

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

Post reported that nearly half of workers laid off between 2003 and 2005 who were successful at finding new employment took a pay cut at their new jobs. Nearly 30 percent reported earnings losses of 20 percent or more.

The same is true for Maine manufacturing sector workers. According to a 2002 survey done by the Maine AFL-CIO, laid-off manufacturing workers who found new employment lost on average 16 percent of their wages. One out of three laid-off workers lost pension benefits.

Congress is under pressure to renew fast track. The administration claims that it cannot negotiate bilateral or multilateral agreements without it.

The administration has had long enough to demonstrate what it will and won't do with fast track authority. Our constituents deserve to be heard when trade deals are negotiated, not ignored. Rather than write another blank check, Members of Congress should take an active part in trade negotiations. We must insert accountability into any future grants of authority to the executive branch. We must strive to create agreements that meet the test of what serves the public good, rather than what serves narrow special interests.

I strongly believe that the choice between agreements that open new trade opportunities and agreements that protect workers is a false one. We can and must achieve both objectives. We can address health care, education, job training, and technological investments to make our firms more competitive. We can do more to retrain and cushion the blow for workers who lose their jobs as a result of foreign competition, and we can rewrite the model for trade agreements so that the interests of hardworking Americans are a priority.

I urge my colleagues to oppose renewal of fast track in its current form.

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

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

SAN FRANCISCO VS. TEENMANIA

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor today to praise the more than 20,000 teens that will reunite in San Francisco this weekend to worship. Their movement called Battlecry has a home base in my district just outside Lindale, Texas.

Their message is a hopeful one: they reject the negative messages often portrayed in pop culture and, instead, they embrace a godly path. They strive

to live a life of Christian values and reject premarital sex, drugs, alcohol, and destructive behavior.

One thing is very clear: there is nothing in Battlecry's message that is hateful. It is a message of love. However, last year, when these teens gathered in San Francisco, they were met by protests, and the board of supervisors passed a resolution condemning these young people of Battlecry and their message.

As we know, there are some in the San Francisco government who are not happy with these voices carrying a Christian message. These teens are congregating at AT&T Park where the Giants play, and they are going to worship and promote a positive path for young people. The entertainment commission in San Francisco issued a restrictive loud speaker permit to them to prevent their use before 10 a.m., and yet these delightful youth are taking the lemon-sour treatment and are going to turn it into lemonade by using the time in a positive, peaceful manner to reach out in prayer and grace to those in San Francisco and the surrounding area. These Christian young people uniting in Teenmania and Battlecry are filled with love and the teachings of Jesus and are fueled by their faith in God, along with hope for their generation.

They offer an alternative to the misogynistic world. They offer alternatives to drugs, alcohol, sexually transmitted diseases.

Mr. Speaker, San Francisco apparently has some who are such religious bigots that they loathe and want to thwart these loving young people because of the grace and kindness these people bring in the name of the Lord. Time magazine has called Battlecry's event the "Lollapalooza for the Lord," and I humbly submit this kind of event is a good thing to have.

Of course, we know the discrimination against wholesome, nurturing groups like the Boy Scouts of America in San Francisco by some intolerant fanatics. But this is an alternative to the kind of head-banging music that sometimes promotes drugs, alcohol, careless sexual activity, and at times even anarchy.

On the other hand, the young Christians believe that embracing God's love and grace can make the drugs, alcohol, and any hallucinogen completely unnecessary.

So I salute these wonderful young people from Battlecry and Teenmania and encourage them to continue promoting positive Christian-type values and the love of the Lord to any and all, including the bigots against them. And for the religiously intolerant who get angry just thinking about Christian young people spreading the love and teachings of Christ, the message needs to go out, far and wide, very clear: Jesus loves you, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CORPORAL CLOY RICHARDS—"WHY I FIGHT FOR PEACE"

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, all too often the painful stories of those who have served in Iraq go unheard by Representatives in Washington; however, their experiences are a window into the truth about the real effect of this war on real people, both in service and after they come home from service.

One of these stories belongs to Corporal Cloy Richards, who bravely served with the United States Marine Corps for two tours in Iraq and may soon be called back again even though he has been diagnosed with PTS.

Cloy Richards has a poem; it is a courage poem. It is entitled: "Why I Fight for Peace." This poem is exactly the message we need to hear.

□ 1515

The message that shows us in our continuing debate on funding the occupation of Iraq, just how this affects our servicemembers.

As I said, the poem is called, "Why I Fight for Peace," by Corporal Cloy Richards, United States Marine Corps. And I am going to read it, Mr. Speaker.

"Because I can't forget no matter how hard I try. They told us we are taking out advancing Iraqi forces, but when we went to check out the bodies, they were nothing but women and children desperately fleeing their homes because they wanted to get out of the city before we attacked in the morning.

"Because my little brother, who is my job to protect, decided to join the California National Guard to get some money for college, and they promised he wouldn't go to Iraq. Instead, 3 months after enlisting, he was sent to Iraq for 1 year.

"Since he has been home for the last 6 months, he refuses to talk to anyone; he lives by himself. The only person he associates with is a friend of his, the one other man out of his squad of 13 men who made it home alive.

"He called me a few weeks ago for the first time, and he told me he's having nightmares. I asked what they were about, and he said, they're about picking up the pieces of his fellow soldiers after a car bomb hit them.

"Because every single one of the Marines I served with, the really brave warriors, even when some friends and people they looked up to got killed and lost an arm or a leg, they wouldn't cry; they just kept fighting. They completed their mission.

"Every one of them I have spoken to since we got home has broken down