

more widespread economic damage in the gulf coast and the entire United States.

The devastating effects of the oil spill go beyond waters and wetlands. For southeast Texas and southwestern Louisiana, our lives are intertwined with the oil and gas industry in the Gulf of Mexico. Over 180,000 Americans are directly employed in the oil and gas and mining industries along the gulf coast, and the prospect for severe economic hardship is very real. And that doesn't include the countless people that make their living in fishing and restaurant and tourism-related industries. Many of these out-of-work fishermen stand ready to help with the cleanup but are denied the ability to help because it is stalled down in Federal redtape.

I think we should have an-all-of-the-above energy policy, one that I believe we can achieve with the highest safety and environmental standards. Our Nation and our economy, however, run on fuel supplied by the oil-producing sector of the Gulf of Mexico. We cannot simply shut off the spigot and expect this Nation to run on nothing. Meanwhile, we need to clean up the mess and find out what caused this tragedy in the Gulf of Mexico. And that's just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE EDWARD DAVIS, QUESTIONS REGARDING GULF OIL SPILL, AND COMMENTS ON REPUBLICAN "YOU CUT" PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart because of the loss of a very good friend of mine, Judge Edward Davis of the Southern District of Florida. He passed this morning. My love and condolences go out to Pat and the rest of the family for this tragic loss. I shall speak more at another time about my dear, good friend.

Additionally, Madam Speaker, while we are "slick and tired" of hearing people pontificate about this ecosystem disaster of apocalyptic proportions, there are questions that do need to be raised, not only for the entirety of the oil industry, but certainly for the United States Government in this particular case.

I would like the questions answered, and am proposing by way of a letter what steps are being taken to determine how much oil is underwater, where it is located, and what path it will take over the next decade.

What do we project the threat to be from a potential hurricane in the Gulf of Mexico, and how is our government planning for the potential impact of such a possibility?

What are the potential long-term impacts if the oil plume stays in its location and-or begins moving through the

loop current and Gulf Stream to various coastal locations?

Why have we not used our tankers that can suck in oil and water and pump out oil?

Why have we not asked Russia or Norway or China or Japan to use their submersibles in a meaningful way?

Interagency coordination is required. I happen to like Thad Allen. I think he is one of the better commandants that the Coast Guard has ever had, and I think he is doing an incredible job trying to coordinate. But what does the Federal Government's short-term, mid-term and long-term response structure look like, and what agencies are in charge, is what I would ask him and anyone else involved.

What steps are being taken to coordinate long-term observations, impact analysis, mitigation research and research that is needed? Not BP's research, but our research. We have an institution, NOAA. They have modeling efforts to improve hurricane intensity forecasting and a sufficient amount of information that could be beneficial, and I am sure many are using it.

What is the government's plan to improve security at these oil facilities? Nothing has been really said to us here in the Congress directly regarding this.

But, now, Madam Speaker, I want to turn to my colleagues on the other side for the remainder of my time.

Earlier today, I spoke on the House floor regarding the Republicans' latest ploy to stall the important work of this body known as "YouCut," which I like to call "CutYou." Each week, a targeted pool of online and cell phone users are supposed to vote for one of five programs that they would like to see cut from the budget. Simply put, YouCut can and probably does undercut our representational responsibilities, which leads to undercutting our democracy.

Once we start getting into the business of government by referendum, we negate representation. Ask my friends in California and ask those of us in Florida what impact that kind of activity has had on our representatives.

The last time I checked, last week, there were 280,000 votes, and that doesn't constitute the will of the American people. That is what brings me to the floor.

Very occasionally, Democrats and Republicans get on the floor and say what the American people want. What the American people know is that we represent them, and therefore when we stand up and say that 280,000 people voted a certain way, or 81,000 of them voted to cut much-needed funding from the Temporary Aid to Needy Families program, that does not represent the majority of Americans.

Quite frankly, I think how this idea got started is that they need to rebrand themselves, and I don't fault them for that, and they are particularly good at messaging, and I don't fault them for that.

The simple fact of the matter is that somewhere along the line somebody decided, let's use us as a mechanism to gather in these emails. Let's use us as a mechanism to get these phone numbers. And then what do we do at campaign time? We turn it back around and go at them to make them intense and enthusiastic. And that is what people can do, so I have no quarrels with that.

I have no quarrels with their new program. What is it called? It is getting ready to be unfolded next Tuesday on their Web site. It is called "America is Speaking Out." Well, the last time I looked in my office, America has spoken out an awful lot.

I don't know that we need too much more undercutting, and the poor in this country sure don't need an uppercut.

What Republicans fail to mention is that the "YouCut" program is inherently selective, and therefore biased. Neither online nor cell phone voters are able to vote to save a program rather than cut it. Furthermore, the "YouCut" program conveniently targets only those who have internet access and cell phones, which disproportionately leave out some of the poor and the elderly.

Instead of continuing to be the "party of no," Republicans should say "yes" to the American people and help pass the legislation that this Nation needs and deserves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SECURING THE SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of following my good friend from Florida in his wonderful address to the House. I wish to talk about one particular issue.

There was a newspaper article that came out today that said that President Obama is scheduled to send 1,200 troops to the Arizona-Mexico border. If indeed that report is accurate, I commend him for that type of activity, because his goal is to try to stop three of the most heinous organizations that are entering this country through public lands on the southern border: Illegal drug traffickers; illegal human traffickers and all the violence, especially against women, that they present; and the potential terrorists coming into those areas.

The escalating violence on the southern border is of unprecedented proportion. Unfortunately, the success of stabilizing that border is not in the number of bodies that we send down there, but the ability of those bodies to have

full access to the border region. Unfortunately, the land manager policies that we have on our southern borders allow the criminal element unfettered access but prohibit the Border Patrol from going into those exact same areas.

The traffic barriers that are put up in this picture on Federal lands in the south are not border barricades to stop illegals coming in from Mexico, or drug cartels, or human traffickers. They are to stop the Border Patrol from going into Federal lands on our southern border. The end result of this activity of all these drug traffickers, the human traffickers coming in, is the massive amount of environmental damage that is done.

If I could give a quote from a 2007 article in the Tucson Weekly dealing with Ironwood National Monument talking about these smugglers that are coming in and their vehicles, mostly stolen from Phoenix: They often travel at night without headlights, with tape over the brake lights. They have been clocked tearing through the monument's dirt roads at 89 miles an hour, endangering the lives of residents and visitors alike. And it also ensures that many of these load vehicles never make it out of the monument, for they smash into trees and run into ditches. The BLM has towed 300 vehicles a year out of this one monument since the year 2000.

These loaded vehicles, as well as the constant foot traffic, destroy habitat and threaten cultural sites and endangered species.

□ 1845

The trash that is left behind, this is from Ironwood, requires pickup crews to have biohazard training and armed guards watching them as they do their work. They have even attacked the cacti in the area, simply cutting it down, leaving it there across roads to create a barrier so they can stop park visitors and there either rob them or steal their autos at the same time. This also destroys the natural environment that happens to be there.

This is not just taking place in the South, I want to emphasize, though. It is also taking place in the North. Although 40 percent of the land on our southern border between California and El Paso is owned by the Federal Government, we have the same situation on our northern borders, with over 1,000 miles of land, 13 States that intersect 12 national parks, four Indian reservations; and the exact same problem exists on our northern border.

In a letter to House Republicans, Homeland Security Secretary Napolitano talked about Border Patrol issues in the Spokane sector up in Washington. She wrote, the sector is currently working with Interior and Forest Service regarding Endangered Species Act issues related to grizzly bears and road use. Government biologists claim agents in vehicles on some roads are detrimental to bears. The

sector, however, must occasionally have some motorized presence in those areas, and a related important issue is retaining access to critical areas. The sector must maintain the ability to respond via a motor vehicle when required.

The importance of this?

Well, the guy who was charged in the 1997 plot to bomb New York City's subway system crossed illegally across our northern border into Washington.

In 2005, a 360-foot drug smuggling tunnel on private land was also found going from Canada to Washington. This illustrates how much effort smugglers are willing to do to try to attempt to come into this country, not just in the north, but also in the south.

We had a testimony today in Resources where some people in the Park Service said, well, if there are exigent circumstances, obviously we make allowances for the Border Patrol to go in there. The problem, though, is definition of that term. Interior defines that term as a life and death situation. Homeland Security defines it as when there is evidence of a crossing. Those definitions are in conflict.

Until the Department of the Interior and National Park Service rules are changed in both the North and the South along our borders and allow access to Federal Border Patrol and Federal employees, there is no amount of numbers that's going to make a difference. Instead, we simply have the worst of both worlds on both borders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FEMA IMMEDIATE-NEEDS FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, our hearts go out to victims of recent floods and natural disasters, but I also fear that we suffer from the old adage, "Out of sight, out of mind." Once the cameras are packed away and the news crews leave for their next breaking story, what happens to the victims and the survivors of our natural disasters?

You know, one would hope that the system of emergency response would keep on plugging away and assisting the families in need across this country. But sometimes, unfortunately, that system breaks down.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring the voices of my constituents in Jefferson County, Wisconsin, to the floor of the people's House.

In 2008, homes along the northern shore of Lake Koshkonong and the surrounding community were absolutely

devastated by a record-setting flood. This was a 500-year flood that ravaged much of the Midwest and, in particular, Wisconsin and Iowa.

During that storm, I knew that the damage was going to be devastating and that many of the houses in our community would be beyond repair. But what I didn't know was that after nearly 2 years after the floods, our government would be leaving those hard-working Americans behind. You see, in February of this year, FEMA instituted what it calls "immediate-needs funding." Basically, they are freezing already approved funds to folks in Wisconsin and in other disaster areas across the country.

A couple of weekends ago I had the chance to visit with the property owners who were affected from the district that I have the privilege of representing. These are survivors of the 2008 floods. I wanted to hear their stories. Many brought photos, letters, and all brought unique stories and anger and frustration.

I met first with Gene and Marie Harris at their home on Lamp Road, one of the most extensively damaged neighborhoods in this flood. The damage was so extensive that their house is absolutely uninhabitable, and has been since the flood. They showed me photos of before and during and after, and we talked about the tangle of bureaucratic red tape that they've waded through in order to get approved for FEMA money.

But they were approved for FEMA money, until the freeze took effect. When I asked Marie to recall what they went through back in June of 2008, not surprisingly, she welled up with tears.

I met with other families affected, a family who had four generations who lived in a property that is also beyond repair. He talked about the generations having put their heart and soul into remodeling.

I met with a young family who had several properties in the area. This young family, with two young sons, decided that, in order to plan for their retirement, rather than investing in a 401(k), they were going to buy a few bungalows along the lake shore and rent them out. After they paid off the mortgage, this would help with their retirement. So they bought five bungalows. Three out of the five were damaged in the flood beyond repair. The remaining two are reparable.

But what's happening, as they wait for those frozen funds, is that this family is having to pull out of their kids' college funds and money that they were saving for their retirement in order to pay mortgages, taxes on properties that are uninhabitable, and for which they are getting no rental income.

They brought when they met with me a letter that asks, and I'm only reading a part: but why freeze the funding now? We've been waiting almost 2 years, and during this time we must still pay taxes, mortgages, and mow what is left