

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 239, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]
AYES—184

Adams	Gallego	Nolan
Aguilar	Garamendi	Norcross
Ashford	Graham	O'Rourke
Beatty	Grayson	Pallone
Becerra	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bera	Green, Gene	Payne
Beyer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peters
Bonamicl	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Jones	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawrence	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Sinema
Crowley	Lewis	Sires
Cuellar	Lieu (CA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loebsock	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowe	Takai
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	(NM)	Titus
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney,	Torres
Dingell	Carolyn	Tsongas
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Doyle (PA)	Matsui	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Vela
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McNerney	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meeks	Walz
Esty	Meng	Wasserman
Farr	Moore	Schultz
Fattah	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Welch
Fudge	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Neal	Yarmuth

NOES—239

Abraham	Benishek	Brady (TX)
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Brat
Allen	Bishop (MI)	Bridenstine
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Amodi	Black	Brooks (IN)
Babin	Blackburn	Buchanan
Barletta	Blum	Buck
Barr	Bost	Bucshon
Barton	Boustany	Burgess

Byrne	Hultgren	Price (GA)
Calvert	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Reed
Carter (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Reichert
Chabot	Issa	Renacci
Chaffetz	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble
Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Collins (GA)	Jolly	Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Comstock	Joyce	Rohrabacher
Conaway	Katko	Rokita
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Costello (PA)	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	King (NY)	Roskam
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross
Crenshaw	Kline	Rothfus
Culberson	Knight	Rouzer
Curbelo (FL)	Labrador	Royce
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Russell
Denham	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Lance	Salmon
DeSantis	Latta	Sanford
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	Long	Schweikert
Dold	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Duffy	Love	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Sessions
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Emmer	Lummis	Shuster
Farenthold	MacArthur	Simpson
Fincher	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Smith (NE)
Fleischmann	Massie	Smith (NJ)
Fleming	McCarthy	Smith (TX)
Flores	McCaul	Stefanik
Forbes	McClintock	Stewart
Fortenberry	McHenry	Stivers
Fox	McKinley	Stutzman
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Thornberry
Garrett	McSally	Tiberi
Gibbs	Meadows	Tipton
Gibson	Meehan	Trott
Gohmert	Messer	Turner
Goodlatte	Mica	Upton
Gosar	Miller (FL)	Valadao
Gowdy	Miller (MI)	Wagner
Granger	Moolenaar	Walberg
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Walden
Graves (LA)	Mullin	Walker
Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Walorski
Griffith	Murphy (PA)	Walters, Mimi
Grothman	Neugebauer	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Newhouse	Webster (FL)
Guinea	Noem	Wenstrup
Hanna	Nugent	Westerman
Hardy	Nunes	Westmoreland
Harper	Olson	Whitfield
Harris	Palazzo	Williams
Hartzler	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
Heck (NV)	Paulsen	Witman
Hensarling	Pearce	Womack
Herrera Beutler	Perry	Woodall
Hice (GA)	Pittenger	Yoder
Hill	Pitts	Yoho
Holding	Poe (TX)	Young (IA)
Hudson	Poliquin	Young (IN)
Huelskamp	Pompeo	Zeldin
Huizenga (MI)	Posey	Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Bass	Lee	Schock
Chu (CA)	Lofgren	Young (AK)
Duckworth	Nunnelee	
Gutiérrez	Roe (TN)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1606

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. LOWEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE AND PRAYER FOR THE VAL-HALLA, NEW YORK, COMMUTER TRAIN ACCIDENT VICTIMS, THEIR FAMILIES, AND THE COMMUNITY

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, a commuter train struck an

automobile at a grade crossing in Val-halla, New York, resulting in the deaths of six people and many others injured.

I stand on the House floor today with my colleagues to call for a moment of silence to honor those who lost their lives in this tragic accident and offer sincere condolences to the families of the victims, pray for the full recovery of those injured, and thank our first responders for quickly arriving at the scene to help others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 173, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]
AYES—250

Abraham	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Aderholt	Dold	Jolly
Allen	Duffy	Jones
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Jordan
Amodi	Duncan (TN)	Joyce
Ashford	Ellmers	Katko
Babin	Emmer	Kelly (PA)
Barletta	Farenthold	King (IA)
Barr	Fincher	King (NY)
Barton	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Benishek	Fleischmann	Kline
Bilirakis	Fleming	Knight
Bishop (MI)	Bishop (MI)	Labrador
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	LaMalfa
Black	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Blackburn	Fox	Lance
Blum	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Bost	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Boustany	Garrett	Long
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Brat	Gibson	Love
Bridenstine	Gohmert	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gosar	Lummis
Buchanan	Gowdy	MacArthur
Buck	Graham	Marchant
Bucshon	Granger	Marino
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Massie
Byrne	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McClintock
Carter (TX)	Grothman	McHenry
Chabot	Guinta	McKinley
Chaffetz	Guthrie	McMorris
Clawson (FL)	Hanna	Rodgers
Coffman	Hardy	McSally
Cole	Harper	Meadows
Collins (GA)	Harris	Meehan
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	Messer
Comstock	Heck (NV)	Mica
Conaway	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Costa	Hice (GA)	Moolenaar
Costello (PA)	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Cramer	Holding	Mullin
Crawford	Hudson	Mulvaney
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Neugebauer
Cuellar	Huizenga (MI)	Newhouse
Culberson	Hultgren	Noem
Curbelo (FL)	Hunter	Nugent
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Nunes
Delaney	Hurt (VA)	Olson
Denham	Issa	Palazzo
Dent	Jenkins (KS)	Palmer
DeSantis	Jenkins (WV)	Paulsen
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Pearce

Tiger Woods, one of the greatest golfers of all time, has often said he may have never taken up the game were it not for the courage, grace, and perseverance of Charlie Sifford.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie Sifford was not a quitter. He was a hero. He was my hero. May he rest in peace.

WORLD CANCER DAY

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today is World Cancer Day, a day to recognize the patients, survivors, caregivers, and those who raise awareness on their behalf. Cancer has touched every family and community in some way, and it is their stories that sustain the fight for increased funding for medical research.

According to the World Health Organization, cancer has caused over 8.2 million deaths worldwide. By the end of 2015, more than 1.5 million new cases will have been diagnosed within the United States.

Investing in medical research leads to advanced treatments and cures and has the potential to lower these devastating outcomes. It boosts the economy through job creation and new discoveries, and it allows America to maintain its position as a global leader in the fight for a cure. Yet, in the last decade, funding to the National Institutes of Health has been cut by nearly 25 percent. This is unacceptable. Last week, I reintroduced the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act with Representatives ROSA DELAURO and PETER KING. It is a bill that invests in the fight against horrible disease.

While today we recognize World Cancer Day, the goal must be to celebrate the day when we have a world without cancer.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a) and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mrs. MALONEY, New York

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-6)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2015.

The Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people continue to make significant progress in promotion of democratic, social, and economic development. The United States also supports the advancement of impartial justice in Côte d'Ivoire as well as the Government of Côte d'Ivoire's efforts to prepare for a peaceful, fair, and transparent presidential election in 2015, which will be an important milestone in Côte d'Ivoire's progress. We urge all sides to work for the benefit of the country as a whole by rejecting violence and participating in the electoral process.

While the Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people continue to make progress toward peace and prosperity, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 4, 2015.

A CALL TO ACTION—BORDER SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the opportunity today to spend some time with my colleagues to highlight an urgent and important issue that, quite frankly, should unite this body in a call to action.

I represent Arizona's Second Congressional District, and that includes 80 miles of the southern border. Today, we are going to be talking about the importance of securing our border both in the south and in the north. My colleague here from New York will be speaking on that matter. We do have Chairman MCCAUL here who will be joining us, but I have just a couple of lead-in comments.

I have spent a lot of time down at the border with our border residents and

ranchers, and I can tell you the border is not secure. These people are daily taking risks for their families, for their livelihoods. This is a public safety risk, and this is a potential national security risk. Although some efforts have been taken, our border is not secure. We now have the opportunity to have a call to action to take the measures that are important in order to secure the border once and for all, which is impacting, again, the residents of my community.

I am grateful that a bipartisan group of Members of Congress came down to visit our southern border just 10 days ago. We had 20 Members, plus myself, so they could see firsthand what our ranchers and border residents are dealing with in Arizona. The group, under the leadership of Chairman MCCAUL, whom I will ask to join us here in a minute, visited the San Diego sector, then came to our Tucson sector, and then moved on to also see the challenges in Texas. We got to see firsthand what is going on in each of these different sectors and to reinforce the fact that this is an urgent matter that we have to address. It should be a bipartisan and uniting issue.

I have got lots of stories to share from the Tucson sector, but I have a number of colleagues who want to join in the conversation. I will first ask Chairman MCCAUL if he would like to join the discussion.

Mr. MCCAUL. Let me thank my colleague from Arizona for her great leadership. I think this House is well served to have the first female pilot who has served in combat.

We thank you for your service, and I can probably tell a few more stories of bravery about you. I am very fortunate to have you on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of grave importance to the Nation. As chairman of Homeland Security, when I go home, it is the number one issue, and the number one question I get back home is: Mr. Chairman, when are you going to secure that border?

I believe we have an opportunity in this Congress to finally get this thing done and to get it done in the right way and the smart way. People say: Why is it so important? In 10 years in the Congress and as a Federal prosecutor prior to that in dealing with this issue, I have seen the scourge of drug cartels, of human trafficking, the poisoning of our kids with drugs, and the potential threat of a terrorist attack in the United States. I don't want that on this Congress' head. We do have an opportunity to act. We have a bill that was passed out of committee, and I think it does several things.

One, it finally directs and tells the Department of Homeland Security how to get this mission done sector by sector. As the gentlewoman knows, Arizona is very different from San Diego and is very different from Texas, which is where we saw 60,000 children crossing last summer. We know that a surge is probably on its way again if we don't

act in this Congress soon. We also know, with the spread of ISIS overseas, that the threat is real.

With the event of the Jordanian's being lit on fire yesterday, it is a wake-up call that we need to act and that we need to act soon in the Congress to protect the American people. This is more than Homeland Security—it is national security. It is really not an immigration issue. This bill is about securing the border in a smart way.

When I was in Afghanistan and Pakistan, I met with General Allen. They didn't really have much of a fence, but I said: "What is your border security with the Pak border?" They pointed to aerostats in the sky that could see for hundreds of miles that we saw on our recent trip down there. With the value of 100 percent visibility to see what is coming in and how to stop it, you can measure success, first of all, but you can respond to the threats in realtime.

□ 1630

In addition, the VADER technology, the radar on the Predator UAVs, is of tremendous value for a smart border. A lot of these assets were actually used in Afghanistan. We have already paid for these assets, and we want to redepot those to the southwest border.

We also fully fund the National Guard, which to our Governors—particularly my Governor in the great State of Texas—is of vital interest and concern. We allow access to Federal lands for CBP, which, in the past, they have been denied; and we have a U.S. exit system set up—which the 9/11 Commission recommended, and to this day Congress has failed to act on that—to determine who is staying with visas legally and who is overstaying those visas like we saw with the hijackers on 9/11.

At the end of the day, this is an important issue that has to get done. It is no longer time for lipservice; it is time for action on what I consider to be one of the most important Homeland Security issues facing this Nation.

I just want to thank the gentlelady for holding this Special Order. I know we have members of the committee here who have great expertise, both Federal prosecutors, CIA, and other experiences to bring this issue to life. I hope we can do more of this in the future.

The American people know this is an important issue. The problem is the Members of Congress have been tone deaf on this and have not gotten the job done. I would argue to my colleagues who are listening to this and to the American people that now is the time to finally get the job done.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really appreciate your leadership on this issue. I also want to thank you for coming to southern Arizona to my district to see firsthand what our border residents and ranchers are dealing with on a daily basis. I look forward to working with you on the committee to get this bill across the

finish line and getting the strategy and the resources to those in the Border Patrol so that they can actually address the threat.

Mr. MCCAUL. If the gentlelady would just yield on this point, too, this is a bill not built from bureaucrats in Washington, down. This is a bill designed by talking to Border Patrol agents, to the border sheriffs who support this bill, to the ranchers. What a great presentation we received from John Ladd and his father, Jack, in Arizona.

I will never forget, when you had the press conference, John Ladd was saying: You know, for the first time, I have real hope.

They said: Well, Members have come down here before.

He said: Not this many and not of this caliber of leadership, and for the first time I have hope.

I don't want to let those ranchers down. I want to get this job done for the ranchers, the border sheriffs, and the agents who spend day in and day out in very tough conditions.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

Would my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) want to join the conversation?

Mr. PERRY. Absolutely.

I want to also extend my appreciation to you for bringing up this important issue. I think this is going to kind of be a continuing conversation, at least for the next couple weeks, as we move forward into bringing this particular bill and the legislation to the floor.

With that, I was just thinking that in the last couple days I saw the President on TV, and he asked a question: What kind of country do we want to be?

I think you can think of that in a lot of different ways, but regarding the border, the President, while he says that, has preached over the years that he has made our Nation's border more secure than ever. I just remember last year when he was literally saying that, we saw tens of thousands of unaccompanied people coming across the border, and all of America was saying to themselves: What are you talking about? How can you say that?

The Border Patrol wasn't stopping these people. They were greeting these people and bringing them into the country. You are thinking, maybe that is a great thing, but we don't know who they are or what their intentions are, and you have no credibility, Mr. President, when you say that.

His statement is just supported by bloated statistics and a false sense of reality. I think most Americans understand that. As a matter of fact, the GAO recently found that only 44 percent of the southwest border was under operational control—44 percent. So 56 is just wide open apparently. Listen, that 44 percent, that is based on some best guess or some estimate because, believe it or not, they don't even keep the records.

Now, you know—you know as sure as you are watching this on TV or in the gallery or sitting at home thinking about it—that those Border Patrol agents and those sheriffs are keeping records of the things they do on a daily basis and a nightly basis, drove so many miles, picked up this many people coming across the border.

What happens to that information? Guess what, folks? They don't want us to have it. They don't want the GAO to have it because then we would know that our back door is wide open.

I mean, these gaps on the border lead to higher crime rates and unemployment for American citizens. It is really no more complicated than your own home. Sure, you love your neighbor to your left and your right and the people that adjoin your home to the north and to the south, but that doesn't mean that you leave your doors wide open for them to come in and go as they please at all hours of the day or night.

We want to be a country that is defined by who we are, and it requires protecting. If we are not going to define our country in those ways, why define it by having a border at all? That is what I think the President and many on the other side would propose, that we just abolish the borders. Well, guess what, folks? If we abolish the borders, we don't have any country at all.

I was thinking about another thing I heard recently. Over the last 6 years of the couple million jobs that were created in a downturn economy, almost all of them, statistically, were filled by people that weren't born in this country. Listen, it is great to have people come here and we need to have that policy, a smart policy, but our policy should be what works for America first, and securing our border and doing what works for America is the right thing to do. It is our duty. It is our oath.

Now, people say: Well, why is it so important?

Look at the crime rates. More than 40 percent of all criminal cases initiated by Federal prosecutors were in districts that border Mexico. Is anybody surprised? Do you think that that doesn't correlate to something? That means something, folks. I mean, the Governor of Texas, Rick Perry, stated more than 3,000 homicides were committed by illegal immigrants in the last 6 years.

Now, are we a nation of laws or aren't we? If we are a nation of laws, what does it matter if you have a law that you are not going to enforce? Does it mean anything? The President has not executed the law for biometric exit. That is where we determine who you are, what you are doing here, and when you leave. Come legally, come across our border, but that is part of securing the border. But when it is time to go, it is time to go. If you want to stay, hey, that is great, but show up and let our government know that you are going to stay a little bit longer and what your purpose is. We don't want

you to stay if your purpose is for something other than what it should be.

The Congress has spoken, as a matter of fact, eight times passed a law requiring an exit system at all our ports; yet the executive branch, the one who executes the laws, has decided that is not important. They are just not going to do it.

Folks, this puts us at a huge disadvantage. It makes us unsafe. We are not secure in our homes. We don't have the peace of mind of knowing that we are safe in our homes. We don't have the peace of mind of knowing that the people coming across the border are being screened for maybe diseases or criminal activity.

There is a cost to that. There is a cost in lives. There is a financial cost to that in caring for people that get diseases that we have long eradicated in America that now come across the border unchecked because our border is wide open. That is why it is important to secure the border.

It is important. Congress has spoken. Congress, the representative of the American people, has spoken eight times on this issue, and the President has just said: I can't be bothered. He designates Federal lands, and our own agents can't be on these Federal lands and do their job.

I mean, who thinks that controlling the border and securing the border means being 50 miles off the border? I guarantee you, if you are in the combat zone securing your perimeter, your border—and the gentlelady knows what I am talking about because she has been there herself, as I have been there—you secure your perimeter and you watch your perimeter right on it, not just set up a little fence or draw a line in the sand and then head to the tent and hope nobody crosses it. That doesn't work there, and it doesn't work here. Yet that is what we are doing, and we are espousing it as though it was some kind of policy that is coherent and is realistic. It is not.

Our agents want to do their jobs. They are excited to do the job, they are committed to do the job, and our Federal Government literally is standing in the way and saying: Absolutely, you can't do the job.

We can get some assistance from our State and local, our National Guard, too. I have served on that mission as well. There is a lot of opportunity there to divide the duties and the resources and make this work that is cost effective. There is a lot of expertise from a military standpoint that can be used legally to help secure our borders, but, here again, the President can't be bothered. Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable.

We need to keep track of these individuals with radical views. If the President had enacted the biometric requirements that have been required by the United States Congress eight times, maybe the Tsarnaev brothers wouldn't have had the ability to come to Boston and blow up people during

the marathon. But we will never know because they just come and go as they darn well please to our country, and we don't ask anything. How is that securing the country? How is that good for America?

Mr. Speaker, thanks again to the gentlelady for hosting this. This is an incredibly important subject that we need to be discussing, and it is great that we have some time on the House floor to discuss this.

I hope what this does is it kind of gets the people that are watching this to say: Huh, maybe there is something to this. Maybe I should call my Representative. What does he or she think? How would he or she vote on such a border bill? Is there something missing in the bill, and is there some reason they wouldn't support the bill, and what is that? What would I like, as an American, to see about my border? Should we be letting anybody that darn well please come across the border unchecked to come into my community and do whatever they would, take my job, harm my family, or do I want something more as an American? Where does my Representative stand?

I think it is a great opportunity to call your Representative, write your Representative, email, talk to his staff and say: What does my Representative think of this?

So I appreciate the opportunity. I appreciate your leadership. I know, I have been to where you live.

Ms. MCSALLY. You know what we are dealing with.

Mr. PERRY. Yes.

I have flown on the Arizona border down there. I have crossed the border in Nogales, and I have been privileged to be there. America is not where it needs to be on this. The Congress is, but we need to pass a bill, and we need the President to execute it.

I thank you very much for the opportunity.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. PERRY, and thank you for your support, again, of this urgent matter and the bill that we hopefully will be bringing before our colleagues as soon as possible, because every day that goes by is a day that our ranchers and border residents are still dealing with this.

Before I recognize my next colleague here, I just want to paint the picture of what we have seen go on in the different sectors. In the early 1990s, the San Diego sector is really where most of the illegal activity, the transnational criminal organizations were just at will crossing into the San Diego sector. A lot was done there.

We were visiting it 10 days ago. We got to see the new tactics, the resources, the fencing, the lights, the technology. The agents there are really able to squeeze the activity related in the San Diego sector. These are living organizations, these transnational criminal organizations that are trafficking in our communities and our neighborhoods, so they react. It is like squeezing a balloon.

Guess what happened? They tightened up in San Diego, and that meant that these organizations were now coming in and out of my community. The sector in Tucson put up some fencing and other resources in more populated areas around Nogales, but then that pushed the activity out into the rural areas where the Ladd ranch is that we visited. Mr. Chairman mentioned Jack Ladd, third generation rancher, and John Ladd, fourth generation rancher, with about 10 miles on the border right there. We got to see firsthand what they are dealing with.

These organizations are nimble. They are going to respond and react, and they are going to move. As we create obstacles and we address in certain areas, they are going to move to other areas. What we have seen in the Tucson sector, from fiscal year 1998 up until fiscal year 2012, we have had the highest number of apprehensions. We have had the highest number of assaults in the last couple of years. In the last few years, we have had the highest amount of marijuana seized.

By the way, we don't know what the denominator is, though. Apprehensions is the numerator, but we don't know what the denominator is because our agents do not have full situational awareness. And you can just look at the price of drugs on the street. This is a supply-and-demand issue. If the cost is still low, which it is, it means that we are still not catching a whole lot that is trafficking in and out of these neighborhoods.

So again, the potential for violence is up, and even though the numbers of apprehensions are down in the last few years, those that live on the border—and the Border Patrol has confirmed to me the types of people that are coming—are more the transnational criminal organizations, the traffickers. It is drugs and people coming north and weapons and money coming south, and they have more of a criminal record, and the potential for danger is certainly up.

I do have some stories to share, but I know I have a number of colleagues who want to join the conversation, so I will yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

What, do you have, 800 miles? I only have 80. You have, I think, 800 in your district.

□ 1645

Mr. HURD of Texas. 820 miles of the border, from San Antonio to El Paso.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman for the time today and also for taking me to your district and seeing that part of the border. Our trip a few weeks ago was great, enlightening to me.

I have spent a lot of time crisscrossing those 820 miles of the border, and it was great to see how the San Diego sector and Tucson and my fellow Texans in McAllen are doing the same thing.

As the gentlewoman knows, I spent 9 years as an undercover officer in the

CIA. I chased groups like al Qaeda and the Taliban. I have chased narcotraffickers all over the world, and the threat is increasing, and the threat is sophisticated.

The drug trafficking organizations in Mexico are making \$50 billion a year in the United States. That is a big number. Their tactics, techniques, and procedures are sophisticated, and we need to keep up. It is about moves and countermoves.

What I like about this bill is it empowers our members of Border Patrol to do their job. A lot of people talk about border security. I like to refine it a little bit. Part of it is interdiction, stopping people before they get to the border. It is grabbing them, it is having them in custody, and then it is removal. This bill is focused on this first piece of border security which is interdiction.

We need to make sure that our men and women that are on the border every single day have the tools that they need in order to do their job. It is different in Tucson. It is different in Eagle Pass. It is different in San Diego. What I like about this bill that was developed under the leadership of Chairman MCCAUL is that it gives them that freedom and flexibility.

Having spent a lot of time overseas, I know the disconnect between the field and headquarters, and that is going on right here on our border. We need to make sure that the guys and gals that are on the border have the tools that they need.

This is a sophisticated threat, as you alluded to, using ultralight aircraft to deliver their payload. They are using tactics that intelligence organizations have used all across the world to do denial and deception. We need to make sure we have all the resources—things like the aerostats, things like radar technology, things like UAVs—in order to have that combined picture of the border.

This is something that for 19 months, I talked to folks in the district. I know, like you, this was a very important issue. The American people sent us up here to do our job, and our job is to protect our citizens and to protect our homeland. This bill does it. It is a strong bill, and I look forward to working over these next few days and weeks in order to make this happen.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. HURD. Again, thank you for your leadership on this issue as well. It is great to be working together with individuals who have operational experience and understand what it takes to get the job done, so I look forward to working with you.

Mentioning the ultralights, I was with our CBP team for several hours a couple of weekends ago and was actually on a Black Hawk getting an aerial tour of the border. We tried to intercept an ultralight. We had a radar hit. We went over to the area. The challenge there is these things are small specks, and you don't have any sense of what altitude they are flying at.

We looked around. We were eyes in the sky. We were trying to find them. As quickly as we have a last radar hit, they pack up, they are out of there, or they are flying back low over the border, and we can't find them. We don't know what they have dropped and where.

These are some of the challenges that our agents have out there in trying to address this threat. It is a very nimble and sophisticated cartel, transactional criminal organizations that are reacting to us. They are much more nimble than we are.

My colleague, Mr. KATKO from New York, if you want to share your perspectives.

Mr. KATKO. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for her wonderful career serving our country. You are serving your country in a much different capacity now, but I want to honor you for what you have done for your country in the past. I also want to thank you for taking a leadership role tonight and having this session so we can discuss the border security bill in more detail.

I also want to thank Chairman MCCAUL for his great leadership and his ability and desire to empower the young Congressmen and Congresswomen, such as you and I, to take leadership roles with respect to the Homeland Security Committee.

I talk about the border security bill from a law enforcement perspective. For the last 20 years, before I came to Congress, I was a Federal prosecutor for the United States of America in the Department of Justice.

I started my career in 1994 and, soon thereafter, was sent to the southwest border in El Paso, Texas, as part of the Southwest Border Initiative. Back then, it was just simply to try and stem the incredible tide of drugs coming across the border. When I got there, I was stunned to see how wide open the border was. To my understanding, it remains so to this day.

When I was down there, I was prosecuting cartel-level drug trafficking cases. We could get on the roof of the U.S. attorney's office and look across the border and see a cartel member's house on a bluff overlooking the United States. It was wide open, and it remains so.

It was dangerous for Border Patrol. It was dangerous for people living along the border. In some respects, it has become even more dangerous for ranchers and law-abiding citizens.

After a few years there and getting great experience and great perspective, I was sent to Puerto Rico to do similar drug trafficking prosecutions and organized crime cases, and I saw a different perspective, that of being 500 nautical miles from Colombia.

My first day in Puerto Rico, the Federal building's parking lot was lined with boats that were seized that were smuggling hundreds of kilos of cocaine at a time across the 500-mile strait from Colombia.

The last 16 years have been in Syracuse, New York, in the northern district of New York, where we have 300 miles of border with our brothers and sisters to the north in Canada.

While it is definitely a different dynamic than being on the southwest border, the fact remains that less than 4 percent of the Canadian border with the United States is secure. It is wide open. It varies from the northern plains in the Central United States to the Northeast, where there are several major cities along the border with the United States, and that brings a different problem.

In the northern district, over the last 16 years, we have dedicated several individual prosecutors to deal with nothing but alien smuggling, illegal entry cases, and major league drug cases on the northern border. We have well-worn smuggling routes in our district, well-worn alien smuggling routes.

In addition to alien smuggling, we have major drug trafficking from the north coming down south, that being hydroponic marijuana. It is a multibillion-dollar a year industry in Canada. That comes south.

It has developed now that cocaine is going north. The Canadian drug traffickers have hooked up with the Mexican cartels, and cocaine is coming north through our district. Guns are going north. Contraband cigarettes are going north. Like I said, many ethnically based alien smuggling rings are in our district.

I say all that to point to the fact that there is a problem on the northern border as well. Everything that is being prescribed in this bill for the southwest border and the southern border is being prescribed for the northern border.

The prescription for the northern border is based on discussions with Border Patrol and the different sectors throughout the northern United States, just like they did in the southwest border in the pieces of legislation regarding that.

It is the first time in 20 years of being a prosecutor that I saw a bill that actually looks like it is addressing the problem altogether, at once, and that is critically important.

While I was running for this office, I made it clear that my opinion is that we need full immigration reform, but any immigration reform has to start with securing our borders. It is foolhardy to do anything other than that.

This is the first step towards immigration reform, and I wholly applaud it. I do not think this bill is unduly burdensome to travelers coming to and from the United States on the northern border. We have many. To the extent there are burdens, we will address those.

I do say that, moving forward, this is the right bill, it is at the right time, and I applaud everyone who is supporting it, and I hope that we can get this passed.

A related bill to that, which I have submitted to Congress and will be considered as early as next week, is a northern border threat assessment.

It has become clear to me that the northern border has not had a threat assessment done in a detailed fashion like it needs to be done, so this bill simply orders a threat assessment to be done and a report back to us to see if there is any additional legislation or funding needed to address concerns along the northern border.

In short, we don't know the extent of the threat in the northern border, and this bill will help us. With those two bills combined—particularly the border security bill—I am confident that we can get a handle on the problems on both sides of the border, north and south.

I applaud you for your efforts. I applaud everyone else who is supporting the bill. I echo the sentiments of my colleagues before me, and I urge the good citizens of the United States to contact their leaders and ask that this bill get passed.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. KATKO, for your leadership and the great experience you are bringing to Congress. It is wonderful to have a freshman class with people like you. You bring a unique experience. You also remind us it is not just the southern border, so thanks for your great additions to the bill.

Next, I will invite Mr. CARTER from Georgia to join in the conversation.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Thank you very much. Let me begin by complimenting you and applauding your efforts, the gentlewoman from Arizona. Your leadership in this has been invaluable. We appreciate it very much. You have taken a leading role in this.

I also want to compliment and applaud the chairman of Homeland Security, Chairman MCCAUL, for his tenacity in assuring that this gets done.

For most of us, when we go home and we talk about illegal immigration or we talk about the terrorists or the threat of terrorism or when we talk about drug smuggling, the one thing that our constituents say is: Secure the border. Secure the border.

That is always the first thing they say, regardless of what we are talking about, whether it is illegal immigrants, whether it is terrorism, the threat of terrorism. They always say that first, and it is very important.

Now, I will be quite honest with you. I am from south Georgia, and I don't get out a whole lot. In fact, quite honestly, this is the first time I have ever been to the southwest border. I have never been to California before I went on this trip. I have never been to Arizona. Although I have been to Texas, I have never been to the Rio Grande, so it was an eye-opening experience for me.

Before I went there, I think that I was like most of my constituents and like many Americans. I would watch what is happening on TV, and I would holler at the TV: Build a fence. Build a fence.

Ms. MCSALLY. Right.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Well, after you visited and after you talked to the

Border Patrol agents, after you talked to the ranchers, after you talked to the local officials, you realize that in each sector, that is not necessarily the answer—that in certain sectors, yes, a fence is needed, but in other areas, in other sectors, that is not what is needed.

We need more technology. We need boots on the ground. Those are the types of things we need in certain sectors, and that was eye opening. That was one of the takeaways that I had from this trip.

Ms. MCSALLY. I wanted to point to one of the visuals we have here. Again, this is from the area in my sector where you can see we do have a fence, but the area that is cut out here in the middle is where the cartels very quickly come up, and they cut it out, and they are across that border in a minute or 2 minutes, maximum.

I will give some other examples later, but this is just a visual example of the fence delays the activity, as you saw when you came to visit, but it is not the answer to build a fence and then walk away because they are smart, they are resourceful, they are adaptive, and they are very quickly getting through many different types of fencing, both pedestrian and vehicle fences.

Thanks for bringing that up.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Well, thank you. That was the first takeaway I had.

The second takeaway I had from this trip was, for most of us, when we think of the southwestern border, we just think about illegal immigration, but it is much, much more than that.

When you think about the drug cartels that are in Mexico, south of us, when you think about the drug smugglers that are bringing those drugs poisoning our children, poisoning families, ruining families, when you think about that, when you think about the terrorism threat we face as a nation, that shows you just how porous our borders are and just how important this issue is.

Again, that is why this bill is so important—because it addresses that. Yes, it addresses fencing, and it calls for fencing where fencing is necessary. It addresses boots on the ground. It helps us to bolster the number of people and the number of agents that we have in certain areas, and we need that. It also takes into consideration technology. It utilizes the resources that we have.

It is a smart bill. It is a good bill. It is a vital bill—a vital bill—to our national security. That is why I am glad I went on the trip. It was very educational, very eye opening to me.

I am supporting this bill. I hope that my colleagues will support this bill. It is essential and vital to our national security.

Again, thank you, the gentlewoman from Arizona, for the work that you are doing, and thank you to Chairman MCCAUL.

Ms. MCSALLY. Again, thank you, Mr. CARTER, for your comments. Again,

thanks for coming to visit my community and listening to the residents there that are dealing with this, having that ear and coming back as an advocate and a leader on this issue. Thanks for supporting this bill. I really appreciate it.

Mr. PALMER from Alabama, would you like to join the conversation?

Mr. PALMER. I would. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for the work you have done on this. I know this has been—I don't want to say a labor of love, but you have an incredible sense of urgency. I think perhaps more than anyone that I have been involved with, a sense of how important this is.

I want to talk a little bit about the fence. Like the gentleman from Georgia, I have been to the border before but not in the context of examining our border security. I am a strong proponent of the fence. I have been all along.

What this trip opened my eyes to is the fact that the fence by itself is not enough. It is an impediment. One of the things that was impressed upon me on this trip was the sophistication of the cartels and the people across the border in breaching our fence and breaching our security.

□ 1700

There is some pretty serious engineering going on here. When we were in San Diego, for instance, we saw where we have double-layer fencing. We have got the metal mat, landing mat fence on the Mexico side. We have got the high, the heavy gauge fence with the razor wire at the top on the U.S. side.

They are using hardened blades for laser saws. It literally takes 1 minute to cut through there. All along that fence you saw where it was patched and what the border patrol calls doggy doors. They cut it out in three places, push it open, and they are through.

The interesting thing is there, you have got 3 million people in Tijuana on the Mexico side, and you have got 3 million in San Diego. Almost the minute they are through, they are assimilated.

But the thing that is going on there is the cooperation between local law enforcement, the Coast Guard, the Border Patrol, and how diligent they are to be there immediately once that line is breached to interdict that.

They have been so effective at it that they are now pushing these folks offshore. They are using the panga boats now, and the Coast Guard, working with the Border Patrol and local law enforcement, have been so good at interdicting that they are forcing them up the coast of California. That is not the case in Arizona.

What people need to understand is that just building the fence and pulling back and thinking that is going to stop them—I don't care how high we build it, how wide we build it, how many layers we have; if we don't have people in forward operating positions to interdict these people when they are staging

to come across, we are not going to stop them.

The picture that you are showing there next to you is the fence in Arizona, and the attention was drawn to where they had cut through the mesh there. That is not the thing that got my attention.

If you will notice there, those are 6-inch I-beams supported by 6-inch channel. That is quarter-inch carbon steel. That is all along that border.

They came along there, with these hardened blades, laser saws, cut through the I-beam, cut through the channel, folded it over, ramped over, and drove trucks over it.

Now, this was not reported in the national media. I am not sure that there was any discussion about it from this administration. It was the local media that picked up on it. The ranchers know about this.

But I think—and you can correct me if I am wrong—but I think they said there have been 47 vehicles that crossed over that. These are pickup trucks loaded with drugs and other items, contraband, whether it is guns or drugs or human trafficking. But that is the issue.

Ms. MCSALLY. If the gentleman will yield, I will elaborate a little bit on that. That was on Mr. Ladd's ranch less than two weeks ago, where we saw that, and they showed where they ramped over.

According to Mr. Ladd, there have been 47 drive-throughs on his ranching area in the last about 2½ years.

That particular case was caught by the Sierra Vista police, which is a town a little bit further inland, because the truck just didn't look right. It was weighed down. Its wheels looked a little funny, and they got about \$600,000 worth of marijuana, 2,000 pounds of marijuana they caught on that vehicle alone. So that is just an example of what is happening.

Mr. PALMER. Well, think about the staging that had to take place for that, that a vehicle that heavy, to be able to cross that fence, obviously—and the interesting thing is they used our own I-beam and channel to support the ramps that would bear that weight for that truck to get over it.

This is not a static situation. Just building the fence is not enough. We have got to have the aerial surveillance, the unmanned aircraft, the aerostats.

Looking into Mexico and seeing the staging that takes place for an operation like that to take place—you have been in the military, you understand this—that if you are going to—it literally looked like a military operation where they cut this down and ramped over it and drove over it.

If we are looking into Mexico and see that, we need people in forward operating bases that can react immediately, not 20 minutes later, not 30 minutes later, because they are already over and gone.

So this has got to be a combination of things. I am fine with the fence. We

can build the fence as high and wide and as long as we want to, but we have got to be able to interdict.

We have got to be able to see them staging, because they are not carrying ramping material on their backs for 3 or 4 miles to the fence. This happened fairly close to the fence, and we should have been able to see that and stop it.

The other issue is the morale, and the fact that we don't—that we are not doing anything about catch and release has really hurt the morale, I think, with our law enforcement and with our Border Patrol.

And it definitely has hurt the morale of the ranchers. My heart really goes out to those guys. They have been there through many generations. They have put in their blood, sweat, and tears in this. And it is not just that they love their ranch. They love their country, and it was very evident in what they had to say.

I think it is incumbent upon us, as Members of Congress, to do our duty to protect the border.

And the other thing, again, going back to the morale, it is different in San Diego, it is different in Arizona, it is different in Texas. What we need to do—and I am very, very grateful for the work that is being done to bring alongside this bill an enforcement bill.

We have got to do this, I think, in a way that makes sense to the American people. Build the fence, secure the border, but have the right enforcement that goes along with this, that makes the work that our Border Patrol is doing worthwhile. When they catch the bad guys they need to be able to—there ought to be some consequences for it.

Earlier, Mr. PERRY from Pennsylvania made this point about, when are you forward-deployed in a combat zone, you secure your perimeter. There are consequences if you cross that perimeter a little more lethal than they would be here, but, in all honesty, we have got to do these things together.

I applaud you for the work you are doing. It is extremely important, and I look forward to working with you on this.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. PALMER. I appreciate it.

Just to elaborate a little bit on what my colleague was talking about, the challenge we have—the men and women in Border Patrol are doing the best they can. They are my constituents as well. I really appreciate them every day putting on the uniform and doing the job they are doing.

But the strategy is not working for those who live in these rural areas near the border, and we need a strategy that pushes our intelligence deeper south of the border, using intelligence-driven operations, so that we can use some of these airborne assets and radars in order to detect the cartel activity, detect the movement, monitor the movement.

Then these forward operating bases are critical. The bill—in consultation with the chairman, they agreed to add

in two forward operating bases in Tucson to get the Border Patrol operating right at the border so that we can either prevent the activity or they can very quickly respond to it when they see a breach happening, a challenging response time if they are further inland or in some of the tougher terrain.

So some of the things that I added into an amendment to address this issue are related to the fact that right now they are focused on defense in depth. So sometimes we are seeing mules and traffickers—and I will show a picture here—oftentimes, 30, 40, 50 miles inland.

This is just one example of mules with packs on their backs. So they are trafficking across private property while they are moving into the defense in-depth strategy, and that is just not working.

So we have got to get the Border Patrol closer to the border. I offered an amendment. I am glad the committee agreed to it, to get the Border Patrol closer to the border, have them patrolling on the south side of John Ladd's ranch and not on the north side.

Have those forward operating bases manned to the max extent possible and also developing a quick reaction capability, so that when we see the activity happening, they can quickly get—especially in these areas of tough terrain—to stop the activity or intercept it as soon as possible when it comes over the border; because this, again, if they are coming through Mr. Ladd's ranch and some of the other ranchers', they don't know who it is. They don't know if they are armed. They don't know what their intentions are, and it puts them at risk on a daily basis.

Mr. PALMER. If the gentlelady would yield, I would like to add one other thing to that.

This bill would allow access through Federal lands, and it has created a huge impediment for Border Patrol in the interdiction of people like this, whether they are coming across on foot or coming across in vehicles, if our Border Patrol do not have access to roads through Federal land. So that is another very important component of this bill.

And then, last thing. Down in Texas we have got this Caruso cane on the banks of the river that basically is a natural hiding place for people who are crossing the river. We have got to allow our Border Patrol to take whatever measures are necessary to eliminate those type of natural hiding places and barriers to interdiction.

So all of this is extremely important. I am glad you put that picture up because I don't think people fully appreciate, when you talk about people bringing drugs across the border, the massive amounts that can cross just on the backs of individuals.

Ms. MCSALLY. Exactly. Thank you, Mr. PALMER.

Now I yield to my colleague from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding. It

was a pleasure to travel to your southern border. I have traveled to the southern border of California many times. And as we saw on the entire border security trip, our entire southern border is very different depending on which State and which area of the State that you are in.

In my home State of California, we saw the jet skis that were coming along the surf that were bringing in a couple of illegal aliens at the time. We have got to be able to address that from a Coast Guard perspective.

And when you have double fencing in those high urban areas, we saw the Vietnam landing strips that, at one time, were a very good piece to add along border security when we had nothing. But now we have got to replace that with new fence that will allow our Border Patrol agents to actually see through and address it when there is a weakened area in that fence.

We have got to go much further. Along the California border we also have a number of mountains and even cliffs where we have to address the border differently. And in your area, we saw where a truck was able to cut through, while you had a big fence, was able to cut through that fence and actually go across the border into your area, which is why we need the VADER technology.

We saw some of the technology that is being redeployed from Afghanistan, and with that infrared technology, we actually saw individuals coming across the border.

But with the VADER technology, we can actually see 150 miles. So you would see people actually lining up on the border or preparing to bring drugs across.

Now we can actually work with our counterparts in Mexico to actually go and address it from their perspective before it even gets on to American soil.

So there is much more that we can do, both with technology that is coming back from Afghanistan, coming back from Iraq, as well as new technology that will give the American public the assurance that we have the measurements and metrics in place to secure our border.

Part of our challenge right now is not knowing how many people are coming across. If you never know how many people are coming across, you can never address how many you are actually catching, and the metrics are on how many people are actually coming into our country.

If we are going to have a full debate on immigration, we have to first give the American public the sense and the security that we need and deserve, and this bill will do just that.

We have to do it now. We can no longer wait until there is another surge of 50 or 60,000 unaccompanied minors or family units that are coming across the Texas border, where they are just hopping in a boat, going 100 yards, and stepping on American soil and then looking for refuge.

We have to send that message across Central America, across South America, that we are actually sending the message that our borders are secure, and this isn't going to just be an automatic path during the summer months across that river.

Many things we can do. Many things we need to do. This bill will give us the measurements and metrics to secure our border.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. DENHAM. I appreciate you coming to visit our district to see that firsthand, and I look forward to working with you as well on getting this bill across the finish line.

One thing I think is important for those who are watching to know is we have had a variety of people speak in support of this bill. Often we have different views on some other topics or even what we should be doing as we are addressing some of the other challenges related to immigration. But we are all in agreement on one thing, which is we need to secure the border; that this is an urgent issue.

Across the spectrum, this is something that unites those of us within the conference, and really should unite this body.

I know my community is a very split district politically, but everyone agrees, whether they are Democrat, Independent or Republican, they want their family to be safe and secure. They want their community to be safe and secure, and this bill does that.

So it is time that we work together to get this thing passed. So thank you, Mr. DENHAM.

I will continue to tell a few stories here from my district that I do want to share.

Mr. PERRY, I yield for just a minute. I do have a number of things I do want to share before we wrap up.

Mr. PERRY. We want to make sure that we get all the information out about this. As I said, the GAO's best estimate, I think, is about 56 percent of the border is not secured.

Another thing to mention about this bill is that we are looking for 100 percent. Now, we understand, just like law enforcement, they don't catch every criminal, and sometimes prisoners escape from prison, but we expect the warden to secure the prison, and the plan is to keep everybody in prison in prison.

But with this bill we expect 100 percent, and it is important to note that the other side would have us diminish that standard.

□ 1715

Right now, GAO is saying that 50 percent of the border is unmonitored and not secured. We actually have people in this Congress saying let's lessen the standard that we have currently right now, and the best we can get is 50-some percent.

I don't know who in their life plans to fail, doesn't plan to exceed and do the maximum. Whether it is showing

up for work on time or anything you endeavor in, nobody shoots for below the bar. You shoot for the best. Yet in this endeavor, we have people literally in this Congress who are saying let's actually do less than we can do—actually, let's do less than we are doing right now. So that seems to fly in the face of what every single American, regardless of your positions on other things, feels about securing the border.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you so much. I appreciate it, Mr. PERRY.

Again, I have about 10 minutes to wrap up here. I do want to tell some stories related to the level of activity in the district and how it is impacting real people in southern Arizona and their families and the threat that has been increasing.

For those who are not aware, Rob Krentz is a rancher in my district, and he was killed. He was murdered on his own ranch in 2010. This is as it was reported by The Arizona Republic:

On a breezy spring morning, a red ATV rolled across southeastern Arizona's border badlands beneath the mystical Chiricahua Mountains. A gray-haired rancher in classic cowboy attire—jeans, boots, denim vest, and shirt—was at the wheel, accompanied by his dog, Blue.

Robert Krentz, 58, was checking stock ponds and water lines on the 35,000-acre spread not far from where Apache leader Geronimo surrendered to the U.S. cavalry. The Krentz clan began raising cattle there more than a century ago, shortly before Mexican Revolution leader Pancho Villa prowled nearby. In modern times, the sparsely populated San Bernardino Valley, bordering New Mexico and Sonora, became a magnet for bird watchers and a haven for smugglers.

Krentz pulled to a stop, as he noticed a man apparently injured. The rancher made a garbled radio call to his brother, Phil—something about an illegal alien hurt; call Border Patrol. It was about 10:30 a.m., March 27, 2010.

What happened that morning as shots echoed across the grassy range would roil Arizona politics and fuel the U.S. immigration debate for years to come.

One day earlier, Phil had put Border Patrol agents onto a group of suspected drug runners on the family's land, resulting in eight arrests and the seizure of 200 pounds of marijuana.

After Krentz's broken radio transmission, family members almost immediately launched a search.

And also neighbors. There were other ranchers in the area that started this search, trying to track the killers, and they enlisted help to track the footsteps south.

Rob was found just before midnight, his body lying on the ground with his feet still inside the all-terrain vehicle. Two 9-millimeter slugs had fatally penetrated his lungs. Another bullet wounded his dog, which had to be euthanized. Krentz carried a rifle and pistol in his Polaris Ranger but apparently never got a chance to use them. After being shot, he managed to drive about 1,000 feet before collapsing.

The only immediate sign of an assailant was a set of footprints. Trackers followed them nearly 20 miles south to Mexico, where the trail vanished.

His murderers have never been caught to this day. Rob Krentz' family deals with this grief and deals with the