

a 15-year withdrawal period. This is consistent with the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986 and with earlier legislation which provided a 15-year withdrawal for Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada.

The Army would prefer a 25-year withdrawal period because of the substantial lead time required to comply with all statutory and administrative requirements to process military land withdrawals. However, the Army can support this compromise of a 15-year withdrawal period.

I would note that the text of the bill you see before you is virtually identical to legislation which passed the House in the previous two Congresses.

As I said, Fort Carson's immediate past mineral withdrawal expired on June 23, 1992. That withdrawal has been extended, both administratively and through a 1-year legislative extension in 1992. This is an important administrative matter, and I hope the other body will move quickly on this legislation so that we can send this measure to the White House for the President's signature.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the third time the House has considered this legislation, having passed it previously in both the 102d and 103d Congress. H.R. 265 would withdraw and reserve for military use certain public lands and minerals in two existing military-use areas, the Fort Carson Reservation and the Pinon Canyon maneuver area, both in Colorado.

I would note that H.R. 256 differs from the version of the bill that passed the House in the last Congress. The bill now includes amendments that were adopted by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in the bill they reported to the Senate last year. If the Senate had been able to pass the bill, it is my understanding that the House would have likely gone along with those changes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope for the sponsor, Representative HEFLEY's sake, that the third time around on this legislation is the charm. I support the legislation and recommend its adoption by the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would comment in response to the comment of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], this has become like the cherry blossoms. It is a rite of springtime here in Washington. I hope this is the last time we have to look at this bill, and

that we can get it passed and move on to other things.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman HEFLEY, for the outstanding job he has done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to know that there is no controversy with respect to this legislation. This bill passed the Committee on National Security without dissent. An identical bill previously passed the House of Representatives and has passed the U.S. Senate. It passed the Committee on Resources on January 18 of this year by a vote of 42 to 0. The Department of the Army and the Bureau of Land Management support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of this legislation.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 256. As my colleagues have stated, there is no opposition to this bill. This is the second year this bill has been taken up. It has been favorably reported out of both the Natural Resources and National Security Committees. I would like to thank my colleagues involved who have put so much work into getting this bill to the floor.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 256.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 256, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 73, TERM LIMITS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 116 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 116

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pur-

suant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the number of terms of office of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed three hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order specified in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, may be considered notwithstanding the adoption of a previous amendment in the nature of a substitute, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. If more than one amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to open this historic debate and mindful of the significance of our discussion. As we speak, reports suggest that there are not yet enough votes to pass the constitutional amendment limiting Members terms. A loss on this issue will be decried by some as failure—but that would miss the point. It is a victory to be here having this debate, to have a rule that forces Members to come clean on where they really stand on term limits. We promised this vote—and we have delivered. It was not so long ago, that Tom Foley was Speaker of this House—the same man who sued the people of his own State over this question; the same man who refused to allow term limits to come to the floor for an honest vote. We may or may not have the 290 votes when all is said and done here this week, but either way the issue of term limits is not going away. There are 22 States with term limits; 80