the result of a failure of initiative. The report of the bipartisan congressional committee that investigated the response to Katrina, in fact, was entitled ''A Failure of Initiative.'' The report cataloged a series of errors in judgment and in planning, including a failure to prepare for a catastrophic event, a failure to execute the National Response Plan, a failure to evacuate New Orleans and other vulnerable areas, and a lack of information sharing and coordination. We were not prepared for a natural disaster that gave us several days of advance notice. We are even less likely to be prepared for a disaster, natural or man-made, that strikes us suddenly.

Under our Real Security plan, the Department of Homeland Security would develop a comprehensive national emergency preparedness and response plan that spells out the responsibility for government and private agencies at every level. While the Department of Homeland Security had a response plan before Katrina, it lacked the details about coordinating various agencies and jurisdictions, and it was not treated seriously even within the bureaucracy.

For example, a review by the Joint Chiefs of Staff found that the National Response Plan did not even specify the role of the Pentagon and other Federal agencies in assisting local leaders during disasters.

In addition, a GAO report found that the National Guard units that responded to Katrina had only 34 percent of their authorized equipment, which also slowed their response.

These, I think, are some of the failures my colleague from Georgia alluded to, and these are also I think incumbent on the party in power in Congress to do its oversight, to make sure that we are prepared, to hold the executive accountable.

We have not done that oversight. We did not do it before Katrina. We have not done it adequately since, and under Real Security, it not only requires organizational changes within the executive, but also requires Congress to step up to its responsibilities, would you say?

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Absolutely, and I will tell you another example of the lack of response as well.

When we look at our military and the overextension of our military, all of our generals are saying that, and we have got to listen to them. They are the ones that we have in place to be able to run the military and be able to execute our programs, to maintain and keep us safe.

Now, we in this Congress, for example, have just allocated the money and the space for 17,000 additional National Guardsmen, and what did this administration do? Cut it, at a time when we have our National Guard so overextended.

As you have been, I have been to Iraq and as I have been to Afghanistan, and I might say at the outset here that our soldiers are doing an extraordinary job. My hat's off to them, and it is just a pleasure to just get on a plane and fly over there into Kuwait and into Baghdad as we have done and into Afghanistan and Kabul and to see them do their job under most extraordinary circumstances and the sacrifices that their families are making.

But this administration and this Republican-led Congress, to not fund them at the levels that the military leadership is asking us to and to have them go on two and three tours of duty and then come back here and to shortchange them in their training operations, that they took 2 weeks periods of times in rotation, to go and provide and do paperwork on the border security, quite honestly sometimes feels insulting to me, and our military deserves better. We have got to strengthen our military.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen, and these issues and the others we will continue to explore in the coming weeks as we further amplify Real Security.

Let me just end on this note. I had lunch with one of the Guardsmen from my district who served in the war in Iraq. He described to me how they had to put sheets of plywood and sandbags in to fill the doorways in their humvees because they did not have uparmored vehicles for their runs. The fact that our Guard have to go to those lengths, part of the Real Security plan that I outlined earlier was making sure our troops have the best equipment possible. We have not lived up to that standard. That is going to change under Real Security.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Or you go into junk yards, they are scrapping metal just to give them some body armor. That is despicable. That is never going to happen again. We are going to make sure of that.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

BORDER FENCING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to address you and the House of Representatives.

As you all know, I have been to Iraq a number of times, and our troops over there in the early stages of this theater and in the overall global war on terror, and it is also known, that we did not send over there humvees that were armored because that was not something that was anticipated was the IEDs. As they began to materialize and manifest themselves, this Nation and our military and all branches of the services that were exposed, they aggressively moved down the path of armoring our equipment.

As I was there, I saw the retrofitting of humvees, the retrofitting of trucks, the retrofitting of the equipment that was going out on to the streets and the roads of Iraq. Given the nature of the logistics of the difficulty, I saw people that mobilized, put their equipment in shape, and it was not very long before nothing that went outside the wire was left unarmored.

So the argument that we did not have enough bulletproof vests or we did not have enough armor, that is true early in the war. It is not true today, and we have provided resource after resource to our people in the Middle East and our people in this global war on terror.

It needs to be noted, Mr. Speaker, that Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld has been in the front of this. They have done everything they can to accelerate the development, the manufacturing, the delivery and I will say the installation of the armor on our humvees, on our mobile vehicles and the bulletproof vests and the equipment for our military. There has never been a military in history that was so well-armored as our military, Mr. Speaker, and I do think it does a disservice to the efforts of all to bring up the issue and make the allegation that that is not enough over there.

Those would be isolated cases, if they are anything, but isolated. I would hope that that information comes to me so I can look into it with my colleagues who just left the floor. I wish they were here to respond to that, Mr. Speaker.

But I came here to talk about the issue that the President has raised today when he made his trip down to the southwest border, the Arizona-Mexico border, Mr. Speaker. Air Force One left Andrews Air Force Base early this morning, headed out along that way, landed and they did some stops along the southwest border of Arizona and Mexico and then turn around, came back here into Washington, D.C.

I have got a clip here from ABC News that says, Bush says border fencing makes sense, Mr. Speaker, and I have made that statement for a long time. I will contend that it does make sense. It makes a lot of sense, and I am here, Mr. Speaker, to endorse that statement and that philosophy. I may want a little bit more fence and I may want it a little more solid than the President wants, but philosophically, we are in key on this border fence.

A week ago, last weekend, so about 10, 11 days ago, I spent 4 days on the ground on the border between Arizona and Mexico. I did not go on a formal CODEL. I did not go on a formal, appointed trip. I went down there on an unannounced trip because even though I appreciate the hospitality that comes from the border patrol and the National Guard and the other entities down there that are defending our border and the work that they do and the way that they have welcomed me and given me the guided tour in the past times I have been down on the border, this time I chose to go down on the

border in a less announced fashion, less formal fashion, to be able to go in and simply show up at our ports of entry, show up at our border patrol operations and be there to see simultaneously, and I will say spontaneously, what is going on.

This last trip I learned more down there than I have any previous trip, and the reasons are because it was essentially a surprise trip, a spontaneous trip down to the border. I have spoken about this on the floor in the past, Mr. Speaker, but I just quickly reiterate that in my time there I went to a place down on the border at Naco, Arizona. There they used to have illegal traffic where vehicles just drove across the border because there was no barrier. Sometimes they would be hauling illegals, sometimes they would be hauling illegal drugs, and sometimes they would be hauling illegal drugs and illegals into the United States.

The violence down there was getting to be intolerable, and the traffic was essentially relentless. They finally built a fence, Mr. Speaker, and I will call it a wall. It is a steel one, with corrugated, heavy duty steel with horizontal corrugations in it. Once that fence went in place, it cut down on a fair amount of illegal traffic. From the links of the fence that was built high enough that people cannot climb over it, with a screen to extend it above and solid enough down into the ground that I will say I did not see any signs that anyone had gone underneath it, extended from there on were vehicle barriers that would keep vehicles from driving across the border but would not keep a human being from walking underneath the vehicle barrier and coming into the United States. After a mile or two of that, it simply went off into a fence, and then some places there was not even a fence and not even a marker that one could tell exactly where the border was.

But it was an improvement, Mr. Speaker, and I saw where people had crossed the border there, and it is a consistent process. There are tracks that go continually. You do not have to be, I will say, a guide or a hunter to be able to see that, and I am a hunter, but it is easy enough to go along that border and pick the places where they are coming through the fence, crossing the border, doing so without much impediment and doing so with impunity, Mr. Speaker, at that location at Naco, Arizona.

And then I moved along and went on down to the Tohona O'odham Reservation, and while I was there, there was a drug smuggler that had been stopped by them. Underneath a box in the false bed of a pick-up, there was 18 bails of marijuana, roughly 10 pounds or a little more per bail, at least 180 pounds of marijuana hidden underneath the bed of that pick-up truck. It was pretty good body work that was done on the south side of the border for the marijuana that came in from there into the north side of the border. So I was there to see that apprehension and the confiscation of those drugs, which I hope end up in a prosecution and conviction of the person, whom I believe is guilty.

That individual had tattoos from his waist up to his neck. He had a 13 tattooed inside his arm. I am pretty sure it was an indication he was MS–13, Mara Salvatrucha 13, the most violent and dangerous gang that has been known in the Western hemisphere.

This individual was hauling marijuana into the United States, and they told me that, even though they had caught him, perhaps he was a decoy with 180 to 200 pounds of marijuana that they had sacrificed in order to run a larger load through when everyone converged on him.

There are mountains down there that have lookouts on the mountains and two men per lookout with infrared optics and for the daytime, high quality, clear, daytime optics and automatic weapons, AK–47s, well-supplied, solar panels to recharge their radios, their radios that send out encrypted audio so they can talk to each other and we cannot listen to them, but they have scanners so they can listen to us, Mr. Speaker. That is going on where they observe all of the travel routes along the entire border. Anyplace they want to smuggle drugs, they know where the border patrol is, where the law enforcement officers are, and they are able to talk from hilltop to hilltop, mountaintop to mountaintop, line of sight to line of sight, and be able to communicate with their entire network and operation. There are at least 45 mountaintops covering that whole area.

That is the kind of position that would be taken if there were a military invasion, Mr. Speaker. They are taking it in order to control transportation routes so that they can run their drugs up into the United States.

□ 2345

And the drugs that come into the United States from the southern border are, according to our Federal Government's announcement, 90 percent of the illegal drugs in America come across our southern border with Mexico. Ninety percent, Mr. Speaker, at a value of $60 billion a year. That is $60 billion, with a B, a year in illegal drugs coming across into the United States from our southern border. Those are illegal drugs brought in here by illegal entries and drug smugglers.

But just the illegals seeking entry into the United States, in 2004, the Border Patrol stopped 1,159,000. Turned them back, to use the President's phrase. For 2005, that calculates out to be 1,188,000 turned back across the southern border into Mexico. Something like 155,000 other than Mexicans came into the United States, many of those, in the past, have been caught and released. We are working to change that policy. We haven't succeeded totally in changing that policy, but I do believe we have a real commitment to eliminating the catch and release policy with the OTMs, the ''other than Mexicans.''

Many of the Mexicans that are caught, and 80 to 85 percent of the illegal entries into the United States across our southern border are Mexicans, those 80 to 85 percent, when they are caught, they are, I will say, presumably and likely, and I hope 100 percent of them are, at least fingerprinted, photographed, identified and then they are put on a bus, taken to a port of entry where they are let out of the bus and they walk back through the turnstile, so to speak, back into Mexico. Sometimes we transport them further down south, closer to where their home territory is, in hopes that they won't be back quite so quickly.

I have asked the Border Patrol to produce the numbers for me so we can crunch the database and find out of that 1,188,000 how many of them had crossed the border before. How many times are we catching them, sending them back, releasing them into their own country and then catching them again. At least 30 percent of that, according to the Border Patrol, are people that have been caught before. So that is 30 percent of the 1,188,000 were caught at least twice in the same year. So we really haven't turned back 1,188,000. We have turned back 70 percent of 1,188,000, but the other 30 percent we have done so twice, and perhaps some of them more than that.

More details to come as the days and weeks unfold, Mr. Speaker, and as I seek to pry into this information and bring a better perspective to the American people.

President Bush says border fencing makes sense. I say border fencing makes sense. In the time we have between now and the end of this period, I want to demonstrate how much sense one can make with a border fence; but I first want to allude to a study that was done by a Robert Rector at the Heritage Foundation who, for weeks, has been poring through statistics in trying to understand what the bills before the United States Senate really say and what they mean and how many people that might be that could be granted amnesty according to the Hagel-Martinez bill that was being debated before the United States Senate today.

That study came out, on Monday it was released, and it had a low of not 11 million, not 12 million, but the low was 103 million people legalized into the United States under Hagel-Martinez. That was the low. The high, if you presume the 20 percent growth and guest worker that was essentially uncapped, that would take it to 193 million. Well, there is a Bingaman and Feingold amendment that capped the guest workers, took the 325,000 annual cap down to 200,000. Then, when I apply that math to this spreadsheet, I come up with a number, Mr. Speaker, of 66,100,000 that would be legalized to bring into the United States, even after the Bingaman-Feingold amendment. That is 66,100,000.

That is if you assume that those that come into the United States would, by the chain migration rule, where they can bring in their spouse and their children, and when they access citizenship they can bring in their parents, their spouse, their children, and their siblings, that each one of them would only bring in 1.2 people. So I don't know anyone that would only have 1.2 or that small a number they would want to bring into the United States. I presume that number would be significantly larger than that.

So we checked with the USCIS, the United States Citizenship Immigration Services, and these are the people that speak for the President. Their number was not 1.2 for every legalized amnestied alien that would be given a path to citizenship here in the United States. Their number was four people for every one. So I plugged that into the spreadsheet, Mr. Speaker, and this 66,100,000 became 88 million and a little more. That is 88 million people with the legislation in the United States Senate today.

We are debating this subject as if it were 11 million or 12 million people that would be given amnesty and legalized, and we are really in that number somewhere between 66 million and 88 million, and perhaps more. Now, I submit this question, the question that is seldom asked and not very often answered by those who are for a guest worker plan: American people, is there such a thing as too much immigration? Is there such a thing as too much?

And the follow-up question is: If there is, then how much is too much? Is 11 million too much, or 5 million, or 1 million, or 12 million, or 13 million, or 20 million, or 66 million, or 88 million, or 103 million? How many are too many?

How many of them will fundamentally forever alter the United States and put a burden on our services that we can never recover from? What is that number? How many does it take before they can no longer be assimilated, Mr. Speaker?

Those are legitimate questions that need to be asked and answered, and I would submit those questions to the President of the United States. He is leading this debate, and he has an obligation to stand up before the American people and answer some questions.

Mr. President, how much is too much? Is there such a thing as too much? And if the answer is yes, then how much is too much? How many are too many? Please give us a number. And, Mr. President, how many do you think are granted a path to citizenship and permanent residency in the United States under Hagel-Martinez? How many do you think, Mr. President?

I believe that number is at least 66 million. My number is 66.1 million; and I would submit that if one would go back to 1789 and the ratification of the Constitution, the earliest records we have, and actually the earliest solid records we have are in 1820, and add up every single person that has been brought into the United States legally, through Ellis Island and through shipping manifests and every way we can add those up, the records and the data that are available today, totaling from 1820, when the first records begin, up until 2000, when my last records are available, that number, Mr. Speaker, in all the history of America, is 66,100,000 total allowed into the United States under an immigration policy. Hagel-Martinez matches the total for the history of America almost exactly, a minimum of 66,100,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how do we stop this? How do we seal up our border? And I have submitted many times that we need to seal the border, end birthright citizenship, shut off the jobs magnet, and apply attrition. So that when people can no longer get jobs in the United States because employers will have to pay sanctions, then they will decide they will go back home. When they do that, many of them will go back home with an American education and a new free enterprise ideal, and they will be able to help their home country grow. Mexico needs it.

It is a crying shame what is going on down there. The levels of corruption and the inability of a government to provide a functioning society in the midst of all the natural resources they have is a crying shame. But we can't fix it by taking on the poverty of the world. We cannot export American values, and we will not be able to maintain them unless we can seal our border.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will submit that it is not that hard to do. The President asked for another $1.9 billion for our southern border. Now, no one is saying what we are already spending on that southern border, but I can tell you it is more than $6 billion spent on our southern border. So the President has asked for another $1.9 billion. That will take us to more than $8 billion. That is $8 billion for less than 2,000 miles, which is easily $4 million a mile.

Now, how many Americans couldn't take on a mile of that border and guarantee nobody is going to get across it if we just paid them $4 million? I will submit what I would do. I would take this desert that I have here, this cardboard box is essentially a desert, and I would build a wall, a concrete wall. I would go in here and, Mr. Speaker, this gap in here represents a trench that I would dig down right along about 100 feet north of our border so that we had some room to work on both sides of it, and we could put a fence right on the border.

This would represent the desert. I would dig the trench, and then I would slip form and pour a concrete footing. And this example would be this, about 4 feet, or we could go 6 feet deep easily, and about 2 feet on either side of the wall a notch that can receive precast concrete panels. I would slip form that and I would dig the trench, and I would pour this concrete right in here, right behind my machine.

And here would stand, then, the foundation for a precast concrete wall. A very simple project to go through. Once this is established in this location, then we bring in the precast concrete panels. And these precast concrete panels look like this. They are 12 feet high, 10 feet wide, and they way 9,000 pounds each. You pick them up with a crane and set them here in this foundation.

Just this simple, Mr. Speaker. Install it like an erector set. You put these panels together. I have spent my life in the construction business, and I can tell you that it is not that hard to do. Except I have to have the rings on top so I can put the wire up there. They go together this simply, Mr. Speaker. Not quite this fast, but pretty quickly. And I can tell you that the small crews we have had in my construction business could build a mile of this a day easily. You can add a lot more manpower and a lot more machines to move this a lot more quickly.

But as you can see, I would build a wall that is 12 feet high, and these are 10 foot wide panels. It has a footing underneath it that is 4 feet deep. We can go 6 feet deep cheaply and easily. And we can put on top of it then a nice little, it might be too hard to do here, but we can put our wire on top of this wall. I have a little bit of wire, but it is a little too hard to put together here. Maybe another time I will string this along and set it on top to demonstrate what that looks like.

We can also, with a wall like this, we can put on infrared cameras, we can put on vibration sensors, we can put on motion sensors; but what it does is it makes it very difficult to cross this wall. It makes it difficult to dig underneath, it is difficult to climb over the top, and it slows people down. It is a barrier that causes them to go somewhere else, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this might seem like it is pretty expensive, but the administration has submitted a request that will take us up to $4 million a mile, $8 billion for 2,000 miles of wall, and I can build this for less than $500,000 a mile. The administration proposes to spend enough money that we could pave an interstate, four lanes down through there at least every year, maybe even twice a year, the full length of the border for the cost that we are spending to have people driving around in Humvees, sitting on ridge tops and trying to chase people down that are pouring across a border that is 2,000 miles long.

And it gets dark down there in the night, like it does anywhere, and that is when the activity begins. That is when the illegal smugglers start to move. That is when the illegals come in and the illegal drugs come in. They don't come through a barrier like this very easily, Mr. Speaker. With $500,000 a mile, which would be $1 billion for the entire span from San Diego to Brownsville.

That is one out of every $8 we would spend on our southern border to build

this kind of a barrier that I will submit will stop 90 percent of the traffic. And we could even go further and we could put out an RFP and let the private sector bid these miles for security. It is that easy and that simple, and we are dug into an idea that we are going to continue to hire more personnel, grow the size of the Border Patrol, and put our military on the border.

And I will support all those things, if that is the best we have to work with. But this makes far more sense. We can cut the number of Border Patrol we are using now on the border, and we can increase the efficiency of our enforcement. And this wall is an easy wall to dismantle as well. We can take it down just about as easily as we can put it together. In fact, maybe a little more easily.

What it says to Mexico is, you haven't been taking care of your people. You haven't taken care of your government. You have a corrupt form of government. Clean up your act. Clean up your act so people will stay in Mexico, and so they want to go to Mexico. Mr. Fox, fix your country so we can tear down this wall.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. LEACH (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of giving a commencement address in his district.

Mr. SHADEGG (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of traveling with the President of the United States to Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of traveling with the President of the United States to Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of traveling with the President of the United States to Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of traveling with the President of the United States to Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of traveling with the President of the United States to Arizona.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHAYS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHAYS, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Friday, May 19, 2006, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7576. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for FY 2006 supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Defense, Justice, and Homeland Security; (H. Doc. No. 109–111); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7577. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Competition Requirements for Federal Supply Schedules and Multiple Award Contracts [DFARS Case 2004-D009] received March 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7578. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Transition of Weapons-Related Prototype Projects to Follow-On Contracts [DFARS Case 2003-D106] received April 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7579. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Prohibition of Foreign Taxation on U.S. Assistance Programs [DFARS Case 2004-D012] received April 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7580. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Chemical Weapons Convention Regulations [Docket No. 990611158-5327-06] (RIN: 0694-AB06) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7581. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Labor Laws [DFARS Case 2003-D019] received April 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7582. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Incremental Funding of Fixed-Price Contracts [DFARS Case 1990-037] received April 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7583. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Global Terrorism Sanctions Regulations; Terrorism Sanctions Regulations; Foreign Terrorist Organizations Sanctions Regulations—received May 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7584. A letter from the Paralegal, FTA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Buy America Requirements; Amendment to Definitions [Docket No. FTA-2005-23082] (RIN: 2132-AA80) received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7585. A letter from the Attorney, PHMSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revisions to Civil and Criminal Penalties; Penalty Guidelines [Docket No. PHMSA-05-22461] (RIN: 2137-AE14) received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7586. A letter from the Chief, Europe Division, Office of International Aviation, OST, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certain Business Aviation Activities Using U.S.-Registered Foreign Civil Aircraft [Docket No. OST-2003-15511] (RIN: 2105-AD39) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7587. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30489; Amdt. No. 3162] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2007 (Rept. 109–471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 821. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5385) making appropriations for the military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, Military Construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes (Repot. 109–472). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows: