	Holden	McDonald
Davis (FL)	Hooley	Miller, Dan
Davis (IL)	Horn	Miller, Gary
Davis, Jo Ann	Hostettler	Miller, Jeff
Davis, Tom	Houghton	Mollohan
Deal	Hoyer	Moore
DeGette	Hulshof	Moran (KS)

Morella	Rogers (MI)	Sununu
Murtha	Rohrabacher	Sweeney
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Tancredo
Nadler	Ross	Tauscher
Neal	Rothman	Tauzin
Nethercutt	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Ney	Roybal-Allard	Terry
Northup	Royce	Thomas
Nussle	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Oberstar	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Obey	Ryun (KS)	Thornberry
Oliver	Sabo	Thune
Ortiz	Sanchez	Thurman
Osborne	Sanders	Tiahrt
Oxley	Sawyer	Tiberi
Pastor	Saxton	Tierney
Paul	Schiff	Toomey
Pence	Schrock	Turner
Peterson (MN)	Scott	Udall (CO)
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Udall (NM)
Phelps	Serrano	Upton
Pickering	Sessions	Velazquez
Pitts	Shadegg	Visclosky
Platts	Shaw	Vitter
Pombo	Shays	Walden
Pomeroy	Sherman	Walsh
Portman	Sherwood	Wamp
Price (NC)	Shimkus	Watkins (OK)
Pryce (OH)	Shuster	Watt (NC)
Putnam	Simmons	Watts (OK)
Quinn	Simpson	Weiner
Radanovich	Skelton	Weldon (FL)
Rahall	Smith (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Weller
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Wexler
Regula	Snyder	Whitfield
Rehberg	Solis	Wicker
Reyes	Souder	Wilson (NM)
Reynolds	Stearns	Wilson (SC)
Rivers	Stenholm	Wolf
Rodriguez	Strickland	Wynn
Roemer	Stump	Young (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Stupak	
	Sullivan	

## NOT VOTING—24

Abercrombie	Kaptur	Schaffer
Bishop	Maloney (CT)	Skeen
Burton	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Clay	Moran (VA)	Trafficant
Crane	Napolitano	Watson (CA)
Cubin	Norwood	Waxman
Hall (OH)	Ose	Young (AK)
Jackson-Lee	Peterson (PA)	
(TX)	Riley	

□ 1139

Messrs. SAXTON, COBLE, GALLEGLY, ROGERS of Michigan, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York and Ms. HART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would advise that the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 20 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 19 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), another member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering this rule and the debate that certainly concerns our support of the United States military and the men

and women who represent us. We are talking in this bill about a better pay raise, a pay raise where we are able to keep the brightest and the best. We are talking about better housing for our men and women; we are talking about increasing our readiness; we are talking about research and development; we are talking about counterterrorism. We are trying to talk about the issues which I perceive are important to the military in this country.

However, perhaps the most key component is we are going to talk about homeland security today, and there is one amendment which will be discussed today that says that no funds for 2003 appropriations for the Department of Defense may be used for space-based national defense programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell my colleagues that I believe that now, more than ever, this Congress should focus on not only ballistic missile threats that face this country, because it is not just what is aimed at our military, it is what is aimed at our homeland. Our homeland security is now an issue.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 28 countries outside the United States that possess not only ballistic missiles, but the desire and the threat to not only threaten America, but also our allies. These 28 countries, as we look around, many of them represent belligerent countries who would wish for America to be harmed. These 28 countries possess the ability to threaten the United States and our military and our allies.

What is important about this debate is that we need to understand what our President has said about it. President Bush has said, America's development of a missile defense is a search for security, not a search for advantage.

Mr. Speaker, homeland security for America is what this bill is also about. I support this rule, I support this bill, and I hope Members will focus on homeland security and the support our President gives for this bill.

□ 1145

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. The defense authorization bill provides a waiver to the Secretary of Defense to get around the current cap on U.S. military personnel in Colombia.

I strongly oppose such a waiver. It is a serious abrogation of the duties of this Congress to monitor and provide oversight to our military programs and presence in Colombia. I oppose this waiver because it provides the Secretary of Defense with the ability for an unrestricted escalation of U.S. military personnel in Colombia and further engages in that country's 40-year-old civil war, a war that Colombia's government has failed to adequately support.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) offered an amendment to