

includes jobs for Minnesotans and additional revenue to fund our schools. To swap these lands trapped within the Boundary Waters for lands located outside the Boundary Waters—to simply execute this Federal action—our State, its people, and our students should not endure years of litigation and disingenuous delay.

Importantly, the Minnesota Education Investment Employment Act would not eliminate a single acre of Boundary Waters land. In fact, it would add Federal wilderness acres to the existing boundaries. The Boundary Water Canoe Area wilderness would therefore become whole.

The Boundary Water Canoe Area is an important and vital aspect of the Eighth District of Minnesota, and we will take care of it. As a side benefit—the bill guarantees Minnesotans will retain their existing hunting and fishing rights in the Boundary Waters.

Now, more than ever, it is our duty as Minnesota's leaders to honor the State's obligations owed to Minnesota students and restore the integrity of the Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness. This is a team effort, and I am ready to work with involved stakeholders and my colleagues to put Minnesota schools first.

SUPPORTING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S DECISION TO STOP DEPORTATIONS FOR DREAM ACT-ELIGIBLE IMMIGRANTS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to announce today that more than 100 of my colleagues have joined me in writing to President Obama to thank him for his action to use prosecutorial discretion to stop deportations for DREAM Act-eligible immigrants.

We are pledging our continued and strong support for this policy. My colleagues and I, 104 of us, are standing together to make clear that we think America is a better place with the immigrants who will be helped by this new policy.

Of course, not everyone agrees. Progress doesn't always mean consensus. My colleague, Mr. KING of Iowa, wants to sue the President, take him to court, because Mr. KING is determined to deport every last young person who is DREAM Act eligible. Mitt Romney says that he would veto the DREAM Act and does not support steps to protect these very young people.

Let's remind ourselves exactly who the Republican candidate for President believes should be deported.

DREAM Act-eligible young people who have lived in America for more than 5 years. Most of them were brought to our Nation as children, many of them as infants, toddlers, yes, babies. They've stayed away from crime. They attended our high schools and colleges. They are no different

from your children or my children. They regularly excel at school. Some are valedictorians. They are athletes and musicians and leaders. Many of them want to serve our Nation in the military. They are leaders in their high school ROTC. They are, in every sense of the word, except for the very narrow, exclusive sense promoted by Mr. KING and Mr. Romney, outstanding young Americans.

Apparently, when Mr. KING and Mr. Romney look at the winner of your high school science fair or a young immigrant eager to become a soldier, they see a threat to our national security.

Sensible Americans see their friends and neighbors, young people who want to make America better. They want these young people to be treated fairly, and they also want our Nation to be safe.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Mr. KING and Mr. Romney a question: In a world where our law enforcement officials have limited time and resources, who should they be focused on investigating, detaining, putting behind bars, rounding up, and deporting—the captain of your high school chess team or a drug smuggler?

I know the answer. I think most of Americans would agree. Immigrants who break the law should face serious consequences. Immigrants who are busy studying for exams should simply be left alone. That's not just my opinion or just the opinion of immigrants or advocates or 104 of my colleagues.

Despite those few who would like to sue the President and force him to kick high school kids out of this country, President Obama's actually legally and responsibly using prosecutorial discretion to leave young people alone and focus instead on actual criminals.

□ 1020

It is the consensus legal opinion among experts. Even the Supreme Court has weighed in. In their Arizona decision last month, the Supreme Court wrote:

A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all.

"Whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all," says the Supreme Court.

If the Supreme Court's opinion is not enough, then I submit the opinions of Members of Congress, including those of Members I don't often agree with when it comes to immigration. These Members include LAMAR SMITH, the chairman of our Judiciary Committee; DAVID DREIER, chairman of the Rules Committee; and even BRIAN BILBRAY, chairman of the House anti-immigration caucus.

Just a few years ago, as this letter notes, they weighed in forcefully on prosecutorial discretion. In a letter to a previous President's administration,

these staunch opponents of immigration reform enthusiastically defended prosecutorial discretion, writing: "The principle of prosecutorial discretion is well established." They wrote that legal experts at Immigration Services "apparently well-grounded in case law" show that the Immigration Services has prosecutorial discretion in the initiation—the beginning—and the termination of deportations.

It's simple, really. The Members of Congress who signed this letter with me today, the Supreme Court, President Obama—and yes, even LAMAR SMITH and dozens of his colleagues just a few years ago—get it. It is time to leave hardworking immigrants alone. When we do, our law enforcement officials can focus on catching the actual bad guys.

JULY 18, 2012.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to thank you and express our appreciation for your recent decision to grant "deferred action," protection from deportation, and work permits to certain young people who call the United States home and who are not an enforcement priority for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We welcome the opportunity to ensure that our constituents who fit the criteria for relief are among the estimated 800,000 individuals whose lives will forever be changed as a result of your leadership. DREAMers coming forward to apply will mark a new chapter, but not the last chapter, in a long struggle for inclusion in society. The new policy represents an important down payment toward achieving broader reforms in the future.

The implications of your policy are already reverberating well beyond those who are potentially eligible for deferred action. With this announcement, you have changed the public discourse about immigration and immigrants, and our communities are now excited and hopeful. Even those who attack immigrants for political purposes are second guessing their negative posture toward the young immigrants you are protecting. You have opened the door to reform, and people of all political stripes recognize that change is coming and is inevitable.

We recognize that there are those who will want to take the power of discretion away from you and the Executive branch. Like you, we agree that you are on solid moral and legal ground and we will do everything within our power to defend your actions and the authority that you, like past Presidents, can exercise to set enforcement priorities and better protect our neighborhoods and our nation.

Despite this vital reprieve for a deserving group of promising individuals, we also understand that it does not diminish the need for a permanent solution and comprehensive immigration reform. Mr. President, we stand committed to fixing the broken immigration system once and for all, and we are ready to fight for a permanent solution that benefits all children and families, the economy, our national security and our nation.

We thank you again for your actions on behalf of DREAMers. We stand ready to work with you to ensure the policy's success and to use it as a stepping stone for broader relief and future legislative action.

Sincerely,

Luis V. Gutierrez; Joseph Crowley, Xavier Becerra; Steny Hoyer; Howard

Berman; Charles A. Gonzalez; Jared Polis; Susan A. Davis; Zoe Lofgren; Judy Chu; Nancy Pelosi; John Conyers, Jr.; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Michael M. Honda; Barbara Lee; Gene Green; Raúl Grijalva; James P. Moran; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Bill Pascrell, Jr.; Janice Hahn; Peter Welch; José E. Serrano; Betty McCollum; Ruben Hinojosa; Lois Capps; Yvette D. Clarke; Laura Richardson; Silvestre Reyes; Hansen Clarke; Terri Sewell; Jerrold Nadler; Bob Filner; Dennis Cardoza; Frederica Wilson; Charles B. Rangel; Edolphus "Ed" Towns; Jan Schakowsky; Jackie Speier; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan; Maxine Waters; Bobby L. Rush; Pedro R. Pierluisi; Carolyn B. Maloney; Gwen Moore; Louise M. Slaughter; Ted Deutch; Chaka Fattah; Rick Larsen; Jim McDermott; George Miller; Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr.; John Lewis; John W. Oliver; James P. McGovern; Joe Baca; Rush Holt; Robert A. Brady; Eni Faleomavaega; Adam Smith; Al Green; Grace F. Napolitano; Earl Blumenauer; John Garamendi; John B. Larson; Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.; Doris O. Matsui; Keith Ellison; Fortney "Pete" Stark; Dennis J. Kucinich; Lloyd Doggett; Corrine Brown; Linda Sánchez; Gregory Meeks; Sam Farr; Gary C. Peters; Eliot L. Engel; Lynn Woolsey; Ed Pastor; Maurice Hinchey; Albio Sires; Mike Quigley; Loretta Sanchez; Danny K. Davis; Nita Lowey; Mike Thompson; Anna Eshoo; Marcy Kaptur; David Cicilline; Russ Carnahan; Nydia M. Valázquez; Chris Van Hollen; Steve Israel; Diana DeGette; Edward J. Markey; Henry A. Waxman; Karen Bass; Jim Costa; Steve Cohen; Henry Cuellar; Barney Frank; Ben Ray Lujan; Sheila Jackson Lee; Robert C. "Bobby" Scott.

HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor once again to reiterate Federal law, a law that was passed in 1982, called the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and the amendments offered in 1987, which said that Yucca Mountain would be the long-term geological repository for our nuclear waste in this country. It's unfortunate that I have to keep coming down on the floor to address this issue because of the administration's position to defund, derail, stop, and to actually break Federal law.

To do that, not only do I just talk about the legal aspects of the Federal law, but I have been going around the country, identifying locations where we currently have high-level nuclear waste, and have been asking the basic question: Would you rather have it at location A or at location B?

So, today, we return to Pennsylvania, to a power plant called Limerick. Limerick has 1,143 metric tons of uranium spent fuel on site. At Limerick, the waste is stored above the ground in pools and in casks. It is 20 feet above the groundwater, and it is on the Schuylkill River, which is 40 miles from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. That is where we currently store high-level nuclear waste.

Now, compare that to where we should by Federal law store high-level nuclear waste—in a place defined in law under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act: Yucca Mountain, in Nevada. This tells you it's a government job. We've only been working on it for about 30 years, and we've only spent about \$15 billion to study, research, and ascertain that Yucca Mountain is a suitable location.

So, at Yucca Mountain, since we've spent approximately 30 years and \$15 billion, how much nuclear waste do we have on site? Zero.

If we had it, where would it be stored? It would be stored 1,000 feet underground. It would be stored 1,000 feet above the water table, and it would be over 100 miles from the Colorado River. There is no safer place in the country, and there is no more studied location than Yucca Mountain. It just makes sense.

What is a better location: next to a major river that feeds into the major metropolitan area of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, or underneath a mountain in a desert? I would submit to you that underneath a mountain in a desert is the proper location.

So what is the holdup? Well, the holdup is the Senator from Nevada, HARRY REID. More compelling are the other Senators from his party who are allowing Senator REID to block this, which is a detriment to their own States. We are going to talk about two in particular, but we're looking at four Senators from two States—Senator CASEY, Senator TOOMEY, Senator MANCHIN, and Senator ROCKEFELLER.

Senator TOOMEY is already on record as supporting Yucca Mountain. In fact, I quote him here:

The alternative is what we have now—highly radioactive waste located at 131 sites in 39 States, including nuclear power plants close to the Lehigh Valley. That cannot be as safe and secure as burying this stuff deep in Yucca Mountain.

The other Senator is quoted, but has got question marks here because, in his being a Senator for 5½ years, we don't know his position of whether he thinks storing high-level nuclear waste at Limerick is a better plan than placing it underneath a mountain in a desert. He understands the concern and the need.

He is quoted as saying:

As a Senator from a State with nine commercial reactors—this being one—and 10 million people living within 50 miles of those reactors, I can tell you that nuclear security is extremely important to Pennsylvanians.

So my question is, which is the question posed here: Will you state a position on whether you think Yucca Mountain is that location since it's in Federal law?

Overall, why is this important? As I've been coming down to the floor for the past year and a half, we've done a tally sheet of where Senators stand based upon their votes or their public comments. We have 55 Senators who

say, yes, Yucca Mountain is the place we ought to go. Of course, if you follow closely in the parliamentary processes between the two Chambers, you really need 60 to move a bill in the Senate. It's over five short. We need Senator CASEY to get on record in support of Yucca Mountain.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NORTH CAROLINA STATE REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. WAINWRIGHT

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to North Carolina's State Representative William L. Wainwright, whose earthly journey has ended.

Representative Wainwright died on Tuesday of this week, July 17, 2012, at the age of 64, after a brief illness. Representative Wainwright was a dear personal friend and leader in the First Congressional District.

Representative Wainwright was deputy democratic leader of the North Carolina House of Representatives, and was formerly the speaker pro tempore of the House. In each position, Representative Wainwright was the first African American to hold the position.

In addition to serving the citizens of Craven and Lenoir Counties as their representative for the past 21 years, Representative Wainwright was a tenured pastor and presiding elder of the New Bern District of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. His ministry touched thousands of people in his home communities of New Bern, Havelock, and Harlowe. For more than 40 years, Representative Wainwright taught God's word in pulpits all across America. He counseled those in need. He visited the sick and was a friend to all.

In the general assembly, Representative Wainwright was a leader among leaders. He was chairman of the Legislative Black Caucus. He served as vice chairman of the Finance Committee. He was also a member of the Commerce and Job Development Subcommittee on Business and Labor, the Committees on Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Military and Veterans Affairs, even the Committee on Insurance.

North Carolina Governor Bev Perdue said this of Representative Wainwright:

Whether he was in the pulpit or the legislature, William Wainwright's priorities were without question and his devotion without peer.

□ 1030

He served the Lord and the people of North Carolina with courage, with humility, and with love. He and I arrived at the general assembly about the same time, from neighboring districts. He was wiser in the ways of both politics and the human spirit. Ever since, and up to his last days, I relied on his invaluable counsel, and I will always treasure his friendship. Heaven is a richer place today.