

use all kinds of gimmicks to try to delay the generic coming to market. That is what the gentlewoman is trying to eliminate. I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has a bill, and some of that language is included in our Democratic substitute that would close those loopholes. Again, this is a pricing issue. Because if we bring generics to market, we reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) is absolutely right. I think what is also compelling about the Democratic initiative is the ability, and I think people understand this readily, to be able to leverage the great buying power that the Federal Government would have in terms of initiating a program under Medicare.

Currently, whether you are a large corporation, whether you are the Federal Government itself, or whether you are a large labor union, you have the opportunity to go directly to pharmaceutical companies and leverage deep discounts in order to make prescription drugs more affordable. Medicare is a Federal program. Medicare would provide us with an opportunity to have large numbers that will allow us to leverage and bring down the cost, just like every other western industrialized country in the world is able to do. This makes common sense.

I commend our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who understand at the heart of this issue is price and getting the cost down here and being able to have a program that is affordable, that is accessible, and will be readily available and, most importantly, workable for our seniors. Again, that is why I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for his efforts.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to just mention one more Republican because I cannot praise them too much here. It is interesting to see that some are standing up to their leadership. This one is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) who said he absolutely would vote against the measure unless more money is included for rural hospitals. He said once pharmacy is a part of Medicare, there will be no extra cash any more.

What he is referencing is the problem for rural areas because, as the gentleman knows, just like with the HMOs that do not offer, do not have benefits, we do not have HMOs in a lot of rural areas, the same problem will exist here because you do not have a guaranteed Medicare benefit. It is unlikely in a lot of rural areas there would be any kind of private drug policy offered, which is what the Republicans are saying. The concern is that rural areas will be left out, and there will be no insurance policies for them to buy.

The other thing is with regard to the pharmacies, particularly in rural areas. What would happen with a private insurance plan, just like with HMOs, they will decide what vehicle to use to

dispense the drugs. They may use a large chain or may decide to do it through mail order and not through the local pharmacy. There is a real problem with those in rural areas, our colleagues who are concerned about whether any benefit would be available at all because an insurance company would not sell in those areas. Or, secondly, if there is one, it will operate like an HMO and will exclude any kind of dispensing of medicine from the local pharmacy.

Of course, we in our bill do the opposite. We say this is a Medicare-guaranteed benefit, and you can go to any pharmacy or any outlet to buy the medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman for pointing out the many Republicans on the other side who understand this.

□ 2215

This is an age-old battle between Democrats and Republicans and why I feel it is so important that we vote side by side on the differences between the proposals and commend those Republicans who have come forward with their own concepts and are focused on pricing, because they are among the few and the brave and the valiant who are willing to go against their own conventional wisdom and ideology.

Roosevelt said it best during the struggles to bring Social Security to the forefront. He was amazed at the time that Republicans seemed to be, as he said, frozen in the ice of their own indifference to what the policies they would perpetrate would do to the American public. Frozen in the ice of their indifference to what their proposals would do to a Nation that is crying out for relief. That is why their Members who are standing up and maybe not in total unison with us but standing up for what they know is right for senior citizens deserve a great deal of credit.

It is my sincere hope that the Rules Committee will provide an opportunity for all of us to have an opportunity to vote on the measures that we believe will best provide relief for those we are sworn to serve in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman for joining me tonight. We probably can find out as soon as we yield back our time what is the situation with the Rules Committee. But, again, I agree with you. We just want this to be brought up, we want to have a debate, we want to have an opportunity for the Democratic position to be considered side by side with the Republican.

And it is not, at least I do not think for most of us it is really an issue that is partisan or even ideological. I just think the problem is we know that Medicare works. We have seen it work. We know that before the 1960s when Medicare came into being that it was virtually impossible for senior citizens

to buy any kind of insurance policy that was affordable, that would pay for their hospitalization or their doctor bills. That is why Medicare started, because the private sector did not provide that opportunity.

This has been a very good government program. It is a government program, so maybe some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a problem with Medicare ideologically. I am sure some of them do. But you have to throw that aside and look at what is practical and what works for the American people. The Democrats are simply saying Medicare works; and the best way to provide this prescription drug benefit, really the only way in the system that we have, is for the government to expand Medicare to include prescription drugs, which is what we are advocating.

Again, I do not know whether it is the ideology or, maybe going back to what I said at the beginning, it is just the money from the prescription drug industry that prevents the Republican leadership from going ahead with a Medicare program and addressing the issue of price because that makes sense. I have to believe it is the money from the drug companies that is really behind the effort to stop a Medicare program.

CORPORATE GREED, THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND COLORADO FIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of subjects of which I wish to cover this evening. Of course, having the opportunity to come over and wait for my time allotment to speak to the Members here, you get to listen to the people that preceded you speaking. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is a very capable individual and speaks very well. There is only one point I want to make clear about his conversations.

At the beginning of his remarks, he expressed some dismay that the Republican leadership may not be able to bring up the prescription care bill, the Medicare bill, this week. He was very discouraged by that. He talked about and gave some examples of people that needed prescription assistance and senior citizens and their trials and tribulations that they go through, of which of course we would all agree with.

What he did not point out was the fact that none of the Democrats want to help us. So there is a reason that that bill cannot come to the floor, and that is because we do not have bipartisan cooperation. The Republicans have asked the Democrats on a regular basis, pitch in and help us. Prescription care is a serious problem in this country. We have got to come up with some type of solution. We prefer to come up

with a bipartisan solution. Prescription care problems out there in our society do not happen to just Republicans. The ability or lack of ability to pay for prescription services does not just happen to Democrats. It happens to all people in our country. That is why it is necessary for bipartisan support.

But, unfortunately, this is an election year; and with November not very far away and with the Democrats vowing that they will make prescription care services their main issue to try and defeat the Republicans, they find within their own conferences no incentive to cooperate. This thing is being driven by politics, and that is exactly why we get criticism of the Republicans not bringing it up.

The reason is Republicans do not have the numbers. They need some help from the Democrats. But there is no way in an election year that the Democrats are going to help us with prescription care services. One, they do not want the issue resolved before November. They do not want the Republicans to get the credit for having solved the big problem in this country, so they will do whatever they can to resist any kind of cooperation. And while on one hand they will not cooperate, they turn around on the other hand and blame us for not bringing that bill to the floor.

So I would suggest to my good friends over on the Democratic side, come on, let us be a little less partisan about this. Help us. Work with us. That is what we are asking for.

But that is not the intent of my speaking to you this evening. I really want to cover three separate subjects. I want to talk, of course, about the outrageous decision made today by the Ninth Circuit in California about the fact that America now must hang its head in disgrace because our Pledge of Allegiance has been declared unconstitutional, unconstitutional by a Federal appeals court.

That is no low-level court. That is a very high court in our country. It has had the audacity to come out and take the most recognized symbol in the world and the Pledge of Allegiance to that symbol and to that country, in a time of war, in a time when every other country in the world encourages its children in its schools, in its institutions, in its areas of public domain, encourages their civilizations to engage in religious practice, that this court finds it necessary for the United States to see that its Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional because it mentions the name God. We will talk a little about that.

I want to talk about the fires in Colorado. In fact, I have got a poster. I want to talk a little about the fire damage in Colorado, the fires and what is going on. During those discussions, I am going to point out, so that you have some proportion of the damage in Colorado, Colorado is not burning as a State. The great majority, 99 and some

percent, of Colorado is not on fire. 99.9 percent of the State of Colorado is open for tourism; and if you want the greatest deal of the summer, you go to Colorado, because there are a lot of deals out there. There are a lot of opportunities.

Colorado is a very gorgeous State. Of course, I am very proud of it. My family on my side and on my wife's side, we have multiple generations in Colorado. I could talk about Colorado all evening, but I do want to put it in some proportion, and we will be looking at this map to my left. I will give you a little idea of exactly what we are talking about.

But we are not going to move to that map yet because I want to also talk this evening about corporate greed, this WorldCom stuff, Kmart, Global Crossing, Xerox Corporation, Tyco Corporation, and now maybe even our favorite, Martha Stewart. What is going on out there in the corporate world? What is going on with the integrity of these people? What are they doing to our society? What are they doing to that credibility gap which is a foundation of the economic cycle of this country, of the economic principles of this country?

It depends on integrity from people who manage these companies and people who oversee the management of the company, i.e., the board of directors. We are uncovering stone after stone after stone in corporate America, and what are we finding? We are finding corporate self-serving greed, not greed in a healthy capitalistic fashion but greed in a way that it is criminal.

I intend to spend some time on that this evening, too. I intend to talk very specifically about what I think some of the solutions are. When I think of what is going on out there, it makes me think of a four-letter word. That is what I think of when I think of corporate greed. I want to use a four-letter word, J-A-I-L, jail. That is exactly what I am thinking about. That is exactly where some of these corporate executives ought to be, and it is exactly where those corporate boards of directors ought to be. That four letter word, J-A-I-L.

I am not trying to jump into these remarks too early, but let me tell you something. If you were an employee with Kmart Corporation or you were an employee with Enron Corporation or Tyco Corporation, or let us go back to Kmart. Let us say you are just a sales clerk at Kmart, at one of their stores and you stole a candy bar. You stole a candy bar from Kmart, from your employer, you stuck it in your pocket, a candy bar, and walked out of the store with it. Up to this point in time, you would suffer more repercussions for stealing a candy bar as an employee of Kmart Corporation than will those executives of Kmart Corporation who loaned themselves millions and millions and millions of dollars and then took a corporate board action and forgave the loans to themselves and then

filed bankruptcy on behalf of the corporation. Think about that. There are people that will get in more trouble stealing a candy bar or a magazine or a tool from one of these retailers than will the CEOs.

Let us take, for example, WorldCom. If you steal long distance services from WorldCom, let us say you steal \$100 worth of long distance services from WorldCom Corporation. You are going to get in more trouble than the chief executive, Bernie Evers, got in trouble; and he got a \$350 million loan from the board of directors, \$350 million of which he will never be able to pay back.

It is unbelievable, and the American economic society is suffering as a result. We have got to bring the hammer down on these executives, and we have got to bring it down hard and heavy. We have got to make it so that every prosecutor in this country, every U.S. attorney in this country when they think of these chief executives, they think of that four letter word, J-A-I-L, jail.

Let me start back and let me talk about in a little more detail some of these subjects. First of all, let me talk about the flag. I, like many millions and millions and millions of Americans today, was stunned, stunned, that a Federal appeals court, that two judges could bring this country to its knees by saying that this country's Pledge of Allegiance, a pledge that every child in this country has said, that every school in this country and every school this country has ever had has been said within its four walls is unconstitutional because it has the words "under God" contained within its four corners.

You think about this decision. What is next? That ought to be the logical question. We have these liberal judges. By the way, you take the most liberal Member of this House Chamber, and these judges make those liberal Members of this House Chamber look like they are right-wing conservatives.

The Ninth Circuit is an island of its own as known in the legal circles. I practiced law. I was an attorney. The Ninth Circuit has always been known as kind of an island of its own, but, nonetheless, it is still a Federal appeals court. So you have to ask yourself, okay, somebody that wants to stir up trouble, what is the next logical thing for this court in California to declare unconstitutional?

□ 2230

Could it be the crosses at Arlington National Cemetery or the crosses at every military cemetery in this country? Is it unconstitutional because the cross is seen as a symbol of Christianity and we find it on Federal property; we find it on every grave of every military person and their spouses and, in some cases, their children, who have served this Nation? And now these judges, do we think that is logical? Of course it is logical. And of course it is something that now, something that

we never imagined any judge would go so far out of bounds of their judicial duties that they would, first of all, declare our Pledge of Allegiance as unconstitutional. Then the next step, logically, would be for them to go to our national cemeteries and start yanking crosses out of our servicemen's graves. What is next?

How interesting. I bet these judges, I bet these judges this week; let us see. July 1, coming next week. I bet on July 1, those judges that made that decision today that the word "God" in the Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional, I bet those judges on July 1 put their greedy little hands out and take their paycheck and take that American money that says "In God We Trust" on it. I bet they take that money, and I bet they stuff it in their pockets.

Now, I would say to these judges, if you are true to principle, you should refuse this cash. You should not take American money. It has "In God We Trust" on it. It is unconstitutional. You should uphold the judiciary of this fine land. You, after all, are the ones who made the earth-shattering decision that the Pledge of Allegiance in the United States was unconstitutional. So it should not be you who steps forward for the benefits of American cash, because after all, that has "In God We Trust" and that would be offensive to the decision that you made.

But, of course, they will not hear of that; and of course, they will take their money on July 1 as they snicker about the decision that they handed down to the American people today.

I studied law. I am a lawyer. Granted, since I have been in Congress, I have not practiced law. Granted, I am not a constitutional lawyer, although I studied the Constitution. I would not be considered as a judicial scholar, by any means. But what kind of scholar does one have to be to say to the judicial system in this country, back off? How far, how hard do you want to push this Nation? In a time of war, in a time when this Nation needs to be unified, what do we think are going to be the ramifications to the generation behind us, to the rest of the world that is looking at this country and sees that its own judges, its own judges declare our Pledge of Allegiance unconstitutional? Not only do they declare it unconstitutional, they issue a dictate that says that this Pledge of Allegiance may not be said, may not be said within the walls of our schools.

I mean, I hope that people understand; and I think the millions, the mass of millions of people in the United States of America understand the slap that was just struck across their face. The refusal, the rejection of the American principle of God and liberty, regardless of what one's God is, that God and liberty and freedom and strength were rejected today by some of the people in whom we put our highest confidence. These judges ought to resign in shame.

Now, I know, I know the arguments. Look, I used to be a cop, I heard the defense attorneys, and I know tomorrow the American Civil Liberties Union and some of these other people will stand up and talk about the bravery of these judges, to stand up against popular opinion, as if popular opinion is always wrong; to stand up against popular opinion and say, the Pledge of Allegiance was unconstitutional, and somehow they want a feather in their cap and a badge on their vest.

Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when we ought to consider the circumstances in our Nation. There comes a time when we have to say, why do we need to take this issue on? As if there is nothing more important in this world going on; as if this is the psychological blow that the American people need right now, and that is to tell them that when their children go to school, it is taboo for their children to say the Pledge of Allegiance; to the finest country in the history of the world, the strongest country on the face of the Earth. I do not mean just strong militarily. I mean strong as far as what it does for other countries; strong as far as what it does for the poor people in this world; strong as far as what it does for its contributions of inventions, of mechanical inventions, of medical inventions, of medicine, of prescriptive services. I mean think about this.

Mr. Speaker, do we know what these judges are? They are elitists. They are in an ivory tower out there in California, and they take for granted the fact of the hundreds of thousands of American soldiers who have died throughout the history of our country to keep this country free. I would like my colleagues to show me one soldier tomorrow that is going to say to us that their children, that children should not say the Pledge of Allegiance, that our Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional.

Now, I do take some reluctance in criticizing the judges' opinion. I think the judiciary has to have some flexibility. But by God, and I said that word just a minute ago, because I mean it. I hope He is not paying much attention; or He or She or whoever that God is, I hope they are not paying much attention as to what these judges in our country did today. I hope the patriotism that all of these hundreds of thousands of soldiers that are now dead and the patriotic cause for which they gave their lives, or maybe not their lives, but gave their career; or maybe not their career, but gave some time in their lives to go to bat for this country, I wonder what they are thinking today about why these judges did not go to bat for our country, why these judges have to stretch the law so far, so extreme. This is such a liberal interpretation of this that they would have the audacity or maybe the ignorance or maybe the stupidity to come to a Nation as great as this Nation, as a part of this Nation, which has given them everything they have, by the way;

those judges have their jobs as a result of these soldiers, as a result of the citizens of this country.

The judiciary has the respect that it does because we do indoctrinate our kids at a young age, like every other country in the history of the world does. We educate them about what a great country it is. We do try and get an allegiance to this country built up early. Is that too much to ask? Is it too much for these judges to swallow that a country says to the citizens of this country, look, we have an allegiance to this country? We have an allegiance to our flag. We have to be willing to fight for the freedom and the principles and the Declaration of Independence. We need these things. Is the next thing they are going to throw out is the Declaration of Independence because it has "God" in it, and that those rights and those thoughts and those philosophies and that ideology expressed in the Declaration of Independence should no longer be taught in the classroom because it has "God" in it? Give me a break. What is going on here?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this to stand. Those judges, those judges should be isolated; and I will tell my colleagues what else. The other body, the leader of the other body who stood up today and agreed with me, and acknowledged that this decision was just pure nuts, ought to let the President judge and get some of these judicial balanced appointments in, get some people in that are balanced. I mean, this decision is so extreme, so radical, that tomorrow when all of America wakes up, and wait until our Americans overseas take a look at this. What do we think it is going to do to them? We talk about discouraging. I mean, we talk about depressing, that is, that your own court would take one of the things that we grew up with and say it is unconstitutional because they use the word "God" in it.

I am ashamed. As a lawyer, as an officer of the court, as a United States Congressman, and more importantly than any of that, as a father, as a citizen, I am ashamed, I am ashamed at what that court in California did today, a Federal court, Federal judges who found that the Pledge of Allegiance of the greatest country in the history of the world is unconstitutional.

Do not kid ourselves. Remember years and years ago when the court first came out and said we cannot have a Christmas declaration on Federal land, we cannot have a cross up there at Christmastime; remember when they came out and said, you cannot have prayer in school; when they came out and started ignoring the basic principles, started penetrating family. And people said, oh, it is just some crazy decision; it is not going to go anywhere. This decision, it is so crazy. But do we know what happens? These judicial judges, they kind of grow on themselves. Some of these judges have egos and they are elitists like we cannot believe.

In an ivory tower they begin to think more and more and bigger and bigger of themselves, and the next thing we know they give another judgment. So do not be surprised. There will be before too long, I am confident of it, some radical liberal will file in the courts that the crucifix, the cross used in our national cemeteries is unconstitutional because it is a symbol of Christianity or a symbol used related to God. Do not be surprised. Although they will use the money, spend the money for their own needs, but they come out and say every American coin, every American dollar that says "In God We Trust" ought to be declared unconstitutional, that our money is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, back during the Cold War, I think it was Nikita Krushchev that said with America, all we have to do is be patient and give them enough rope, and they will hang themselves. Give them enough rope, and they will hang themselves. We do not have to go to battle with America. Just give me elitists. Give the elitists enough rope, and they will hang themselves. Give these elitists that declare our Pledge of Allegiance as unconstitutional, just give them enough authority and enough jurisprudence, and pretty soon they will divide their own country.

Many countries throughout the world are amused by this. These countries that hate us: Iraq, Iran, North Korea, think of these countries. They are overjoyed. They look and they see within the family, one of the most respected symbols of the family, of the American family, the family is split. They are probably as surprised as we are; but they are smirking, they are elated, they cannot believe their good luck that the American family is being split, not by outside members, but by members within the family itself, these elitist judges. Those judges should be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I did not think when I went to law school, I never thought throughout my time as practicing law, which I practiced for 10 years, I never thought when I represented the fine State of Colorado in the State House of Representatives, nor did I imagine that being on the House floor of the United States Congress, a privilege and an honor for me, that I would be standing in front of my colleagues talking about these judges in the way that I am, about the disgrace they have brought about to our country. I hope that the generations and generations of their families from now, assuming that this country survives over a long period of time, I hope that their families will look back someday upon the words of my record this evening and understand my anger and my disgrace directed towards them for the decision they made today.

Mr. Speaker, this is not emotionally driven. This is driven by my intense love and my intense belief that this country has to have a guiding light, and that guiding light is not only a su-

preme being that all of us may or may not believe in or the type of supreme being that one believes in, but a guiding light driven by a sense of patriotism, a guiding light driven by a flag, by a symbol, a guiding light driven by a President with integrity, a guiding light driven by a Pledge of Allegiance. What is wrong with singing a National Anthem? Mr. Speaker, that is probably next, for some reason. These are all tools, tools of protection of democracy; tools that make people come together as a team; tools that are used to excite us about our Nation, that are used to encourage us to rededicate time and time and time again our belief in this fine country. And yet tonight, a couple of judges at a Federal court trash it. I am stunned, disappointed, and even disappointed beyond the point of being angry, but I am ashamed of what these judges have done.

Let me move on to an entirely different subject, the subject of fire and the fires in the State of Colorado. First of all, I will tell my colleagues that my district consists primarily of all of the mountains of Colorado. There are a few mountains that are out of it, but most of the mountains in Colorado are in that district and will remain in that district after redistricting. Our district in Colorado, it is the third district, the highest district in elevation, highest place in the country when you take the elevation. I am pointing out a few of these things because we are having pretty serious problems with a drought out in Colorado.

□ 2245

We do have serious fires. We have had a horrible fire in Durango, Colorado. Yesterday we got a second fire in Durango, Colorado, just across the road; and it was from another origin, another cause. It was caused by an entirely different source. We have a terrible fire raging in Arizona. We had a terrible fire near Denver, still in the Third Congressional District, called the Hayman fires.

But these fires, the national press, all the pictures that we see in the national press would lead us to believe that Colorado has been hit by a bomb; that Colorado, somehow all the mountains are on fire, and that Colorado is a dangerous place to visit. I will tell the Members that on its face is inaccurate.

I have to my left, and I would like to go through this map, what this map does is shows Colorado fire damage. The black spots on this map will show Members where there has been fire damage.

Members have heard about the size of these fires. They are huge. We have heard about them. But when we put it in proportion to the entire State of Colorado, these are not the size areas we imagine by seeing all the pictures in the national press.

Here is that massive, massive fire called the Hayman fire near Denver, Colorado. That fire is about 70 percent

contained, meaning that we are 70 percent around it. We are going to whip that fire. That fire got the best of us for a few days. But all the publicity Members heard, that is where that fire is. That fire does not have any national park in it. It has part of a national forest. We have closed part of that national forest down.

We have numerous national forests that are still open for the public that are not affected by this fire. We have four national parks that are not affected by this fire that are open for the public. We have thousands and thousands of tours and attractions, tourist attractions, that are not affected by this fire that are open.

If Members wanted to camp in this black spot, of which I would guess, of the people who visit in Colorado, probably less than one ten-thousandth of a percent of the visitors we have every year in our State, less than one ten-thousandth of a percent of the total visitors that come to our State every year would camp or be in these particular areas to visit. Members' visit or vacation to Colorado would not in all likelihood be in any of these black areas of Colorado.

Durango is down here in this black area. It probably is not a very accurate depiction. I am looking for a date. This is 3 days old. This map is 3 days old, so Durango would be down in this area about right over here where this little black mark is right here. That is the Durango fire. That black mark has grown. But Durango, the City of Durango, has not burned down.

In fact, if Members want to go visit a community, right after the New York City disaster what a lot of us in this country said would help New York was to go visit New York. What would help Durango, Colorado, what would help Colorado, is to go visit Colorado, go have a vacation over there.

There are lots of things that can be done, and we can help the State and help Durango. Durango needs our help. Why? Not because the city has burned. It has not burned at all. It needs our help because the perception out there is that we ought to cancel our vacations to Colorado.

In fact, one of our State newspapers ran an article to say, hey, come back next year. That on its face is an absurd statement. As I said, 99 and some percent of this State is unaffected by those black marks, and the majority of those black marks up near Glenwood Springs, for example, in Glenwood Springs, I do not think, and I am from there, I was born and raised there so I know the fire pattern very well, I do not think one campground in Glenwood springs was closed as a result of this fire, or is closed as a result of this fire. I might be off by one. But there is so much area around Glenwood Springs.

This is the flattop region. Look at all this area. There are hundreds and hundreds of thousands of square miles, or, excuse me, hundreds and hundreds, millions of acres and hundreds of thousands of square miles, I guess would be

correct, that we can go visit and camp and these attractions that we can go to.

Let me explain what got us to the fire situation that we are in. First of all, keep in mind the dryness and the drought. What we have had is we have had a large accumulation of dead forest material, and we call that material fuel. It drops off the trees, for example, and it accumulates on the forest floor.

Now, nature, frankly, before the Native Americans, before humans occupied, nature used to take care of these forests because they were what we could truly call at that point natural forests, and fire would rage on a consistent basis throughout much of the United States. In fact, to give a little history, in the 1900s, 1910, 1920, and really this is what led to the birth of Smokey, the Bear, we would, on an annual basis, have 50 million acres, up to 50 million acres a year that would burn in this country.

Last year, for example, I think we had 3 million acres burn, because we have become much better at fire suppression. Our acreage, and because we have really educated the public about the dangers of fire, instead of losing 50 million acres a year, we are losing much closer to 3 to 5 million acres a year, which means over a period of time 45 million acres a year is not being cleared out by fire, so we have fuel.

It is like trash in the home. Over time, it accumulates; and, over time, it becomes a hazard. That is what has happened on our forest floors. We have not been able to get in there for a number of reasons, the least of which is the not the least of which is the environmental movements, which have opposed, because they are so emotionally driven against logging.

And, by the way, Colorado is not even a logging State. I am not sure we have a large commercial sawmill left in Colorado.

But they are so emotionally driven by logging and their hatred towards logging that they have used these emotional arguments and their educational efforts to try and stop the thinning of the forests. Now, of course, after the fire they cannot wait to get up there and say, Oh, no, we support thinning of forests, but look at the facts, and they have contributed to it.

I am not saying that these radical organizations, these radical environmental organizations, are the cause of the fire. I am not saying that they are the only contributing factor to the fire. But what I am saying is, do not let them leave the table. Bring them back to the table, because they did contribute. Their actions, instead of allowing our forest service to manage our forests based on science, they have engineered and financed and engaged in a very sophisticated educational effort to have our forests managed by emotion, not by science.

We have to come back to science. We need to let the people who specialize,

who are educated, who grow up in it, who work it every day, our Forest Service, our BLM people, these Federal biologists, we need to let them manage these forests. We need to follow their advice, instead of going out to the public as a whole and driving emotional thought and then forcing it back on these agencies. I hope these fires wake some of these people up.

But putting the environmental issue aside, I also want to say to my fellow homeowners out there in the mountains, I have had some of my colleagues who have come up to me and said, look, why do you guys live up there? Why do you live in those mountains? Why do you live out there where there are trees that can burn up?

I said, wait a minute, why do you have trees in your yard in the big cities? That is where we live. It is our home. It has been our home for many, many years; generations in my family's situation and in my wife's family, too. Do not tell us to move from where we lived since the 1860s and where our Native American people have lived for several hundred years. That is our home.

But we do have a responsibility, fellow homeowners out there, and that is to take care of our own properties. Every one of us who lives out there in what we call the urban interface, where the homes start to come into these forests around ponderosa pine or things like that, we need to put some money and put some investment in the protection of our home.

I frankly do not think it is going to take government regulations to force us to do it. What I think is going to force us to do it out there are the homeowners insurance companies. They are going to say, with some justification, we are not going to ensure your home unless we get a check-off that your home has been treated, that the trees around your house have been trimmed back, that you do not have a ponderosa pine tree up against your house, that you have done the proper trimming, treating, and cleaned out the pine needles, and so on, and then we will ensure your home against fire. So that is something we can do for the future.

But what are the dangers we are seeing this year in this fire season? Why is everything so explosive? Not everything, but why, where we have had the fire, do we see fires so intense, so intense they sterilize the soil?

And these people that tell us, well, this fire in Durango or the Hayman fires, these are good for the environment. It is not good for the environment. These are horrible fires. In Durango, it rained dead birds. We had birds falling out of the skies, flying into the gases. We had smoke plumes 50,000 feet in the air. We have soil that is so hot that it has been, as I said, it has been neutralized. It will not be good for planting. It is so hard, the water is just going to run right off it. It will not go in it anymore. It has

been scorched to that point. These fires are not good for us.

These fires are burning with an intensity that we have not seen in recorded history. These fires are burning at a rate that is incredible. Yesterday's second fire in Durango burnt 20 acres in 4 minutes, 20 acres. Think of four football fields in 4 minutes burning; starting at one point, not multiple points, but starting in one point and going through 20 football fields, approximately an acre, going through 20 football fields in 4 minutes. There is a reason that is happening.

The other thing that concerns us about the fire season that we are facing this year is that it is so early in the season. We do not usually see these kinds of fires of this intensity this early in the season.

The other concern we have, as I mentioned earlier, the district that I represent, am privileged to represent, is at the highest elevation on the continent. We do not have fires above 9,000 feet this early in the season. Our Nation, for the first time since we have had a level 5, which is the highest level of alert for firefighting that we can go to, for the first time in the history of this alert we have gone to it before July 28.

Now it is not uncommon to go to a level 5 alert system on our fires. We did it in, I think, the fire year 2000. But what is uncommon is to go so early.

So there are a lot of challenges we face out in Colorado, but I will tell the Members, what would really hurt Colorado was for tourists, for people who wanted to come visit what is one of the most beautiful States, one of the most beautiful geographical locations in the world, to cancel their visits this summer and decide to come next year.

I am telling the Members, there are a lot of people that would hurt very, very badly if people just decided not to come to Colorado this year. I would urge my colleagues, in our own little way we have suffered greatly. Some of our families, probably 700 or 800 of our families, have lost their homes. Fortunately, the loss of life has been minimized, although last weekend not far from my house we lost five firefighters in a car accident, which brings me to the point: I want everybody to wear their seatbelts. It was a tragic loss, young people.

In fact, it was interesting, one of the fathers of one of these men said, you know something, these bastards, they will not let us timber these forests, but they expect us to send our young men and women in there to fight these fires. So there is some bitterness out there.

But one way to help ease this pain, it is the same thing that we talked about after September 11 to help New York City ease its pain: Go visit New York City. Go visit Colorado.

Again, I want to refocus on this map to my left. The areas that have burned out, the areas where the fires are, and they were burned out as of 2 days ago, are indicated by the black marks. If we put all of the black marks together,

follow my finger here to the left, we probably would have an area about like this, and the rest of the State is green.

So do not think for a moment that all of Colorado is burning, that it looks like a desert of burnt-out ash. It is not that at all. We have our problems, and we have some fires. We are working on them, and we need your help. But the best thing you can do to help us, outside of your prayers, is to come visit us in Colorado. Go ahead with your scheduled vacation. I urge Members to do it, and I am asking people for the help. I am asking for consideration to come out to Colorado and help us this year. Of any year we have needed some help, we are asking for it now.

Let me move on to my final subject of the evening. I will talk about some of the principles of American economics. Now, I am not an economics scholar. I do have a degree in business administration. I have enjoyed business all my life. I read everything I can about business. I think I am pretty studied on it, but I certainly am not a scholastic professor or talented, maybe, necessarily. But I do understand some principles.

□ 2300

And some of the principles that we have in business in this country, really, our capitalistic system works pretty well; but when you really take a look at the capitalistic system, there is one part of the foundation, we have a couple of parts of foundation that are important for the building to stand. One of them is the judiciary, the enforcement of contracts in this country. The other is the freedom to operate. Another foundation pillar would be interstate commerce, the ability to do business from one State to the other.

But in the center of all of this, one of the pillars of the foundation for our capitalistic system is integrity, integrity and credibility from the people that manage these corporations, the chief executive officers; and he can tell you that America has been let down. Not let down by one person here and one person there. But we have now been let down by enough of these chief executive officers, by enough of these boards of directors, that the perception amongst the American people is that a great majority of the business community in our country is corrupt. That is not true. But that is the perception that is out there. And frankly the perception is well deserved. Why? Take a look at what has gone on. And I am going to give you a few examples of why people in this country are sick and tired of what is going on in corporate America.

I want to tell you I am proud. The President promises that we are going to have a WorldCom investigation. And I think the President has mentioned a couple of points I think that are worth repeating right here. President Bush, and I am urging the Democrats to join us in this effort, but President Bush today said, "Let me answer the second

question first." Let me repeat that question. The question from the reporter, "Do you believe there is a crisis in confidence amongst American people vis-a-vis the economy, particularly the stock market in view of yet another failure of an American corporation?" The President responds, "Let me answer the second question first. The market is not as strong as it should be for three reasons: one, corporate profits." The President is right. We are having an economic cycle. We have economic cycles, and in the downturn your profits are not good. The President is right on that point. "Second, there are concerns whether or not the United States and our friends can prevent future terrorist attacks."

So you have number one corporate profits; you have number two post-September 11. What is next? How do we protect our assets? Are our nuclear plants at risk? Is the Capitol at risk? How do we protect our assets? That is the second item.

But of interest this evening to my remarks are what the President says is the third factor that is hurting our stock market, that is hurting our national economy. I quote from the President: "Thirdly, there are some concerns with the validity of the balance sheets of corporate America and I can understand why. We have had too many cases of people abusing their responsibilities and people just need to know that the Security and Exchange Commission is on it. Our government is on it. We will pursue within our laws those who are responsible or acting irresponsible."

The President is right. Corporate America, many of your leaders in corporate America have let this country down in many different ways. You can take a look at some of the corporations that are making every effort they can to incorporate in other countries to take their headquarters, even though they have no customers, like Stanley Tool Corporation. Even though Stanley has no sales in Bermuda, no customers, no employees in Bermuda, they have reincorporated their corporation, remember Stanley Tool, the tape measures you buy at the hardware store, in Bermuda to avoid paying taxes like every other American has to make. Despite the fact that we have American soldiers fighting so that corporations and business in this country can have the freedom of commerce, they give their lives, these young men and women, people throughout this country sacrifice whether it is in the judiciary or other means, to provide for free enterprise, to provide for commerce and the free flow of commerce, and yet we have these people that are abusing the privilege that has been granted to them.

Let me give you some other examples. We hear about Enron. Take a look at WorldCom, which today admitted, today admitted a 3 or \$4 billion fraud against the stockholders of its corporation. And not only the stockholders of

its corporation, it has a ripple effect. It affects all of America. What did they also announce today? That because of this fraud they had to lay off 17,000 people. There are 17,000 people today without jobs because of greed in that corporate board room, because of greed of a few self-serving criminals, in my opinion. And you can find it in WorldCom Corporation.

And WorldCom is not alone, unfortunately. Take a look though what WorldCom did. They are not a bank. WorldCom is not a bank. It is a long distance company. It is a communications company. It is a telecom company. It is not a bank. Banks loan money. Long distance companies do not loan money. They sell you long distance services, but WorldCom was different. It was a bank. It loaned money. But you know who it loaned money to? It did not loan money to any of its employees at the lower level. It loaned money to their chief, to the president. The guy needed five bucks for a sandwich at lunch. That is not what they did. They loaned the chief executive officer, Bernie Ebbers \$350 million, \$350 million. By the way it did not come out of the board of directors' pockets. It came out of the stockholders'. It came out of the corporate treasury. It came out of the consumers'. It came out of the American buying public to give one person a 350 or \$360 million loan, while at the same time this person who is the head of the corporation so he is captain of the ship, a ship which is committing, while this is all going, a 3 or \$4 billion fraud just unveiled in the last few days. Why are those people not in jail?

I am telling you I am going to do everything I can within the abilities of the office that I hold to faithfully and diligently prosecute these people who are abusing the privileges in our system of commerce in this country.

Now, was it WorldCom alone? No, take a look at K-Mart Corporation. K-Mart is in bankruptcy. That is a fine corporation, and they drove it into the hole. But before they took it into bankruptcy, what did the executives at K-Mart do? Well, they borrowed money. K-Mart is not a bank. K-Mart does not loan money to its customers. K-Mart sells merchandise. But their executives used K-Mart, their board of directors used K-Mart as a bank. Their executives used it as an ATM machine. Just like Bernie Ebbers pulled 350 million out of the ATM machine at WorldCom that he built and put in place, the ATM machine, so did the executives at K-Mart corporation.

How many people have lost their jobs at K-Mart because of their corporate greed? Those executives not only borrowed the money, but they wanted to make sure right before they have filed for bankruptcy for K-Mart corporation, that they passed a board resolution which forgave the loans, said do not pay us back. You do not have to worry about it. It is a gift.

Enron, we have heard a lot about Enron. What a disgrace. Andrew

Fastow, you heard about Andrew Fastow, F-A-S-T-O-W, sets up secret partnerships, pays himself \$40 million. And I am telling you today, so far at this point in time, if you stole a candy bar or you stole a magazine at the magazine store up the street here from the Capitol, you would be suffering more consequences than this Andrew Fastow who worked for Enron Corporation is suffering for stealing 35 or \$50 million that he paid himself as a salary. He does not call it stealing. He says, look, I earned it. I went out and did a little work for a couple of months and should have got paid \$40 million. By the way I did not bother to tell anybody about it because I wanted it to be a secret.

By the way, I was a big art donor and down there in Texas I gave lots to charity and stuff so leave me alone. You know what? Andrew ought to spend a long time in that four letter word I used earlier on, J-A-I-L, jail. He ought to go straight to jail. He ought to be on that Monopoly card when he bets everybody else's money. And he not only bets their money, he takes their money for his own self-serving purposes. He ought to pull that card every time he reaches into that deck, he ought to pull out that card that says you ought to go straight to jail. He ought to go straight to jail. And that is not the only one at Enron. We all know about the Ken Lays and some of the other mismanagement that went on.

Take a look at the bonuses they paid to their executives. They paid some of their executives millions and millions of dollars to stay with the company after the news broke about the corruption of the company. And some of these executive officers took their millions of dollars in bonuses and walked away 30 days later. And how many thousands of employees of Enron now are losing houses because they cannot make payments, have to give up their cars, cannot send their kids to the colleges they all dreamed of? How many of these 17,000 employees that got laid off today at WorldCom lose their dreams because Bernie Ebbers got a \$350 million loan from the corporation while they drove the corporation into the ground as a result of a \$4 billion fraud.

□ 2310

It does not stop there. Take a look at Xerox Corporation. Who could have ever imagined that Xerox would find itself in this situation? Take a look at Global Crossing. Who today, on a small paragraph in the national media, you will notice Global Crossing also admit they shredded a few documents, that they really are going to try and behave themselves, but how much punishment has been doled out to the Global Crossing executives?

Take a look at the billionaire that runs that, billionaire, flies around. By the way, the executives at WorldCom, the executives at Enron, the executives at Kmart, the executives at Xerox, the

executives at Global Crossing and the executives at Tyco, as well as our favorite, Martha Stewart, all fly around in private jets. This has not hurt many of these people. You think Andrew Fastow down there in Texas is flying private commercial jet, living like a king down there, having taken all this money.

How many of those people that work for Enron are flying around like that? They are lucky to go to a garage sale to try and sell some of the things they have.

Let me go on because it does not stop just at Global Crossing.

How interesting that WorldCom today had as its auditor Arthur Andersen. Ever heard that name before, Arthur Andersen? I can tell you, instead of bringing the corporation down, I do not understand why we did not go to those specific auditors that are responsible for the obstruction of justice, that are responsible for the malfeasance in Enron audits and now WorldCom audits and take those auditors and send them to jail, give them that four-letter word, give them that card in the Monopoly game that says you go straight to jail. It is not happening.

I got a little encouragement today when President Bush, and you know how he is when he announces a commitment, when he sets his eyes on something. When he is focused, he goes for it; and I think he is committed.

I would hope the Members of the U.S. House, both Republican and Democrat, come on board and clean the system of the dirt that we have got in there. This dirt is in our filter, and this filter is important for our engine to run. Our economic engine needs clean filters. We have got to take the time to slow the engine down enough, although it has been slowed down because the filter is too dirty. We have got to pull those filters out, and we have got to get the dirt out of the filters.

The dirt means that we go after people like the WorldCom that have taken this money, that have committed these acts of larceny and crime against the people of America and their stockholders, and it does not stop there. Look at Tyco Corporation, look at the lawyer for Tyco Corporation. I used to practice law. This lawyer made an agreement, had their board of directors approve an agreement that if he was convicted of a felony within a year and got fired because he was convicted of a felony, they had to pay him \$10 million. This guy got paid \$20, \$30, \$40 million, and he put the payments in such a way that he did not have to go in front of the board of directors or disclose it on their public disclosure statements as an executive salary, and his lawyer stands up for this lawyer and says this is justified when the whole story comes out.

We are anxious to see the whole story, and I will tell you this, if the whole story does not pan out, and it is

not going to pan out, by the way, that lawyer ought to go to jail. He ought to be disbarred and every asset that he has that he got through his ill-gained fruits ought to be taken away from him and given back to the people that he took it from.

It is the same thing with the guy at WorldCom. I understand I think his annual retirement is \$4 million a year. They ought to take it away from him.

Why do we reward these people who have put dirt in the filter that is so important for our economic engine to run? It does not stop there. How do you restore confidence in the stock market in this country? In the last 5 years, what we experienced in this country was a tremendous participation in one of the neat mechanisms of our economy and that is the stock market. We had people, whether they were driving a taxicab, we had congressmen, myself included, we had people that had never before been in the stock market. They invested in the stock market.

Now we have got an economic downturn, but that is being hidden. The cycle of the economic downturn is being concealed and hidden and distracted, diverted from by fraud in the corporate boardroom and in the corporate chief executive offices.

Once we start this cycle, and we need confidence to get that cycle going back up again, how many of those people driving those cabs or how many of those people that invested in that market are going to have enough confidence that they will get back into the market?

Take a look at some of these people. What is that guy named Henry Blodget or something from Merrill Lynch, and he went out there and on TV and in front of the public he said, this is the greatest stock since sliced bread; and then behind the scenes, he would write something, this stock stinks or what a rotten piece of stock or this breakdown in that funnel of trust is significant, and we need to go after it.

I will tell you, it is amazing to me. Martha Stewart, is that what is next? How many more rocks out there that when we look under them we are going to find problems, we are going to find fraud? I hope not too many are left.

The only way to teach a lesson here is you have to have punishment. You have got to have consequences to their actions. You cannot allow these chief executives, this Andy guy, Andrew down there at Enron or Ken down there at Enron or Bernie Ebbers or the lawyer that worked for Tyco or John Rigas of the cable company, whatever it is out there in California, you cannot allow these people to walk away, rewarded from malfeasance. These people have to pay the consequences, or the credibility of the system is damaged for a long, long time.

Let me summarize my words this evening. I really covered four areas.

First of all, I wanted to stress to my friends on the Democratic aisle, who in their comments this evening started

out by criticizing the Republicans, because this week and the remaining 2 days of this week we may not be able to bring a prescription care bill to the floor. My point was the reason we cannot bring it is we are not getting any Democratic support at all. We have had no Democrat over there, especially on the liberal side of the Democratic party, none of them have come across the aisle and been willing to help us. That is why we cannot bring the bill to the floor. All they want to do is kill it for political purposes.

So let us call an ace an ace. That is why we cannot. We want to bring it to the floor. We want bipartisan support. I urge the Democrats to help us.

I talked about the fires in Colorado and the characteristics, some characteristics of the fire, what we are concerned about. We have plenty of resources that we are putting out there in those fires. The Forest Service has done a tremendous job so far, the Bureau of Land Management, our local fire departments, our local volunteer fire departments have saved thousands, thousands of structures in Colorado around these communities that were burned.

I cannot tell you how proud I am of our emergency personnel, whether they are ambulance drivers, whether it is the Red Cross people volunteering their time, whether it is our local sheriffs, our local police chiefs, our policemen, our sheriff's offices, our whole communities have come together in Colorado to put the resources necessary to beat down these fires. And we will win. We will win over time, but in the meantime we have taken a horrible loss to our wildlife, to many people's residents. We lost five firefighters last week.

The other point I wanted to make about the fires in Colorado was Colorado is still open for business. Colorado is open for tourists. And again, I just want to point out in this map to my left, please look to my left, it is the black part on this map here and a few dots throughout the mountains, and that is actually a lake down there. These blackened areas, that is all of Colorado that is burned. The entire State is not on fire. Our State does not look like a wasteland, a desert of ash. It is a State waiting for you to visit. It is a State prepared to give you a time. It is a State that this year more than

anyone probably next to New York State needs you to come and spend some of your money. Come to our Rockies baseball games, go see the Air Force Academy, go over to the Western slope, go enjoy the pool in the Glenwood Springs and the Colorado National Monument in Grand Junction or up in Estes Park the Rocky Mountain National Park or the great sand dunes down near Alamosa.

□ 2320

We have a lot of areas open for you to come and enjoy. I hope you do.

And, of course, the final subject that I spoke about this evening was corporate greed. All of us, and I am urging the Democrats to join us, must fight this corporate greed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7640. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change in Disease Status of Estonia With Regard to Rinderpest and Foot-and-Mouth Disease [Docket No. 01-041-2] received May 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7641. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Virtual Military Health Institute: Promoting Excellence in Executive Skills for the Military Health System" as a requirement to the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act FY 2001, Section 760; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7642. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Use of Interstate Branches Primarily for Deposit Production [Regulation H; Docket No. R-1099] (RIN: 3064-AC36) received June 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7643. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7783] received May 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7644. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: Arizona [AZ-113-0054a; FRL-7233-6] received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7645. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Sandpoint, Idaho, Air Quality Implementation Plan [Docket ID-15-6995a; FRL-7232-1] received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7646. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: Arizona [AZ-109-0051a; FRL-7233-5] received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7647. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA261-0344a; FRL-7227-6] received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7648. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA261-0343a; FRL-7220-4] received June 21,

2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7649. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA247-0352; FRL-7227-2] received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7650. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Visible Emissions and Open Fire Amendments; Correction [MD062-3087a; FRL-7236-8] received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7651. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Wisconsin: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7237-2] received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7652. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Excess Volatile Organic Compound Emissions Fee Rule [WI104-02-7334; FRL-7226-8] received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7653. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of