

clear. There's a difference here between where we stand as Democrats and where they stand as Republicans.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI. I appreciate you and Representative CICILLINE joining in this important half-hour of discussion. But I can clearly state that no one that I talked to in this House, no Representative, was hearing advocacy to end Medicare during our campaigns last year. I didn't hear one individual tell me that—senior, non-senior. I didn't hear anyone ask me to give more profits, more handouts, to big oil companies. I didn't hear one person say, Protect the corporate loopholes for corporations out there. I didn't hear anyone say, Hand more tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires.

I did hear, Make my budget work at home. I need the basics. I did hear, I can't survive with the situation as it is. I did hear, We need jobs. I did hear, Start growing our economy. Stop shrinking the middle class.

Well, evidently this majority was not listening. There was anger—undeniable anger, understandable anger—that existed out there. But this is not this quantification that they were looking for. They did not want to see this as a result, as an outcome. I think we need to continue to fight this effort to end Medicare, and we're going to continue that fight.

With that, I thank the gentlemen for joining me in this half hour.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

#### OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It's a privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, in this great deliberative body. I came here to talk about a different subject matter. But after I listened to my colleagues for a little while, I believe it's pretty important that we set some of this record straight. I don't know where they would be satisfied. It seems as though the attack is on anybody that's in free enterprise and the support goes to anything that is government. Anything that raises taxes and grows government is good, and anything that taxes free enterprise, and especially profits—those evil profits—are bad. That's the theme that I hear from the gentlemen who spent the previous half hour or hour demagoguing the issue of Big Oil and big insurance companies. This is particularly appalling to me when I walk in here on the floor and I hear a statement made by the gentleman from California saying this: You're going to turn them over to the most voracious sharks in the country—the health insurance companies. Well, if it happens to be that the health insurance compa-

nies are operating without competition, keeping their prices down, why doesn't the gentleman or others that might believe that engage in the health insurance industry?

The President of the United States made it very clear. He said he wanted more competition in the health insurance industry. He wanted to create a government-run, government-owned health insurance industry as part of ObamaCare. And he didn't realize, I don't think, when he uttered that statement, at least before ObamaCare was passed and began to knock the competition out of the way, that there were 1,300 health insurance companies in America—1,300—and over 100,000 policy varieties that one could choose from depending on the State that you might live in.

That's a lot of companies, and they've all been shot down here with a blanket allegation that they're voracious sharks. How can anybody be a voracious shark if there are 1,300 companies to compete against and 100,000 policies to choose from? Surely, there's something there that would satisfy the gentleman from the perspective of that array of variety that was available before the President decided he wanted to make the 1,301st insurance company be the Federal Government and perhaps give us a half-dozen or so policy varieties with a community rating that compressed it down, that raises the health insurance premiums for the youngest, lowest income people among us, and subsidizes the premiums for the highest income people among us.

□ 1900

That's ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and it clearly is. The gentlemen seemed to have forgotten what they all worked together to do to America over the last 19 months. They worked to impose ObamaCare on 300 million Americans, 306 or so million Americans, and they come here on the floor tonight to talk about the effort on the part of Republicans to try to save this Republic from the voracious appetite of government, the voracious shark of government that feeds upon the sustenance of the American people, that puts into debt every single person, every man, woman and child in America, and puts the mortgage on their head the day they are born.

Last fall, I talked about my granddaughter, my most recent granddaughter, Reagan Ann King. She's about 7 months old now, 6 to 7 months old. On the day she was born, her share of the national debt was \$44,000. Welcome to America; welcome to the world; welcome into life. You owe Uncle Sam \$44,000, and the interest is building. The interest is building, and this young lady is going to have to work a long time to pay that off.

I hear the same Members over here, at least from the same party, talking about the average debt that a college graduate has, that student loans are costing too much money. They had to

confiscate all the access to the marketplace for the free market on student loans and turn it completely into a government-run operation because they believed that somebody was making money off the interest, and they lamented that an average student loan when someone graduated from college was in the area of maybe \$20,000 to \$40,000. But it doesn't concern them that their policy and the President of the United States and the former Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, and the majority leader of the United States Senate, HARRY REID, the three of them, the ruling troika, President Obama, NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, could get in a phone booth and do what they would to America, and they have driven up this national debt and deficit to the point where it is appalling to the fiscally responsible Americans who pay their bills on time with the paycheck that they have with the amount that's left after they pay their taxes and their payroll.

They want more government, more taxes, more irresponsibility. They want the nonproductive sector of the economy to feed on the productive sector of the economy, and they stand here and talk about a company that they claim made over, maybe the aggregate of all these companies, made over a trillion dollars in profits in the last decade. I'd like to see that data. And perhaps, if they have anybody on that side of the aisle that's ever actually engaged in business, they would do a calculation to see what the return on investment was, what was the capital investment that returned that kind of an investment, if those numbers would actually hold up under scrutiny, and I suspect they won't. Then, if they're going to do a legitimate measure, they would also take a look and see what have been the windfall profits of the Federal Government in collecting royalties off the product that has been produced by these companies that are doing high-risk exploration in deep waters to make sure, yes, for a profit—they should have a profit—but they also are making sure that there is cheaper energy here in the United States certainly than there would be otherwise if we didn't have these companies exploring for oil in places like the gulf coast and up in the Bakken region, and if we didn't have some kind of support here in Congress to open up offshore drilling, drilling on the non-national park public lands in America.

We're an energy-rich nation. We have a large share of the world's energy and a smaller percentage of the world's population, and we have that energy, I suspect, because we've actually explored for it, identified it, measured it and quantified it. But, of course, that stuff escapes the people on the other side that are making these arguments for political reasons.

The talking points of the Democrats are now, demagogue the Republican budget, attack the Republicans and accuse them of threatening senior citizens, and they completely deny the

fact that people 55 and up in the Republican budget are expressly protected from any kind of budgetary changes. It is truly an entitlement for those 55 and up.

I'm not going to take the stand that we should then transfer that all the way down and guarantee my little granddaughter, Reagan Ann King, that her anticipated Medicare and Social Security benefits will be what she expects them to be on the day she's born with her \$44,000 worth of national debt that she has to pay off. Are we going to guarantee her that she gets her retirement benefits under Social Security in the amount that has been calculated in the actuarial tables and a promise? Is that an entitlement? Are we going to guarantee her the level of Medicare? Are we going to take away any incentive for all children born in America to establish themselves, to protect themselves, to plan for their own retirement, their own future, and perhaps be responsible enough to take themselves off the entitlement rolls so that there can be a future for America?

This economy collapses unless we address it. If we don't have the will, if we're going to listen to this kind of talk and cower before that and misdirect the American people with statements that clearly cannot be supported by the facts and think somehow there's a solution, my question is: What's your solution? More debt, more deficit, more demagoguery? For what? You'll put America into debt to exchange it for more political power? We saw what you did with political power and the American people rejected it in a resounding election just last November, and the large super-Democrat majority in this Congress turned completely over to a large Republican majority instead. Eighty-seven freshmen Republicans. You should be able to understand, none of them got elected because they want to grow government or increase the debt and deficit. Not one. Every one ran on the repeal of ObamaCare.

While I'm on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I would make this point. Of all that was said about what it is that allegedly Republicans would do with seniors, here's what ObamaCare exactly does with seniors. It cuts Medicare by \$532 billion, a direct assault on seniors, a direct assault on their Medicare. Now. It's not a delay. It's as soon as they can get this monstrosity implemented, and they believe that they're going to take that money and roll it over into something else, and it was part of the smoke and mirrors to come up with a CBO score that they could allege that it was actually going to be a money saver.

But the American people threw a lot of people out of office last November because they knew when the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader all say the same thing, we're going to insure 30 million more people with ObamaCare and it's going to be at no cost, 30 million more people insured at no cost, the American people know

that's false. No matter how many times it's repeated, they know that that's false. You can't get more for less. Things cost money.

And they could understand this. That if you take the 306 or so million Americans and if you're concerned that there is a percentage of them that are uninsured, we should only be concerned about the Americans that were uninsured and remain uninsured, I might add, that don't have affordable options.

If Bill Gates is uninsured, I don't have any heartburn over that. Bill Gates can manage his own health care. He can be self-insured. He may well be, for all I know. If Warren Buffett is uninsured, I'm not concerned about that. He can manage his own health care. If somebody that's making \$174,000 is uninsured, I'm not concerned about that person because they're making enough money to take care of their own health insurance. And on down the line. To what level?

But the people that they're trying to argue were uninsured, this larger number of around 46 million uninsured Americans, when you start subtracting from that those that are eligible for Medicaid but don't bother to sign up, those that are eligible under their employer but opt out, those who are here in the United States illegally. I don't want to cover them, Mr. Speaker. As you begin subtracting from the 46 million and you get down to the number of those Americans that are uninsured and do not have affordable options, that number turns out to be not 46 million but 12.1 million. That's making \$75,000 or less. That's the measure. Those who are uninsured and don't have an affordable option.

Now, 12.1 million is still a lot of people, but it only amounts to less than 4 percent of the U.S. population. And ObamaCare completely transforms the best health care system in the world, the best health care delivery system in the world, and the best health insurance system in the world to try to get at a small percentage of the less than 4 percent of Americans who were uninsured without affordable options.

What do we have today? Do you hear any Democrats coming to the floor to tell us how many people are uninsured in America after ObamaCare was passed?

□ 1910

I can offer this guarantee. It's more. There are more that are uninsured today than there were on the day that ObamaCare was passed because more employers became more doubtful about what it would be that would be imposed upon them. There are fewer employees today than there would be if ObamaCare had never passed because the companies don't have the confidence that they can operate within the environment of an implemented ObamaCare.

And I listen to demagoguery on big insurance companies, Big Oil, big banks. Well, America is set up on com-

petition, and if these companies have such a market share and such an advantage that now they can take unreasonable profits from the marketplace, somebody's going to get in the market and they're going to start a bank and oil company or insurance company.

But here's what I'm for within the area of health insurance. I want to allow people to buy insurance across State lines. I want the people in New Jersey, the young man that's buying a typical policy, in good health, roughly at age 23, for \$6,000 a year—that's before ObamaCare passed—I want him to be able to go to Kentucky and buy that similar typical policy for a 23-year-old healthy male in Kentucky for about \$1,000 a year. Isn't that a good solution? That way your 1,300 health insurance companies that we had are competing all against each other instead of being isolated within the States, operating under individual State mandates. And they can then afford policies that can have higher deductibles, higher copayments and significantly lower premiums.

And I want to see people get off the entitlement rolls, both of Social Security and of Medicare, and this can be done. And, Mr. Speaker, I will take you quickly down the path of how we get there with Medicare and HSAs.

Under the HSA legislation that was passed in 2003 under Medicare part D, a young couple, let's just say, they presumably fell in love and got married at age 20 and went to work on their life's work. I can do the math work with round figures. And over the course of 45 years of work, from 20 until 65, they maxed out on their health savings account. They started at \$5,150 a year for that couple, and then it grows by COLA on up and just continues as long as there is a cost-of-living allowance that increases it. And if you subtract from that amount \$2,000 a year that would come out of their health savings account in what we might call typical expenses of health care, going to the doctor, doing those things that you don't want to put on your insurance policy and if you compounded the balance of that health savings account at 4 percent, which is historically accurate—and I did this math before we had the downturn over the last 2½ years—it comes up to this.

That couple would arrive at Medicare eligibility age 65 with a health savings account that had \$950,000 in it. \$950,000, Mr. Speaker. Now, the liability, the present value, present negative value of an individual that arrives at Medicare eligibility age today is about \$72,000. That's the average that the Federal Government would be paying for health care benefits for the duration of the life of the individual after they reach 65 Medicare eligibility, \$72,000. So the couple then would be at \$144,000, and you have to adjust it for inflation, but I just go without tonight for the purposes of mental figuring.

So you would take the \$950,000 and you subtract \$144,000 to take care of

what would be the premium for a Medicare replacement policy, a paid-up Medicare replacement policy similar to an annuitized health care plan for life. And now you're in this area of—let's just say \$806,000 would be the balance in your health savings account, \$806,000. And what's the Federal Government's interest in that health savings account after that point? They want to tax it as regular income as it comes out of that account as being spent by the individual, or they want to tax it as death tax later on if the people, once they pass away, to tax it on the way to their heirs, the death tax.

Why wouldn't this Federal Government offer to the people that have their health savings account, why wouldn't it offer them this? Buy a Medicare replacement policy, and you can keep the change tax free and you can will it to your children or you can use it as a pension plan.

Now, we're already solving this situation of Social Security, Medicare by allowing HSAs to grow and let people manage their own lives. That's the kind of thing that we need to have going on for solutions, not demagoguery, not trying to conflate the philosophy of a budget that's designed to get us to balance.

Where's your balanced budget over there on that side of the aisle? Is there a single one of you that will stand up and tell me that you have offered a balanced budget? You didn't even offer a budget when NANCY PELOSI was Speaker the last year or two here, and now you're here attacking this budget. You don't have a plan. You don't have a platform to stand on to criticize this platform, and you had plenty of opportunity to offer your own. But there's no balanced budget that's being offered on this side of the aisle. That's clear. That's why no one responds to me, or I'd yield to someone who wanted to allege that Democrats offered a balanced budget. If they did, it would be with—what's that word? The voracious shark of tax increases would be what would happen, Mr. Speaker.

So I think perhaps we've dispatched what took place in the previous half hour or an hour, and I will then now, without segue, transition into the subject matter that I came here to talk about. That's this.

Day before yesterday, I listened to the President's speech that he gave in El Paso, Texas, and it was surprising in a way, a bit shocking in a way. It was a political speech on immigration. I mean, that's clear. And the people that analyzed it came to the same conclusion that I did, Mr. Speaker.

But as I listened to the President of the United States, who was standing in El Paso very near the border of the United States, begin to ridicule people who want border security, well, first, he uttered the breathtaking statement that the border fence is, quote, basically complete, close quote. Mr. Speaker, the border fence is basically com-

plete, uttered by the President of the United States? I have a few data points I think he should go back and revisit.

One of them is, Mr. President, there are 2,000 miles of southern border, about 4,000 miles of northern border. But just dealing with the southern border, 2,000 miles of southern border.

Now, whatever it was that Janet Napolitano told you, Mr. President, here are the facts on the border fence as of today, as constructed. Out of the 2,000 miles, there are 350 miles of pedestrian fence. That's called primary fencing. That's a fence that you don't just walk through. It's a bit of a barrier. They get climbed all the time, but it's a single fence. Often it's a chain-link fence. I don't know if they're referring to the barbwire fence. I suspect not, because I think actually we've got a little bit more of that on the border. Even the Federal Government, the Department of Homeland Security claims the primary fencing, pedestrian fencing is 350 miles out of the 2,000 miles. Now, they add this all up and they say we've got all of these miles of fencing, but if it's double fencing or triple fencing, they count each mile of it even if it's layered. Then, if that's the case, it's all done, it's a triple fencing, then we've got 6,000 miles of fence, Mr. Speaker, but that isn't the case at all.

Here's the comparison. 350 miles of primary fencing or pedestrian fencing. Now, we know that a single fence doesn't do us a lot. It slows some traffic down and it gives a line of demarcation. Double fencing slows them down a lot better, and it sets up kind of a no man's land we can patrol and sometimes catch illegals inside of that before they climb the second fence and go off into the underbrush.

So of the secondary fencing they have, there's not 350 miles of that. Remember, 2,000-mile border. Secondary fencing, 36.3 miles. Now, remember the primary fencing, 350 miles; the secondary fencing, 36.3 miles. I'm going to tell you that we don't have a lot of effectiveness until we get to at least the secondary fencing component of this.

So of 2,000 miles of border, 36.3 miles of secondary fencing, 36.3 miles is kind of what you can say is somewhat built, but a lot of it requires also triple fencing. And I've been down to visit the triple fencing, and that exists in a number of places and it exists very effectively in some areas of Arizona, in the southwest corner of Arizona, of course on the Mexican border.

Now, when you look at the border, out of the 2,000-mile border, the fence that is—they call it tertiary, that's the third layer of fence. I have 350 miles of primary fencing, 36.3 miles of double fencing; and of that 36.3 miles, 14.3 miles are triple fencing.

□ 1920

The triple fencing, as far as I know, has never been defeated by anyone. They go around it. They may tunnel under it sometimes, but they've not defeated the fencing, and it's been pretty

effective. But if you've got effective fencing at 14.3 of the 2,000 miles and within 220 yards of that triple fencing—and by the way, there is triple fencing in El Paso—the President is standing within 220 yards of triple fencing in El Paso, arguing that the fencing is basically complete, and he's ridiculing Americans who want border security by saying—now I'm just going to include myself in this—that we'll never be satisfied, that we keep raising the bar. Well, no. I always set the bar up pretty high. I don't think I need to raise it.

It reminds me of the way Margaret Thatcher once responded to a student when she was in Iowa and she was asked the question, What have you changed your mind on since you left office? She thought a little bit, and she said, Goodness. I was in office 11½ years. My principles were very soundly based. I saw no reason to change them.

Well, the principle that I've laid out for border security, as far as infrastructure on the border, is this: We've got 2,000 miles on the southern border through which comes 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America. I don't suggest that we have to build 2,000 miles of triple fencing. I want to build a fence, a wall, and a fence. Yes, that's effective. It's cost-effective as well. I only suggest that we build that fence until they quit going around the end, Mr. Speaker. That will be the measure. That's how we'll know if it's effective. If they're going around the end, we'll extend it a few more miles. If they keep going around the end, we'll keep building. If the illegals are still entering the United States, then we'll build it from Brownsville all the way up to San Diego or to Tijuana if you prefer.

The President said the fence is basically complete, that he's basically got 14.3 miles of completed fencing on 2,000. I don't think anybody is going to think that that's a very basic completion. I should have, perhaps, done this math, but if I just do 14.3 miles and if I divide that by 2,000 miles, I get—let me see—seven-tenths of 1 percent of completion. That would be the President's idea of basically complete. Seven-tenths of 1 percent of the entire 2,000-mile border has triple fencing on it and 2½ times more than that, so maybe you'd have, oh, let's say, 18 or 19—1.9 percent completed if you'd just consider the double fencing instead of the triple fencing.

And the President is making fun of people who might want a moat?

I have a picture here. I've flown that within the last couple of months in a helicopter to evaluate the border, almost all of it, all the way from El Paso across all of New Mexico and almost all of Arizona—I know I've flown all of it at one time or another—and it occurred to me that the President was standing pretty close to the moat at the time, 220 yards away from right there at the border. Not only does it have the triple fencing that Janet

Napolitano made fun of—she said, If you show me a 20-foot fence, I'll show you a 21-foot ladder—but in El Paso, here's what we have:

We have the Rio Grande River, moat No. 1, with water in it, flowing down. You have a fence. You have a patrol road. You have another fence. Then you have a canal that has a fairly fast current in it and a lot of water with concrete sides and bottom. Then you have another fence, so you have triple fencing. If anybody is going to come into the United States into El Paso, they've got to get across the river—sometimes swim, most of the time wade—climb a fence, avoid the Border Patrol that has a patrol road and stations posted along inside the column of the two fences, climb a second fence, get into the canal, swim the canal, get up over the top of the next fence and into El Paso.

Mr. President, it's not happening in El Paso because fences work. By the way, the natural water streams there have been really useful as well, and I think that, if I had any staff that stood me up within 220 yards of a structure like that to make fun of it, I'd probably have different staff the next day. I hope he takes note of that, Mr. Speaker. I make these points that the immigration situation in the United States is this:

We have a GAO study, and this study that just emerged here a few weeks ago tells us that there are a number of people who die in the Arizona desert while sneaking into the United States. The loss of every one of those personal lives is a tragedy, and it's of high proportion to their families, but I began asking the question: How many Americans die at the hands of those who do get into the United States? That study report comes out and tells us this:

In the Federal, State and local prisons in America—and this is a very minimum number. This is a floor, not a ceiling. We know the number is higher. We know it's no lower than this—there are currently incarcerated 25,064 criminal aliens who were arrested for homicide and who are currently incarcerated in those prisons that I mentioned in the United States. That's 25,064 homicide victims at a minimum that we know of, and that's some of the price for our not securing our border.

If we had 100 percent enforcement on our border and 100 percent enforcement over people in the United States illegally, then theoretically at least all 25,000 of those people would be alive. They would not be under the ground in the United States—one coffin at a time, one obscure village at a time, one tragedy in a family at a time. It's more than 25,000, certainly, which is a number that soars when you think of it, a number of multiples of the victims of September 11, and we sit here and say, Well, you know, it's only people who want to come here to make a better life.

It's not only that to the families who have lost victims to this.

I just sat down and had a discussion within the last couple of hours with Tiffany Hartley, whose husband was a victim of the vicious murder out on the jet skis on Falcon Lake, which is just north of McAllen, Texas, on September 30 of last year.

The tragedy of his death, the unwillingness on the part of this administration to go in and investigate his death, to find the perpetrators who killed her husband, and come to the truth of that incident is inexcusable and unconscionable. The Justice Department needs to drill in with this. They need to turn up their diplomatic pressure. The State Department, Hillary Clinton, needs to connect with the Mexican consul. Let's get to the bottom of this. Let's get the facts as they stand. Let's find out who investigated what and when, and let's take a look at the communications as they go back and forth so we can get a sense of the level of focus that maybe existed or maybe didn't exist.

I'm calling upon Eric Holder to take a look at the murder of David Hartley. Do so for Tiffany. Help her get some closure.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### A SLAP IN THE FACE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS—SUM TOTAL OR NOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to get something off my chest.

Last night, the President hosted a poetry event at the White House. The invitation of one of his guests has sparked a lot of anger, and let me explain why.

The musician wrote a song in which he vocally supports a convicted cop killer and her escape from jail. Oh, by the way, she's still at large, living in Cuba, living the good life. It may not mean much to some, but I've got a serious problem with this.

Before coming to Congress, I spent 37 years as a cop. I lost friends in the line of duty, and I'm not the only one. As we speak here right now, police officers—thousands of them—are coming to Washington, D.C., to go to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. Tomorrow night, those men and women will attend a candlelight vigil to honor those law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. This is the 23rd Annual Candlelight Vigil at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. This year, it will also include a 36-year-old father of three, who was struck down last Tuesday night.

The White House press secretary said the President opposes the lyrics in question but that they do not represent the sum total of the artist's work.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I don't care. It's not the point.

The point is that you've got thousands of men and women in law en-

forcement who put their lives on the line every day for this great Nation, just like our troops, and the President invited to the White House someone who supports and glorifies a convicted killer of a police officer—an officer who volunteered to protect his community. He was a husband and a father. The loss was not only to that community but to America.

Our law enforcement officers are the first line of defense for America. Mr. President, can you not see what this means to the people who put their lives on the line every day? It's a slap in the face—sum total or not.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 13, 2011, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1552. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Indiana, Maine, Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0075] received April 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1553. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Citrus Canker, Citrus Greening, and Asian Citrus Psyllid; Interstate Movement of Regulated Nursery Stock [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0048] (RIN: 0579-AD29) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1554. A letter from the Secretary, Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting a report detailing an Average Procurement Unit Cost and a Program Acquisition Unit Cost breach for the Global Hawk program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1555. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Additional Assignment Pay or Special Duty Pay for Afghanistan, pursuant to Public Law 111-84, section 619; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1556. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Minimizing the Use of Materials Containing Hexavalent Chromium (DFARS Case 2009-D004) (RIN: 0750-AG35) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1557. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Glenn F. Spears, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1558. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Chances