

Reynolds	Simpson	Tiahrt
Riley	Sisisky	Tierney
Rivers	Skeen	Toomey
Rodriguez	Skelton	Towns
Roemer	Slaughter	Traficant
Rogan	Smith (MI)	Turner
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)
Rohrabacher	Smith (WA)	Udall (NM)
Ros-Lehtinen	Snyder	Upton
Roukema	Souder	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Spence	Vento
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Visclosky
Ryun (KS)	Stabenow	Vitter
Sabo	Stark	Walden
Salmon	Stearns	Walsh
Sanchez	Stenholm	Wamp
Sanders	Strickland	Waters
Sandlin	Stump	Watkins
Sanford	Stupak	Watt (NC)
Sawyer	Sununu	Watts (OK)
Saxton	Sweeney	Waxman
Scarborough	Talent	Weldon (FL)
Schaffer	Tancredo	Weldon (PA)
Scott	Tanner	Weller
Sensenbrenner	Tauscher	Wexler
Serrano	Tauzin	Weygand
Sessions	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Shadegg	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Shaw	Terry	Wilson
Shays	Thomas	Wise
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Wolf
Sherwood	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wu
Shoos	Thune	Wynn
Shuster	Thurman	Young (AK)

NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage Paul

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman	Gordon	McDermott
Bachus	Greenwood	McNulty
Bateman	Gutierrez	Meehan
Becerra	Houghton	Pallone
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Blagojevich	(TX)	Porter
Blunt	Johnson, E.B.	Rothman
Crane	Jones (OH)	Royce
Davis (LL)	Klink	Rush
Delahunt	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Doolittle	Lowe	Smith (TX)
Engel	Martinez	Weiner
Eshoo	Matsui	Young (FL)
Ewing	McCollum	

□ 1934

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3844

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 3844.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 701

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 701.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3573, THE KEEP OUR PROMISES TO AMERICA'S MILITARY RETIREES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this government offered a comprehensive employment contract to our military retirees. As a former member of the armed services, I was personally presented the package in the 1960s. I remember the sales pitch quite well, for the Army was very honest in pointing out the pros and cons of a military career.

The negatives were, first, that you might get killed or maimed in the line of duty but if you survived, you would have to move your family from one side of the country to the other every couple of years, maybe even overseas, and you would be paid far less than you would in a similar skill civilian job in spite of having to deal with these hardships. The supposedly offsetting positives were that your out-of-pocket living expenses would be far less, since major expense items such as health care would be covered directly by the Army, both during your active duty years and in retirement. Retirement was available after 20 years of service at half of your last paycheck.

Therefore, we were told we could afford to work and retire for far less than our jobs would command in the private sector or the Federal civilian workforce, for that matter, because of all of these great benefits. We would not need a big retirement check since we would have fully funded health care for life.

We could live off a lot less since we would never face big health care bills. I was homesick for Georgia the last time I heard that pitch in the Republic of Vietnam in 1969, so I passed on the deal. Air Force Sergeant Earl Terrell of Smyrna, Tennessee, took the government at its word and stayed in for over 21 years. Sergeant Terrell retired in Smyrna because of access to military benefits at the Smyrna Air Force Base. His retirement pay is \$14,676 a year for both Earl and his wife. That is below

the Federal poverty line, but that did not bother the couple that much since they would not have to worry about health care costs so they could live off the entire \$14,000.

The deal started to go sour 6 years after Sergeant Terrell settled down in Smyrna when the Federal Government closed down the Smyrna Air Force Base. Sergeant Terrell has suffered a stroke and had heart bypass surgery. Mrs. Terrell had heart valve surgery just in January and has also undergone surgeries for an ovarian cyst and back problems.

Without access to military health care, Earl and his wife now are paying \$5,760 a year to Blue Cross and Blue Shield. That is 39 percent of his retirement income. That leaves the Terrells with less than \$9,000 a year to live on. The Federal poverty line for a family of two is over \$16,000. Since 1995, the Terrells have paid nearly \$29,000 of their retirement income for health care that was promised free in exchange for 20 years of military service.

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of this House, I ask you, have we fulfilled our side of the employment contract with Air Force Sergeant Earl Terrell? The answer is unequivocally no. We have a bill pending in the House and Senate that will meet our promises to those who have borne the battle, H.R. 3573.

Sergeant and Mrs. Terrell would be given the same FEHBP plan as our retired Federal civilian workers, at no cost. That means they regain their \$14,000 a year retirement pay, still below the poverty line but at least what they were promised.

At last check, the majority of the Members of this House from both parties have cosponsored this bill, The Keep Our Promises to America's Military Retirees Act. Mr. Speaker, let us try to do the right thing and let America keep her word and her honor and pass H.R. 3573 into law before this Congress ends.

IN OPPOSITION TO S. 1287, THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1983, President Reagan signed into law the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The new law began with a reasonable scientific approach. The country would search all over the Nation looking for geological formations which were capable of burying high-level nuclear waste. The new law would also consider three sites so as to provide some regional equity to the burden of storing the waste. One site would be in the northeastern part of the country, one site would be in the southeastern United States, and one site would be in the West. These three sites would be studied and then presented to the President of the United States for a decision.