

zero—illegal immigration. If immigrants who have been living in our country illegally want to become tax-paying American citizens, they need to pass a background check, pay extra taxes, work towards citizenship, learn English, register.

We need immigration reform that is both principled and pragmatic. We in this country have the right to decide who lives in our country and who doesn't, but we haven't been exercising that right. We've been allowing millions of people to live here without knowing who they are or what they are doing. Yet we continue to refuse to take action, and we do so at our own peril.

Yes, we should hear very clearly from Arizona and from other States that they are demanding action of the Federal Government. There is no good solution for a county or a State. I sympathize with our cities, our counties, and our States which are dealing with the failure of a Federal policy to protect our borders—Federal policies that undermine the rule of law and our national sovereignty, but it falls to the United States Congress to act to fix our broken immigration laws. People should not be able to cross the borders or to overstay their visas without permission, and businesses should not be able to exploit cheap labor off the books, undermining jobs for American citizens.

We in Congress have a unique opportunity now to take action. The American people are tired of excuses. They are tired of demagoguery. They want a solution that works and that ensures that we will have zero illegal immigrants in a year and in 10 years and in 20 years rather than seeing an increase from 10 or 12 million to 20 million or to 25 million or to 30 million.

What does "national sovereignty" mean if you don't even know who is within your borders or what they're doing or whether they're criminals? Why are we putting over 300,000 of them up at expensive hotels at over \$100 a day at taxpayer expense? Is that part of the solution?

□ 2015

It doesn't sound like part of the solution that the people of Arizona want. It doesn't sound like part of the solution that the American people want. Obey our laws, learn English, pay taxes, and welcome to America. We need to replace a broken system with one that works.

I call upon my colleagues in this Chamber and in the United States Senate on both sides of the aisle to stop playing political games with an issue that the American people are crying out for a solution on and to act and bring forward a real solution along the lines of the proposal that was introduced in the Senate today, along the lines of the House comprehensive immigration reform bill to demand that Congress move towards fixing this problem, restoring security to our bor-

ders, sovereignty to our Nation, preventing the undermining of the rule of law that this Nation was built upon, and strengthening our economy and providing jobs for American families.

Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleagues join me in moving forward immediately on comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken laws and replace it with a system that works and is enforced.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to be recognized by you to address the floor tonight.

I am standing here trying to decide whether I want to support or rebut the statements from the gentleman from Colorado. I support a good number of the statements that he has made, and I may well try to rebut some of the other statements that he has made.

But the statement "replace a broken system with one that works," it's an interesting comment. I think it's clear that our immigration system is not working. Well, let me say that the system doesn't work, but I am not certain that the laws are incorrect. And that's the point that I would make is that I roll back to 1986 when Ronald Reagan was straight-up honest and failed me when he signed the amnesty bill of 1986. And the intent was that about a million people would be granted a path to citizenship and that would be it, it would be the end, and there would never be another immigration bill ever as long as any of us lived, and we would preserve the rule of law, and we'd learn to respect the rule of law, but we would allow for the million or so that were here illegally to have their path to citizenship in order to put this away, package it up, and be able to move on.

Well, it wasn't 1 million. It was closer to 3 million people, and there was fraud and there was corruption and there were counterfeit documents that were used that was part of that tripling. We might not have counted it right. It might have been more than a million. It might have been 1½ million. It was unlikely to be 2 million. But it turned out to be 3 million because people were gaming the system.

In my particular office, I took applications in and I made sure they filled out their I-9 forms, and I took copies of their documents and made sure my files were complete and considered their applications because I was sure that INS would be into my office to go through my books and make sure that I followed the law because it was going to be enforced by this newly robust Federal Government. That was the commitment. Amnesty now, enforcement forever, never amnesty again.

That was 1986. And here we are all these years later, 24 years later, and we have had by each succeeding administration—I'm not particularly happy with the enforcement we saw in the Reagan administration, and I was less happy with the enforcement that I saw in Bush 41 and less happy with what I saw under Bill Clinton and less happy with what I saw under George W. Bush, and I'm less happy with what I've seen under President Obama. Less and less effective enforcement.

And they do find a way to put together the data so that they can point to their enforcement and allege that in this particular administration, the enforcement against employers appears to be marginally stronger than it was under George Bush, but the enforcement against illegal workers is significantly less than it was under George Bush, and I wasn't happy with what George Bush did.

So is the system broken? I think the enforcement of the system is broken, Madam Speaker. I think that we have had a succession of Presidents who didn't demonstrate the will to enforce our immigration law, and because of that, there has been a growing disrespect for our immigration law. And even people that respect the law have seen that their competition who would hire illegals have a comparative advantage against them if they are going to adhere to the intent of the law. So the competition pushes other employers to violate the intent and the rule of law sometimes and hire the illegals to give them that comparative advantage against their competition. And slowly the respect for the rule of law and their adherence and compliance with the law has been diminished in this country to the point where I have people in my neighborhood that will say, Well, if you don't think I should hire an illegal, then who is going to fix my leaky roof? Who's going to paint my house? Who's going to do these other things?

That's not my job, Madam Speaker. My job is to stand up for the rule of law. And, yes, if I think there are laws that are unjust, then I should join with my colleagues and we should find a way to change them.

I don't happen to believe that our immigration laws today are unjust. I believe they are unenforced. And I think they are founded on good and just rule of law foundation.

Not having the documents in front of me, but I will reach into it a little bit. I've seen some documents that illustrated the laws that Mexico has with regard to their immigration laws, which are if ours are considered Draconian, theirs, in fact, are Draconian. And President Calderon has been arguing against Arizona law while he is enforcing more Draconian laws in the nation of Mexico against people who would come into their southern border. Crossing the border illegally is a felony, punishable up to 2 years in the penitentiary. That's one of the examples that we have.

So I would, Madam Speaker, just remind the American people that we have grounded these laws in just and rational cause. And now Arizona has seen that the Federal Government has been unwilling to enforce the laws, and they are watching a crime rate that, if you look at the data over the last 10 years, has increased in almost every category over the last 10 years. In order to be objective, not probably to the extent that has been articulated by many of the pundits, but it has been a gradual and significant increase in the crime rates in Arizona in the areas of murder and rape, violent crime, and certainly about the only thing, except illegal border crossings, which have diminished marginally over the last couple of years.

And a year ago last August, there was a report that there were as many as 1½ million that have been in the United States illegally that reversed their travels and voluntarily deported themselves back to Mexico and points south. Most of that is attributable to the decline in the economy rather than the increase in enforcement.

But it doesn't mean that there has been a diminishment of illegal drugs coming across the border or a diminishment in illegal activity along the border. In fact, those numbers are up. The violence numbers are up. The illegal drugs are up. The contraband crossing the borders are up. And the numbers of just individual illegal people by interdiction data that's delivered to us by Janet Napolitano, the Secretary of Homeland Security, are marginally down.

Now, it may or may not be that there are more illegal border crossings. It might well be that they are just simply interdicting fewer coming across the border and there is less enforcement. Although I do believe that there are marginally fewer illegal border crossings but more illegal drugs, more violence, more kidnappings. The State of Arizona has the highest kidnap rate in the Nation. In fact, some of the cities there have the highest or second highest kidnap rate in the world. That's because of the drugs and it's because of the cartels that are doing business in that area.

So Arizona passed a law, and this law does a number of things. It sets up a situation where law enforcement—it requires all of the political subdivisions in Arizona, the counties, the cities, the other political subdivisions, and the State, to enforce Federal immigration law. It sets it up so that an individual has standing to sue the political subdivision, local government, if they fail to enforce immigration law. And it provides for reasonable suspicion for a law enforcement officer to pick up an individual that's out in public if they reasonably suspect that that individual is unlawfully present in the United States. Those are good things, and they are all that I have described within the parameters of existing Federal law today.

The argument that has been made and the demonstrations that are queued up for May 1, and that will be this coming Saturday, they are trying to establish demonstrations all over America of people rising up to demonstrate against Arizona's immigration law. Well, look at what has happened. The Federal Government hasn't enforced immigration law.

I would say that our immigration laws are true and just and right altogether. And our problem is not because our laws are wrong. Our problem is not because we need to replace broken laws. It's that we need to take this system that—"broken" is not the right word for it, I would say to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS). I think instead it's a system that is not being utilized because we lack the will to enforce immigration law in the United States. And that will has been diminishing over the years. The greater the number of illegals, the more people get to know their neighbors that may be in the United States illegally. They don't see that when you contribute to or allow or tolerate people who are unlawfully present in the United States in your neighborhood, when you hire them, you're contributing to the problem. People don't see that.

They just understand that we're all God's children. They like the people that came in. They see that they work hard, and so, therefore, they become their advocates. It's a natural thing to happen. But at the same time, while our laws are being broken and our laws are being disrespected, there's an undermining of the American system.

There's a reason that the people want to come to the United States. There isn't a country in the world where there aren't significant numbers of people that don't want to become Americans. And the reasons for that fall into a lot of categories, but one of them is we have respect for the rule of law. Our traditions honor the rule of law. Lady Justice is blind. When you think of the image of Lady Justice standing there blindfolded with the scales of justice balanced, without consideration for race, creed, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, or disability. That's the American creed.

We have equal justice for all, and justice is blind with regard to those characteristics. So people want to come here. They want to come to the United States from countries, countries that do not have that tradition of honoring the rule of law. They want to come to the United States from countries that have a corrupt tradition where you have to pay to play and it's who you know and how you pay them off or you curl up and you try to avoid the scrutiny of government and interactivity with the government agencies.

Here in this country, we're straight up, open, and honest, and, for the most part, moral and ethical, and we respect the law. But if we grant amnesty to 12 or 20 or more million people because

it's described as an insurmountable problem, that the argument that's often made that we can't deport 12 or 20 million people, in fact, we could. We could do that. It's not logistically impossible to do so.

I went over to London a little over a year ago to deal with the immigration issue over there. And I listened to them talk about the numbers of illegals that they have, and I have forgotten the exact number, but let's just say that we are in that 12 to 20 million category, and population ratio-wise, they are down in that 1½ million category, perhaps, of illegals in England. And what is their argument? You can't deport 1½ million people. It's too many. It's an impossible thing logistically.

Well, interestingly we're here with 12 to 20 million. We're making the same argument. Well, then, how many could we deport? If it's not 20 million and it's not 12 million and the British say they can't deport 1½ million, could we deport 1½ million if we chose to do that, or is it 1 million or ½ million or 100,000 or 10,000 or one? What is our capability logistically to deport people that are in the United States illegally?

And I will suggest that it's in direct proportion to our resources and our will to enforce the law. Our problem is not that we can't do so logistically. Our problem is we lack the will to do so from a moral standard because we're listening to both sides of this argument. The argument that people are here, that they just want to work. They want to earn for their families. And for the most part, that's true. And we disregard the argument that is this point that I need to make, Madam Speaker, and that is that 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in the United States of America come from or through Mexico, 90 percent. It's a consistent number that comes from the Drug Enforcement Agency, and it's been consistent throughout several years.

□ 2030

And the illegal drug distribution chains in America, magically, and this is a Drug Enforcement Agency response, magically if every one of the people that are in the United States illegally, magically tomorrow morning woke up in their home country where they were legal to live and reside, if that happened by magic wand overnight, there is at least one link in every illegal drug distribution chain in America that would be severed because at least one link has an illegal alien that's part of that drug distribution chain.

And so if it was in our endeavor to shut off the illegal drug distribution in America, we would simply make sure we enforced our immigration laws. And that would be a very temporary fix, and it might only last for hours or days, not much longer than weeks and perhaps not months, but it would sever the distribution of all illegal drugs in America, however temporarily that might be.

So when we look at what happens when we have 12 to 20 or more million illegals in America, what are the effects on our society? First, they are delivering 90 percent of the drugs from or through Mexico. And some of them at least touch the delivery of every illegal drug that's delivered in the United States of America while that's going on.

What is accompanied by the illegal drug trade? Violence, murder, theft, rape, all of those things that go along with crime are wrapped up and associated with the illegal drug distribution. And the people that are illegally distributing drugs that are in the United States illegally are also, however inadvertently, the channel of their work is enabled by, and not always willfully, and sometimes even unknowingly, it's enabled by the illegal community in the United States. It becomes an underground railroad for illegal people and illegal drugs that are pouring through, from and through Mexico into the United States. And it is something that brings about a high amount of death and destruction and diminishment of human capital, human resources, and human potential. That's why we outlaw those illegal drugs in the first place.

It doesn't mean that all the people that are involved in that are willfully evil or willfully trying to undermine our society. It might be inadvertent. But they are part of the problem. And if we are to have the rule of law, we have to enforce the rule of law. And to imagine that when law enforcement comes in contact with people who are here illegally that we would be unwilling to put them back into the condition that they were in at the time they broke the law is unconscionable for a rule-of-law Nation to think such a thing.

Think in terms of this: if someone walks into the bank and robs the bank and would walk out of that bank with all of the loot, and we would interdict them with our law enforcement and decide, well, you really only want to provide for your family, so we are going to let you go on here because we don't have the will to stop you at this point. Or our immigration laws, simply deporting people is the equivalent of putting them back in the condition they were in before they broke the law. It's the equivalent of taking a bank robber and saying you don't get to keep the money, but we are going to take you out of the bank and set you outside the door and let you go. That's the equivalent of deportation.

It is we put people back in the condition they were in before they broke the law. It's like taking a bank robber out of the bank, not letting them keep the loot, and you set them outside the door and say, okay, go. You are free to go. It's as if you never broke our law. That's what deportation is. It is not Draconian. It is not harsh. It is not cruel and unusual punishment. It is de minimis that we can do if we are going

to enforce the law. And if we are not willing to put people back in the condition they were in before they broke our immigration law, then we cannot have enforcement of our immigration law whatsoever.

It doesn't work to set a standard of amnesty that's been advocated by President Bush, President Obama, by many of the leaders over here on the left side of the aisle that we should give people a path to citizenship, make them pay a fine, force them to learn English. That seems a little odd to me, how you force somebody to learn a language and require them to pay their back taxes. Those are the minimum standards for somebody who would come into the United States legally in the first place.

If you want to become an American citizen, get in line. Get in line in a foreign country. Don't jump the line. Don't jump the border. And when you do that, and you go take your citizenship test—first, you have to pass the test that asks the question what's the economic system of the United States of America? And the answer is free enterprise capitalism. That's a little heads up there, Madam Speaker, on that one.

But when people come into the United States legally, they are required to learn English. If they want to become a citizen, if they want to go through the naturalization process, they are required to learn English. They are required to demonstrate proficiency in English in both the written and the spoken word. They have to understand our history and understand those principles that made America great. And we are not going to naturalize somebody that didn't pay their back taxes.

And the idea of a fine for being in the United States illegally, and that's the only other condition that we would add, whether that would be pay a fee of \$1,500—I remember when it started out to be \$500. And then \$500 seemed like a pittance, so they raised it to \$1,000 and then \$1,500. And under the Bush administration we had the discussion and the argument that their position was, well, it's not amnesty if they have to pay a fine. Oh, really? If the fine is cheaper than what you have to pay a coyote to sneak into the United States is it really a fine? And does the fine replace the penalty that exists for violating Federal law? And I say no.

If you grant people the objective of their crime, it's amnesty. To grant amnesty is to pardon people for the violation of the law and grant them the objective of their crime. That's what amnesty is. And so if we are going to have amnesty, let's be honest about it, Madam Speaker. Let's ask the people in this Congress, the President of the United States, the executive branch of government, and the people in the United States Senate that are now crafting up legislation are you for or against amnesty. If they want to support amnesty, it's fine with me if they

will just admit that. And then we can have a debate as to what degree of amnesty they are going to advocate.

But it's offensive to the American people to hear United States Senators or Members of the House of Representatives, Congressmen and -women, or the President of the United States, or his spokesmen or -women, argue that amnesty isn't amnesty when we know very well what amnesty is. Pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crimes. That's amnesty.

President Reagan understood it. He admitted amnesty was amnesty. He signed the amnesty bill in 1986. Yes, he let me down, but he was honest about it. And we haven't been honest during the second half of the Bush administration, and we certainly aren't honest during the Obama administration, this first third or so of the Obama administration about amnesty or immigration.

And so here are my concerns, that 90 percent of the illegal drugs that are consumed in the United States come from or through Mexico. Of all the violence that pours forth from that, it costs American lives dozens and dozens, in fact by the hundreds, every year Americans that die at the hands of illegals that are here in the United States of America illegally. That's the definition. And if we would be effective in enforcing immigration law, those people who died at the hands who are here illegally would still be alive.

When the school bus wrecked in southwest Minnesota and we lost four or five young girls there because it was caused by an accident by an individual who had two or three times been interdicted by law enforcement in the United States but was turned loose again, those girls would be young women today. They would be alive today. And their parents know that. It happens over and over hundreds of times. In fact, it's happened thousands of times since we failed to enforce our immigration laws.

So what do we do? We put together the will to enforce our immigration laws. The American people rise up and make the argument that we are going to have the rule of law, that we are going to shut off all illegal traffic at the border. We are going to force all that traffic through the ports of entry.

It's been a little while since we have talked about the necessity of building a wall and a fence on the southern border. Someone said to me we can't build 2,000 miles of fence. Yes, we could. We could build 2,000 miles of triple fencing. We could put sensors on it. We could put lights on it. We could build roads in between. We could patrol it. We could enforce it. We can fix it so nobody gets through all that. Yes, we can. And for the people that will argue if you build a 20-foot fence I will show you a 21-foot ladder, that's got to be the silliest and the weakest and the most specious argument I have heard here on the floor of the United States Congress. I have heard the Secretary of

Homeland Security say build a 50-foot fence and I will show you a 51-foot ladder.

Madam Speaker, what in the world could that mean? All right, if you build a rocket that will fly to the Moon, I will show you a rocket that will fly a mile past the Moon. So what? What does that mean? They are not going to be building a 51-foot ladder. And if they do, we are going to be sitting there with our sensory devices, our roads, our monitoring, and we are going to make sure if they can get over that fence they don't get to the next one. And if they get over that one, we are going to make sure they don't get to the next one.

I have designed a concrete wall. And it is not the only barrier; it is not the only tool. And when those of us that talk about the necessity for extending the fence and the wall on the southern border and building double and tertiary fences and walls, the argument against it becomes this silly argument of well, that's not going to solve the problem.

None of us believe it's the total solution. None of us believe that building an effective wall and fence is the only thing we would do. It's among the effective things that we could do.

So, Madam Speaker, here are some things that the American people don't know. The President doesn't know. His actuaries don't know. The Speaker of the House doesn't know. HARRY REID, the majority leader in the Senate doesn't know. And the committee Chairs don't know. And I may well be the only one in the United States Congress that knows this. And, Madam Speaker, now the whole world is going to know. Here are the numbers. About 2006 we were spending \$8 billion on our southern border. Now we are spending about \$12 billion on our southern border. All together. These aren't numbers that come out of the administration except one piece at a time. And you have to add them up and calculate it out and calculate it back to the numbers of miles of border that we have. \$12 billion when you add up all of the expenses necessary for ICE that are operating down there near the border in that 20- to 40-mile, maybe 50-mile range of the border.

You have to pay the personnel, their health care package, their benefits package, their retirement funds, their equipment, their vehicles that they drive, guns, uniforms, all those things that they do. And you add to that Custom Border Protection, our CBP people, our Customs personnel, our Border Patrol personnel. And all of the forces that are there lined up that are part of that coordinated effort to defend the border are right in the area of \$12 billion. \$12 billion for 2,000 miles of border. That is \$6 million a mile, Madam Speaker.

Now, think of this. Most of us can think what a mile is. For me, I live on the corner on a gravel road in Iowa. And a lot of those corners you can stand out there in the middle of that

intersection and you can see a mile in each of four directions. It is not the case in mine, but I know how far a mile is. Most of us do.

Now, when I stand on my corner and I look to the west that full mile, a mile west, which is the clearest vision that I have, and I think would the Federal Government pay me—if that were the border, would the Federal Government pay me \$6 million to guard that border for that mile? Could I do that for \$6 million? Would I be willing to take on that contract and control that border for \$6 million for that mile? And that's the average for 2,000 miles. Some of it's barren and desolate. Would I be willing to do that, Madam Speaker, for \$6 million? You betcha. You betcha, to pick up on a phrase. I would do that for \$6 million a mile.

And, furthermore, I would be willing to guarantee nobody would get across that mile. I would guard it, I would protect it, I would hire the personnel necessary. And, in fact, rather than paying a lot of people that were boots on the ground, I would have some, and they would be in mobile vehicles, and we would have sensors, and we would have some lights, and we would have radios, and we would have warning devices and ground-based radar. We would do all that stuff.

□ 2045

But we would also build a fence and a wall as a barrier to slow that traffic down and make it hard enough that they wouldn't come through my mile at all. In fact, I would shut down all the traffic in that mile for \$6 million. And if you award me that contract, I would be willing to let you dock me from that contract. I would guarantee it. I would bond it. I would let you dock me. If they got across my mile, then subtract from my contract every illegal crosser that is there. Then you would put the incentives in place to actually succeed in what we're doing as opposed to just simply doing—it's not catch and release back into America anymore. It's catch and release at the port of entry and turn them back in to Mexico, and then they come back around with a smirk on their face. And I have watched them do that, Madam Speaker.

Another tool that we need to have is the New IDEA Act. New IDEA is legislation that I have introduced in the last three Congresses. The New IDEA stands for the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. That's the acronym, New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. It comes from this part. If you look around, across the agencies of the Federal Government and think about those agencies and how aggressively and how effectively they do their jobs, we have the Department of Homeland Security, which has really pledged that they're not going to deport illegal workers in America.

In fact, they picked up some illegal workers by accident in Boston some months ago back in December or Janu-

ary. They found out that they were illegal. They processed them. These workers were on their way up to Gillette Stadium in Boston. So ICE, after they processed them, hauled them up to work. They gave them chauffeured transportation up to their job to be groundskeepers at Gillette Stadium in Boston, a complete lack of focus on their job.

I mean, you talk about open borders. Jump across the border, come in here and sneak in and get yourself a job and have your documents being invalid, falsification, whatever it might be, misrepresents your status. And if we run across you by accident because our ICE people are out there doing what they do, we will take your fingerprints and your names, and then we'll give you a chauffeured ride on up to work at Gillette Stadium. That is bizarre. It is so far away from an understanding of what it takes to enforce the law.

I take us back to a time in the fifties when my father was a manager of the State police radio stations, and he also was the mayor of a small community. The local town cop came across an illegal who happened to be traveling through the community, and I don't know how they interdicted him, whether it was his license plate light that was out or whatever it was, but he was arrested. He was incarcerated. He was held up in the city jail, and they had to process him. And my father, as mayor, was the justice of the peace as well. There never was any consideration about turning him loose because it was too hard to enforce the law. The only thing that could come from that was the person that was illegally in the United States was going to go back to their home country. And by my recollection, that's what happened.

But the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act recognizes that the Department of Homeland Security hasn't shown a complete will to enforce immigration law. They have got good officers out in the field. They want to do so. They want to deliver on a mission and accomplish a mission statement. They want to accomplish their mission statement, but the lack of will from the White House down through the Secretary of Homeland Security prevents them from being as effective as they can be.

So there's your agency. Department of Homeland Security is not as effective as they can be, enforcing against employers because politically that's more palatable but refusing to enforce against illegal workers because they have decided that those illegal workers can be Democrats. I stand on that statement, Madam Speaker. They've decided those illegal workers can become Democrats, so they want to pander to them.

We've got the Social Security Administration that has a database that should be feeding information to the Department of Homeland Security. Whenever you have duplications of those Social Security numbers, you

can bet that as soon as the second one shows up, if it's outside the neighborhood in the driving range of the first one, that you have one illegal there at least that's working off of that Social Security number—and maybe both of them are illegal.

The Social Security Administration is willing to take the checks that come from the payroll taxes of those millions who are working illegally in America, paying their payroll taxes because it's withheld from their paycheck, but declaring the maximum number of dependents so that they pay Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, but not State and Federal income tax. The Social Security Administration's willing to take those checks from those illegal workers and not explore the duplications on those Social Security numbers because the money's going into the account which is being spent by this Congress but is kept in an accounting process in Parkersburg, West Virginia, in a filing cabinet. And bonds that are worth no more than this piece of paper was, a print on top of it. I happen to have one in my filing cabinet as well. \$3.54 billion in bonds in the Social Security account. It's an IOU from the government to the government. They put them in a filing cabinet in Parkersburg, West Virginia. But illegals pay into that out of proportion because they're not going to file a tax return. And so the dollars that are contributed on that Social Security number go into that filing cabinet along with those bonds.

And we have the Department of Homeland Security who is not willing to enforce the law to the extent that it must be against illegal workers. They may be willing to enforce the law in even an increasing degree over the Bush administration against employers who are hiring illegal workers. The Social Security Administration is cashing the checks of people who have fraudulently misrepresented their identity, and so neither agency has demonstrated the will to enforce the law.

So I brought this legislation called the New IDEA Act which clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible for Federal income tax purposes, and it establishes that there will be a cooperative working effort between Social Security, Homeland Security, and the IRS. The IRS, who has demonstrated they do have a desire to enforce the law, they have been vigorous in enforcing the law, and they would be very useful in stepping into the enforcement of illegal immigration law, and they happen to be in just exactly the right position to do so.

And so under my bill, should it become law—and in fact, my bill has been advocated by the Democrats in the Senate who are proposing immigration legislation, Senator SCHUMER and others. They didn't define the title of the bill, but they defined the bill within their talking points, so I can commend them for recognizing the need.

New IDEA, the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act, clarifies that wages

and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible for income tax purposes, and it directs the IRS to go in under the normal course of their audits, run the Social Security numbers of those employees through, which will show up on the tax forms, run them through the E-Verify program. E-Verify is the Internet-based program that can verify the identity of the employees. It identifies a person who can lawfully work in the United States, and it has a very, very high degree of success and accuracy.

So the IRS would come in in an audit, and they would audit corporation A, and say corporation A has 25 employees. Their Social Security numbers will be listed in their tax forms. They will punch those Social Security numbers in to E-Verify. If it comes back that they can lawfully work in the United States, fine. No problem. If it comes back that they can't verify, then the IRS can give the employer an opportunity to cure those records, to straighten them out and to correct them. But failure to correct those records then can be concluded by the IRS, under the New IDEA Act, the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act, the IRS can then deny the tax deductibility of the wages and benefits paid to the illegals.

When the IRS denies that, then those wages—let's just say that it's \$1 million worth of wages that are paid, are deducted as a business expense like you would deduct, oh, let's say, fuel or any of your overhead that you might have, input from produced products or whatever it might be. That business expense would be denied. And when it's denied, presumably, it goes over into the income column. So \$1 million worth of wages are denied as an expense because it was paid to illegals and denied by the IRS. It would go over here to the other column on the profit side.

And I did this calculation at 34 percent corporate income tax, and it might well be 35 percent today, and I think it's more accurate to say so. But at 34 percent, your \$10 an hour illegal, by the time you add interest and penalty and the 34 percent tax, becomes a \$16 an hour illegal. The IRS steps in then to enforce immigration law by denying the deductibility of wages and benefits paid to illegals, adding the interest and the penalty, and the \$10 an hour illegal becomes a \$16 an hour illegal. Employers will understand that instantly, and they will set about cleaning up their workforce, using E-Verify.

And, by the way, we give that employer safe harbor if he uses E-Verify, using E-Verify to clean up his workforce. And an employer that can't function with the illegal staff that he has may make the decision to incrementally transition over into legal employees over a period of time. Whatever it takes. It's not draconian. It isn't stark. It isn't something that shuts businesses down, but it is something that sets up an incentive for businesses to comply with our immigration law. Should they choose not to do that,

then they can pay the Federal Treasury the difference of \$10 an hour up to \$16 an hour.

We need to fix E-Verify, and we do in my bill. We set up E-Verify so that an employer can use E-Verify to verify the employability status of the applicant upon a bona fide job offer rather than having to hire the individual. Under current E-Verify law, you can't use E-Verify to determine if a job applicant can lawfully work in the United States. You can only do that after you actually hire them. So if you hire an individual, and you run their data through E-Verify and it comes back that they can't confirm that they can lawfully work in the United States, then you have to turn around and fire them.

And I'll take the position that American employers should not be compelled to hire illegals in order to find out that they're illegal. They should be able to say to the individual, Sam, John, Larry, Sally, whoever you are, I'm offering you this job, and the job that I'm offering you is contingent upon your data being approved through E-Verify. I will do that now if you're willing to accept this job. If they say yes, you run the data through. You've got, at a maximum, a 6-second delay to get this verification done. If they don't meet the test, you don't put them on the payroll. I think that it's immoral to hire people that are illegal, and I don't want to be compelled to do that because we've got a flaw in our E-Verify law.

So I appreciate the statement that Mr. POLIS from Colorado made that he's for zero illegal immigration. I don't know how you get to that unless you're willing to enforce the law. I think we need to force all traffic—legal and illegal—and all products—human and other products—through the ports of entry on our southern border. I think we need to go ahead and build a fence and a wall. And at the expense of \$6 million a mile, that's the maintenance of our border. What will it cost us to build a fence and how much will it cut in the cost to maintain the enforcement of that? If we can, for a couple million dollars a mile, build some very effective barriers, that means that we can cut down on the cost to the boots on the ground to enforce those sections and focus our boots on the ground that we have in the areas where we have trouble with enforcement. That's a logical thing to do.

Look around the world. Look at the barrier that they have in Israel, for example, where they had suicide bombers coming through over and over and over again. They built a barrier there, and it's set up to protect the Israelis from the people that would come and do them harm. Is it immoral for them to protect themselves from that kind of damage to their lives and to their limbs and to their treasure? I suggest it is not. And those that would argue that a wall on our border is comparable to the Berlin Wall just completely and intentionally and willfully miss the

most important point, and that is that a wall to keep people out is morally and fundamentally different than a wall to keep people in. The Berlin Wall was about keeping people in. You don't hear the same people argue against the Great Wall of China because they know the Great Wall of China was designed to keep people out, not in. We know that the barrier in Israel has worked. We know that our barriers on our southern border where we have them have worked.

We have tertiary fencing down there in San Luis, Arizona, that is, as near as I can determine, that section of fence—however short it is—it's three layers of fencing. As near as I can determine, it has not been defeated by anyone. It's easier to go around the end than it is to go over, around, under, or through. I don't suggest we build 2,000 miles of wall and fencing with sensors and monitoring and patrol roads. Madam Speaker, I suggest that we simply build a fence and build a wall until they quit going around the end. If we do that, it may take 2,000 miles. It may not. We may just be building the 784 miles that are required by the Secure Fence Act. We would need to have a smart immigration policy.

And here we are, down into the depths of this downward spiral of our economy, this economy that's been referred to a good number of times as the "great recession." And we're talking about, what, granting amnesty to people, perhaps moving pieces of legislation through this Congress that would legalize 12 million to 20 million people in an economic environment where we have 15.4 million unemployed Americans that fit the category, that fit the definition, another 5 million to 6 million Americans who no longer fit the definition for unemployment because they quit trying. So we have over 20 million Americans that are looking for work or should be looking for work or have given up, and we have at least 8 million illegals that are working in the United States, taking up jobs that Americans could and should be doing.

□ 2100

The argument that there is work that Americans won't do, we haven't heard much of that argument in the last year or so, since the economy went into the downward spiral. They haven't said that as often. I have always argued that there isn't work that Americans won't do. We do everything. There is no job in America that is not being done by Americans. No matter how many legal or illegal immigrants might be doing that work, there will always be Americans standing there doing that work as well.

When we travel around the world and look at the work that is being done, work that is characterized as work that Americans won't do, I see that work being done by every nationality in every country. There is no work that Americans won't do. When JOHN MCCAIN talked about he would pay \$50

an hour for people to come and pick lettuce, I am not sure that he ever wrote that check; but I was quite concerned that I would lose my construction crew, who might all migrate down to Arizona to pick lettuce for \$50 an hour.

It isn't a matter that there is work that Americans won't do, it is a matter of there has been a flood of under-skilled labor that are mobile. They are more reactive. They can beat Americans to that job because they are not as tied to real estate. They don't have those kinds of possessions. They have a cell phone network, and if they need 25 people to pick the lettuce in Arizona, that network brings a lot of illegals in there to do that. It doesn't mean Americans won't do it. There is no work Americans won't do.

I mentioned JOHN MCCAIN, and it isn't for the purpose of being critical of the positions he has taken in the past, I say my hats off to the people who have served this country. He is an authentic American hero. He has gone through a tremendous amount of torture and pain and suffering, and he has not lost his resolve to defend this country in a fashion that he believes as a United States Senator.

I would just suggest, here are some real facts. I have asked this question, and I come down to a bottom line consensus: What is the toughest, dirtiest, most dangerous job that we ever ask Americans to do? I will suggest that it is not in the United States. It has been and perhaps will not be again in that particular location, but it is rooting terrorists out of places like Fallujah, or places in Afghanistan, where we ask our soldiers and our marines to put their lives on the line to do that, sometimes in 130 degree heat with 70, 80 pounds that they are carrying. They go in and root those terrorists out of Fallujah. They root them out of Afghanistan. They do that, and if you calculate them at 40 hours a week, for about \$8.09 an hour.

If Americans will do that, if they will take on the toughest, the hottest or the coldest, the dirtiest, and the most dangerous jobs in the world for that kind of money, there is no argument to be made that there are jobs that Americans will not do. We work hard and are willing to take a risk. We stand up for freedom and liberty and the rule of law. The people who put on the uniform to put their lives on the line are very much about defending the pillars of American exceptionalism, the principles that made American great, and they are not about defending someone having a path to citizenship being granted through amnesty.

We owe the honor to the people who have defended our liberty and freedom to stand up for the rule of law. The rule of law has been reestablished by the statute in Arizona, the immigration legislation that they have passed and has been signed into law by the governor.

These immigration laws in Arizona are laws that reflect the Federal immi-

gration law. They fit within the umbrella of the Federal immigration law. Yes, there is a standard called Federal preemption, and that means if the Federal Government passes a law, provided it is constitutional that supersedes that of the States, that is Federal preemption. But we don't have any statutes that preempt immigration law in Arizona because they have drafted their immigration legislation to fit within the umbrella of the Federal immigration law.

And they have set up some clear standards, clear standards that there shall not be racial profiling used as the only criterion when it comes to interdicting or stopping an individual.

Now that happens to fit consistently with Federal case law. We have a responsibility and a duty and an obligation and a legal standard that allows our law enforcement officers to use a profile provided their race isn't the only criterion. And reasonable suspicion includes a whole lot of other criteria in addition to race. We don't want to be foolish or stupid about this.

I recall an incident that took place in Urbandale, Iowa, 15 or more years ago. It is a community that at the time was not populated by minorities in any significant percentage. There was a Cadillac being driven down the street in a higher income residential area by an African American. The law enforcement officer saw that and wondered, and maybe it was actually Windsor Heights, come to think of it, but it was one of the suburbs of Des Moines, and the officer saw that and thought, That doesn't quite fit what goes on in this community. It could have been the same police officer in an African American community that would have made the call if it were perhaps a white person in that community.

But it turned out to be the other way around. He ran the plates on the car and the car was registered to a Caucasian female who lived in the neighborhood. So the officer suspected something was out of order, pulled the car over, and found out that the African American driving the car was the husband of the Caucasian lady whom the car was registered to who lived in the neighborhood.

Okay, it wasn't what you would normally see as typical. One could argue it was racial profiling, but I would argue it was police work picking up the things that were inconsistent and trying to pick the populous. In any event, the settlement was \$60,000 paid to the driver of the car, the husband of the lady who owned the car and was a very legitimate resident of the community and as far as I know, was a very well-respected Iowan.

But sometimes you get caught in the anomaly, and you have to give the police officers their due. They are picking out those things that are out of order and don't fit the normal practice in the neighborhood. And I know the difference. I live in a rural neighborhood. When somebody drives down my road,



we generally know who they are and where they are going. If I drive down the road, they know me. It is part of our own built-in security system.

Where I reside out here in D.C., I know who stands on the street and what the flow of traffic is, and you see those things that are outside the normal flow. That's what police officers do. It isn't and should not be targeting people because of their race. But race can be a factor in a legitimate police activity as long as it is not the only factor. That is what the Arizona law says.

I want to presume that those police officers are operating to enforce the rule of law and protect society and to use the tools that they have to protect the people. That's what they are. They provide security all across this country. Having grown in an law enforcement family, I respect the job that they do and the risk that they take and the judgment and the education that is necessary for them if they are going to enforce the law.

In Arizona, the executive order by the governor ensures that they are going to continue to teach and train their officers so that they stay within compliance of Federal law, Arizona law, Arizona Constitution and the United States Constitution. And if there are deviations from that, I am very confident that the people who are driving wedges between us as Americans will find a way to litigate.

I regret and it saddens me, and in fact it infuriates me, Madam Speaker, that we would see the people who are race baiters who are seeking to drive wedges between the American people, trying to capitalize on this and scare the American people and make it out to be something that it is not. What it is is, it is a law that sets up and honors the Federal immigration law that uses the Arizona law enforcement people to enforce an immigration law that is now a State law that is the mirror of the Federal law. We need to understand that in the case of *U.S. v. Santana Garcia*, and several others, that there are Federal precedents that local law enforcement implicitly has the authority to enforce immigration law.

Regardless of whether there is a 287(g) agreement, local law enforcement has the authority to enforce immigration law, and there is a Federal law that prohibits sanctuary cities. It has been exploited by many cities in the country, including San Francisco and Houston, a number of cities that want to boycott Arizona, the violation of the Federal law from prohibiting cities from becoming sanctuary cities has been a circumvention, and it says the series of requirements that are in there that prohibit local cities from, let me say, protecting illegals in their communities, and have they found a way to pass memorandums of understanding or city ordinances that direct their police officers to not gather information, because the statute that was written wasn't tight enough and requires that

once they have the information, they have to transfer it on to Federal law enforcement officials, so they just prohibit their local law enforcement officers from gathering information on illegals.

And so they become sanctuary cities and the streets of the city fill up with people who are here illegally. They are taking jobs from Americans. They are among the 8 millions taking jobs from Americans; and as the streets fill up, they are also turning a blind eye to the illegal drugs and the violence and the abuse that comes out of that community in its entirety.

Madam Speaker, I go back to 12 to 20 million illegals living in America, at least 8 million working in America, 15.4 million unemployed, another 5 to 6 million that quit looking for work that fit that category except they are not trying any longer, over 20 million Americans who need a job, 8 million illegals that are occupying jobs that would all go to people who are either Americans or lawfully present in the United States, in an economy that has been declining and shrinking.

And by the way, we have 1.5 million green cards that are issued on an annual basis. If you look at the workforce in America, 10 years ago the workforce in American was 142 million, now it is 153 million.

□ 2115

It has increased about a little over 1 million a year over the last 10 years. And if you would go back and look, the numbers of green cards has accelerated from about three quarters of a million in that period of time—and that actually is a guess, Madam Speaker—on up to about 1.5 million a year now. Almost the sum total of the expansion of our workforce has been attributable to the legal immigration green cards that are a component of this. And so our economy has to grow and create 1.5 million new jobs a year just to accommodate the legal immigration, let alone the illegal immigration. Those are the facts of what we're faced with today.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm going to make this statement, that we have to put a stop to the illegal immigration in America. We've got to direct all traffic through our ports of entry where we can stop the traffic of illegal drugs, contraband, and people coming into the United States. We need to enforce our immigration law. We need to adopt the new ID Act so the IRS can help us enforce immigration law. And then, while all this is going on, we've got to take a look at the legal immigration in America and make a determination as to how many jobs we want this economy to create to accommodate those who are coming in here legally, and we have to have an economy that's going to be robust.

Furthermore, according to Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, a household that's headed by a high school dropout costs taxpayers in America an average of \$22,449; \$22,449

over 50 years of heading the household, a \$1.5 million cost to the taxpayers to help sustain this household because we have become a welfare state. When my grandmother came here before the turn of the previous century, she didn't come here to a welfare state. She came here to a meritocracy, and they wanted to ensure that the people that came through Ellis Island were physically and mentally fit and could sustain themselves. And even though they were screened in Europe before they got on the ship, 2 percent of them were sent back from Ellis Island because they didn't meet the standard.

And so here we are today, 1.5 million legal immigrants who are granted work permits in the United States consuming all the new jobs in America and expanding the workforce when we have many more Americans that we could tap into to do this work that we haven't tried. That's 15.4 million unemployed, plus 5 to 6 million who no longer meet that category, 20 million altogether. And if I would put them into this category, those Americans of working age are in the area of 80 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce. So if we would just simply hire one out of 10 of those, we could replace all the illegal workers by hiring 10 percent of those who are not in the workforce, but are of working age; and about 20 million of those are looking for work.

So, Madam Speaker, we have an economy we need to heal up. We've got a rule of law we've got to reestablish. We have demonstrations that are likely to come across America that are designed to just pit Americans against Americans, race-based, race baiting for political purposes, when what we're really looking for here is the enforcement of the rule of law and a robust economy that's going to employ American workers.

We are the most generous country in the world when it comes to allowing legal immigration, roughly 1.5 million a year. No other country comes close to matching that. We need to take a look at our economy, the rule of law, the culture in America, enforce the rule of law, stand with Arizona—who has not done anything except define their Arizona immigration law to reflect that of the Federal law. And the President of the United States, who has directed the Justice Department to examine Arizona law, I think is finding out that it's constitutional, it's statutorily consistent, it cannot be and should not be preempted by Federal law, and it should be honored and respected and supported, not investigated, nor litigated. And I encourage and I thank the people in Arizona for having the courage to step up and pass their legislation.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. CALVERT, for 5 minutes, May 4 and 5.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, May 6.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 6.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 6.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5147. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 3, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

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

7255. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2008 Tariff-Rate Quota Year received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7256. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2009 Packers and Stockyards Program Annual Report", pursuant to the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7257. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Charles C. Campbell, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7258. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the De-

partment's report on National Guard Counterdrug Schools Activities, pursuant to Public Law 109-469, section 901(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7259. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on activities under the Secretary's personnel management demonstration project authorities for the Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7260. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket IN: FEMA-2010-0003] received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7261. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Deposit Insurance Regulations; Temporary Increase In Standard Coverage Amount; Mortgage Servicing Accounts; Revocable Trust Accounts; International Banking; Foreign Banks (RIN: 3064-AD36) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7262. A letter from the Office of Research and Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — School Food Safety Program Based on Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point Principles [FNS-2008-0033] (RIN: 0584-AD65) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7263. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Race to the Top Fund [Docket ID: ED-2010-OESE-0005] (RIN: 1810-AB10) received April 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7264. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tire Fuel Efficiency Consumer Information Program [Docket No.: NHTSA-2010-0036] (RIN: 2127-AK45) received April 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7265. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor/Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Facilitate Use of Spread Spectrum Communications Technologies [WT Docket No.: 10-62] received April 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7266. A letter from the Acting Associate Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — High-Cost Universal Service Support Jurisdictional Separations Coalition for Equity in Switching Support Petition for Reconsideration [WC Docket No.: 05-337] [CC Docket No.: 80-286] received April 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on U.S. support for Taiwan's participation as an observer at the 63rd World Health Assembly and in the work of the World Health Organization, as mandated in the Participation of the 2004 Taiwan in the World Health Organization Act, Pub. L. 108-235, Sec. 1(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7268. A letter from the Deputy Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, trans-

mitting the Agency's annual report for Fiscal Year 2009, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7269. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7270. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7271. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 10 [Docket No.: 0907021105-0024-03] (RIN: 0648-AY00) received April 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7272. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XU89) received April 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7273. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Resources of the South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 060525140-6221-02] (RIN: 0648-XU16) received April 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7274. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone of Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2010 and 2011 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XS43) received April 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7275. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2010 and 2011 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XS44) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7276. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Inseason Action to Close the Commercial Gulf of Mexico Non-Sandbar Large Coastal Shark Fishery (RIN: 0648-XU90) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7277. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule —