| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Towns | Wasserman Schultz | Wexler |
| Udall (CO) | Waters | Wilson (NM) |
| Udall (NM) | Watson | Wilson (OH) |
| Velázquez | Watt | Wolf |
| Visclosky | Waxman | Wu |
| Walden (OR) | Weiner | Wynn |
| Walsh (NY) | Welch (VT) | Yarmuth |
| Walz (MN) | Weller | Young (AK) |

NAYS—150

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aderholt | Flake | Miller (FL) |
| Akin | Forbes | Miller (MI) |
| Alexander | Fossella | Moran (KS) |
| Bachmann | Foxx | Musgrave |
| Bachus | Franks (AZ) | Myrick |
| Baker | Gallegly | Neugebauer |
| Barrett (SC) | Garrett (NJ) | Nunes |
| Bartlett (MD) | Gillmor | Paul |
| Barton (TX) | Gingrey | Pearce |
| Biggert | Gohmert | Pence |
| Bilbray | Goode | Peterson (PA) |
| Bishop (UT) | Goodlatte | Petri |
| Blackburn | Graves | Pickering |
| Blunt | Hastert | Pitts |
| Boehner | Hastings (WA) | Poe |
| Bonner | Hayes | Price (GA) |
| Boozman | Heller | Putnam |
| Boustany | Hensarling | Radanovich |
| Brady (TX) | Herger | Regula |
| Brown (SC) | Hobson | Reynolds |
| Brown-Waite, Ginny | Hoekstra | Rogers (AL) |
| | Hulshof | Rogers (KY) |
| Burgess | Inglis (SC) | Rogers (MI) |
| Burton (IN) | Issa | Rohrabacher |
| Calvert | Jindal | Royce |
| Campbell (CA) | Johnson, Sam | Ryan (WI) |
| Cannon | Jones (NC) | Schmidt |
| Cantor | Jordan | Sensenbrenner |
| Capito | King (IA) | Sessions |
| Carter | King (NY) | Shadegg |
| Castle | Kingston | Shimkus |
| Chabot | Kline (MN) | Shuster |
| Coble | Kuhl (NY) | Simpson |
| Cole (OK) | LaHood | Smith (NE) |
| Conaway | Lamborn | Smith (TX) |
| Crenshaw | Latham | Souder |
| Cubin | LaTourette | Stearns |
| Culberson | Lewis (KY) | Sullivan |
| Davis (KY) | Linder | Tancredo |
| Davis, David | Lucas | Tiahrt |
| Deal (GA) | Lungren, Daniel E. | Turner |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | | Upton |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Mack | Walberg |
| Doolittle | Manzullo | Wamp |
| Drake | Marchant | Weldon (FL) |
| Dreier | Matheson | Westmoreland |
| Duncan | McCarthy (CA) | Whitfield |
| Emerson | McCotter | Wicker |
| Everett | McCrery | Wilson (SC) |
| Fallin | McHenry | Young (FL) |
| Feeney | McHugh | |

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bono | Kennedy | Sali |
| Boyd (FL) | Larson (CT) | Terry |
| Camp (MI) | Murphy, Tim | Van Hollen |
| Davis, Jo Ann | Rangel | Woolsey |
| Hunter | Roskam | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1456

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 131, I was in a hearing during votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD and regret that I could not be present today, Thursday, March 8, 2007 to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 127, 128, 129, 130, and 131 due to a family medical matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted: ''yea'' on rollcall vote No. 127 on the previous question to H. Res. 219, on providing for the consideration of H. Res. 202;

''Nay'' on rollcall vote No. 128 on the amendment to H. R. 700, to prohibit the bill's authorization levels or other provisions from taking effect if they would result in costs to the federal government;

''Yea'' on rollcall vote No. 129 on a motion to recommit H.R. 700 with instructions;

''Yea'' on rollcall vote No. 130 on the final passage of H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act; and

''Yea'' on rollcall vote No. 131 on agreeing to H. Res. 202, a resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 110th Congress.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

## CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–17)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the Iran emergency declared on March 15, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2007.

The crisis between the United States and Iran constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Iran that led to the declaration of a national emergency on March 15, 1995, has not been resolved. The actions and policies of the Government of Iran are contrary to the interests of the United States in the region and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Iran and maintain in force comprehensive sanctions against Iran to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 2007.*

## DEMOCRATS RETREAT FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, after waiting for months, the new Democrat majority has introduced their plan for Iraq today, and it can be summed up with one phrase, fully funded withdrawal.

Seeking to micromanage the war, the Democrats have come up with a plan that attaches strings to troop funding in order to seek American withdrawal from Iraq by 2008. This Democrat plan for a fully funded withdrawal could also be described as a well-equipped retreat. A fully funded withdrawal might well be added to that classic list of American oxymorons that includes plastic glass and jumbo shrimp.

Since their election pledge to ''fix the war,'' it has taken our friends on the other side of the aisle 4 months to come up with a strategy in Iraq. But even though their proposal does include funding for our soldiers in the field and our veterans here at home, their latest poll-tested approach for fighting the war in Iraq can best be described as cut and run.

For all the Democrats' furtive backroom efforts and tortured explanations, it is not nearly as complex as they describe. In fact, their strategy could be described by George Orwell: ''The quickest way to end the war is to lose it.''

We don't need a fully funded withdrawal. We need to fully fund victory for freedom in Iraq.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1500

## YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn in the strongest possible terms President Bush's latest attempt to resurrect the fatally flawed Yucca Mountain Project in my home State of Nevada.

This past Tuesday, the White House ordered the Energy Department to seek reintroduction of the so-called Fix Yucca Bill.

In a nutshell, this special interest legislation guts key safety and environmental rules, makes it harder for Nevadans to challenge Yucca Mountain, gives the green light to a water grant in the middle of the Nevada desert where there is no water, and increases the amount of deadly nuclear

waste that can be buried outside of Las Vegas, a major metropolitan area in the western United States where 1.7 million people reside.

In calling for passage of this bill, the Bush administration has renewed its attack on Nevada, and their goal is simple: open Yucca Mountain at any cost.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal isn't about safety and it isn't about science. It is not about protecting our communities from shipments of nuclear waste. This legislation is all about using political muscle to ram through changes to the rules of the game in order to ensure that nuclear waste comes to Nevada.

The reason they need the bill is clear: Yucca Mountain is all but dead as a result of scientific uncertainties, of bloated budget, and total mismanagement. The proposed dump is decades behind schedule and has already cost upwards of $12 billion according to the figures published this January by the General Accounting Office.

Outgoing Nuclear Regulatory Commissioner Ed McGaffigan, not exactly a great friend of the State of Nevada, recently said that it will take until 2025 or beyond before Yucca Mountain is completed. But more importantly, he said it is time to ''stop digging'' at Yucca Mountain and look at alternatives because the system that created this abomination is so flawed that nuclear waste will never be stored in Nevada.

Clearly, this legislation, which was introduced last year and went absolutely nowhere, is a last ditch effort to try and bring Yucca Mountain back from the brink of total collapse. Make no mistake about it, Yucca Mountain's days are numbered. Working with my colleagues in the House and with my Nevada counterpart, majority leader HARRY REID, we will ensure that this dangerous and misguided bill never reaches the President's desk.

Despite claims to the contrary, Yucca Mountain has never been proven safe, and there will be no way to keep thousands of shipments of nuclear waste secure as it travels across our roads and railways.

Among the changes included in the White House bill is a provision that seeks to eliminate the current restriction on the amount of waste that can be stored inside Yucca Mountain. Right now, it is 77,000 tons. They want to double that. Lifting this cap would enable more nuclear waste to be dumped in Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and would increase the number of waste shipments that would have to travel along America's roads and railways.

I am also concerned that this bill is designed to try and pave the way for President Bush's plan to allow nuclear waste from other nations. It is bad enough they want to stick nuclear waste from across the country in Nevada; now they want to take other nations' nuclear waste, ship it to Nevada for burial at Yucca Mountain.

Right now there is a limit on the nuclear waste that can be stored at Yucca Mountain. If the President has his way, Nevada will become the world's nuclear garbage dump.

Another provision in the bill will make it easier for Congress to spend billions on dumping nuclear waste in Nevada, with little or no oversight to protect taxpayers. Billions of dollars have already been wasted on this hole in the middle of the Nevada desert, and the truth remains that Yucca Mountain is no closer to opening today than it was 20 years ago when Nevada was unfairly singled out as the only State to be considered as a location to bury nuclear waste. That is known affectionately in the State of Nevada as the Screw Nevada Bill.

Funding for this disaster waiting to happen does not deserve special treatment. Yucca Mountain should have to compete with our Nation's needs to fund homeland security, education, clean energy, health care, Social Security, and the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. There should be no special budget treatment for Yucca Mountain, and Congress should exercise its full oversight authority, something we haven't seen for a while, on runaway spending on this failed project.

This brings me to the fact that we have not seen an updated cost estimate for Yucca Mountain for years, despite the rising cost of fuel and construction projects and labor. I suspect that Yucca Mountain could ultimately cost hundreds of billions of dollars before we are through. Is this where you want to stick our taxpayers' dollars? I don't.

The answer to this Nation's nuclear waste problem is not Yucca Mountain. The answer is to keep waste on-site where it is now produced in so-called ''dry cask storage.''

I urge all of my colleagues to take a good look at this and make the right decision for our country and for our taxpayers.

This system is already in use in nuclear power plants, has the blessing of nuclear regulators and will keep waste safe for the next 100 years in hardened emplacements guarded by the same security precautions in place to keep nuclear power plants safe.

I say to my colleagues: Do not fall for false claims that Yucca Mountain can be ''fixed'' by sweeping aside important health and safety protections or through a water grab that turns Nevada's water law on its head. Or by lifting the cap on the amount of waste that can be stored at Yucca Mountain so that Nevada can become a global nuclear garbage dump.

Keep nuclear waste on-site, preserve the rules now in place to protect families and the environment, protect your right to scrutinize the billions being squandered on a hole in the Nevada desert and reject calls to support the reintroduction of the so-called ''Fix Yucca'' legislative package.

---

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

(Mr. SALI 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 California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

---

## NO MORE ''BLANK CHECKS'' ON TRADE: FAST TRACK HAS HURT MAINE'S WORKERS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to renewing trade promotion authority, also known as fast track.

Fast track in its current form is nothing more than a blank check for the administration to negotiate harmful trade agreements without congressional input.

I voted against the Trade Act of 2002, which granted fast track authority to the President. Those of us who opposed such a large grant of authority are not surprised that, given a blank check, the Bush administration has made regional and bilateral deals to suit narrow corporate interests and cut Members of Congress out of the process.

We need to examine what has happened to hardworking people in my home State of Maine since Congress signed that blank check. Between January of 2001 and December of last year, Maine lost more than 20,000 manufacturing jobs. In the same period of time, Maine also lost 8,000 information sector jobs, in what surely is just the beginning of trouble for our service sectors. Only one month ago, Moosehead Manufacturing, a furniture-making firm in the towns of Monson and Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, employing 120 people, closed its doors as a result of competition from China, Mexico, and Brazil. Moosehead Manufacturing tried for years to adjust to the pressure of foreign competition by changing its products and the structure of its workforce, unfortunately, to no avail. Fast track authority allowed the administration to continue to make trade deals without adjusting their tactics in the least, even as jobs flowed out of my State.

It isn't clear how lost manufacturing jobs will be replaced in Maine. What is clear is that these jobs were casualties not of the inevitable forces of globalization, but the abuse of a process that is closed to the majority of Americans.

That is why I voted against fast track, and why I am here to urge my colleagues to vote against renewal in anything like the form of the current law.

Mainers who lose their jobs because of global competition often have to accept lower wages when they find another job. This week, The Washington