

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as I always do, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people here in the United States of America.

And I ask God to bless President Obama, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people in America, today and tomorrow.

And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

RECENT U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL DEATHS FROM DoD

Staff Sgt. Israel P. Nuanes; Sgt. Brian L. Walker; Pfc. Richard L. McNulty III; Spc. Alex Hernandez III; Sgt. Wade D. Wilson; 1st Lt. Alejo R. Thompson; Petty Officer Second Class Jorge Luis Velasquez; Sgt. Jacob M. Schwallie; Spc. Chase S. Marta; Pfc. Dustin D. Gross; Spc. Junot M. L. Cochilus; 2nd Lt. David E. Rylander; Staff Sgt. Thomas K. Fogarty; Sgt. John P. Huling; Master Sgt. Gregory L. Childs; Staff Sgt. Zachary H. Hargrove; Capt. Bruce K. Clark; Sgt. Nicholas M. Dickhut; Pfc. Christian R. Sannicolas; Master Sgt. Scott E. Pruitt; Staff Sgt. Andrew T. Brittonmihalo; Spc. Manuel J. Vasquez; Staff Sgt. Brandon F. Eggleston; Sgt. Dick A. Lee Jr.; Lt. Christopher E. Mosko; Spc. Moises J. Gonzalez; Spc. Jason K. Edens; Spc. Benjamin H. Neal.

DON'T BE FOOLED BY PRENDA

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the falsely named Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act, or PRENDA. This might be one of the most disingenuous bills to ever come to the floor of the House. The authors of this bill are talking out of both sides of their mouth. Today, I want to set the record straight.

In one breath, the proponents of this bill say they are protecting female fetuses by preventing abortions based on sex and that we must pass this bill to protect women everywhere and show that girls are as valid as boys. Yet, just last week, these same Members obstructed the passage of an expanded Violence Against Women Act that would have protected all victims of violence.

The same Members who today espouse equality for women voted against the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which will help combat the discrimination against women that keeps them earning 77 cents for every dollar that men earn.

The same Members who today talk about protecting female babies continue to vote to gut the Prevention and Public Health Fund, which will be used to provide lifesaving breast and cervical cancer screenings to millions of the very women PRENDA's proponents claim to care so much about.

Here's the truth: this is not about women's equality. PRENDA is simply

another attempt by choice opponents to obstruct women's access to reproductive health care.

I agree with the bill's proponents that abortions based on sex are a problem around the world, and I agree that we must take action to stop these abusive practices both at home and around the world. But let me be clear that this bill will not prevent sex-selective abortions.

Here's why:

First, criminalizing such practices simply will not work. Banning sex-selective abortions has already been tried in various countries around the world, and what expert agencies such as the World Health Organization—which operate in these countries—have found is that these bans don't prevent abortions. Rather, they simply result “in a greater demand for clandestine procedures which fall outside regulations, protocols, and monitoring and basic safety.” These restrictions serve only to drive these procedures underground, making them less safe. Our own history proves this point;

Second, criminalization of sex-selective abortions would force physicians to question women about their reasons for seeking abortion. It would likely compel physicians to target certain groups of women from cultures where sex-selection abortion is more prevalent. To avoid liability, physicians may even cease providing such care to entire groups of women simply because of their race. This bill would promote racial profiling and discrimination;

Additionally, targeting such motivations in practice would be nearly impossible. According to an analysis by the World Health Organization and four other U.N. agencies, “prosecuting offenders is practically impossible.” And, further, “proving that a particular abortion was sex selective is equally difficult.”

These expert international organizations do offer a viable solution to address this issue, a solution unmentioned in H.R. 3541. Address the root causes which drive individuals to prefer sons over daughters. The United Nations, through its work in nations where sex selection is prevalent, has stated that the most effective way to address this son preference is by fighting the root economic, social, and cultural causes of sex inequality.

South Korea successfully lowered its male-to-female ratio from 116 boys for every 100 girls in the nineties to 107 boys per 100 girls in 2007. They did this by passing laws to improve the legal status of women and by implementing a public education campaign emphasizing the importance of women.

If we're going to consider this bill, let's be honest about it. Its supporters are not promoting women's equality, and they are not serious about preventing sex-selective abortions. If they were, they would be promoting programs to empower women and girls to combat son preference. Instead, they are criminalizing physicians, profiling

cultural groups, and driving abortion services underground. The truth is that this bill is another attempt to restrict women's reproductive health care wrapped in the rhetoric of women's rights.

Don't be fooled by PRENDA. Vote “no.”

□ 1030

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF MONTGOMERY GI BILL

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

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take note of the 25th anniversary of the Montgomery GI Bill on June 1, and to share with my colleagues that this landmark legislation continues to pay dividends in strengthening our all-volunteer military and providing far-reaching educational opportunities for so many Americans.

I'm also proud to note that the author of this GI Bill was G.V. “Sonny” Montgomery of Mississippi. He served the Third Congressional District from 1967–1997, the same congressional district that I'm so honored to represent today. Sonny was chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for 14 years and a senior Member of the House Armed Services Committee. He understood military and veterans issues and worked tirelessly in support of a strong national defense and the men and women who served our great Nation.

All across central Mississippi, one can find many tributes to Sonny. The VA Medical Center in Jackson bears his name, as does the G.V. “Sonny” Montgomery National Guard Complex in his hometown of Meridian, Mississippi.

Another facility that deserves mention is the G.V. “Sonny” Montgomery Center for America's Veterans at his alma mater, Mississippi State University. The professionals at the center have won national praise for their work in helping veterans, dependents, and family members transition from military life to the classroom, including administering benefits for the GI Bill. Their efforts enhanced Sonny's legacy as the champion for military and veterans causes. His 35-year background as a World War II veteran and Korean war veteran, and as a retired major general in the Mississippi National Guard, gave Sonny a unique perspective for the leadership role he played in Congress on national security and veterans issues.

The United States abolished the military draft in 1973, and by the late 1970s, the success of the all-volunteer force was in peril because the service branches had difficulty recruiting quality individuals. One high-ranking U.S. Army official referred to it as a “hollow army” and decried the need for help in crafting a plan to boost enlistments.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Sonny recognized these needs and proposed a cost-effective education incentive that would be popular with college-age youth. Sonny's vision won high praise, with one admiral saying it "reversed expectations of failure and planted the promise of success" in our post-Vietnam era military.

One official at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point wrote:

Transitioning to the all-volunteer force was the most important change the Army made since World War II. The Montgomery GI Bill was the policy vehicle that allowed this to happen.

I should also note that the law made National Guard and Reserve personnel eligible for educational benefits for the first time in history. It reflected Sonny's understanding of the importance of our reserve components and our national defense picture. The role of our Guard and Reserve today is even stronger, and I'm confident that the Montgomery GI Bill has been key to that success.

Over the past quarter century, more than 2.6 million veterans have used the Montgomery GI Bill. It has made a difference in the lives of the men and women who have pursued higher educational opportunities that otherwise might not have been available. It is also one of the foundations upon which our military continues to stand as the greatest military power in history.

POVERTY AND FARM WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, as the cofounder of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus, I rise today to continue talking about the crisis of rising poverty devastating families in every single congressional district all across our country.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize Linda Lee and Geraldine Matthew. These two extraordinary women are among a group of farmworkers who spent their lives working in the swampy fields bordering Lake Apopka in Florida. Their backbreaking work helped to provide the bulk of the winter season produce on the eastern seaboard.

In the early 1990s, a settlement was negotiated with the large farming corporations where 20,000 acres of land were sold for roughly \$100 million. A negligible amount of 200,000 was allocated for the 2,500 farmworkers, and most were simply given pink slips, despite decades of service on the farm.

For years, these workers were exposed to a chemical mixture of carcinogens and other contaminants as planes crop-dusted the fields. Now these workers are suffering from an array of diseases that have been linked to long-term pesticide exposure. Their children suffer from defects caused by prenatal exposure to harmful contaminants.

These women have worked for over a decade to bring attention to their

cause, while many of their former colleagues, unfortunately, have passed away. Although these women are desperately seeking some relief and good health, what they ask for more than anything else is their dignity. Dignity is the contribution of their community to feeding this Nation and the sacrifices they made in doing so.

I would, therefore, offer my profound and earnest gratitude to these incredible women, to their community, and to farmworkers across the country, for theirs truly are the hands that feed us. Mr. Speaker, now more than ever, we need to redouble our efforts to reward hard work. We must work to be sure that Americans who work all of their lives have something to show for it.

This does not just affect Linda Lee or Geraldine Matthew. We cannot ignore the fact that millions of Americans have seen their retirement savings decimated, their pensions short-changed, and their wages stagnant or falling.

Even in the face of a rising tide of poverty and an economy with high unemployment, the Tea Party-led Republicans continue their efforts to slash programs which protect the health and well-being of millions of low-income and working poor families.

In the coming weeks and months, we will begin to see the impact of the, quite frankly, immoral cuts to vital unemployment benefit extensions as thousands of people, thousands of people across our country who are struggling to find a job will be thrown off of unemployment benefits, thrown off, kicked off the rolls.

Some of them may be lucky enough to find work, but far too many will be suddenly cut off with nearly nothing, nothing to keep them from falling behind into poverty. They will have been left out and left behind.

We may disagree on how to help families in need and workers who are struggling find work access needed health services or feed their children, but we can all agree that leaving struggling families completely cut off of unemployment insurance with nowhere to turn for help is not the American way.

When Republican politicians protect tax cuts for millionaires, we must be very adamant about protecting the working poor. When Tea Party Republicans fight to protect tax writeoffs for corporations and Big Oil, we must fight to protect hardworking Americans.

When Republican Tea Party members continued to expend their energy protecting the dividend gains on investments, we must fight to protect Linda Lee and Geraldine Matthew, women who have worked their entire lives and are left with nothing to show for it.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there are some who continue to support policies for the 1 percent where profits, rather than people, matter. We need a jobs bill for those who are desperately in need of a job, and we need to help with their support for themselves and their families. So we do need a strong safety net

to act as a bridge over these troubled economic times. It's critical to reaffirm that the needs and the aspirations of the poor and the working poor are really important and critical for us to address where they too are aspiring to be part of the middle class.

I want to thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for her support because I know she cares about Linda Lee and Geraldine Matthew and all of the issues that she continues to fight for.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come back to the floor again—this is my 13th time, really—doing a tour of the United States highlighting the locations where we currently store high-level nuclear waste in this country.

□ 1040

With the end of this location, I will have placed in the RECORD the position of our U.S. Senators in each one of these States on where they stand on either keeping high-level nuclear waste in their State at their location or helping us move to a centralized repository at Yucca Mountain in the desert in Nevada.

So let's go to the location. Here's Yucca Mountain, which is, by law, the site, based upon the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the amendments passed in 1987. So I'm comparing it to a place in Virginia very close by, the North Anna Nuclear Generating Station on North Anna Lake, which is a recreational lake that many people in Virginia know.

Yucca Mountain right now has currently no nuclear waste on site. What about North Anna? North Anna has 1,200 metric tons of uranium, spent nuclear fuel, on site.

If we had nuclear waste in Yucca Mountain, where would it be? It would be stored 1,000 feet underground. Where is the nuclear waste stored at North Anna? It's stored above the ground in pools and in casks.

If it was at Yucca Mountain, as designed by law, where would it be in comparison to the groundwater? Well, it would be a thousand feet above the water table because Yucca Mountain is in a desert. What about North Anna? Well, it is 53 feet above the groundwater. And as you can see from the photo, it's right next to a major lake in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

If the waste was at Yucca Mountain, how far would it be from the largest body of water in the area? It would be 100 miles from the Colorado River. Again, from the photo, you see that North Anna is right next to the lake.

So let's look at the Senators from the Commonwealth of Virginia, and in their time serving, what's their position on where the nuclear waste should be? Should it stay in the Commonwealth of Virginia or should it move to the desert underneath a mountain?