

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

of our lawn. How much longer are we expected to keep paying and waiting with no more source of rental income?

Please, somebody, wake me up from this nightmare and tell me it's all a bad joke. Our government couldn't do something as unfair and cruel as this, could they? Do they think about the people whose lives they are destroying?

I know there are people who are a lot worse than us and suffering even more. But at least, at least we have another home to live in right now.

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

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

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

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

THE DEFINITION OF A HYPOCRITE

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, as we approach the passage of the Jobs for America Bill in the next few days, we need to talk about a subject that is at the heart of the debate, hypocrisy.

The definition of a hypocrite is someone who acts in contradiction to his stated belief. In other words, he says one thing and does another.

For example, a hypocrite would deplore our Nation's deficit in a floor speech today, even after helping President Bush turn the biggest budget surplus in our Nation's history into the biggest deficit ever.

A hypocrite would vote for two wars with a price tag of over \$1 trillion, two tax cuts for the wealthy, and a new entitlement program, all without ever thinking about how to pay one thin dime of their cost, and then turn around and say they voted to cut off unemployment benefits out of concern for the budget deficit. That's what people will argue in the next couple of days.

A hypocrite would complain that there are not enough budget offsets, that is, pay-fors, in the jobs bill before us while, at the very same time, try to eliminate the over \$50 billion in offsets that are contained in the legislation. Closing loopholes is against the philosophy of a hypocrite.

I think it's safe to say that all of us have not lived up to every pronouncement that we've made in our lives. No one is perfect, but rarely has hypocrisy been as constantly and blatantly dis-

played as it has been by the opponents of this bill.

The same people, the same people who spent like drunken sailors when they were in charge, now say we cannot afford to help our fellow citizens who've lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

Here is the bottom line: if we don't pass this bill, 1.2 million Americans who were following the rules and working and paying their taxes will lose their unemployment benefits by the end of June. Moving forward, a total of 2 million will be off by mid-July and 5 million Americans will lose their benefits by the end of this year.

Thanks to the hypocrites who say, oh, I can't, I'm worried about the deficit; I can't worry about these people who have no way to pay for their home or their food or their mortgage or their children, Americans will face these cuts of their unemployment benefits because people will not follow what they say they believe.

They were unable to deal with the spending on wars and tax cuts and all the rest; but when it comes time to pay the benefits to somebody who lost their job, their message to them is, well, you know, tell your children that they're just going to have to tighten their belts a little, and we're not going to have three meals today. We're only going to have two because your dad or your mom or both haven't been able to find work.

There are six people in this country looking for every job that's out there. The chances of people getting a job today are very low, and people are giving up because, with 8 million jobs lost in the last 2 years, they are simply unable to find work to take care of their families.

Now, to take away their last lifeline because you're saying you're being a budget hawk and you're against deficits, when you spent like that in the last 8 years, is pure and unadulterated hypocrisy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

THE DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, tonight the Doctors Caucus, people who are physicians, and those of us who are involved in health care on the Republican side, are going to be talking a little bit tonight about ObamaCare. We've talked about ObamaCare a lot over the last several months, and it's now law. We hear over and over again about how ObamaCare is beginning to filter out, and how it's going to affect the American people.

Our President has said, Madam Speaker, that when the American people know what's in the bill, they're going to like it. Well, to the contrary. As the American people get to know what's in the bill, they dislike it more and more, as they rightfully should, because ObamaCare is going to be extremely expensive for everyone.

□ 1900

It's going to be very onerous to almost everyone, except for the Federal bureaucrats who are going to be hired to put ObamaCare into place and who are going to be enforcing it. And in fact, we are even going to have to hire, I think it is 16,500 new IRS agents to enforce it. That's right, Madam Speaker, 16,500 new IRS agents just to enforce ObamaCare on small businessmen and women around this country. The more the American people discover about ObamaCare, the less they like it.

We just heard, I think it was last week, where the Congressional Budget Office said, Oops, we made a mistake. We made a mistake. We were \$115 billion too little on our estimate, which puts it way over a trillion dollars. Our Democratic colleagues, their leadership—actually, it's not even all the