But in fact, what we're left with is this do-nothing approach and the leadership in Congress saying let's adjourn for 5 weeks rather than address this problem because they're afraid of the realization, and I think they realize that if we had a vote on this, we opened it up to all amendments so that we could actually talk about a full, comprehensive energy plan which our country doesn't have—the fact that if we did that, you would see an immediate drop, even bigger than that $10 a barrel drop you saw that one day. You would see a dramatic drop, as my friend from California talked about, at least a 20 percent drop, which our people, our constituents all across this country would realize very quickly in a lower price of gas at the pump, and that's ultimately what we should be trying to achieve.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. We're here tonight to ask the Democrat majority to let us take a vote on all-the-above, no more excuses.

You know, the interesting thing is we actually took a vote on the floor today. You know, we're here taking votes, 435 Members. We took a vote today to go home. So leadership's letting us take votes but just not on energy bills. I think that's a point that ought to be taken to the American people. They need to understand that we're taking votes. We're just not taking votes to increase the supply of energy. All of the above, wind, solar, coal, oil, drilling, natural gas, we're taking votes but not to increase energy. We're taking votes to go home for 5 weeks. That means for 5 weeks gasoline prices are going to be high back in northeast Tennessee. That's not what the American people look for.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I ask any Member here, what's the Democratic leadership afraid of? Do y'all know? I think they're afraid it will pass. I think that's the problem. I think they're afraid that this will pass and they won't have the environmental wackos and radical environmentalists that they can pander to anymore.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. I think I have an answer to that because I do believe there are some commonsense Democrats on this floor. This is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democrat issue. This is an American issue. The only thing standing between us and the vote is NANCY PELOSI's Democrat leadership. I would call on the Democrat leadership to let us vote. Let Republicans vote. Let Democrats vote. Let them vote their conscience. Let them vote their district.

And I would, without a doubt, believe that we could go home on August 1, 48 hours from now, with an energy plan that would bring down prices at the pump because there's going to be some commonsense Democrats that will vote to make sure that moms and dads have some relief at the pump; young families have some relief at the pump; senior adults have some relief at the pump; small businesses have some relief at the pump. We need some relief at the pump.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Reclaiming my time, because as we begin to end here, one, I want to thank all my colleagues for coming down, for talking to the American people about the quarterly report, telling them what actually goes on in this building.

When we think for one moment that, as this House adjourns—not because anybody on this floor right now voted to adjourn. We said let's stay here and let's create a plan that creates an energy program that has all the above, from wind, to solar, to hydrogen, to nuclear, to exploration, takes us into the new frontier.

Because when you think of the floor that we're on, they built this Dome in the Civil War. You think of the challenges that this country has faced. And time and time again, we have met that challenge. But how did we meet that challenge? By not being afraid of debate, by not being afraid of the idea coming forward, not being afraid of one side of the aisle or the other, not saying the country's red or blue. This country is red, white and blue.

And that's the American energy plan we have. It makes us American independent of foreign countries. It stops sending the greatest amount of wealth out of this country to somebody else by creating American jobs right here.

But the only way we're ever going to be able to do it is that this Democratic-controlled Congress has got to change. It's got to allow the idea to come forth and not be afraid of the vote.

So, today, when you go home and when you see your Member out maybe in a parade, maybe on a street corner, maybe they're having a town hall meeting, ask that Member if they voted to adjourn. Did they vote to stay? Did they vote to make America energy independent? Or did they vote no, let's go home, let's let that price go up higher?

Well, I want to thank the Members for being a part of this tonight, and thank you for coming down and telling the American people where the report stands, where we're going forward and being willing to lead, going to Golden, Colorado, to see the renewable energy, and going to ANWR.

□ 2215

D&D DISPLAYS INNOVATES IN NORTH WILKESBORO

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to salute the innovative and hardworking folks at D&D Displays in North Wilkesboro, North Carolina.

Earlier this week, I visited D&D's manufacturing facilities in North Wilkesboro, North Carolina to learn more about this fine company's contributions to the local economy in Wilkes County. I toured D&D Displays' facility and spoke with company employees about policies that promote economic growth and well-paying jobs in North Carolina. I was honored to be joined by D&D Displays' CEO, James D. Brown, as well as by representatives from the Chamber of Commerce.

Our great Nation has a long tradition of economic growth that provides one of the foundations of our freedoms, so it is exciting to see the progress that D&D Displays has made in Wilkes County to create good jobs and to boost the local economy.

During my visit, I also learned that this local employer recently landed a new project that could provide up to $22 million in new revenue for the North Wilkesboro-based company and that could double or triple the company's employment rolls.

Success stories like D&D Displays are based on the innovative, creative and hardworking people of this country who ask nothing from government except to get out of their way so they can thrive. Congratulations to D&D Displays on their upcoming expansion. My hope is to see them continue to expand their business and to contribute to North Carolina's economy.

IMPROVING ENERGY, NATURAL DISASTER AND HEALTH CARE POLICIES IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TSONGAS). 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. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of Congress, and to kick off this Special Order moment, I would be pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank my colleague for yielding.

America right now is drilling for ice on Mars. Yet we cannot drill for oil in America. This is insane. If we have the technology to explore beneath the surface of Mars, then we must have the technology to explore for oil here at home in an efficient, environmentally friendly fashion.

Our home-grown energy businesses employ that technology off the coast of Louisiana today. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita toppled many of the oil rigs offshore, but there was no environmental catastrophe. Not one drop of oil was spilled. Not one drop washed up on the shorelines.

I respect Louisiana Democrats CHARLIE MELANCON and MARY LANDRIEU, who support their State's exploration and development in the face of stiff opposition within the Democratic Party's ranks.

Why can't we learn from Louisiana's success?

There are some who like to say we're facing an energy crisis, and then they'll use those two words to manipulate votes this December. For there

truly to be an energy crisis, there would have to be a shortage of fuel. Fortunately, there isn't one today, but there is a shortage of courage in this body, a shortage of creativity and a shortage of will to do what needs to be done to ensure that there will never be another 1970-style fuel shortage.

The best way to cope with a crisis, real or not, is to avoid it in the first place. The Georgia Bulldogs are in my district, so you know I love a good football analogy. We all grew up with Charles Schultz and his Peanuts comic strip, so we are familiar with the image of Lucy's yanking the football away from Charlie Brown just as he's running to kick a field goal.

What image better represents the Democratic leadership's approach to energy policy—this so-called new direction for our Nation? this new direction energy policy? the Democratic leadership's energy policy? A sound, obvious proposal comes to the table, such as expanding domestic resource exploration. The Democrats quickly yank it away from under the American consumer.

Why? Because it's tradition for most of them to appease radical environmental groups and to oppose domestic exploration and production even in the face of rising costs and of increasing dependence upon Middle Eastern oil.

Some of the ideas springing forth from the New Direction Congress are policies from an old era best left forgotten. I'm speaking about this absurd notion of nationalizing, read ''socializing'' our Nation's oil and gas businesses. The most recent mention of it has been quickly forgotten by the press, but I want to point out how this allegedly fresh idea has evolved without even going into the original idea's ultimate failure in the former Soviet Bloc.

Nearly 80 percent of world oil reserves are controlled by nationally owned oil companies, not by American or by other private companies. Today, as a nation, we scoff at nationalized oil and gas production in Iran, Cuba, Venezuela, and Bolivia, but somehow socialization is acceptable to some Members of the ''New Direction'' House and Senate. To me, it's a new direction headed down an old path to a dead end.

I reject socializing oil companies because it is un-American and because I trust our market economy. As we learned when Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita caused no oil spills, offshore oil rigs are safe, and offshore oil rigs attract new marine life as we're still learning from the new artificial reefs there.

One Democratic aide summarized the liberal energy plan as ''drive small cars and wait for the wind.'' We developed this picture of the Democratic Party's policy for energy in America. It's absurd. Well, Madam Speaker, not everybody owns a small car, and it's not windy every day. America wants energy solutions now, and we should vote to serve their interests, not the interests of the radical environmentalists.

We've introduced a bill called the American Energy Plan. It encompasses all of the above, every single possible energy source that we can figure today, and we'll even stimulate the production of new sources that we may not even know about. We need to have a vote on that bill.

The Georgia Bulldogs' head football coach, Mark Richt, has a saying he uses to energize the Georgia Bulldogs football team: Finish the drill. As a Congressman, I've got three words to energize America: Start the drill.

We do that by voting for the American Energy Plan. We do that by voting to expand offshore drilling, ANWR drilling. We do that by voting to produce new nuclear energy and to permit new refineries. If Habitat for Humanity can build a house in 1 week that will withstand a hurricane, we can build a refinery to produce more gasoline for America in 1 year. We have to have a vote. The American public is absolutely dependent upon it. I want people to understand the reason that the gas prices are high at the pumps when you go pump your oil today. It is because we're not able to vote on the American Energy Plan or on some comprehensive means of establishing new oil supplies in America.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia's coming to the floor here tonight, Madam Speaker, and for addressing these issues that matter to America, also from a Georgia perspective.

There are a lot of things I do want to say about energy tonight, Madam Speaker. Yet I think it's important for me to address first the situation that's going on in Iowa with the disasters that we've had.

To lay some of this backdrop out for you, I have significant background when it comes to the experience of having been flooded myself. I go back to '93 when we had the 500-year flood event in Iowa. I can remember earlier than that, in about 1991, sitting down and actually playing gate tag in the airport with Ellen Gordon, who was the director of Iowa Emergency Management at the time.

We worked out a system by which we could respond to disasters in Iowa. She was very, very good, and was in the business of making sure that we were prepared for disasters. Yet our discussion didn't really cover the breadth of the floods. It was more the idea of the more localized tornadoes that do come and that have visited our State and many others throughout the centuries.

Our focus was on: What if there is a large fire? What if there is a series of tornadoes or of bad tornadoes? How could we put the equipment in and the people in to respond to that kind of disaster and clean it up?

Yet, just a couple of years later, we had the 500-year flood event, and so it wasn't something that we had had previous significant experience with in our memories. Although, anyone can look back at the times before we did some of the Corps of Engineers' work that stabilized the Mississippi River on our east side and the Missouri River on the west border and some of the other major rivers, including the reservoirs that we built throughout the State on up through the Des Moines River that are designed to protect Des Moines. For example, there is the Saylorville Reservoir and the Red Rock down below Des Moines and the Coralville Reservoir that protects Iowa City. At least it did a respectable job of doing so. Those would be the major reservoirs in the State. Then additionally, there's Rathbun down in the south.

It turns out that we have actually done work on all of those reservoirs, Madam Speaker. Having been under water myself and having delt with four of our major projects in 1993 and having volunteered to go over to Keokuk to spend some days on a rock pile, which at that time was out in the middle of the Mississippi River which today is on the shoreline of the Mississippi River at Keokuk, I'm not without experience when it comes to floods and disasters.

Having been one of the first Members of Congress to go down into New Orleans in the immediate aftermath of Katrina and having flown, really, all of that—most of it in helicopters, some of that in a plane—and having gone down on the ground and having traveled on the ground around New Orleans and into Louisiana—Slidell, Louisiana comes to mind immediately—and having slept in a Red Cross cot and having felt bad about it because I found out that a Red Cross personnel had given up his cot for me to sleep on, I've been in the middle of this. I've watched people when they've been hit by floods. I know, I think, what goes on in their heads and how it is when the flood waters come up. The faster they come up, the more adrenalin you get to try to stave off that flood and the more sandbags you can throw and the more you can mobilize, let's say, manpower and machinery to protect us from those floods and to try to keep the floodwater out of our critical infrastructure.

When it crests and if it runs over the top of your levees and over the top of your sandbags and when you watch that fill up, it's a feeling of despair. It's a feeling of we tried as hard as we could. We did everything we could do to be ready for this, and then when it was time for all hands on deck, all hands were on deck. All men and women came to the levees, and they pitched the sandbags, and they did everything they could do to get ready. When the flood crests and you lose and when the water fills up in places where it has never been before, like in Cedar Rapids, Iowa and in places like Iowa City and Coralville, when that happens, you have a crushing feeling of despair.

Sometimes there is that long wait, the wait for the water to go down because, especially on the eastern side of

the State, along the Mississippi drainage area and in the Mississippi Valley, the water comes up slow, and it goes down slowly. So there's a longer period that it takes to be in a position to recover.

On the west side of the district that I represent, the water goes up fast and comes down fast, and there's a shorter period of time that it takes for it to dry up and a shorter period of time for us to recover, but all the while that's going on, your adrenaline peaks at about the crest of the flood, and then it diminishes in the aftermath of the flood.

As to where we are now, I was actually, I will say, surprised, sadly surprised, internally taken aback to see what I saw last Saturday in Cedar Rapids and in Iowa City. I know those towns. I know those cities. I know those river valleys. I've seen them flooded before, especially the Iowa River Valley, not so much the Cedar River Valley. I've not seen the cities of Iowa City and Cedar Rapids under water like I did when I flew over that just after the high watermark. First, I'll tell you what happened.

It rained perhaps more than ever before in a section of Iowa that would be the northern half of the State, almost exactly the northern half of the State. It would be 100 miles from north to south, from the Minnesota border down to the south—that line and 300 miles roughly east and west. That area also expanded into southern Minnesota and into other places of the east and west of Iowa, but in that area in Iowa, 100 miles by 300 miles—and there were intermittent rains and additional rains, but in one rain on one night and on one morning, Iowa took in that area of 100 by 300 miles no less than 4 inches of rain, something meeting and exceeding 10 inches of rain in other areas within that 100- by 300-mile area, three-30,000ths square miles with more than 4 inches of rain and up to 10 inches of rain.

When you see something like that, you see that it's probably more water than has ever come in a single rain before. When it came on saturated soils and as the water ran off of those hillsides and down the rivers and it crested at Cedar Rapids, the Cedar River cresting at Cedar Rapids—it did its share of flooding in Cedar Falls and in Waterloo, but when it crested at Cedar Rapids, that city had already been seeing the worst in '93. When the high watermarks in '93 were noted, the businesses looked at that and said this is as high as it's ever going to get. This is a 500-year event.

□ 2230

And so if I make sure that my business is above that elevation of the water crest in 1993, put it up, say, a foot above, who above that line would need to buy flood insurance? The rational thing is, when you get a 500-year flood event, you're probably not going to live to see another event where the water gets higher than it did.

And it might be something that one could understand if it came back and it approached that level or exceeded the 500-year flood event level by a foot or so, but what really happened in Cedar Rapids was the high water mark there was in 1851, and the new high water mark set in the floods less than a couple of months ago crested 11.12 feet above the previous high water mark, which was set in 1851. That's not a level that anyone could have anticipated. It's not something anybody can build for. Its not something the Corps of Engineers can tell us that we can adjust for. It was a weather anomaly where huge rains came in—and just in the watershed areas, and broader, but it focused on those watershed areas. It sent the water down through the funnels that are the river valleys, the Cedar River Valley and the Iowa River Valley.

And Cedar Rapids, the second largest city in Iowa, had its downtown flooded with something like 600 to 800 businesses flooded, and now, 1,300 square blocks of residences that were flooded—probably more than that, but that would be one of the measures. And I'll submit this, Madam Speaker, that I've been to those places where we've had natural disasters and had floods and hurricanes.

And I did a number of trips into New Orleans and I walked the streets of New Orleans and I went back to see their downtown dark when the power was off and the utilities weren't functioning and the businesses were gone. And some of them had the windows out and the doors open and they were being aired out, trying to dry them out. To go in and strip out the drywall off the walls—the wet drywall, I would add, if that's not an oxymoron—to have to go in and replace all the furniture and the carpet and the walls and the appliances and re-wire and come back in with new walls and new flooring and new carpeting, for example, and new furniture, to get all of that done takes time. It takes time to find people, it takes time to find the resources. And the sad thing is it takes a lot more time to find the money and know what you can plan on. All of that I've worked with in New Orleans. And all of that that I've described exists in downtown Cedar Rapids today and in the residential areas.

To go into downtown Cedar Rapids on a Saturday afternoon and look around there and see there isn't any business functioning down there, that there are generators set up to run light plants to carry just some streetlights at night because the utilities aren't back up. There is a steam power system that has been providing that utility for the downtown Cedar Rapids; about 25 percent of the businesses have access to that and all the rest do not.

There were businesses that were established businesses that have been there for—the building was functioning in that fashion for perhaps a century or more; never been flooded—or not flooded in our memory, anyway—but under water six, eight, 10, 12, 14 feet of water that went in and destroyed these businesses, depending on the elevation of the business and where the water decided it would want to go.

This Congress, however much empathy they've provided—and I appreciate it all. And I appreciate, of course, the how responsive they had for Katrina—but this Congress has not reacted fast enough to the situations in Iowa and in Illinois and in the Midwest from these past floods.

What we have done in this Congress to date is, in a supplemental bill, we brought $2.65 billion in funding to backfill FEMA, an existing account for FEMA. And that's all that's been done from an appropriations standpoint or from a policy standpoint.

We do have a whole series of tax packages put together by Senator GRASSLEY. And this tax package that he has put together is a good one, it does what can be done for tax relief. And it is the tax relief that was offered to the people and the businesses in New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina and Rita. It was that with some loopholes closed that were found by some folks down there—we were happy to close the loopholes. That tax package hasn't been moved. We don't have a response from Ways and Means here. I don't know that we have a response from the Finance Committee in the Senate and how that might be. Those things need to happen.

The business people in these communities, in Iowa City and in Cedar Rapids, and the smaller communities up and down the river, including Columbus Junction and including Oakville, they need to have some definitive action on the part of this Congress. This Congress can act definitively when they see a disaster that grips their heart. Here's how they acted in Katrina back in 2005:

September 2, 2005, we appropriated, in a special supplemental spending bill, $10.5 billion for the initial down payment on Katrina relief; $10.5 billion, September 2. Six days later—not a week later, six days later—Congress appropriated $51.8 billion for Katrina relief. That was September 8. Then December 30, Congress appropriated $29.1 billion, Katrina relief. Then June 15, 2006, $19.3 billion, Katrina relief. Then on May 25, 2007, $7.7 billion, Katrina relief. And on November 13, 2007, late last year, $6.4 billion, Katrina relief. That adds up—and don't hold me to this math, this is a memo note—$123.5 billion in Katrina relief that began when—the disaster declaration was made August 29, 2005. And on the second day of September, the first $10.5 billion came through. And then 6 days later, and then late December, then June of the following year, then May of the following year, then November also of last year; $123.5 billion, Madam Speaker.

And this Congress—and the only measure is not how much money did we appropriate to backfill FEMA, that was

$2.65 billion, in that same bill, Katrina relief, more than twice as much went to Katrina, $5.8 billion, Madam Speaker.

So I wouldn't make a big issue of this if I didn't think that there was a desperate need. And even though I had flown over the entire flood area—that we could identify at least in eastern Iowa—and western Iowa for that matter, and we had some of our own flood that wasn't as broad and probably not as severe, even though I've flown all over that and looked at that—and I know what floods look like from the air and the ground and I've lived them and I've been flooded myself—I was sadly surprised and gripped when I saw especially downtown Cedar Rapids with the businesses dark on a Saturday afternoon.

And also, to talk to the businessmen and the businesswomen there that are trying to figure out what they can do without definitive answers and response, I know it's difficult. And I said with Katrina that even if Mayor Nagin and the Governor of Louisiana—let me just put it this way: Even if the city of New Orleans, the State of Louisiana and the Federal Government, all of our agencies, if they had all performed at their maximum statutory authority, we still didn't have the resources and we didn't have the mechanism in place to save everybody, and as many resources as possible in that disaster down in New Orleans.

We've learned a lot from that. I'm not here to criticize FEMA or Small Business—they're certainly not the Corps of Engineers—and the balance of the Federal agencies, and certainly not to criticize the Red Cross. Everybody mobilized, they went to the rampart, so to speak. The volunteers came out in numbers to the point where sometimes they were actually turned away because there were more volunteers than there were sandbags, so to speak, in some areas. I'm proud of that. I'm proud of that response, and I'm proud of the work that got done and I'm proud of the example that got set.

And I'm proud of the spirit of our Iowa people. And as I met with the business leaders and the businessmen and women in both of those cities, Cedar Rapids and Iowa city, as I went back to FEMA headquarters and stayed and spent some time—about 2.5 hours on a Sunday morning—with the State Disaster Coordination headquarters of FEMA, I met with many of their people, and even right down to a second generation FEMA employee. There is a lot of accumulated knowledge, a lot of disaster expertise within FEMA. I'm not here to criticize that.

Madam Speaker, the issue that I raise is, downtown Cedar Rapids is dark. Their power is off. They've been flooded out. Six hundred to eight hundred businesses are out; some will not come back. Every day that goes by, the odds of losing another business and another business and another business get greater and greater.

These businesses that have been flooded have lost a lot of their capital base, a lot of their assets. Some of these people have worked for a lifetime and put all of their resources back in their business. And their business was above the 100-year flood event. They didn't have flood insurance because that was a rational decision, not an irresponsible decision. And the water got 11.12 feet higher than ever before and they are caught by an act of God calamity of rarest proportions, and yet they don't have anything that they can really hang their hat on as to what will be the sequence of events? What resources will be deployed in the area?

Yes, we know that Small Business Administration is in there offering loans. And I think they've done an acceptable job of processing the paperwork and giving people something that they can count on. They showed me the numbers of the loans that have been written and approved. And yet I know that, even though the loan is approved for people in residences, for example, as well as businesses, that isn't the only thing required to get people up and going. For example, if your business has been flooded and wiped out, and let's say you qualify for a small business loan, you still have to come up with locating the materials and you have to locate a contractor, and you have to put together a real business plan that's going to carry you on.

I had to make some of those decisions when I was under water in 1993. And at that time I was in my early forties. So to look at something that was capitalized over 20 or 30 years was a different equation for me than it is today in a place like Cedar Rapids or Iowa City, where some of the business owners are retirement age, 63, 64, 65 years old. And when they're looking at a disaster that's cost them hundreds of thousands of dollars, and the equity that they've used to leverage their business through these years is gone and they're looking at a 4 or an 8 percent loan—and by the way, the higher the risk, the higher the interest—a 4 to an 8 percent loan, they have to make a decision, when they're borrowing money, when the last payment on that 30-year loan is beyond their life expectancy and they've already reached about the end of their working life expectancy, how, then, do you pay the bills? What do you do with your life's work?

When you think of the Enron people who had all their pensions wrapped up in Enron stock and found out that the Enron loophole allowed for the fraud and their pension funds collapsed, many of those people that were retired had to go back to work. And some of them that stayed retired had to dramatically shorten their budget and squeeze everything down. The happy golden years of retirement didn't materialize because of something that was beyond their control. And yet we have a situation here that was beyond the control especially of the business people and the residences, and all of the region. And I'm using Cedar Rapids as an example because that's where this chart is.

Madam Speaker, I have here a picture of a residential area in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. And this is very, very typical. Although the report from FEMA is that essentially the debris removal and clean-up is caught up—and I don't disagree with that—when they pile this out in the middle of the street, they come along and pick it up and load it way. We don't have what I saw in Katrina, which was huge wind rows of debris that were piled out there. And sometimes you had people objecting to having the debris hauled out. That's not happening in Iowa. When people haul debris out, they put it by the edge of the street, sometimes right in the edge of the street so it's easy to pick up. It's being picked up and removed.

I saw the city of Palo was entirely under water. Every house in that city had suffered major damage. And they carried their furniture and their appliances and the ruined material on out into the street and began to strip out the wet drywall—which is now a common phrase. And most of that debris is all picked up.

This is an example of a pile waiting to be picked up. You can see it has furniture in here, it has appliances in here, it has some clothing and waste. There are pieces of lumber and boards and furniture all piled out here to be hauled out. And all of this, Madam Speaker, has got to be replaced, and it's all got to be put back again.

And the homeowner back here doesn't know whether there is going to be an initiative to buy this all out, whether there will be an initiative to come in and rebuild, whether there is going to be a flood insurance premium that will be too costly and it might be wiser to move on out. They don't know if they can get a building permit to go in and rebuild their house and put it back into pre-flood conditions with or without a loan, with or without a buyout, with or without a city plan, they don't know.

And the hardest part of being in a flood—and it isn't easy to answer all these questions—the hardest part is you can't make decisions because there are so many variables that are beyond the scope of being answered or can be answered by the local officials. But that's an example of the debris that's there last Saturday.

This is a relatively fresh picture. This is an example of the spirit of America and the spirit of Iowans. This is in Cedar Rapids. These buildings are all empty, they're all flooded. The high water line I'm going to guess is someplace about right here.

□ 2245

The defiance of America shows up this way, Madam Speaker. That is, you go find the largest, boldest American flag that you can find and you hang it up there for all to see, and that says,

We're going to beat this. We are coming back. We're not going to let this get us down. That is what that flag said.

If you look up this street off in this direction, there was flag after flag coming out from the buildings that were set up. That is the message that I am proud of. But these buildings are stripped empty now. They have been flooded out. They have all got to come back again. These are businesses that probably don't get a grant of any kind. They will have to settle for a loan, if they can qualify. And then for 30 years they can pay it back.

This also, Madam Speaker, is another example of along the street in Cedar Rapids. Again, Cedar Rapids is just the epicenter. This goes up and down the river valley, town after town.

You can see the appliances that are laid out here and the debris that has been stripped out of the homes right along the street so it's easy to pick up. Nobody is resisting here like they did in New Orleans and taking the position that the workers, the volunteers, and the cleanup crews shouldn't set foot on this ground. They are saying, I put it out here for you to pick it up. Please do so. Thanks for helping me. Let's all get to work.

We have some people that don't know whether they are going to have enough money to fix their house or not, but they want to do something. So they go in there and they strip it out, they clean everything out, they throw everything away that they can throw away, that they need to throw away, and fix that house so that they can start rebuilding if they come up with the money, if they get a grant, if they get a loan, and if they can come up with the materials and the contractor.

But that looks to me like New Orleans looked. I spent a lot of time walking the streets in New Orleans. If I would take this picture and ask the question of our friends from Louisiana, I think a lot of them would say, Oh, yeah, I saw that down south. I saw that along the gulf coast in 2005. Well, it's 2008. It's Iowa. They are still looking for some answers and looking for some relief.

This also is an example of what we saw for the disaster. This is a bridge that was taken down. They knew that the bridge was going to take a lot of water so they ran train cars out here, filled these train cars with stone and ballast, and I believe they said water, to put some weight on the bridge so the bridge wouldn't go out. The bridge went out anyway.

Here's the train cars still sitting on the bridge. This is a little bit older picture. Some of these are actually floating homes that were pushed down up against this bridge. I saw this all from the air when I flew over Cedar Rapids.

So that is an idea of how devastating this was when you see this kind of carnage with a railroad bridge taken out and the homes that are floated down against it.

This, City Central, this is an island in the middle of the Cedar River, where city hall and some administrative buildings are. This is at not quite the peak high water mark, but that shows you what happened.

We have, Madam Speaker, a grant system that comes primarily from FEMA that does this. It allows for residences to qualify. So a residence like this potentially could qualify for up to a $28,800 grant. That grant then can be used to refurbish and rebuild the interior of the home and put it back in its pre-flood condition. That is there for the residential homeowner.

We also have qualified grants to help the city out. Political subdivisions, say the city, the county, perhaps the State, and I believe the State, so that if they have damage to their buildings, they will be rebuilt. We have a Federal building that was flooded, the Federal courthouse in Cedar Rapids. It's slated for reconstruction, to be built new, but I do believe that it's going to be refurbished before we can get a new building built. That's a pretty big check to replace the building. It's also a big check to refurbish the building.

But my point is that political subdivisions, the institutions of government, will receive Federal dollars to be reconstructed, Madam Speaker, and the residences will receive Federal dollars to be reconstructed. Even some of our critical infrastructure can qualify. Our railroads will likely qualify in some areas, as we have in past disasters seen that our utilities qualified for grants to put power poles back. Say in the case of an ice storm that might take the power out in a large area, we provided Federal dollars to go to those utilities, put the poles back up, the lines, and at least take some of the sting out for the utility companies.

So it's not unprecedented for us to cross a line, a line from a residence here, a line that includes municipal government and county and State government here, a line that includes a railroad bridge here, a line that includes utilities occasionally. All of those things qualify for Federal grant.

The only people that we're asking to go without any kind of a grant in this are the people that are paying the taxes on everything else, and that's the businesses in the communities. So if you run a business in Cedar Rapids, Iowa City, in the valleys of the Cedar or Iowa River or the Mississippi River Valley, likely below the confluence of the two rivers in Oakville, if you run a business in those areas and your business is flooded, chances are you're going to be applying for an SBA loan, if you qualify. If you're a large business, you may not.

But there is no provision in law that allows the Federal Government to step in and provide a grant for the small businesses that are as devastated, in fact, in many cases more devastated, than the residences are themselves.

I don't know that we have got this entirely backwards, Madam Speaker, but I will submit that if you have the healthy, economic, social, and cultural ecology of a community, it was the evolution of that community that was formed around the commerce in the first place. It's likely somebody set up a trading post. Maybe that trading post was on the Cedar River or the Iowa River and then they traded furs through there and the trading post began to sell goods and then, after a while, services, and they built a residential house. They probably slept in the store when they first moved there. Then they built a home to live in and then they needed more services. As the businesses expanded, they justified the people that would be building more businesses around them. They needed a place to live. So they built homes. It wasn't that somebody moved to Cedar Rapids 150 or 180 years ago and decided that they just wanted to live there like a vacation home, Madam Speaker. It was the first people that built the towns and the cities in the Midwest at least and in the United States, for that matter, they set up the businesses first and the residences came next. Then they had to have government to provide order and the government buildings were built.

Sometimes it was the transportation links like the railroads that caused the towns to be built along them, especially at the intersections of the railroads, and where we had the intersections of the rivers, which were the flow of commerce back in the day. All of this was surrounded and came together because somebody went out there and established a business because there was an opportunity to make some profit. The residences were built around the businesses.

And so we have our priorities in a condition where they need to be rearranged. Our priorities, I believe, should be this. Recognize that the source of the taxes are the businesses that earn the wealth and pay the taxes and hire the workers to pay the wages so that people can afford to live in the houses that they live in.

So we here in our government response to disasters of, let me say, epic proportions, help out the residences and the railroad and the political subdivisions but not the businesses.

I have legislation I have introduced in the Congress this week, Madam Speaker, and the number of the legislation escapes my memory for the moment, but what it does, it goes in and amends the Stafford Act. The Stafford Act is the language that allows FEMA to provide grants to residences and this allows businesses with 25 or fewer employees to qualify for disaster relief grants in the same fashion, on up to the $28,800 limit that is there today in statute for residences.

This, I think, is a change that is a long time coming. It's been endorsed by all of the Iowa House delegation. We are asking to go out then to the Representatives from the other States that are affected by this flood, asking them

to sign on as well. The idea being this: Small businesses can perhaps be put back on their feet very quickly if their damage is such that a limited grant, and I know for some of these businesses, it won't amount to a lot, and some will turn up their nose and say, You're not really helping me enough. But it's something and it's what we can do. It may in fact be all we can do. I don't think that it's more than we can do. But, for me, if we are going to justify grants to residences and grants to railroads and municipalities, then I don't know how we say no to the businesses that are funding it all and the reason for it all in the first place.

So what is the point in fixing up homes and providing residences for people that won't have jobs in the businesses that are closed? Why is Cedar Rapids dark? Why is there not a plan, a plan that they can at least count on, and if the answer is no, then it's no, and they can make their plans accordingly.

But right now, under the current statute that we have, the answer is, well, maybe. And there will be some decisions made later. The city will work in cooperation with the county, with the State, who will work in cooperation with the Federal Government. I endorse all of that. The working groups that have been put together look to me like they are good people, working in a good cause, but we still don't have the definitive response.

So I am encouraging this, the adoption of the language to amend the Stafford Act so that small businesses with 25 or fewer employees qualify for grant relief in the same fashion that residences do, up to $28,800, and that can be enough to keep a business open, it can be enough to refurbish the inside of the businesses.

I walked into a number of them on Saturday. Some are under reconstruction and some are just sitting there. Some have been stripped out but they don't have a plan to put it back together. That is what we are working with, Madam Speaker.

We have got to move on this. If Speaker PELOSI is not willing to move the tax relief package that is drafted and introduced by Senator GRASSLEY and endorsed by Senator HARKIN, the package that was good enough for Katrina and Rita, it should be good enough for Iowa floods, Madam Speaker.

This $123.5 billion that flowed through to Katrina relief, we are looking right now at $2.65 billion for the Midwest flood relief, which includes a number of States, including parts Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas. Those States come to mind right away.

We have got to move some relief, and this Congress is ready to adjourn for August, the August break, by late Thursday night or sometime on Friday. We will go home for 6 weeks and during that entire 6 weeks that this Congress doesn't at least send a signal that we are willing to step up and help the people that are in distress, then if we do not do that, we have failed them. They need a definitive response from this Congress. You have to be able to plan on something.

I believe that the people have performed well in Iowa. One of the things that they said was that they just went out and worked. They didn't ask for anything. I have talked to the FEMA people that have been around the country in these disasters for a career—and they were constantly complimentary of the way Iowans have responded to this. I hear anecdotes about Iowans that will say, Yes, I could use some relief, but don't stop and help me because my neighbor needs it worse than I do. Go help my neighbor.

It's been neighbor helping neighbor. What has been missing here is not volunteers, not good cheer, because there is a smile on their face in a lot of the cases no matter how the dire circumstances are, no matter how much adrenaline has drained off, and no matter how much they look through that tunnel looking for the light at the other end. No matter how much that is, their spirit has been strong.

But the joke came up, Well, we didn't have any protesters, we didn't have any looters, and we didn't have much media. So if we'd had protester, looters, and media, maybe we would have had some of this legislation moved by now. Maybe Speaker PELOSI would have had a little more sensitivity. But these polite and quiet people, these respectful people, these salt-of-the-earth people, as Congressman LOEBSACK referenced earlier tonight, haven't been beating the drum, they haven't been demanding relief. They have just been doing their work and pulling their end together.

□ 2300

It reminds me, Madam Speaker, of our debate on the Medicare reimbursement language that we fought through here in this Congress back in I believe it was 2003, perhaps 2004. When one calculates the relief, or the funding for Medicare patients, the per-patient funding for Iowa was last in the Nation. Medicare reimbursements, last in the Nation. Of the 50 States, Iowa ranks 50th. Before we passed that legislation, Iowa ranked 50th, and it was a long ways up to 49th. It is more than a coincidence that Louisiana ranks first. They ranked first then. We passed the reform relief, and they ranked first afterwards.

So the analysis goes this way. Back in the seventies, when Richard Nixon imposed a wage and price freeze, Iowa health care providers honored that wage and price freeze, so they didn't give increases in wages. They lost some people to other States that didn't respect that and gave wages anyway, but Iowa respected that.

There is another situation. That is Iowans don't use health care services with the frequency and regularity that they do in Louisiana, for example. So, historically, at least, Louisiana didn't honor the wage and price freeze imposed by President Nixon, and they utilized the medical services more regularly than those in Iowa.

So the formulas that were put in place that were based upon frequency of usage and cost reflected the two things: More wages were being paid in Louisiana than Iowa because they didn't freeze their wages, and they used the health care services more. Those two indicators, multiplied over the years from back in the early seventies to today, where the reimbursement rates in Louisiana were far higher, highest in the Nation, and Iowa, lowest in the Nation. We were 50th, and a long ways up to 49th. We have made some marginal improvements in that. We are still 50th, it is just not so far up to 49th.

But what happened is Iowans not using health care services is similar to Iowans not demanding services from this Federal Government. It was said by the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, here is how it works: Iowans will not go to the doctor or the hospital sometimes when they need to. Sometimes they will stay home and die in bed instead. So they aren't running up health care costs, because they are independent and want to be self-reliant and take care of themselves. But that former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said, but Louisianans are a little different. They will wake up in the morning and feel good and go to the doctor and ask them why.

Well, if those two things are right, and they are just used to describe the stark differences and not meant to be a particular representation of the people in either State, because we know there are outstanding people in all States, that is the kind of people though that we have here in Iowa right now that have been underwater and seen floods of epic proportions; the kind of people that will stay home and die in bed; the kind of people that won't go to the streets and demonstrate; the kind of people that aren't criticizing the Federal, State, county or city government for not doing enough. They are not criticizing their Governor or Members of Congress or their Senators. They are not criticizing FEMA in an intense, significant way. They are saying, just give me some answers so I can plan, and I will do what I have to do. And if I have lost my entire life's work and all I have left is a chance to go on Social Security, I am going to figure out how to adjust to that. But give me some real answers.

I think this Congress needs to give some real answers, and I think we need to expand the Stafford Act to include small businesses so they qualify for grants in the same fashion that residences do. And if we can't do that, I don't know how I can justify the grants that go to the residences.

The businesses are essential in the entire economic ecosystem of the communities, because if it weren't for the businesses, the residences wouldn't be there. If it weren't for the businesses, the railroad wouldn't need to be there. If it weren't for the businesses, there won't be anything there.

Nobody is going to go out and move out in the countryside and just live there and live on the land, because, sooner or later, somebody has to start a business. They are the key, and they are the source of at least 80 percent of the new employment in America. We need to get them on their feet quickly.

One of the smart people in the meeting on Saturday is a city council member who is also a CPA who said, these businesses that have taken the flood losses have been kicked into a business startup mode. The risk of failure in a new business startup is significantly greater than it is in a business that is established. Even though these businesses were established, for the most part they have lost so much capital and they have got such a deep hole to come back out of, they are essentially startup businesses.

So they don't need to have a 30 year liability. That doesn't help their cash flow. And, by the way, these losses that they have are losses that aren't going to be funded. It isn't like a new investment that you put in when you go in and replace the floor and the furnishing and appliances and the walls and the wiring in your business, and the inventory. It isn't like you have added on to a production line and you kick up your gross receipts and help your bottom line. This is a great big hole that has to be filled in the equity that has been created often through a lifetime of work. That is what is up.

I am asking the leadership in this Congress to quickly go to work with us, and let's get the tax package passed that all of the Members of the Iowa delegation in the House and Senate support. Let's get some relief there. Let's provide some grant money for the businesses that all the members of the Iowa delegation in the House of Representatives support, the amendment of the Stafford Act. Let's send a message from this Congress that there is hope to the people that live in the city that has seen more water than ever before, a city that is indistinguishable from New Orleans at the peak of the recovery of its disaster, a city that is the second largest city in the State of Iowa, as an example, which represents the cities up and down those valleys of the Cedar, the Iowa, the Turkey River and others, and along the Mississippi River Valley.

All this needs to be done by this Congress. When one goes and looks at the example of the appropriations that have taken place to try to lift the people in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, along the Gulf Coast and parts of Texas out of their Katrina and Rita disasters, we can do the same for people in the Midwest. Not just Iowa, Madam Speaker, but also across the river, up the river and down the river. We need to do the right thing.

Once we cross the line and make the commitment, we need to do a balanced commitment and help these businesses out, as well as the residences. And it needs to be a definitive response, a response that they can count on, and one that build their future on.

That is what I am asking of this Congress. That is what I am asking of our leadership. And I am asking for the cooperation across the aisle between the Democrats and the Republicans. I am going to ask my colleagues in this Congress to come down to this floor and raise this issue and join me in the next opportunity we have to do a special order together.

That, Madam Speaker, concludes this subject matter. I believe that being this close to our adjournment time, I am going to just fit in one more subject quickly for the matter of information purposes for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is something that is continually distorted on the floor as we have these energy debates. The statement is consistently made, why would you drill in ANWR? It will take 10 years to get any oil out of ANWR. Then that moves up to 15 years, and then 20 years I heard last week; 20 years to get oil out of ANWR.

Well, we passed ANWR legislation out this House not that long ago, I am going to say not 20 years ago, but about 4 or 5 years ago. Had that made it to the President's desk, instead of having been filibustered in the Senate by the same party that opposes energy expansion in this Congress, we would have oil coming out of ANWR today.

I was signed up to go up to Alaska to open up the oil fields in the North Slope of Alaska. I was signed up to do that in 1970, and as I prepared to go up there, there was a court injunction that was filed. That court injunction in 1970 froze the development of the Alaska North Slope oil fields, and as it froze that development, there was no development that took place. It took until 1973 to open up those oil fields. I actually reported that to be 1972. I was operating from memory. It was actually 1973. I went back to get some of those records, and here is what I find.

The court injunction stopped the development of the Alaska pipelines in 1970, and it froze that development with an injunction that prohibited their development until 1973.

In 1973, the Congressman for Alaska, who is here in this Congress still, Congressman DON YOUNG, introduced legislation, because the environmentalists had successfully blocked access to a massive supply of crude oil that this country needed. Mdand this legislation was introduced and became law, and I see the date here, and I believe this is the date that it was enacted, but I am not certain, and it is November 16, 1973, when legislation was passed to open up Alaska for oil, and it reads like this. There had to be legislation that blocked all of the litigation, all the environmentalist, extremist lawsuits, and allowed for the development of the oil fields.

It says in this piece of legislation, Public Law 95–153, November 16, 1973, Section 203(a): ''The purpose of this title is to ensure that, because of the extensive governmental studies already made of this project and the national interest in early delivery of North Slope oil to domestic markets, the trans-Alaska oil pipeline be constructed promptly without further administrative or judicial delay or impediment. To accomplish this purpose, it is the intent of the Congress to exercise its constitutional powers to the fullest extent in the authorizations and directions herein made and in limiting judicial review of the actions taken pursuant thereto.''

In other words, Article III, Section 2, court stripping said you don't have any jurisdiction to hear any cases that are going to block the development of the North Slope of Alaska, the right-of-way roadway to go from Fairbanks north up to there, nor the about 850 miles of pipeline that was built from milepost zero up on the North Slope at what is known as Dead Horse access on down to Port Valdez.

Reading again from Public Law 93–153, ''The actions taken pursuant to this title which relate to the construction and completion of the pipeline system and to the applications filed in connection therewith necessary to the pipelines' operation at full capacity as described in the final environmental impact statement of the Department of Interior shall be taken without further action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.''

Congress said enough with the litigation. We want the energy out of the North Slope. Environmentalists said, you will destroy the ecosystem. What happened? Article III, Section 2, stripping, said courts, you don't get to hear any more cases. This is going to go forward, because Congress says so.

This Congress can say so to open up ANWR the same way, the same ecosystem. That is right, neighbors. It takes 74 miles of pipeline to be added to connect it to the 850 miles or so of Alaska pipeline that is there.

This legislation, November 16, 1973, opened it up. We had to build the road. We had to build the pipeline. We had to drill the wells. We had to put the feeder tubes together. We had to get it to the terminal, get all of that done. And 3 years later, by our calculation, actually 35 months later, crude oil came out of the pipeline in Valdez.

Now, if that can happen back in 1973, with the technology we have today, who would believe that we can't drill ANWR, build a 74 mile pipeline and get that oil coming out of that pipeline at Port Valdez in a lot less than 10 years, and a far lot less than 20 years. I would submit it is easily less than 3 years.

This Congress has vacillated on this subject matter. We can't get a vote out

of this Speaker because they don't believe that we ought to have more energy in the marketplace. I believe we should. I believe that it is the law of supply and demand.

We need more energy into the marketplace of all kinds. We need to drill ANWR; we need to drill the Outer Continental Shelf; we need to drill the non-national park public lands; we need to open up the natural gas, the vast supplies we have, about 420 trillion cubic feet on the Outer Continental Shelf; we need clean burning coal, and lots of it; and we need to take the oil out of the coal shale in the heart of the west, in the Rockies.

We need more nuclear, and this Congress blocked access to another location for uranium, the last place that I know we can go to. We need to expand our nuclear. And, yes, we need wind and we need solar and geothermal. Those are the only three sources that were not met with vigorous opposition. But those three sources altogether, wind, solar and geothermal, only comprise 0.74 of 1 percent of the overall energy consumption in the United States. My friends on this side of the aisle, that really don't have a plan except to shut down access to energy, would want to take those three little pieces and expand them into 100 percent of the new energy supply for the United States and then say, well, we want to be energy independent.

Now, how are you going to do that? It is not possible to do so, unless we expand and grow the size of the energy pie, produce more of every kind of energy that we use, in an environmentally safe fashion, add another piece to the pie called energy conservation, and take that 72 percent of the energy that we are consuming, 72 percent of the energy we are consuming is the energy that we are producing, we need to expand the 72 percent to 100 percent to be energy independent.

We can do it. We must believe. We must do it in all ways, and we need to act now before it is too late and our wealth is transferred overseas to the Middle East, to people that don't like us all that much.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence and the privilege, and 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. MATHESON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LOEBSACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3352. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 31, 2008, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7850. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement and the Group Risk Plan of Insurance Regulations (RIN: 0563-AC17) received July 22, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7851. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0302; FRL-8369-5] received July 22, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7852. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Acquisition Policy, and Strategic Sourcing, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Conforming Changes — Standards of Conduct and Extraordinary Contractual Actions [DFARS Case 2008-D004] (RIN: 0750-AG01) received July 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7853. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Acquisition Policy, and Strategic Sourcing, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Small Business Program Name Change [DFARS Case 2008-D001] (RIN: 0750-AG00) received July 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7854. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Acquisition Policy, and Strategic Sourcing, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Definition of Congressional Defense Committees [DFARS Case 2007-D026] (RIN: 0750-AF99) received July 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7855. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Withdrawal of Final Flood Elevation Determination for the District of Columbia, Washington, DC [Docket No. FEMA-B-7791] received July 22, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7856. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Virginia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision; Withdrawal of Immediate Final Rule [EPA-R03-RCRA-2008-0256; FRL-8574-7] received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7857. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Reasonably Available Control Technology Under the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2007-0449; FRL-8696-6] received July 22, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7858. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Idaho [EPA-R10-OAR-2008-0336; FRL-8697-1] received July 22, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7859. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Semiconductor Manufacturing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0086, FRL-8695-9] (RIN: 2060-AN80) received July 22, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7860. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Comp. Bur., Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Development of Nationwide Broadband Data to Evaluate Reasonable and Timely Deployment of Advanced Services to All Americans, Improvement of Wireless Broadband Subscribership Data, and Development of Data on Interconnected Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) Subscribership [WC Docket No. 07-38] received July 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7861. A letter from the Deputy Division Chief, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of The Commercial Mobile Alert System [PS Docket No. 07-287] received July 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7862. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Comp. Bur., Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Development of Nationwide Broadband Data to Evaluate Reasonable and Timely Deployment of Advanced Services to All Americans, Improvement of Wireless Broadband Subscribership Data, and Development of Data on Interconnected Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) Subscribership [WC Docket No. 07-38] received July 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7863. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-73 concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Iraq for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7864. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-86 concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to