

love. As American author Washington Irving put it best, "A mother is the truest friend we have, when trials heavy and sudden, fall upon us; when adversity takes the place of prosperity; when friends who rejoice with us in our sunshine desert us; when trouble thickens around us, still will she cling to us, and endeavor by her kind precepts and counsels to dissipate the clouds of darkness, and cause ace to return to our hearts."

My heart goes out to those mothers with children who are away at war, I cannot even imagine the fear that they must feel daily. I want to recognize the First Lady, Michelle Obama, who is striking a balance ALL between motherhood and her duties as the First Lady. I want to congratulate and praise all of the mothers in America for all of their hard work. Another former First Lady, Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis once said, "If you bungle raising your children, I don't think whatever else you do well matters very much."

I hope that we can all reflect on all the sacrifices our mothers made for us throughout the years. A mother's love is unending and her arms are always open. I wish all mothers a Happy Mothers Day this weekend.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 402

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of myself and my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRISTOPHER SMITH, as we have introduced a resolution condemning the transport of certain types of nuclear waste, commonly known as mixed oxide fuel, containing plutonium and uranium, through international waters. And we urge the countries that produce the waste to keep such nuclear waste within their borders.

□ 1830

Madam Speaker, last month two British-flagged vessels left France with 1.8 tons of plutonium bound for Japan. They are scheduled to arrive in port at some point this month. From what has been made public, the shipment is to travel via the Cape of Good Hope, across the southern Indian Ocean, then through the Tasman Sea between Australia and New Zealand, and then through the southwest Pacific Ocean, and finally to Japan.

The plutonium itself is contained within what is commonly known as MOX fuel, a toxic mixture of plutonium and uranium oxide. The MOX will be used by Japanese electric utilities to power their nuclear energy plants.

Madam Speaker, mixed oxide fuel containing plutonium and uranium is legal. The release of even a small amount of it during transport over thousands of miles of open sea, whether as a result of accidents or malicious intent, would cause serious health and environmental harm to surrounding areas. That has always been made clear.

But MOX poses a far more ominous threat. With the right technology, it can be reprocessed into weapons-grade material. And according to reputable estimates, enough plutonium is contained in the MOX currently headed towards Japan to produce more than 200 nuclear bombs. Every Member of this Chamber, Madam Speaker, knows that al Qaeda and its networks would like nothing better than to get their hands on enough fissile material to build a nuclear explosive device or a radiological bomb, however crude, and to detonate it where it can do the most harm. We and our allies around the world have committed our best intelligence, military and civilian officials, to work around the clock to eliminate the possibility of that ever happening.

And yet by permitting the transport of MOX over open seas, obviously we are providing terrorists one more avenue of attack for getting access to the nuclear materials they have so long coveted.

Indeed, the OECD Nuclear Energy Agency said that the risk of hijacking a ship carrying nuclear materials, while small, could not be ruled out.

Madam Speaker, piracy has become an obvious problem around the globe. So far this year just in the waters of Somalia alone, pirates have attacked 61 ships. More than a dozen of those vessels remain in the pirates' hands to this very day. One of them, a Ukrainian cargo ship, actually contained military equipment—33 battle tanks.

Madam Speaker, I have no doubt that everyone here remembers the recent hijacking of the Maersk Alabama off the Somali coast, and the heroic actions of Captain Richard Philips and his crew of 21 members. The ship was captured by four Somali pirates on April 8 last month. The captain surrendered himself to ensure the safety of his crew, only to end up in a lifeboat with the pirates for 4 days while the FBI attempted to negotiate his release.

Thankfully, Captain Richard Philips was rescued on April 12, but our Navy SEALs, justifiably, had to kill three of the hostage-takers. In the aftermath of that event, Somali pirates have issued threats to specifically target American interests in this region.

We know that it doesn't cost much to hire a band of Somali pirates and that they are not fussy about their clientele. While the ships in question may not sail over Somali waters, they will likely pass through the Straits of Malacca, the vital link between the Indian and Pacific Oceans.

But make no mistake, those straits are plied by their own bands of pirates. Indeed, according to the International Maritime Bureau, these and nearby waters have been ranked the world's most dangerous sea routes. In the year 2004, 40 percent of all pirate attacks in the world took place in the Straits of Malacca and nearby Indonesian waters.

Of course, terrorists need not hire pirates to do their dirty work. In the year 2002, al Qaeda operatives rammed

a boat rigged with explosives into a French oil tanker off the coast of Yemen.

The two particular vessels transporting the MOX from France to Japan, the Pacific Pintail and the Pacific Heron, are not without protection. They are armed with five 30 millimeter Naval cannons. In addition, a group of armed police officers from the United Kingdom Office of Civil Nuclear Security is on board.

However, a study done by the U.S. Department of Energy concludes that due to the risk of attack on nuclear shipments, there is a need to provide "continuous backup support for the vessel by military security assets."

In 1992, a shipment of 1.7 tons of MOX nuclear material from France to Japan was escorted by a Japanese Coast Guard vessel. This time, the public does not know what sort of a dedicated Naval vessel or vessels are escorting the ships.

The Pentagon concluded in its own assessment of sea shipments of plutonium that "even if the most careful precautions are observed, no one could guarantee the safety of the cargo from a security incident, such as an attack on the vessel by small, fast craft, especially armed with modern anti-ship missiles."

Madam Speaker, thus the transport of this nuclear waste poses not only the environmental hazard we have long been concerned about, but also a non-trivial terrorist or even nuclear danger as well.

I ask my colleagues, is the practice of transporting these lethal nuclear waste materials across international waters worth the risk? I say absolutely not.

It's time for the countries of the world that produce nuclear waste to keep it within their own borders. That will be a first step.

Madam Speaker, make no mistake, transport of nuclear materials even within a country's borders poses serious risks. Nuclear fuel is dangerous stuff. According to the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, "A person standing 3 feet from unshielded irradiated fuel would receive a lethal radiation dose in 10 seconds." Moreover, the shipping containers in which radioactive waste are transported over land typically are designed to withstand, at most, a 30-mile per hour crash into an immovable object.

I am certain that every Member of this Chamber studiously obeys the speed limits, but I am not aware of too many highways with a speed limit of 30 miles an hour. What I find particularly disconcerting is that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has not tested these shipping casks. Instead, the commission depends on the reliability of computer simulations.

A Nuclear Information and Resource Service fact sheet also states, "The more severe an accident, the more likely that radioactive material would be released into the environment." A low-

speed accident could unseat a valve or damage a seal, releasing radioactive particulates into the environment. The same event could crack the brittle metal tubing around the fuel."

In response to a 2001 Baltimore rail accident involving dangerous chemicals, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID of Nevada said, "Everyone needs to recognize that transporting dangerous materials is very difficult. The leaking hydrochloric acid in Baltimore is nothing compared to the high-level radioactive waste proposed for the Yucca Mountain site 100 miles northwest of Las Vegas. A speck the size of a pinpoint would kill a person. What we should do with nuclear waste is leave it where it is."

Madam Speaker, even just within our own domestic borders, we have become a deeply divided nation concerning the storage of nuclear waste materials within our own country. Years ago in its so-called infinite wisdom, Congress decided to build a multibillion-dollar storage facility at Yucca Mountain in the State of Nevada. Were the people or the residents of Nevada ever given an opportunity to have a say in the process, despite strong objections from its congressional delegation and State government officials?

If I were a resident of Nevada, I would certainly object to the whole idea of other States shipping their nuclear waste and materials into my backyard. The question that comes to mind, Madam Speaker, what town, what city, what rural farm areas are going to be used or designated for shipments by truck, by train, by car, by airplanes? What guarantees are there that these shipments are not going to be subjected to terrorist attacks or even by accident?

Remember the oil spill of Valdez in Alaska, Madam Speaker? Everybody said it was absolutely safe to conduct such shipments of oil. Well, it happened, and the same thing can also be said if nuclear waste materials were shipped from other States to Yucca Mountain in the State of Nevada.

Madam Speaker, I could not agree more with our majority leader, Senator HARRY REID, expressing his concerns. I urge my colleagues to join me and Congressman SMITH in calling for an end to this even more dangerous and in my opinion needless practice of shipping MOX nuclear waste materials over the open oceans. I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 402.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate being recognized and joining my colleagues here on the floor of the House of Representatives and for an opportunity to address you and an opportunity to convey some thoughts that are going on in my mind that I think it

is important for you and the American people to hear.

One of the pieces of subject matter that has been very little debated in this Congress, at least in this new 111th Congress, and was not debated in any kind of depth whatsoever in the Presidential race after the nominations came from both the Democrat and Republican Party is the issue of immigration.

As we move along here complacently, I am aware there are pieces being moved behind the scenes to arrange a situation so this Congress could potentially be taking up, I call it a comprehensive amnesty bill. And if anyone doubts where I stand, I am opposed to amnesty in all of its forms. I lived through the amnesty bill in 1986. I revered Ronald Reagan, and I still do. There were very few times I disagreed with him. But the day he signed the amnesty bill in 1986 was a day I disagreed.

At that time I was operating a business that I had founded over a decade earlier. I was compelled to comply with the Federal directive that came from the 1986 amnesty bill. It was the INS at the time, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the requirement was this. There were about a million people in the United States illegally that would be granted amnesty, and President Reagan was straight up honest with us. He called it amnesty, and it was. It was amnesty for about a million people. And the trade-off was this: the conclusion that the Congress had come to and President Reagan had come to was we really couldn't enforce the law effectively enough to clean up the problem of the people that were illegally in the United States, and so because we couldn't clean that mess up by enforcing the law, we would just solve the problem by legalizing those million people that were here illegally, grant them a permanent status here in the United States, grandfather them in, so to speak. But from that point forward, Madam Speaker, from the point forward from when Ronald Reagan signed the amnesty bill of 1986, there was to be a major commitment on the part of the Federal Government to enforce our immigration laws under the idea that in order to pass amnesty out of this Congress, there needed to be a commitment to, from that point forward, enforcing the rule of law.

The argument that came was this. It was that we can't make it work because we have a million people here, but from here on we're going to enforce the law, and we're going to enforce the law aggressively. So the amnesty of 1986 was to be the amnesty to end all amnesties.

President Reagan signed the bill with that in mind, that there would be enforcement. And his administration was responsible for the duration of his term in office, a couple of years, to do the enforcement. And I, sitting there as an employer in 1986, am thinking a promise to enforce the law does not equate into enforcing the law.

□ 1845

But I think INS will come in, and they will enforce it against me as an employer.

And so I complied with the law because, first, I believe in the rule of law. I think it is an obligation to adhere to the rule of law. If you don't like the law, it isn't something that Americans should be doing by ignoring it; we should comply with it. But if we don't like it, we should set about trying to change it. That is the process. That is the system, Madam Speaker.

And I did comply with it. In fact, I agreed with the component of it of the enforcement side. And so when we had job applicants come in my office, from that point on after the 1986 amnesty bill was signed, I took a copy of their drivers license, I took their other data. I brought out the I-9 form and had them fill out an I-9 form. And we took the copies of their identification material and we attached it to the I-9 form and put that in a file. And to this day—I'm not sure that I can, but I think I can go back and find some of those original records, however dusty they might be. I kept those records. I kept it right because I believed in the rule of law. I believed in the Federal law. I believed the government, when the Federal Government told Americans—and that means those who are here legally and illegally and those who might come here—that they were going to enforce immigration law to the letter, I believed them. And I adhered to that immigration law to the letter.

But since that time, the immigration enforcement was, I will say, as high then, from a concentrated basis, as it has been since. And since 1986, the enforcement of American immigration law has diminished incrementally over that period of time. I think it was more effective under Ronald Reagan than it was under the first George Bush. I think it was more effective under the first George Bush than it was under Bill Clinton. And I think it was more effective under Bill Clinton than it was under George W. Bush as President, Madam Speaker. And I think George W. Bush's enforcement at this point has been more effective than it has been under this current administration of President Obama, under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano.

I think if you would graph on a chart the worksite raids, the actual interdiction of people that are unlawfully in the United States, the deportations, the prosecutions, the data that's there on a proportional basis, I think you would find what I have described. Immigration enforcement has declined over the last 20-something years, perhaps 23 years. And I don't know that it has reached a bottom at this point. I hope it has; I hope it turns around and goes the other way.

But we have learned a lesson from the 1986 Amnesty Act, the amnesty to end all amnesties. It would be the last