

This language represents a significant shift in U.S. policy, and would guarantee that talks with Iran currently scheduled for May 23 would fail. Current U.S. policy is that Iran cannot acquire nuclear weapons. Instead, H. Res. 568 draws the red line for military action at Iran achieving a nuclear weapons capability—capability—a nebulous and undefined term that would include a civilian nuclear program.

Indeed, it's likely that a negotiated deal to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran and to prevent war would provide for uranium enrichment for peaceful purposes under the framework of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons treaty, with strict safeguards and inspections. This language in this bill makes such a negotiated settlement impossible. At the same time, the language lowers the threshold for attacking Iran. Countries with nuclear weapons capability could include many other countries like Japan or Brazil. It is an unrealistic threshold.

An associate of former Secretary of State Colin Powell stated:

This resolution reads like the same sheet of music that got us into the Iraq war.

Now, H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act, authorizes war against Iran and preparing the military for it. I want to point out how this happens. While H. Res. 568 undermines our diplomatic efforts and lowers the bar for war, H.R. 4310, the NDAA, begins military preparations for war. Members ought to read this. Section 1221 makes military action against Iran a U.S. policy. Section 1222 directs our Armed Forces to prepare for war. Now if you read these sections, you'll see that what I'm saying is true.

Now, under subsection A, it says that Iran may soon attain a nuclear weapons capability, a development that would threaten the United States interests, destabilize the region, encourage nuclear proliferation, and further empower and embolden Iran, and on and on. But the International Atomic Energy Agency, as well as the U.S. and Israeli intelligence, have all agreed that Iran does not currently have a nuclear bomb, is not building a nuclear weapon, and does not have any plans to do so. Both U.S. and Israeli officials also agree that a strike on Iran would only delay their nuclear program and actually encourage them to pursue nuclear weapons.

Sustained diplomatic engagement with Iran is the only way to ensure transparency and to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. Rejecting or thwarting any inspections-based deal we are currently seeking with Iran, even when analysts are expressing guarded optimism that a near-term deal is achievable, makes preemptive military action against Iran more likely.

Now I just want to cite some provisions right from the bill.

In order to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, which they're not doing, the United States, in cooperation with its allies, must utilize

all elements of national power, including diplomacy, robust economic sanctions, and credible—get this—“visible preparations for a military option.”

Under section 1222 where they talk about U.S. military preparedness, it talks of pre-positioning sufficient supplies of aircraft, munitions, fuel, and other materials for both air- and sea-based missions. Under subsection B it talks about maintaining sufficient Naval assets in the region—get this—to launch a sustained sea and air campaign against a range of Iranian nuclear and military targets.

Now come on, we're getting ready for war against Iran. Why? I mean, we ought to have a broad debate about this other than just burying this section of a bill in the National Defense Authorization Act. We have plenty of evidence there is no reason to go to war against Iran. We made the mistake in Iraq. Let's not make another one with Iran and set off World War III.

□ 1020

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I've come back to the floor, as I have almost weekly since this Congress, to talk about nuclear waste.

It's kind of unique to follow my friend from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) because we are a nuclearized country; we do have nuclear weapons. A lot of our nuclear weapons were developed from World War II. And guess where the waste still is from World War II? Still buried in silos under the ground in Hanford, Washington. That's a legacy of 50 years of nuclear waste that we still have yet to address—not including the nuclear waste for fuel, which is what I'm going to talk about today. I'm going to the State of Michigan and the State of Indiana.

Michigan has five nuclear reactors. They're all on the Great Lakes—either Lake Michigan or Lake Superior, I think—and the waste is right next to these Great Lakes. So we want to do a comparison/contrast, as I do every week based upon a region of the country, and compare where the nuclear waste is in Michigan to where it should be, under Federal law—the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the adjoining amendments passed in 1987—that says we need to consolidate our high-level nuclear waste and put it in one single repository that is underneath a mountain in a desert, and that place is Yucca Mountain.

So let's compare the two locations. I'm picking the Cook Nuclear Generating Station in Michigan, comparing it to Yucca Mountain. How much nuclear waste do we have at Yucca Mountain? Zero. How much do we have at Cook? We have 1,433 metric tons of uranium—this is of waste—at just one nuclear facility at Cook.

Where is the waste stored? At Yucca, it would be 1,000 feet underground. Where is the nuclear waste stored at Cook? Well, it's stored above ground in pools and in casks. How is it compared to the groundwater issue? Well, at Yucca Mountain it would be 1,000 feet above the water table. As we know, at Cook it's 19 feet above the groundwater table.

Yucca Mountain is 100 miles from the only body of water you can find in a desert, and that's the Colorado River. That's 100 miles away. How far is the nuclear waste at Cook? Well, you can see from the picture it is next to Lake Michigan. So in a comparison/contrast, it's easy to see that Yucca would be a safer place to put high-level nuclear waste than Cook Generating Station in Michigan.

So what have the U.S. Senators done from the surrounding States on this position of, should they have nuclear waste in their State or should they not? Senator COATS is supportive of Yucca Mountain. Senator LUGAR is supportive of Yucca Mountain—I have quotes here that affirm that. Senator LEVIN has voted for Yucca Mountain and supports that. And our friend, my former classmate here in the Chamber—and she is a good friend of mine—DEBBIE STABENOW, has not supported Yucca Mountain.

So part of why I'm coming down to the floor is just to help paint the picture that there is nuclear waste all over this country—104 different reactors, not including our defense waste—and it's stored all over the place. Wouldn't it be better to have a centralized location to put the nuclear waste in? So I've been doing a tally of U.S. Senators, and we finally got over the 50-Senator mark. Because of the Senate rules, you know you have to break the filibuster. That's 60 votes.

It's interesting now, based upon the information, past information—whether gleaned from votes or public statements—we have 54 U.S. Senators who say we ought to have Yucca Mountain as our single repository. We have 19 that we really have no record of a statement or a vote. And then we have 21 that have, either as a former House Member or a public statement, said, no, we don't think Yucca Mountain is a place for nuclear waste to go.

We still have a couple more States to go, and we're hoping that we get to a 60-vote position to make the claim throughout the country that these Senators should really deal with this issue of high-level nuclear waste, not just the spent fuel, but, as we talked about earlier, the defense waste in this country.

This was a promise made to the rate-payers of States that have nuclear power. The government said we're going to charge you extra for your electricity. We will take your money, and we will build a long-range geological repository for nuclear waste, and that's Yucca Mountain.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, yesterday, this Chamber narrowly passed a bill entitled the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. But although the bill we voted on shared its name with landmark legislation that this Chamber passed in 1994 to deter crimes against women, it failed to advance the important protections that should be afforded to all victims of domestic violence and sexual assaults.

Our colleagues in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, worked together to pass a strong, bipartisan reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Yet, rather than carrying on the important tradition of working in a bipartisan fashion to strengthen and reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act here in the House, Republicans crafted a partisan bill that failed to include many of the important protections enacted by the Senate. In fact, the Republican legislation would undermine vital protections and services for victims of domestic violence. The House Republican proposal left out improvements that the Senate had passed, including protections for immigrant women, college students, and LGBT Americans.

A bipartisan coalition of 13 women Senators, including Republican Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, signed a letter to Speaker BOEHNER yesterday urging that he call a vote on the strong, bipartisan Senate-passed bill that would strengthen protections for all victims of domestic and sexual violence saying, "We should not let politics pick and choose which victims of abuse to help and which to ignore"—a bill, by the way, that every single woman in the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, voted for.

Reauthorizing important provisions that help ensure the safety of all victims of domestic and sexual abuse across our country should be routine—even in Washington, D.C. But once again, House Republicans have allowed a far-right ideology to interfere with the commonsense approach to protecting women and families from violence.

Women's lives are too important for another round of congressional brinkmanship. Last year, in my home State of Rhode Island, more than 13,000 hotline calls were answered by the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

Republicans in this Chamber are wrong to relegate the safety and well-being of these women behind an extreme political ideology. I urge my colleagues to continue their strong support for the bipartisan Senate legislation that would provide effective protections for all victims of sexual or domestic violence. We must keep the pressure on for passage of the Senate

bipartisan bill. America's women and our families deserve no less.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Madam Speaker, later today, we will debate the National Defense Authorization Act. Just yesterday evening, section 1021 of last year's bill was given an injunction by U.S. District Judge Katherine Forrest when she stated:

In the face of what could be indeterminate military detention, due process requires more.

As we debate this bill, we will have an opportunity to act on several amendments which will make due process a key part of this bill and eliminate the concerns that the judge had when granting that preliminary injunction.

I take the opportunity today to remind us of some history. Dateline: Paris, December 20, 1787. In a letter to James Madison, Thomas Jefferson wrote, in regard to the Constitution of the United States that was being proposed:

I will tell you now what I do not like. First, the omission of a Bill of Rights providing clearly and without aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restriction of monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land, and not by the laws of nations.

To say, as Mr. Wilson does, that a Bill of Rights was not necessary because all is reserved in the case of the general government, which is not given, while in the particular ones, all is given which is not reserved, might do for the audience to which it was addressed; but it is surely a gratis dictum, the reverse of which might just as well be said; and it is opposed by strong inferences from the body of the instrument, as well as from the omission of the cause of our present Confederation—that would be the Articles of Confederation—which had made the reservation in express terms.

It was hard to conclude, because there has been a want of uniformity among the States as to the cases triable by jury, because some have been so incautious as to dispense with this mode of trial in certain cases; therefore, the more prudent States shall be reduced to the same level of calamity.

It would have been much more just and wise to have concluded the other way, that, as most of the States had preserved with jealousy this sacred palladium of liberty, those who have wandered should be brought back to it, and to have established general right rather than general wrong.

□ 1030

He goes on:

For I consider all the ill as established, which may be established. I have a right to nothing which another has a right to take away.

And he goes on:

Let me add that a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on Earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference.

There are those, in regard to the debate on the NDAA and particularly section 1021 of last year's bill and the similar language this year, that it is inferred that those rights are not given away. Jefferson was not willing to allow us to rest on the rights of inference, nor should we in this Congress also not be willing to rest on the rights of inference.

And when particularly you have language such as this coming out of the court yesterday evening, this court finds the plaintiffs who are, as discussed below, have reasonable fear of future government action sufficient to confer standing.

Ladies and gentlemen, many of you cannot see it, but behind me here in the desk is the word "liberty stands," it is written in. It was not left to inference. It's right here for us to look at every day. And, ladies and gentlemen, as long as I serve in Congress, I will stand up for liberty and make sure that no citizen of the United States has their due process removed.

I will support the Amash amendment, the Smith amendment, and the Goodlatte amendment. Thank you very much. I hope you do the same.

OUR NATION IS AT A HISTORIC CROSSROAD

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today because our Nation is at a crossroads. We are emerging from a deep recession but face a deficit topping \$1 trillion for the 4th straight year.

And while we all agree that we must reduce our deficit, the real question, of course, is: How? How we decide to reduce our deficit will not only define our budget, it will define who we are as a Nation. Will we be a Nation that cuts vital programs like food and Medicaid in order to not only preserve but grow an outsized defense budget? Or will we choose a middle ground that is balanced, bipartisan, big, and leaves nothing off the table, including defense?

Sadly, the National Defense Authorization Act before us offers no middle ground and is not bipartisan. It is not balanced. At a time when we are being asked to cut education, infrastructure, and health care, this defense bill increases spending \$4 billion over the President's request.

Let me be clear. We all want to cut spending. In fact, I, myself, introduced a bipartisan budget that mirrored the Simpson-Bowles plan and would have reduced the deficit with two-thirds cuts and one-third revenue. But the key to developing a bipartisan, balanced plan is to put everything on the table, including defense.

Military spending has more than doubled in the last 10 years and now comprises close to 20 percent of our overall budget. We spend almost four times more on defense than China and more