

FIRST 100 DAYS OF BUSH
ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for holding forth for an hour on what I think is a very important discussion. I think it is also important as we debate this issue that we clarify the reason why we rise to the floor, Mr. Speaker, for some might think that it is clearly to make a very bland or a very superficial analysis of 100 days of an administration.

Might I say as a Member of the United States Congress, I am willing to look at our 100 days as well because frankly what I am concerned about is the future of this Nation, the good future of the Nation, the improved quality of life. As I look to the 100 days, what I say to the American people is we can analyze 100 days because we have certain documents and certain actions that we can determine whether or not there is a vision for the future of this Nation or whether in fact we are going backward.

What I would say to the administration is of course there are analyses that suggest that it has been an okay 100 days, it has been a good 100 days, there is nothing that has been disturbed in the 100 days. That may be the case, but the question is who have we helped, what vision have we set forward in order to improve the quality of life of so many Americans? What have we done to be bold in our leadership?

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House and cite several aspects of concern that I have. I have not seen the bold leadership that is necessary. When we left the last Congress, the 106th Congress, we knew that we had a problem with uninsured children in America. We know that in the last Congress and in the Congress before, we put aside \$24 billion to ensure that children around the Nation could be insured. Yet that has not been fulfilled. And so it would be important that a bold vision for America be a commitment to insure every uninsured child. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that surpasses any need to give a \$1.6 trillion tax cut on a surplus that is unsteady.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we had bipartisan support on smaller class sizes for our Nation's schools. Not only smaller class sizes but to rebuild our crumbling schools. Not in someone's district but in America, whether it is rural, suburban or whether or not it is an urban area. There is not one of us who can go to our districts that cannot find a 50-year-old school, a 60-year-old school. Certainly there is great history and many of the old graduates are glad

that their building is still standing, but, Mr. Speaker, this is a circumstance where windows have to be opened, where bathrooms are not working, where stairwells are crumbling and our children are going to these schools. Bold leadership, Mr. Speaker, would have meant that in the 100 days of the administration that we are assessing and in this Congress we would have already brought to the floor of the House legislation to rebuild America's schools, collaborating with our local jurisdictions, talking about smaller class sizes.

As a member of the Committee on Science, let me say that I have spent some 6 years dealing with technology, research and development. My colleague from New Mexico spoke about Los Alamos. I went to Los Alamos and visited and saw the needs there. They have hardworking professionals but I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, we need resources in the Nation's labs. We need to rebuild them. We need to ensure that they are safe. And can you believe that we in the Committee on Science have oversight over a proposed budget by the administration that cuts this kind of research and development. In fact, what we are finding out is that there is more money for defense research and less money for civilian research. That means that NASA, the Department of Energy, NOAA, all of these entities that deal with the quality of life of Americans, improving the quality of life of Americans, helping to clean up nuclear waste, are now being proposed to be cut. That is not bold leadership. It falls on the backs of this Congress and it falls on the back of the administration.

Let me just quickly say, Mr. Speaker, why I am concerned. Both bodies, if you will, both segments have not functioned with the majority in the Senate and in the House that are Republican and this administration. One of the first things we did that now is being muffled over, if you will, in the 100 days is after 10 long years of work, we thought it was important to repeal the ergonomics work safety rule which was helping Americans with skeletal injuries because Workmen's Compensation did not pay. The administration thought that that was a big victory to repeal that long, hard work, starting under Secretary Dole of the Department of Labor and now we are repealing that.

Let me close by saying to you arsenic in the water, lowering emissions, lack of dollars for affordable housing and homelessness. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we will strike a vision for the American people, come together with some leadership, and respond to what everyday, average Americans need in the 21st century.

FIRST 100 DAYS OF BUSH
ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we have come to the floor today to offer a critique of the President's first 100 days in office. I think it is only fair that before we offer some of our valid criticisms, that we recognize where praise is due. I think before you give a new person on the job a critique, you always start with something positive. I want to start with something positive for the President. President Bush's FEMA director, Joe Albaugh, has done a good job responding to the Seattle earthquake, Mr. Speaker. We had this earthquake out in Seattle. He sent Mr. Albaugh out there and they have done a crackerjack job responding to my constituents' problems and we have appreciated it out there in Puget Sound country.

But, Mr. Speaker, there has been another earthquake of longer ramifications in my State and that is the earthquake of these incredibly high energy prices, electrical rates that are going up 30, 50, 100 percent, people who are charging wholesale electrical rates five, 10, 20 times higher than were just charged last year. Wholesale electrical generators, many of whom happen to be from the President's home State, who were charging \$20 a megawatt-hour last year are now charging \$250, \$500 a megawatt-hour, 10 to 20 times what they charged last year.

Mr. Speaker, you can imagine what that is doing to the economy of my State. We have had 400 people laid off from a pulp and paper mill that has shut down. We have got small business owners that are curtailing hours. We have got the prospect of 40,000 jobs lost as a result of these incredible price hikes.

What has this President offered the people of the West Coast, Washington, Oregon and California, in the face of this crisis? Nothing. We have come to this President and offered meaningful price mitigation legislation. We have asked him to urge FERC to ask for a meeting in the next hour or so to potentially consider a response to do something about these incredibly obscene prices that are not justified by cost, not justified by new generating capability but are only occurring due to folks who are gaming the system.

What has he said? "Let them eat cake." He said this is just a California problem. It is a Marie Antoinette energy policy and my constituents are suffering because of it. We are continuing to urge this President to give up this sort of mantra that this is just a California problem. California is still attached to the rest of the country. The earthquake has not caused it to be separated. My constituents in the

State of Washington are suffering just as badly as the constituents, if not worse, in California. We need this President to recognize he is the President for all the people, not just those in Texas, not just for the generators in Texas but he has got a responsibility to the people I represent. We need him to work with us to design a price mitigation strategy. If he will do that, he will win the applause of the folks on the West Coast. Until that happens, Mr. Speaker, he is getting a D-minus when it comes to this energy crisis on the West Coast. We need his help and we are here to ask for it.

The second issue, Mr. Speaker, is on the environment. The President's first days, first 100 days, have been tremendously inspirational. They are inspiring people to come up to me in bus stops, in grocery stores, on the ferry boat and they are saying, Jay, can you stop him? Can you fight him? Can you fight him when he is trying to cut the Hanford nuclear cleanup budget? Can you fight him when he is trying to loosen arsenic rules? Can you fight him when he is trying to allow drilling in the Arctic refuge? Can you fight him when he wants to loosen the roadless area policies so that they can do clear-cutting in our roadless areas, the last remaining nonclear-cut areas in the country? He has been an inspirational figure. He has inspired people who have never before lifted a political finger to get out there and get active to try to resist this environmental jihad that is going on right now.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the votes come up on the floor of this House, those inspirational messages will be heard and we will defeat this President in his effort to drill in the Arctic and we will have an opportunity to defeat this attack on the roadless area policy, because what my constituents are telling me, Mr. Speaker, is that in the first 100 days of this President's administration, his environmental message has been, "Leave no special interest behind." We are going to continue this fight.

A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about an issue that I know is going to become a very serious issue in this session of Congress, and that is a national energy policy. This administration is going to unveil in the coming weeks their plan for a national energy policy and I thought it was important to talk a little bit about what I think should be in that national energy policy and how we ought to look forward. Energy and energy issues are not just about today. I

think the people of this country pay us to look out to the future, 25, 50 years, and put this Nation on a very strong basis where we can be energy efficient.

Are we in that condition today? I do not think so. I think increasingly in recent years, we have gone up and up with imports. We have increased our dependence on foreign oil. In fact, in the 1960s we imported about 20 percent of our oil. We are approaching today about 60 percent of our oil.

□ 1600

So we are getting heavily dependent on imports. Where is the foreign oil coming from that we are importing? Over 55 percent of that oil is coming from seven countries. They are in the Middle East, a volatile region, a region where there is always something going to happen that might impact the oil supply. So we need to look ahead.

I wanted to talk a little bit about what are the components of a national energy policy.

First of all, we have to look at having a strong domestic industry. Many States out in the West, New Mexico is one of them, have strong, vital domestic oil industries. We have to make sure that those industries stay strong and that we give the incentive so that they can develop.

Secondly, we have to look at fuel efficiency. In the last end of this administration, the Clinton administration, we talked about energy efficiency and the Clinton administration, through Secretary Richardson, who is from my home State and a colleague of mine, he put in a requirement that air conditioners in the future have 30 percent energy efficiency. I find it very unfortunate that this administration has rolled that back. Rather than get more energy-efficient air conditioners which use up huge amounts of energy in the summer, that has been rolled back.

We need to look at fuel efficiency. If we just increased our automobile efficiency 3 miles per gallon, that would equal all of the oil that is in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. So fuel efficiency on automobiles is another important component, and I hope that this administration recommends that.

In addition to air conditioners, there are a number of other appliances which could be more energy efficient. We need to look at every one of those, and I hope there are some major recommendations in that area.

Then we need to look at conservation. Since 1900 until today, we have used up enormous sums of oil. Some estimates are that we have used up half of what all there is out there. That, to me, is deplorable. The amount of time that people have been on this earth and just a couple of generations here are using it all. A good conservation ethic says that we should leave the world in a better place for our children. So we should not be using such a vital re-

source at such a rapid pace. So we need to apply a conservation ethic. I hope this President speaks out and says, in terms of a national energy policy, we need conservation and we need it to be a big part of government and private sector and throughout the economy.

The last area that I think needs to be emphasized here is alternative and renewable forms of energy. If we focus on fuel cells, solar, wind, biomass, do the research, bring down the costs, we can be a country that is energy independent; and we will not be so dependent on this foreign oil. When it comes to those areas, I really do not understand this President cutting solar and wind and some of the other renewable forms.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, let us look at a true national energy policy in the coming weeks.

EDUCATION, AN IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THE STATE OF UTAH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, the House is going to be taking up the issue of education over the next couple of weeks, and I thought it would be important to communicate some of the thoughts that I have learned, having spent a significant amount of time in my district over the Easter recess talking to teachers and superintendents, talking to students, and talking to parents. I can say, I come from a State that is unique. Utah's needs are not often represented in national discussions on education, and I think it is important to point out some of the unique characteristics in my State and how national policy may affect that.

I represent the State with the lowest per-pupil expenditure in the United States. I represent the State with the largest student-teacher ratio in the United States. Utah schools are struggling to keep up. The State Office of Education estimates Utah will add over 100,000 new students over the next 10 years. It is going to require 124 new schools to be built in my State.

These challenges that I mention, these challenges we face in the State of Utah, make the Federal-State relationship very critical. We believe in Utah, and I firmly believe, that education is fundamentally a State and local issue. So as we talk about education policy here in Congress, I want to make sure that we talk about it in the context where we are not creating Federal programs with a number of strings attached. It is important that we maintain local control.

Let me talk about five quick issues that we should consider during our education discussion. The first is class-size reduction. The Federal class-size