

the illegal drugs and the illegal human trafficking and potential terrorism exists.

So the question has to be: Why is that the entrance level of choice? It's actually very simple. Everything that is red is land that's owned by the Federal Government on this map. In Arizona, 80 percent of the border is owned by the Federal Government. Over half of that is in the "Wilderness" category, "Endangered Species," or "Conservation Habitat" category, where, by special law, the legislation provides this land a special status which prohibits the Border Patrol from entering that area. They can't enter in a motorized vehicle. They can't even pedal a bicycle. They can go into that area on foot, on specially fed horses, and that is it. The drug cartels recognize this. They're not stupid. And they realize that this is the problem.

When this Congress insisted a fence be built along the California border, we passed legislation that waived 40 environmental laws that were prohibiting the fence from being built. Those same 40 laws are the laws that prohibit the Border Patrol from going along the red areas of that border and doing their job, which simply means, as ironic as it sounds, Federal law is stopping the Federal Border Patrol from going on Federal land to do a Federal purpose, which is federally stupid. But this is, indeed, what we're doing.

The Border Patrol actually cares about the environment. Drug cartels don't at all. This cacti, cut down by the drug cartel, is an endangered species. It was cut down there to stop east-west access on the only road that allows the Border Patrol to follow in that particular area.

This truck is a temporary sensor device in a wilderness area. The Border Patrol wanted to move it from point A to point B. It took them 6 months to get approval by the land manager in that area before they could back the truck up and move the truck over to another stop because the land manager was not happy with the Border Patrol being in his Wilderness territory. And the law was on the side of the land manager, not on the side of the Border Patrol.

The Senate has tried to say that they're coming up with a compromise solution to increase border security. In actuality, they have done just the opposite. They have put language in there that says that the Homeland Security Secretary can, notwithstanding any other law, require certain elements to be built in this particular area. But that allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to have the political discretion of whether to do it or not. It allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to have immediate access into these border areas, but only in Arizona. If they go anywhere else along this border, they have to have the written approval of the Secretary of the Interior as well as the Secretary of Agriculture. And most importantly, it says in there

that the manner in which the Homeland Security Secretary shall make these decisions must be in the manner that best protects the natural and cultural resources on Federal land.

I'm sorry, but as soon as they put that language in there, it requires some bureaucrat to establish what the standard is, and it opens it up to someone else initiating litigation that that is not the best standard possible. In essence, we're back in a worse situation.

They wish to have another 25,000 Border Patrol agents. This is what our fence looks like in Arizona today. This is a fence, this is Mexico, that's Arizona, and the open area is the animal habitat to allow animals to go back and forth from Mexico and Arizona. The one road on here is the only road in which the Border Patrol is allowed to go. You can have another 100,000 agents in that area, and you'll simply find out that it won't help unless you let them go outside of that one road.

We don't need money. What we need is access. What the Senate is proposing is actually worse than the status quo.

□ 1020

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the impacts of climate change can no longer be denied—superstorm hurricanes, massive tornados, record-breaking droughts and heat spells, accelerating melting of glaciers, and increasing ocean salinity. Due to the effects of climate change, many highly populated communities at low elevation face increasing pressure from storms and rising waters, potentially driving massive migrations to higher ground. If we continue on this path, extensive and severe droughts will hurt food production and fresh water supplies in the United States. Similar occurrences around the world will certainly be destabilizing and potentially draw the United States into dangerous conflicts.

Most climate change models predict increasing severity of these and other effects. However, the reality is that most computer models are being outpaced as the carbon buildup and energy trapped in the atmosphere accelerates.

Despite these developments, there is an increasing partisan divide on the issue of climate change. Many of my Republican colleagues are either in complete denial that global warming is happening, don't believe human activity is causing the problem, or think that it would be too expensive to take the necessary steps to mitigate and adapt to global warming. This gross partisan behavior in denial of science is becoming a clear and present threat to our national security and well-being.

Would we sit by if a foreign power built up a threatening military force

on one of our borders? Of course not. And yet, climate change presents a threat that's just as dangerous.

So what will it take for this Nation to greatly reduce carbon we are adding to the atmosphere and begin the process of preparing for the changes that are coming? Will it take a global weather catastrophe? Will it take several more Hurricane Sandy's? How many years of drought will the Midwest be forced to endure?

With global warming, the signs of change are overwhelming. We cannot wait for a global catastrophe that will impose massive suffering enough to overcome our civil institutions. Our national security depends on us taking action now.

The good news is that if we do take action now, the cost is affordable and the benefits are significant. Even if climate change were not a threat, reducing our consumption of fossil fuels will make the environment cleaner and energy costs less volatile. Increasing energy efficiency will greatly reduce family utility bills while making our homes more comfortable. Using renewable energy creates stable jobs. On the other hand, if we wait until a global or regional climate catastrophe forces desperate action, the consequences will be expensive and possibly deadly.

Those who reject science and deny human-caused climate change are fostering a dangerous threat to our Nation's future and to future generations of all Americans. I hope that those who deny the effects of climate change see the danger that they are subjecting our Nation to, or that the voters elect representatives who will take the responsible actions necessary to address the imminent threat of climate change.

WILDFIRE RESOLUTION

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, the West Fork Complex Fire—acreage burning now in Colorado—is more than 141 square miles and counting. The East Peak Fire—over 13,000 acres and counting. These are just two of the fires that are burning in my district now, and it is still early summer. Tens of thousands of acres of forests are already gone and entire communities are being threatened.

Brave men and women are working around-the-clock to be able to stop this devastation. They are truly incredible, and I want to thank all of them for all they are doing to be able to protect property, save lives, and to be able to contain these wildfires.

Just like the wildfires that have ravaged our State over the last decade, these fires have destroyed property and are doing irreversible damage to the environment—to the fragile ecologies and watersheds on which we rely.

The incident commanders in charge of the suppression efforts on the West