

just working people issues; it is business issues. A lot of people try to put workers against business. It is not that issue at all. It is these unfair trade deals.

I would like to ask Congresswoman SUTTON a question, if I might. How would you address this issue: We hear all kinds of times the issue, you are a protectionist. What is your response to that?

Ms. SUTTON. Well, again, this is the way those who like what is going on with our trade deals, and those would be more or less the multinational companies who are very involved in helping to push them, whenever we start talking about this and the real impact and the real effects, they like to call you names like protectionist.

That is how they shut the debate down; but we can't allow that to happen, because, again, this is not a question of protectionism versus trade. It is a question about what are the rules of trade going to be.

We just have to keep saying that, because there are going to be voices out there that would like people to believe otherwise. But all we are talking about is what kind of rules of trade do we believe should be engaged in.

Mr. MICHAUD. That is very good. I know we are running out of time. I do want to thank you, Congresswoman SUTTON and Congresswoman KAPTUR, for your leadership in this role, and I really appreciate the hard work that everyone is doing on this issue, especially our freshman class.

As Ms. KAPTUR had mentioned, the freshman class has really come forward and really taken on this issue, taken an interest in this issue, I think primarily because you just came off the campaign trail. You heard what people were talking about out there. It is important for Members who have been here for a while to listen to you as freshman Members because you definitely have a lot to talk about when it comes to this trade issue.

We have seen it firsthand. As I mentioned earlier, I worked at the mill for over 28 years, and I have seen firsthand what NAFTA has done to my town, my community, to individuals who worked in the mill.

So I want to thank each and every one of you for taking an interest in this very important issue.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker: I am proud to join many of my House colleagues today to present a strong voice in opposition to renewing Fast Track trade negotiating authority in any way, shape or form.

Fast Track allows the President to negotiate trade agreements without input from Congress. In addition, Congress is prohibited from amending any trade agreements reached under Fast Track authority.

Cynically repackaged as "trade promotion authority" in 2002, under President Bush's watch, Fast Track has been utilized to unjustifiable ends. Wages are flat, our trade deficit has skyrocketed and good-paying manufacturing jobs have been lost by the thousands.

Increased imports from low-paid workers abroad, combined with threats made to work-

ers by companies to move operations overseas, drive American workers' wages down. Through the 1950s and 1960s, the American middle-class grew and prospered. In 1973, the average U.S. worker made \$16.06 an hour. Today, after adjusting for inflation, that same worker would make only \$16.11 per hour.

In stark contrast to hourly wages, average U.S. worker productivity has nearly doubled over the same period. Clearly, the divide in America between the "haves" and "have-nots" is growing, and the richest few, along with multi-national corporations, are the big winners under our nation's flawed trade policy.

Up until 1973, the U.S. experienced relatively balanced trade, with small trade surpluses being the norm (\$1.9 billion surplus in 1973). Since Fast Track was granted in 1974, the U.S. had a trade surplus in just one year (1975). Now, in 2006, our nation's trade deficit has skyrocketed to over \$760 billion.

Our trade deficit has more than doubled since President Bush took office. For 2001, our trade deficit was \$362 billion. Last year, our trade deficit reached yet another new record high at \$764 billion.

Since WWII, good paying manufacturing jobs have been the driving force behind our nation's robust middle class allowing families to own homes, send their children to college and gain access to quality, affordable healthcare.

Since President Bush took office, the U.S. has lost 3 million manufacturing jobs. Michigan alone has lost 213,000 manufacturing jobs, or about one-quarter of the state's manufacturing jobs.

My record is clear. I voted against the Trade Act of 2002, which mistakenly granted this Administration "trade promotion authority." Now, it is time for Congress to put the brakes on the Bush Administration's failed trade policies and come to our senses to realize the damage done. First, we must not make matters worse. Congress should reject the pending free trade agreements with Peru, Colombia and Panama. My colleagues should not be misled. Fast track trade negotiating authority is not required to negotiate or approve free trade agreements.

Second, we need serious, thoughtful review of our nation's trade policies and their impact on wages, jobs and our trade balance. Pitting American industries against one another, political gamesmanship, and manipulation and sloganeering must come to an end so that Congress and the Administration should get down to business.

The United States is a world leader, and we must enact trade policies that truly encourage positive standards and quality of life for both the United States and our foreign partners. Reject renewal of Fast Track trade negotiation authority, so we can get back to sensible and fair trade policy.

SOLUTIONS TO TRADE PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege to be seated here in this Chamber and listen to the presentation over the last probably hour and a half or so. It is quite interesting as I listened to the presentation made

by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the concern about the imbalance in trade, which I am concerned about, and the argument that we need not necessarily free trade, but fair trade.

As I carefully listened to the 60-minute presentation, I hear some things that are wrong, and I agree with some of them, as a matter of fact, most of them, but I heard no suggestions on how we are going to fix this, except ask the administration to do it better and get it right.

I think it is important for us, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to identify these issues that we are going to call problems that we should also step forward and have the will and the foresight to present some solutions.

So in the time I have had here to listen now, I will just present some solutions that I would have liked to have heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because I think we ought to be here to fix the problems we have.

First, I don't have quite the same number of trade deficit that the gentlelady from Ohio presented in the poster here just a little bit ago. I recall that 2 years ago, actually now 3 years ago, our trade deficit was a minus \$617.7 billion. Last year it was a minus \$725 billion. Her number was slightly higher than that. We should by now have the records for the 2006 trade deficit. I have not had access to that number, and I note the gentlelady from Ohio didn't present a number for the 2006 trade deficit, but it had been increasing about 20 percent a year for several years.

I heard no evidence that convinces me that NAFTA is the only reason. In fact, I will submit that there are a number of other reasons that we have a trade deficit. I would challenge my colleagues, join with me in some of these solutions that I will present here.

But before I do so, I am just going to go back and review some of the remarks that were made and then respond to them with solutions rather than lamentations, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Wisconsin called for fair trade. He showed a poster that has a minus \$233 billion trade deficit with China. I don't dispute that number. I expect that is as very close, if not as accurate, a number as there is out there. But that is a portion of and not even a majority of our trade deficit that we have from a global imbalance.

Then the gentleman from Illinois made the statement "We need fair trade." Fair trade in fact was called for by I believe every one of the speakers, and at least no one disagreed with that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to allow my staff to use the word "fair." In fact, I refused to let my children use the word "fair" as they were growing up, because I know something that most Americans know, and that is anyone who has raised two or more children knows there is no such thing as fair.

If you are going to use “fair” and be able to define the word “fair,” you have to be talking about a county fair or a State fair or some other type of gathering where people display their wares, because the term “fair” is not definable; it isn’t universally understood. So one person’s idea of fair is another person’s idea of a injustice, and it will be ever thus.

We can talk about justice and equity, and we can talk about using the equal enforcement of trade agreements and laws, and I think we should do that; but to even try to define what we would like to do with a term like “fair,” we have chosen the vaguest term that there is in the dictionary and the one that submits itself to anyone’s redefinition of it.

Also the statement was made that we have no options, we have to vote these fast track trade agreements up or down. That is not true. Yes, they come to the floor as unamendable, but a couple of years ago, maybe 3 years ago, I amended two unamendable trade agreements, and I did so in committee.

□ 2145

These were trade agreements that had to do with Singapore and Chile. Ambassador Zoellick had negotiated immigration agreements into those trade agreements. And so with the wisdom and tenaciousness of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), we brought those trade agreements before the Judiciary Committee, and although they were unamendable trade agreements, up-or-down, to be voted on, we had a mock markup in committee. And in that mock markup, I was successful in getting two mock amendments put on the mock bill. And when we finished with our analysis of the trade agreements that had been negotiated by the U.S. Trade Representative and had perfected the trade agreements in the process of going through the mock markup, the U.S. Trade Representative then, even though it was supposedly impossible to go back and reopen those negotiations, reopened those negotiations and adapted those two amendments into the trade agreement, and we struck out the immigration language out of the trade agreement. It had no business. It had no place there, and that is one way you can effect a change if you disagree with the trade agreements.

But it sounds to me like the people that are speaking here are against all trade agreements no matter what they might be. They will always be able to oppose any agreement no matter how it is defined because they will always reserve the right to redefine their own term called fair. It will be, it isn’t fair. We can’t do it because it is not fair. Well, you have to be more specific than that.

As I listened to my colleague from Iowa talk about the Maytag issue at Newton, and that has left a big hole in

the central part of Iowa, and I look back on the 34½ years of my marriage, and there has never been anything but a Maytag washer and dryer in my home washing clothes for our family. That is deep in our heritage, and we are loyal to the brand.

But part of the equation also was that, when it came time to resolve the labor disagreements and to settle the salary and benefit and pension plans, the burden of that was just too high to be able to hold the jobs in Iowa. It is too bad, but those were some of the circumstances that no one over here uttered, when you get collective bargaining and it drives the package up so high; when you overplay your hand, you lose the company. You don’t have the option to back down, and the union doesn’t come forward and say, I will be happy to take a \$2 or \$5 pay cut, or maybe we will negotiate the health care plan or do a package that has to do with our contribution versus our benefits, defined contributions versus defined benefits plan, that stuff is hard to get when you have a lucrative labor agreement, collectively bargained agreement, those types of agreements could not be resolved favorably to Maytag. That is one of the reasons why we no longer have Maytag centered up in Newton, Iowa. I think we need to talk about that.

Yes, these jobs are going overseas. But, also, Maytag made an investment overseas to go over there and make washing machines to sell to the Chinese. They invested initially \$70 million in that plant. And, finally, after some years of trying, they couldn’t make it work and pulled out of that investment.

There are many, many different components to these transactions. It isn’t just simply American corporations, that they are simply greedy capitalists and that they quickly move our industries overseas. They are reluctant to go. But we set up the burden of taxation and regulation. And then you have the compensation packages of the collective bargaining agreements; and that being the environment here in the United States, having then to compete against the cheaper labor overseas. All of those things work against us, not just the corporations deciding to make a decision that is simply based on greed. That is not so, Mr. Speaker.

Also, the argument, the gentlelady from Iowa said our trade deficits soar, we need a new trade model. I heard no proposal of what that new trade model is. It is criticism, but it is not a solution. We need to provide solutions.

The other gentlewoman from Iowa talked about Hershey is moving out and going to Mexico. I am saddened to see that go. But some of my colleagues who have been here a number of years have had an opportunity to put a fix in place so we could sustain, could have sustained some of these businesses that we are losing, and we could still sustain many of these businesses today if we could get to work and roll up our

sleeves and do the right thing for real tax reform.

That would be to simply bring forward H.R. 25, the FAIR Tax. And that eliminates the IRS and the Income Tax Code, so it eliminates personal and corporate income tax. It eliminates the tax on your interest income, your dividend income and your capital gains. And it eliminates the AMT. It takes the tax off your savings and investment, and your pension and Social Security. It does all of those things.

One of the things I would think my colleagues would want to do if they are concerned about the trade deficit, I would think that they would want to border adjust the taxes so we weren’t operating here in the United States at a disadvantage, having to put taxes on the cost of our goods and be competing against imported goods from overseas that do not have that tax component in there. That is part of what they are talking about, is unfair trade, subsidized goods was the term used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the onslaught of foreign subsidized goods.

Well, they may be subsidized goods, and I am sure there is a definition that can be applied to that, but we do the opposite. We put the tax burden on everything that we manufacture in this country, on materials and labor, and it has to be built in and embedded in the cost of the things that we sell, because corporations, companies that are in business to sell a good or a service or any combination of the two, do not pay income tax. They can’t pay income tax. They collect it from people. The end user, the last stop on the retail chain, are the ones that pay the taxes, but it is collected through the companies that sell the goods and the services, and then they transfer it to the IRS in the form of corporate income tax, business income tax and sometimes the personal income tax of the executives and the shareholders as well.

Corporations and businesses don’t pay taxes; they collect it from real people. The consumer is the last stop on the retail dollar. Once we can get our minds around that absolute truth, then we can begin to talk about how we can work together to border adjust our taxes and become a more competitive Nation again.

The studies that we have had done indicate that the components boil down to this: On average, 22 percent of a product that is on the shelf for sale here in the United States, 22 percent is the embedded cost of the tax structure that the company that is producing that product has to build into the price. So that says, if you are selling a widget and that widget is a dollar, 78 cents is the cost of the widget and 22 cents is the cost of the tax.

If you put that on some more expensive items, go from the \$1 widget to the \$30,000 vehicle, and we have millions of dollars worth of vehicles coming into the United States every year. Some of our trade deficit, I can tell you, would be \$800 million worth of Mazdas that

come over from Japan every year, made in Japan, put on ships, brought here, off-loaded into the United States and marketed on our dealers' lots, \$800 million. As that price goes up, and that is a couple-of-year-old number, we could be into a billion dollars, and that would be one-700th of our entire trade deficit because we are buying Mazdas but we are not exporting Chevys or Fords back to Japan. If we sent a billion dollars worth of Chevys or Fords to Japan instead of them sending a billion dollars of Mazdas to us, then we pick up a two-for, and we reduce that trade deficit by \$2 billion, not \$1 billion.

But if you put a Chevy and a Mazda on a dealer's lot and each has a sticker price of \$30,000 and they are comparable vehicles, comparable quality and accessories that are built into that price so the competition will establish that price and they are selling against each other at \$30,000; if we pass H.R. 25, the FAIR Tax and we cease taxing all productivity in America and we put the tax on sales instead of income, a national sales tax, that \$30,000 Chevy, the price of it goes down.

If you take the tax component out, you take 22 percent out of that \$30,000 Chevy, and it takes us into that area of \$23,400. The Mazda stays at \$30,000.

When we put our tax back in, we have to build it back in, the sales tax on the price, now the Mazda goes up by 23 percent, and it ends up as a \$39,000 Mazda. That is the amount you would write the check for to drive it off the lot. But you would write the check for the Chevy or the Ford at \$30,400. That is an \$8,600 marketing advantage that we would gain simply by getting rid of the IRS and the Income Tax Code and put our tax back on sales and allowing these companies and competition to drive the embedded tax component out of everything that we are producing here in America.

That gives us a 28 percent marketing advantage here in the United States. So when foreign companies are competing against American manufacturers, they would have to look at that huge 28 percent advantage that we would have. I can tell you, there would be a lot more products produced in the United States.

I will take you back to the \$800 million worth of Mazdas coming over from Japan by ship every year. Those cars are made in Japan. A lot of the components are put together in Japan, and wherever you make something, that is where the labor and jobs are. When we are purchasing from a foreign country, we are transporting and exporting our job market there.

Now, that is true for everything that we are purchasing that is a good from a foreign country. Those jobs, whenever we send money overseas and purchase a good from a foreign country, we are also transferring jobs there.

We pass the FAIR Tax, those jobs come back home, many of them, and we hold most jobs here. We end up with

a 28 percent marketing advantage, and it does a number of other things. That is, it doubles our economy in 10 to 15 years. It fixes our balance of trade, that minus-\$725 billion, probably a larger number now, because we can compete not only here better, and we will be pulling jobs back here and creating more jobs here in the United States, but also our export markets. Many times the export markets turn on a 1 or 2 percent margin.

We pick up instantaneously a 28 percent advantage from where we are right now if we can take the tax component out of the products that we are selling. So we do a number of good things. We hold our manufacturing base here. We hold our jobs here, especially our blue collar jobs, the jobs like Hershey and Maytag, that are leaving America. These are manufacturing jobs after manufacturing jobs. Those kinds of jobs stay here. We create more jobs here. These are American-made products, and the dollars will stay here. As those dollars stay here, they turn over seven times in a community, as the economists tell us they do. They create more and more and more jobs. Pretty soon we would have that trade deficit gone. We would end up with a trade surplus. We would end up with a healthy, robust industrial base in America and a strong economy that would be doubled in 10-15 years.

If we do that, the rest of the world would have to stand up and take notice. We are already the most dynamic economy the world has ever seen. But we have a problem, a series of them. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem I am speaking of is the problem of going back and indexing Alexander Tyler's statement, that when a democracy realizes it can vote itself benefits from the public treasury, on that day the democracy ceases to exist.

We are at least 44 percent of Americans not paying income tax. If we go to a national sales tax, a FAIR Tax, that does a number of things, but it untaxes the poor, and I will get to that in a moment. But it also makes taxpayers out of every consumer in America. And we are all consumers.

Each time we step up, and I think of little Johnny stepping up to the counter, and he is going to buy his baseball cards, and he is going to put a couple of dimes up there for Uncle Sam. Those children from little on up will understand that the Federal Government is expensive, and they will know that they are funding the Federal Government, and they will be buying into the Federal Government. And they will also be advocating for let me have a few less services and let me keep a few more of my dimes. That penetrates into young people.

I remember a story told by a candidate for Congress in last summer's primary election. He had a little son; I believe his name was Michael. Little Michael had saved up his money. Little Michael, he picked up his box of Skittles, and he had counted out 89 cents for the box of Skittles.

□ 2200

So he put his money up on the counter with the box of Skittles, carefully counted out 89 cents, and the lady at the check-out register rang it up and said that will be 96 cents. He did not have anymore money. He got that look on his face of what am I going to do; they are 89 cents; I have 89 cents. The lady said, well, with the tax. Little Michael turned to his dad and said, Dad, I have to pay tax on Skittles? Yes, that is what you have to do if we eliminate the IRS and the Federal income tax code. You could be a consumer who chooses when to pay your taxes, and like little Michael, pay taxes on Skittles at age seven or eight or less, and realize how expensive the Federal Government actually is.

That changes the psyche of an entire culture. People that are always looking to the Federal Government for a solution begin to realize they are funding the Federal Government and they are part of the solution. They are bought into this.

Going for a national sales tax, a consumption tax, a fair tax, Mr. Speaker, does everything good that everyone else's tax policy does and more besides, and that is not just my words. Those are also the words of one famed chairman who has been the lead guru on economics here in America for a lot of years.

It fixes everything that you can fix with a tax policy. It fixes everybody, all the pieces that come along here, puts them all together and does more besides. It border adjust taxes and it provides incentive for savings and investment. It doubles our economy in 10 to 15 years. It repairs our balance of trade and puts it on a surplus of balance of trade, and this growing economy then, on top of that, Mr. Speaker, it solves our deficit, our deficit in our revenue that we have here, our deficit spending because, when the economy doubles, we are going to have a lot more dollars that come flowing in here.

We replace the payroll tax, the Social Security, the Medicare and the Medicaid, with a consumption tax portion. I advocate for a 23 percent embedded tax that is made of these components. I said I would get back to this.

Three percent of that 23 percent provides a rebate into everybody's household to untax everyone in America up to the poverty level. So let us say the poverty level is \$20,000 for a family of four, and I think the number is actually \$18,500 for a family of four. They would pay about \$458 in a month in taxes if they were going to consume to the level of their income. So this 3 percent goes into a fund, and immediately at the beginning of every month, it would do an automatic transfer into each household as registered by the Health and Human Services for the level of sales tax that that family would pay just up to the poverty level. So anybody that is living at the poverty level or below pays no tax, pays no national sales tax, but those that start

spending above that, above that \$18,500, they start then paying the sales tax on that until you get to someone like I presume Bill Gates would be a rather robust consumer, I do not know that, but if I were he, I would be a robust consumer. People of that kind of income will be the ones who will pay the highest percentage of tax off their income. This is progressive, but also, it untaxes the poor. The first 3 percent collected is the portion that goes in to untax everyone up to the poverty level, and then those of us who spend more than the poverty level will pay our fair share of taxes going on up. That is 3 percent.

Eight percent goes to replace the payroll tax, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, so that we no longer have to have that most regressive kind of a tax. That is a very regressive tax on especially the lower income people. There is no exemption for you if you are only making \$10,000 a year. You are going to take the .0765 percent times two, and that is 15.3 percent, multiply that by your \$10,000, and you are going to give up \$1,530 to the payroll tax even if you only make \$10,000 a year.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that is a 15 percent tax on some of the poorest people in America. We eliminate that tax and put it back on consumption. And by the way, when people max out on Social Security, the most wealthy people are paying at a lower rate on the payroll tax than the poor are among us. So payroll tax is a very regressive tax. We replace it with 8 percent. We untax everyone up to the poverty level with 3 percent, that is 11, and then to replace the income tax itself and be revenue neutral that takes a 12 percent embedded tax. That is how we get to 23.

This plan works. Every time I turn this rubrics cube around and look at it another way, it looks better and better and better, but my colleagues over here are content to stand here night after night, give us a list of lamentations on what is wrong with the President, the administration, the previous majority, the decisions that have been made here in this Congress over the last 15 years on trade. They argue that free trade is fine as long as it is fair trade, but I did not hear anyone advocate for any trade agreement that they ever agreed with. So that makes us trade isolationists unless they can come forward with some real changes.

Well, I will submit that I can support trade agreements. I can support them, Mr. Speaker, if we can have smart trade, but also, we need to have a more competitive environment for America's producers. That means pass the fair tax.

Also, a couple of years ago, I was sitting over in China. As I watched the negotiations go on and engaged in them, I saw the eyes of the negotiators on the other side of the Pacific Ocean, and I watched their smiles and I watched their heads nod. We were talking to them about the billions of dol-

lars of intellectual property that is pirated by the Chinese, and it is essentially a national standard. At least there is so much of it that goes on, there is not a punishment going on for it, this standard of stepping in and stealing our intellectual property as quick as it comes on the market.

We might have a Hollywood movie that comes out and before the premier, the DVD has been pirated by the Chinese and it is on the streets in its black market version, undercutting the intellectual property and the creativity of Hollywood. Those things happen.

The copyrights and also the patents and the trademarks, those 3 pieces of intellectual property are consistently and persistently and strategically pirated by the Chinese. The Russians, too, only the Russians just are not as good as it yet, and they are getting better.

As I listened to those negotiations and as we put pressure on them over there to bring criminal charges against those who are stealing U.S. intellectual property rights and selling Rolex watches, fake Rolex watches would be another example that brings to that mind's eye, Mr. Speaker. As we put pressure on them to bring criminal charges and civil charges, they said to us, well, we are fining people for stealing U.S. intellectual property and we are moving forward more aggressively to enforce. So I asked them for a report on those fines, and they gave me 150 pages. It was all in Chinese, Mr. Speaker, so I did not really have the ability to determine that except that, by their witness and their verbal presentation to me, they had levied some fines for X number of yuan, Chinese dollars, but we also know that a government-owned company, that if it is owned by the government and if the government fines that company, it is like me deciding I am going to fine myself and I will take a couple of dollars out of this pocket and put it over here in this pocket. Makes no difference to a Communist State and State-owned businesses if the State fines the company. The State is the company, and so those statements did not move me very much, Mr. Speaker.

Then I asked about criminal charges, and they said, yes, we have brought some criminal charges and we are getting more rugged with our enforcement. So I asked the point blank question: Who have you locked up in jail? Who is in jail today because you are stealing our intellectual property? And of course, the answer was, Mr. Speaker, well, we have not locked anybody up just yet, but we are moving forward to enforce.

Well, I came to the conclusion that the Chinese saw it as a price of doing business. The cost of doing business was to smile and nod and speak nice and make nice to Americans that are over there that want to alleviate the burden of the pirating of the U.S. intellectual property rights and that they will continue smiling and nodding and

hosting Americans as long as we are willing to come over there to complain, but nothing is going to happen. Nothing is ever going to happen unless we bring some leverage against them.

So I will submit a second solution for the folks over here and ask them: Do you care to weigh in on this? I would be happy to yield to you, and I hope you come to the floor at a later time, too, or we can get together and you can sign on to some of this legislation that actually provides solutions to the problems that you so articulately laid out here tonight.

But one of these solutions is this. Direct the U.S. Trade Representative to conduct a study to determine and evaluate the loss to American intellectual property rights holders to the Chinese for the pirating of those intellectual property rights. Once that amount is quantified, and Mr. Speaker, I can tell you it is in the billions, then direct the U.S. Trade Representative to levy a duty on all goods that come from China in an amount equivalent to be able to recover the complete loss that American property rights holders have sustained because of the piracy of their property rights and to distribute those proceeds back into the hands of the people that hold the copyrights, the trademarks and the other intellectual property rights.

That is another concrete solution that I would lay out here for the folks that come to the floor and talk about what is wrong but do not provide a solution and do not provide a way to fix things and turn them around and make them right, Mr. Speaker.

I did not necessarily come here tonight, though, to talk about the shortfalls of the presentation that was made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I came here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to talk about a great big issue that we have to face in this country.

As I stand here, this being the week beginning the 5th of March, it has been my understanding for some two to three weeks that the senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, was preparing to introduce a, I will put it in quotes, a "comprehensive" immigration bill sometime the week of the 5th of March. I am hopeful that that does not happen, at least coming out of him, the subcommittee chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary on the Senate side.

We saw what they did last year over in the Senate and actually passed, and it was an abysmal piece of policy, Mr. Speaker. Now they are winding up to try it again, same person or persons, same face, same philosophy. That same philosophy is amnesty first, enforcement maybe never.

I remember Senator KENNEDY standing out here on the Mall just on the West side of our West portico when we had demonstrators by the tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands last spring. He said to them, and these demonstrators, many were not lawfully present in the United States, one can presume I

think accurately, and he said to them, some say report to be deported; I say to you, report to become an American citizen.

That was the clarion call of the left wing liberals and the voice of Senator KENNEDY calling for people, come to America, come here illegally and when you are here, we are going to pave the way for a path to citizenship for you and hand over to you all the benefits of American citizenship.

Well, I say to Senator KENNEDY, if your mantra is amnesty, those of you who stand on amnesty, you deserve to be branded with the scarlet letter A for amnesty and treated as such because amnesty undermines the rule of law in this country.

These are some pillars of America that are essential for us in order to be able to sustain ourselves and sustain ourselves into the future. In order to identify those pillars of American civilization, we need to look back and identify what has been some of the roots of American exceptionalism. Why are we an exceptional Nation with such a dynamic economy? Why have we been so robust as a people?

There are a number of reasons, but one I would point out is that because we have brought in immigrants from all over the globe, because it was difficult to get here, because many of them had to sell themselves for seven years to pay off their passage to the United States, to work off the cost of that ride aboard ship across from Western Europe, for example, the people that had that sense of a dream, the sense of wanting to come here to realize their American dream, to raise their families here, they also had that sense of adventuresomeness.

Within all of that, the dream, the industriousness, the creativity, the sense of adventure, that desire to join with us in our manifest destiny as we settled a continent in lightning speed, all of that was the vitality that came in with our immigration. We were able to skim the cream off of the crop in Nation after Nation after Nation. Donor Nations gave up a measure of their most vital population because they came here so they could spread their wings and they could excel.

□ 2215

That is one of the pillars of American exceptionalism. Without belaboring that point very much any more, another pillar of American exceptionalism has been the foundation of our Constitution, which is drafted based upon the principles that you will find in the Declaration. And in the Constitution are our basic rights, freedom of speech, press, religion, assembly, and the second amendment rights, the right to keep and bear arms, and what used to be in our fifth amendment, the right to property, which says, "nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

But now after the Keloe decision, it says, "nor shall private property be

taken without just compensation," the for public use words have been eliminated from the fifth amendment by the Supreme Court in the Keloe decision.

But up until that time, the sanctity of property rights rode right along with the sanctity of our first amendment rights, and we have done a good job of defending our second amendment rights. Throughout this is the vitality of America, because we have individual rights that are guaranteed, and they are passed down from God to each one of us. Then the individuals, we the people, then hand that responsibility over to our elected representatives to represent us in places like this House of Representatives.

But we have guaranteed rights, and those guaranteed rights and the rights of due process and to be protected from discrimination in a court of law have given us a sense of justice and a sense of the rule of law that gives every American, every American citizen and those who aspire to be American citizens, solid ground on which to stand, confidence that it is predictable into their future so that they can invest capital, borrow money against their property, be able to pay off the mortgage, be able to reach for the stars and dream, create and become an entrepreneur, be one of those people that really makes a big difference and realize their fortune and their dreams. These are some of the foundations of American exceptionalism, but the rule of law is a foundation for it.

If we grant amnesty to people who broke the law to come here, then we have undermined the rule of law. If we undermine the rule of law, we don't have the culture for a strong America any longer. We have lost a pillar for what makes us great.

So to reward law breakers does exactly that. As I listen to people that come in and testify in the immigration subcommittee meeting, I will often hear people; there will be those that come in and say, well, I was a beneficiary of the amnesty in 1986. I came in illegally when Ronald Reagan signed the amnesty bill; there was supposed to be some say as low as 300,000 that would get amnesty. I recall about 1 million, but we know that went over 3 million who received amnesty because the fraud was so rampant.

The document forgers kicked into high gear. For everyone that got a designed amnesty in a legal fashion, there were others who by hook and crook got their amnesty. But all of them are for amnesty today if they happen to be alive and still in this country, and so are their families and their friends for amnesty. They say, well, it is not a hard thing to figure out. It was good for my dad or my mother or my brother or my uncle. Look, they are here in America, and they are doing well.

Why shouldn't we give amnesty to other people, because it has been good to us. Now that is a very simple equation and not a very rational thought

process but, for every one we grant amnesty to, there will be several who will say, I think that is a good idea because my friend or my relation thought amnesty was a good idea.

If this becomes amnesty for 12 million or 15 million or for 20 million or more, and they bring in their extended families at the tune of maybe as many as 273 for every anchor baby that comes into the United States, we won't just have 12 or 15 or 20 or more million who have no respect and, in fact, contempt for the rule of law; we will have 100 or more million that will have contempt for the rule of law.

That then would utterly destroy the rule of law in America. We would go back to a third world kind of country where the rule of law doesn't work down south in places like Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Colombia. It is the rule of who has the power and who has the guns.

I see that my friend and colleague from Texas, the wonderful doctor, whom I seek his counsel quite often, especially on these technical issues, has arrived on the floor. I would be happy to yield as much time as the doctor from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), would consume.

Mr. BURGESS. I would thank the gentleman for yielding. Certainly, I was sitting in my office and watching you, watching your discussion with the American people tonight. I am always so grateful that you take the amount of time that you do to come to the floor and explain things to people in simple commonsense language that the average person can understand. I heard your discussion, of course, on fundamental tax reform. As you know, I am committed also to fundamental tax reform.

I knew that you wouldn't want your good friend Steve Forbes to think that you had forgotten all of the good things he had told us in a meeting about his flat tax. So I just wanted to remind the Members of Congress that in addition to H.R. 25, which deals with a consumption tax, there is also another approach to fundamental tax reform, which is H.R. 1040, what a clever number and scheme that is, which is the resurrection, if you will, of the flat tax that was previously espoused and popularized by former majority leader Dick Armey, and, of course, the subject of the ever popular book by Steve Forbes, the "Flat Tax Revolution."

I am not sure how many weeks it has been on the bestseller list, but it certainly should have stayed on there for weeks at a time.

This really meets the criteria, meets the test that was set forth by the President at the start of his second term for a simple, fair, pro-growth tax. The flat tax almost immediately eliminates the marriage penalty. It repeals the death tax. It abolishes the alternative minimum tax. If there was ever a time to consider the abolishment of the alternative minimum tax, it is today with more and more middle class

people being pulled into that type of unfair taxation. It eliminates multiple taxation of investment income, and it allows for immediate expensing of business equipment.

This bill, H.R. 1040, which is a voluntary election for a flat tax, it is not a requirement. If someone has constructed their time and their talents and their financial portfolio towards compliance with the IRS code, God bless them, my hat is off to them. But if they would rather take a more fundamentally sane approach to their family's finances, to their business's finances, and wish to elect a flat tax system, this should be available to them.

My concern is that we don't trust the American people enough, that if we gave them the opportunity to coexist with the IRS code as it exists today, it is completely unintelligible and not understandable by anyone with any level of education, or we gave them the opportunity to elect into a simple flat tax that they would choose to do so.

In fact, the gentleman from Iowa is quite aware that, since November, the elections in November, we have heard a lot of discussion from the other side of the aisle about the so-called tax gap, the tax gap being that \$350 billion which is assessed by the IRS but never collected.

Well, what are the reasons it is not collected? To be sure, there is some fundamental dishonesty that exists in some people. But some people just look at the IRS code and say it is too complicated, I am going to ignore it and hope it goes away, I am not going to deal with this, and they are caught, and they are punished.

It is a shame that has to happen. If they were allowed the option of having a simple pro-growth system, such as the fair tax, such as the flat tax, I think the American people would be all the richer for it.

I just want to point out one passage in Mr. Forbes's book, which does not deal so much with the bill that I introduced, and I know it is going to surprise the gentleman from Iowa to hear that, but in 1989, a Senator requested a revenue forecast from Congress's Joint Committee on Taxation, on a hypothetical tax increase, raising the top rate to 100 percent. There is a flat tax, 100 percent on incomes over \$200,000. The Joint Committee on Taxation responded by forecasting increased revenues of \$204 billion in 1990, \$299 billion in 1993. Incredibly, the Joint Committee on Taxation failed to recognize or at least assume that people would continue to work and work hard even if every penny of their income was taken away in income taxes.

I suggest that that indicates a departure and a divorce from reality that the Joint Committee on Taxation has, and it is for that reason that it is incumbent upon us to introduce measures that are, again, commonsense, straightforward measures that the American people can understand and get behind.

I notice that the speaker from Iowa had gone on from talking about taxation to talking about issues dealing with immigration. I will just say that we have had a lot of discussion in this Congress since Congress convened in January about the 9/11 recommendations or the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission from a couple of years ago.

To me, the two most important recommendations of the 9/11 Commission that have yet to be enacted, one was quite simply to build stable democracies in Middle East. I think we are doing that. We receive a lot of criticism for doing that, but that is one of the fundamental steps we must take in order to achieve stability worldwide and ultimately gain control in the global war on terror.

But the other concept, and it is so simple that it astounds me that it hasn't been taken up yet, and that is simply to secure the border. Both north and south, our American borders are not secure. They need to be secure; we deserve secure borders. The American people deserve secure borders after the ravages of 9/11, and I think that was a sensible recommendation the 9/11 Commission has made. I frankly do not understand why the House leadership has not taken that up with the seriousness it deserves.

With that, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa and the Speaker for his indulgence.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In reclaiming my time, I thank the tenacious Texan for coming to the floor. He knows how much I revere Steve Forbes and Steve Forbes' financial acumen, as well as Alan Greenspan's. Perhaps on this subject matter it is one versus the other.

I also notice the gentleman from Texas, however compelling the argument, didn't present a list of things that his tax policy does better than the tax policy I advocate. But I think we both recognize that either is far better than what we are dealing with today.

There is nothing coming out of the other side of the aisle, particularly from the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, except, well, we are going to figure out some ways to raise some of these existing taxes and maintain the convolutions that are within them. That is what we have to look forward to.

The stock market last week had its worst single week in 4 years. I don't think its coincidental that the tax increases that this have come out of this Congress, the Pelosi Congress, and the noises coming out of the Ways and Means Committee, particularly the Chair, have added instability to our New York stock exchange and all of our financial markets. Once the inertia of this continues, we might find ourselves in a significantly poorer situation and not very far from now.

I, also, on the immigration issue, there were some statistics that I had made a promise that I would unfold here and send this message out, and

that is that we are faced with a tremendous amount of loss here in America in the lives of Americans because we are not enforcing at our border.

As the gentleman from Texas said, we need to first stop the bleeding at the border and get that under control. We need to push all traffic, both, all products, all contraband, all human traffic, through the ports of entry. We need to beef up our ports of entry.

You know, as I was sitting in an immigration hearing a couple or 3 years ago, I began to listen to the testimony about how many people died in the Arizona desert in a year.

It is a significant number then; it was about 250. Now, I think it is 400. That is sad, and it is tragic, but I, again, wonder, the 11,000 a night that sneak into the United States across our southern border, I sat down there by the fence in the dark and had the infiltration going around on either side of me, and that 11,000 a night is calculated by this Border Patrol agent who testified they stop between a fourth and a third.

And they stop 1,188,000 last year. If you do the math on that, that shows about 4 million a year get into the United States, and out of that 4 million, that works out to be about 11,000 a night.

I would expect there is someone around here that knows the size of Santa Ana's Army when he came across the river. But me being a Yankee, I have to guess at it. I think it was about 6,000 strong. It was then that when they attacked the Alamo at San Antonio. But if it was 6,000 strong or less than that when they attacked the Alamo, I would just suggest that twice the size of Santa Ana's army comes across the border every single night.

They may not be in uniforms, and they may not be marching in orderly ranks, and they may not be all of them armed, but they are carrying with them \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming into the United States, \$65 billion.

□ 2230

And we are spending \$8 billion a year on our southern border. And out of that \$8 billion, that is \$4 million a mile, and we are getting some kind of efficiency rating of our dollars of maybe 25 percent of enforcement, and often I hear a 10 percent number from the Border Patrol people that are down there.

So what is the price to America? \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs that comes out of the pockets of Americans. And the price in lives? The question that I ask and commissioned the GAO study for was, How many Americans die at the hands of those who do get across the border? And that number came out, not quite apples to apples and I had to do a calculation or two off of other government studies to match up with the GAO study from April of 2005, and it works out to be this: of the inmates in our Federal and State penitentiaries, 28 percent are criminal

aliens. And I am going to presume that if we had enforced our laws, none of them would have been in the United States.

So if you take 28 percent and you calculate that across the murders that we have in America, and that is about 16,000, a little over that, you will end up with a number 28 percent of that is 4,518 murder victims in the United States at the hands of those who are criminal aliens in the United States. You add to that the victims of negligent homicide, most of them drunk driving victims, and that is going to run 28 percent of those, that comes out to 4,746, Mr. Speaker. So you add those two together, that is 9,264 lives in America die violently every year at the hands of criminal aliens, presumably who would not be in the United States had we aggressively enforced our laws.

That is a shocking and astonishing number. It is three times the amount of victims that we had on September 11, and that is an annual number every single year.

Now, what does it cost us in dollars? Incarceration costs alone of the 267,000 illegal aliens that we have locked up in our prisons that we can count, and many of them we don't know, but we know we can count 267,000 and they will cost us in incarceration costs \$6.7 billion just to lock them up.

So we are spending \$8 billion on the border on our Border Patrol for maybe 25 percent efficiency; we are spending \$6.7 billion to lock up the criminal aliens and hold them in our prisons. And then, on top of that, the cost to murder victims, and that number has been calculated by government numbers at \$3.9 million per murder victim. That comes out to be \$17.05 billion in the cost of murder victims in dollars. And those victims of negligent homicide, I have measured that a little bit smaller at two-thirds of that overall cost of the murder victim because the investigations don't go so far. That comes to \$11.37 billion.

So I add these numbers up: Incarceration costs, \$6.7 billion; the value of lost productivity in lives of murder victims, \$17.05 billion; the value in lost productivity in lives at negligent homicide victims, \$11.37 billion. It comes up to \$35.12 billion out-of-pocket costs out of the United States just for those who were killed and to lock up those who kill. That does not include rape victims, assault victims, grand larceny and theft victims. That list goes on and on and on.

Sex victims is another one. We have identified about 240,000 sex criminals who are criminal aliens. And of those, they have at least four identifiable victims. So you do the math on that. It is just a few short of 1 million victims of sex crimes, and many of those are sex crimes where there is a murder involved as well.

The price to this society is unbelievable. It has only begun to be quantified. But to put it in a context, it works like this: \$65 billion worth of il-

legal drugs is costing our economy \$35 billion-plus a year, just the victims of murder, negligent homicide, and to lock up those who do the same, \$35 billion.

The value of the entire oil industry of Mexico is \$28 billion. We pay more for murder victims and negligent homicide victims here in the United States and plus locking them up than all of the oil revenue of a pretty good oil-producing country the size of Mexico.

And then, additionally, another \$8 billion a year just to guard our southern border. And on top of that, there will be a report coming out very soon, if it is not out already, that shows that remittances is a term they use. This is a transfer of wages from mostly immigrants here in the United States, some illegal, some legal, out of the United States. That number has been going up incrementally year by year, and last year it was \$45 billion a year that was transferred out of the United States in remittances, or usually wire transfers, back to home countries.

This report that is due to come out if it is not out now will show \$60 billion transferred in the last year, \$30 billion of it going to Mexico, \$30 billion of it going to other places in the western hemisphere, but usually the lion's share of that goes into Central America and the Caribbean.

So when you look at the dollars transferred out of our society, \$60 billion being sent out by labor, \$65 billion paying for illegal drugs, \$35 billion to pay for the cost of violent death, and \$8 billion to guard the border, you can see, I think, Mr. Speaker, how massive this burden is here for the taxpayers and the victims of crime here in the United States.

And one thing that I have always wondered about crime victims is that if society really paid that whole cost, if we had to write the check for the \$35 billion or so that it costs for victims, the violent death in America at the hands of criminal aliens, if we had to write the check for that, the taxpayers would be outraged if it were a line item on an appropriations bill here in the United States Congress.

But, instead, it isn't quite like that. There are costs picked up by the taxpayers, investigations, prosecutions, incarcerations. We pick those up. But the real costs comes out of the lives of the people who are their victims in great huge whopping chunks of their lives, their future, for their families, their productivity, and leaves a hole that can never be healed again.

That is the burden that is all of this, and the injustice of it comes from the psychology that the State is the one that is wronged and the crime victim is made whole when the State believes that they are whole. And the crime victim in this country by our process is seldom made whole, and as a matter of fact, maybe is never made whole.

So we have a big problem here in America. But sometimes there are faces that need to be identified, too,

Mr. Speaker, and so I have gathered up some of the faces of these perpetrators. When I stand here and say 9,264 violent deaths in America, that is kind of faceless. I would point out, too, though, that maybe people were skeptical of my numbers. Maybe they think that those numbers are too high. I would ask, what are your numbers? Produce those.

But here is another way of looking at it. Violent death in America is 4.28 out of every 100,000 people. Violent death in Mexico is 13.2 out of every 100,000. That is a good, solid three times the violent death rate in Mexico as it is the United States.

Now, Mexico happens to be one of the more peaceful countries south of us. If you go to Honduras, their violent death rate is nine times that of the United States. And I don't know what El Salvador's is, they don't publish that. But when you get to Colombia, their violent death rate is 15.4 times the violent death rate of the United States. And, on top of that, the people that are coming in from those countries are young men. Young men will commit more than twice as many violent crimes as any other demographic group, in fact, significantly more than that.

And they are coming from countries that are more violent, and they are bringing drugs from those countries to the tune of \$65 billion. So there is crime and violence associated with the drugs; there is crime and violence associated with young men. There are young men coming from countries that are far more violent than in the United States. And when you sit down and do the math and calculate out, if you were going to predict the crime results here in America, you would find, Mr. Speaker, that the 28 percent that are incarcerated in our prisons today that are criminal aliens probably don't represent the overall crime impact on the United States society.

But to personalize this a little bit, I have brought a few of the faces of these evil perpetrators down here to the floor. This, being one of the more evil. This is the face of Santos Cabrera Borjas. He is a 22-year-old, was a 22-year-old illegal alien from Honduras, that country that has got nine times the violent death rate of the United States. They can live with a lot higher level of violence.

Here is the kind of violence you get with one of these people. On June 4, 2006, Borjas murdered an innocent 9-year-old boy named Jordin Paudler of Georgia by hacking him to death with a hatchet. Borjas was in a car that was driving through the neighborhood, it had a wobbly wheel, and this young 9-year-old boy Jordin Paudler called out to the car and said, You have got a bad wheel on your car, being helpful, like young boys will do, like a lot of good Americans are. And Santos Cabrera Borjas got out of the car and attacked this young 9-year-old boy with a hatchet and twice split his forehead with a hatchet and left it in, as I understand it, all because he tried to help.

This is an example, and I will bring many of these examples to the floor as time unfolds, Mr. Speaker, and this is one of the faces of evil. There are many, many faces of evil. We have a big debate in front of us. I thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 6 on account of official business.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 6 on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today through March 8 on account of official business.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a family medical matter.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 6 on account of official business.

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. LATOURETTE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and March 6 on account of attending a funeral.

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

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. CARNAHAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CARNAHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and March 6 and 7.

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, March 6.

Mr. AKIN, for 5 minutes, March 6.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, March 6.

Mr. SALI, for 5 minutes, March 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and March 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, March 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 7.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, 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 10 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 2007, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

680. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [COTP San Francisco Bay 06-020] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

681. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Evergreen Point Bridge, Lake Washington, Washington [CGD13-06-029] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

682. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; USAV CANEY, Port of Ponce, Puerto Rico, United States [COTP San Juan 06-087] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

683. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Captain of the Port Sault Ste. Marie Zone, Cheboygan River, Cheboygan, MI [CGD09-06-045] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

684. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Dogue Creek, Fairfax County, Virginia [CGD05-06-090] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

685. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Pier 66, Seattle, Washington [CGD13-06-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

686. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; St. John's River, Jacksonville, FL to Ribault Bay [COTP Jacksonville 06-045] (RIN: 1625-

AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

687. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Waters Surrounding U.S. Forces Vessel SBX-1, H1 [COTP Honolulu 06-004] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

688. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone Regulation; Naples Beach, FL [COTP St. Petersburg 06-043] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

689. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; San Francisco Bay, CA [COTP San Francisco Bay 06-010] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

690. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; St. John's River, Jacksonville, FL [COTP Jacksonville 06-058] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

691. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30529; Amdt. No. 465] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

692. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30523; Amdt. No. 464] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

693. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30524; Amdt. No. 3195] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

694. 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. 30521; Amdt. No. 3192] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

695. 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. 30525; Amdt. No. 3196] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

696. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30526; Amdt. No. 3197] received February 27,