

all over America today. Boys and girls, whom some would call a menace to society, will one day grow up to be good men in society. Those very same boys cry themselves to sleep at night because they don't know how to deal with the pressures and with the pain. You have to walk in their shoes to understand.

I call upon this Congress today and upon this Nation today:

Don't profile them.

Don't fear them.

Don't despise them.

Don't fill our prisons with them.

And please don't hunt them down like dogs and kill them.

Love them and educate them. They could be your son. They are all somebody's son. And they, too, are God's children.

Thirty-one days and still no justice. Shame, shame, shame. And today, I again demand justice for Trayvon. I demand justice for all murdered children. Power to the people and power to the children.

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, March is National Developmental Disability Awareness month. This is a time that we can all take a moment to bring attention and understanding to both the needs and the potentials of people with developmental disabilities.

This awareness month was first declared by President Ronald Reagan in 1987 to recognize the bright future that these American citizens have in front of them. Thanks in part to proclamations like this, the perceptions of young people and adults with developmental disabilities has changed.

On a personal note, as an individual with a significant hearing disability and a grandfather of a child with special needs, I am very familiar with the hardships of overcoming the obstacles of disabilities. My grandson, Maxwell, has CHARGE syndrome and deals every day with intense developmental and medical challenges. He is a true inspiration to his mother and our entire family.

□ 1030

During Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month, I encourage everyone to engage with people in our communities who have developmental disabilities and recognize their talents and abilities that will make this a better Nation.

REVEREND AL SHARPTON AND TRAYVON MARTIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to all who are

within the sound of my voice or may be viewing what is said that I am exceedingly grateful and I thank God for Reverend Al Sharpton.

Reverend Sharpton has been involved in the Trayvon Martin circumstance for some time now. That is not unusual. What may be considered unusual is that he is involved at a time when he has lost his mother, and he is acting under some courageous circumstances that require courage, I might say, under these circumstances. I admire what he does, but I especially admire the fact that he is doing it under these circumstances, and today he is funeralizing his mother.

So to Reverend Al Sharpton, I want to express my gratitude; and I would like to just take a very short brief moment of silence and express my sympathies silently to Reverend Sharpton and his family.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues who have supported what the Justice Department is doing. It is exceedingly important that people understand that this is a bipartisan effort across the length and breadth of this country. This transcends the lines that can divide us. This is not about being a conservative. It's not about being a liberal. It's about justice for Trayvon Martin. I believe that people of goodwill come in all stripes, they are affiliated with all parties, and people of goodwill want to see justice done.

My colleague before me expressed that it has been 31 days and there has not been an arrest. We are now hearing more about what may have happened. I say "may have happened" because we have not had an eyewitness to come forward and give statements. It's important to note that what we're hearing is not coming by way of eyewitness testimony. Someone has had someone say something that they are repeating.

My hope is that there will be a thorough investigation. There should be an investigation. My hope is that we will have the opportunity to produce evidence by and through the constabulary to show what actually happened to the extent that the standard that is commonly used to make an arrest is applied to this case. That standard is probable cause. It is not guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, not clear and convincing evidence, but, rather, probable cause. It is whether there is probable cause to make an arrest.

We have many laws that are coming into play, and I want to thank Chairman JOHN CONYERS. I call him chairman. He is now the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. I want to thank him because he is taking the lead today on a forum that will take place. In fact, he's making it possible for us to have this forum today. At this forum today, there will be some clarity brought to how the Federal Government is involved in these kinds of circumstances.

In '09, there was a hate crimes law that was passed. There will be some

considerable talk about this hate crimes law that was passed. Federal jurisdiction has been expanded under the '09 law, pursuant to the 14th Amendment and the equal protection provided thereunder. There will be talk about how the Justice Department has a role in these processes from time to time. There will be talk about how financial support can be accorded the local constabulary under certain circumstances. There will be talk about how Federal charges can be promulgated and enforced under certain circumstances. So I will be honored to have an opportunity to be at this forum today so that we can talk more about the Federal role.

In the final analysis, here's what we're dealing with. We're dealing with a circumstance wherein there are at least two people who deserve a fair trial. Trayvon Martin is one of the two people, at least, who deserves a fair trial. He deserves a fair hearing on what happened that day. He cannot speak for himself, but there is evidence that speaks volumes about what happened on this occasion. That evidence has to be considered such that some impartial body can make a determination as to whether or not there should be an arrest.

If there is an arrest—and I believe that the evidence exists such that there is probable cause—if there is an arrest, then there can be a trial and then there can be the transparency that the United States of America produces whenever we have trials, because there will be an opportunity for all sides to present their evidence in a court of law before a jury if a jury is desired. This is the way we do things in the United States of America.

Regardless of his color, he deserves a fair trial. Regardless of what he had on, he deserves a fair trial. And to those who say that hoodies make you a criminal, I say: Be careful, because you're getting dangerously close to saying women can cause themselves to become victims. You're dangerously close, so be careful.

LETTING THE ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT TAKE HOLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about something that is very important, a great opportunity for this Congress to lift the red tape from Washington and allow the entrepreneurial spirit of America to take hold.

We know that, 3 years into an economic recovery, America's labor and capital markets continue with unprecedented challenges. Entrepreneurship is at a 17-year low. Deeply troubling, as we know, is that 40 million jobs since 1980 have been created by small businesses or start-ups. What is interesting about this is that those are the folks

that are likely to fail when you create a small business. But still, we have netted 40 million new jobs out of this one sector over the last 30 years.

Fixing this mess that we've seen in this recent downturn won't happen overnight, and there is no silver bullet for fixing it; but we have to recognize that America has seen the world catch up, catch up to what once was the most vibrant capital market on the planet here in the United States. The world has caught up because they see what that does in terms of job creation. They have caught up in terms of regulation, and they allow capital to flow more easily in other jurisdictions around the world.

We also know, according to the World Bank, that the Doing Business report found that the U.S. fell from third to 13th in the ease of starting new businesses. It's fallen that quickly just in the last 5 years. And because of Dodd-Frank, credit is less available and more costly than it was before. We have restricted the opportunity for businesses to get the lending that they need.

At the same time, we haven't updated our securities regulations in the United States in 80 years. There has been no significant rewrite since the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. They put in place restrictions that were right at the time. You had this new technology called the telephone. You had folks hawking securities on street corners in New York, and so they wrote regulations at the time that were applicable to the time.

We know that the Internet is a fully mature ecosystem now. We know that billions of dollars are transacted just on eBay alone. People have an online reputation with social networks that they can utilize. We want to take that power and actually allow businesses to use that power of the Internet and social networks. That's why I filed, and this House passed, the Entrepreneur Access to Capital Act that provides those updates, so you can actually have crowdfunding.

What is crowdfunding? crowdfunding is the best of microfinancing and crowdsourcing. You use a wide network of individuals and you can raise capital for your new business, your start-up, or your small business. We passed that and sent it to the Senate.

The Senate didn't do anything, they didn't act, so we repackaged the bill and put it within the JOBS Act. This House passed it with an overwhelming majority of nearly 400 votes. We sent it to the Senate and the Senate changed a few small provisions and is sending it back this week. We hope to pass that bill this week and send it to the President's desk.

What the legislation for crowdfunding does is remove that restriction on communicating, which the Securities Act of 1933 puts in place, and lifts the cap on investors that the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 provides for.

□ 1040

So, crowdfunding is a great opportunity for small businesses to raise equity. Unfortunately, the Senate decided to amend a few small provisions within this crowdfunding act that we were able to pass here in the House. I believe a few misguided, ill-informed provisions: one, expanding liability provisions for issuances of crowdfunding securities, and, number 2, banning general solicitation, which means that a company can't put up on their Facebook or post on their Twitter account, they can't tweet the fact that they're trying to raise capital. I think those restrictions are flawed and misguided, and I would ask the Senate to come around to fixing these provisions.

I think it's very important the House pass the JOBS Act this week so we can make capital formation more democratic, more in touch with the market as it is today. And so I ask my colleagues to vote for the JOBS Act, and I ask the President to sign this bill so that we can help capital formation in the United States and get people working again.

NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it's been a couple of weeks since I've been able to come down to the floor and talk about high-level nuclear waste. As you know, through the past year, I've been coming to the floor. I am chairman of the Environment and the Economy Subcommittee. We have jurisdiction over a lot of different types of waste. One of those is nuclear waste.

I also have come to the floor to just give a short history lesson on where we're at, where we should be, and the problems that stand in our way. In 1982, the national government passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. In 1987 amendments were then offered that said we need to have a long-term geological repository and that repository should be Yucca Mountain.

So I've been going around the country and looking at the different places where we have high-level nuclear waste, whether it's on the west coast, the State of Florida, Massachusetts, in the central part. Today I go to the State of Colorado, which has nuclear waste in the State, and I want to compare it to where it should be.

As a review, Yucca Mountain is, by law, defined as the place where we should put high-level nuclear waste. Currently, there's no nuclear waste on-site. The waste would be stored a thousand feet underground. The waste would be a thousand feet above the water table because it's in a desert. And the waste is 100 miles from the Colorado River.

Now, compare that to the nuclear waste that is at a location called Fort St. Vrain. Currently, there are 30 mil-

lion tons of uranium, of spent fuel, on-site. The waste is stored above-ground in vaults. The waste is less than 25 feet above the groundwater, and the waste is 1 mile from the South Platte River. A mile from the South Platte River, 100 miles from the Colorado River.

So part of this debate is, why haven't we moved and complied with Federal law? Well, we all know that. It's the Senator from the State of Nevada, who's made it his personal crusade to block our ability to proceed and has blocked funding for the final scientific study.

This whole debate has moved into the political arena, not the arena of law, and in the U.S. Senate you really need 60 votes to move public policy. So I've been coming down to the floor and looking at Senators from States that surround Colorado and see where they have either declared their position or cast votes on the national repository, Yucca Mountain.

As you see, from Texas, you've got Senator CORNYN, who's a yes; Senator HUTCHISON is a yes. Oklahoma, Senator COBURN's a yes; Senator INHOFE's a yes. New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN has voted no. Senator BENNET from Colorado is new, hasn't really stated a position. We'd like to see him get on the record.

My two friends, the UDALL cousins, both TOM and MARK, we will check the record, but I believe that they've cast a vote in the Senate, and if not, they haven't stated a recent position.

Why is that important? Because we've been tallying where the Senators are, and right now we really need 60 votes to come to conclusion. We've already spent \$15 billion, and we have no nuclear waste on-site. Right now, based upon our calculations, we have 45 Senators that would support moving of high-level nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. We have 17 who we don't know their position, and we have 16 who have stated or they have voted in the past as no. So our challenge here is to get these Senators on record and show the collective will.

Now, we've done it in the House. We've had votes in the House in which we had about 300 Members of this Chamber, a bipartisan vote, in support of moving forward on the funding, the scientific funding to finally finish a single repository at Yucca Mountain.

It's very important for our national security. It's very important for all the locations around. We already have 104 nuclear power plants in this country; all have nuclear waste on-site.

We also have nuclear waste that's involved with our defense industry back at Fort St. Vrain. That waste was supposed to be transported to Idaho, but litigation has kept it there. If we don't move that waste, then by 2035 the Federal Government will have to pay the State of Colorado \$15,000 a day until we take the responsibility that we have committed to as a national government.

I appreciate this time, Mr. Speaker, to come down. We'll continue to get