Preyer and add his name to that long list of great Americans.

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) expressed interest in speaking on this Special Order, but they are at committee meetings and it appears unlikely that they will be able to come to the floor. So, Madam Speaker, let me conclude.

Much has been said during this Special Order about Emily Preyer, but I do not believe it was mentioned that she pre-deceased her husband by several months.

I recall, Madam Speaker, recently, several days ago, we were at a full House Committee on the Judiciary meeting, and I looked into the faces of several people in the crowded room, and I detected a man who served as a former staffer to Rich Preyer. I called him forward. He came to the podium where I was seated in the Committee on the Judiciary hearing room, and I said to him, Ed, Rich Preyer is not in good health. I said, I am told that he is failing and I thought you needed to know that, because he was very close to Mr. Preyer.

He thanked me for having shared that with him. The next day, Rich Preyer passed away; and that told me in glaring terms, Madam Speaker, about the uncertainty, about the indefinite phase, of life. I am talking to Ed one day. His staffer was going to call him the next day to talk to him and it was too late.

I would extend our condolences and good wishes to the surviving children and their families and conclude with this comment, Madam Speaker. Jim Slosher, one of our well-known reporters at the Breezeberg News and Record, called me for a quote shortly after Rich Preyer's death. I thought for a moment, and I said when you saw Rich Preyer you instinctively uttered or concluded there stands a gentleman. He was, indeed, a rare gentleman.

I want to thank those who took part in this Special Order today, Madam Speaker; and I want to urge those who wanted to be here who were otherwise detained to feel free to submit their comments in a subsequent edition of the RECORD.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the memory of the late L. Richardson Preyer who served my home state of North Carolina and our country with distinction. Richardson Preyer has an outstanding record of public service dating back to his time in the U.S. Navy during World War II, for which he was awarded the Bronze Star.

Through his years as a State Superior Court Judge, a United States District Court Judge and then as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives for six terms, Richardson Preyer saw his responsibility and fulfilled his duty when called upon. Serving with a quiet demeanor but effective in getting the job done, he commanded the respect of his constituents and his peers in the Congress.

Richardson Preyer was always concerned about the welfare of the people and his desire to help those who were less fortunate was well known. It was the hallmark of his unsuccessful campaign for Governor of North Carolina in 1964 and then of his Congressional career from 1969 to 1981.

Richardson Preyer was never too busy to give of his time and his considerable abilities when he was needed. When Congressman Preyer passed away recently, North Carolina lost a valiant patriot who loved his country, and who served us well.

I am honored to have the opportunity to pay tribute to Richardson Preyer and I extend my sympathy to the Preyer family on their loss.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that is a very important issue to my home State, Washington State, and to the people in that State. That issue is health care. As I traveled around my district during the Easter recess meeting with health care consumers, physicians and hospitals, again and again I heard of rising costs, declining reimbursements, and general frustration with our system.

First, I would like to address the issue of prescription drugs. I strongly support adding a prescription drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries. Today, many seniors are forced to purchase expensive Medigap policies or join HMOs to try and avoid the high out-of-pocket expenses for prescription drugs.

□ 1445

Seniors should not be forced to choose between groceries and their medicines.

In this time of government surpluses, I believe some of the surplus must be used to provide a Medicare drug benefit; and using the surplus for a drug benefit within the framework of reducing the national debt, we can provide for a more prosperous and healthy Nation.

I also have great concerns about Medicare reimbursement, particularly in my home State. Because of a flawed complex formula, the Federal Government provides fewer Medicare dollars for seniors in Washington State. Medicare reimbursements are based on the region's average cost of living, rather than on an individual's personal income, so Washington State senior citizens receive less Medicare support than most other States. Medicare payments in Washington rank fifth from the bottom nationally; and between 1998 and 1999, Medicare payments in Washington experienced the sixth fastest decline of all States.

As a result of the low reimbursement rate in Washington State, many health plans have opted to withdraw from Puget Sound area plans that serve seniors. Last year, as many as 30,000 seniors in Washington State received notice that their health plans would no longer serve them or that they would increase the deductible for the same coverage. That is wrong. I support access and affordability; but, above all, equity for Washington State seniors and will work to rectify this unfair provision.

In addition, according to the Washington State Medical Association study, the average medical practice in Washington State lost $95,000 in 1999. Reduced Medicare payments have led to a white-coat flight, with physicians leaving the State or retiring early. This is simply unacceptable.

Local hospitals also continue to contact me about their deep financial difficulties related to the cutbacks of the Balanced Budget Act legislation of 1997. As we know, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 enacted some far-reaching changes in the way Medicare pays health care providers. These changes were intended to both modernize Medicare and save some $115 billion over 5 years.

Today we know that the actual savings are much larger than Congress had anticipated and those changes are affecting services. Like many Members, I have been hearing from health care providers in my district regarding these cuts in the BBA and how they are affecting and may affect in the future their ability to provide quality health care to our seniors. I take these concerns very seriously.

For instance, Whidbey General Hospital on Whidbey Island has detailed for me their hardship. Approximately 50 cents of every dollar they receive goes to the cost of running their facilities and dealing with insurance plan requirements, not to patient care. These skyrocketing administrative burdens add cost, but little value, to the delivery of health care. Patients must come first.

So, Madam Speaker, I have outlined many of the health care concerns that are of the highest priority to patients and providers in Washington State. I plan to work on these issues in a bipartisan fashion in the 107th Congress so that we can get some much needed relief at home in Western Washington for our seniors, for our physicians, for our hospitals, but, most importantly, for patient care.

EVALUATING THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST 100 DAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I would like to begin discussing today the first 100 days of the Bush Administration. I know that over the next week you will probably hear from both Democrats as well as from the President about the first 100 days, because

traditionally the first 100 days of a Presidency have been a sort of benchmark for judging the President.

I believe the actual day when Mr. Bush, President Bush, will have been in office for 100 days is next Monday, April 30th.

The first 100 days has been a useful yardstick for measuring new Presidents since Franklin Roosevelt's first term. What I would like to do is give my analysis of why where I think we are.

During the campaign, the President promised to be a compassionate conservative. I am sure many remember that saying. He said he would unite the country behind a common agenda. He said he would promote prosperity with a purpose and be a reformer, that he would be a reformer with results determined to leave no child behind.

I feel very strongly, Madam Speaker, that, to date, President Bush has failed to back up this rhetoric that he used during the campaign with any actions. This is an administration of, by and for the special interests. I see the oil interests, I see the big mining interests, I see them, the defense contractors, holding sway; not the average person.

The President has made a string of decisions that, if you look at it, are extremely partisan, and I think a payback to the special interests who contributed to his campaign. I could go through a list of areas where I could point what I am saying out and be more specific, but I really wanted to focus, if I could, on two areas that are very important to me and I think to the average American, and that is the environment and, secondly, health care and health issues.

Perhaps in no area has the President during these first 100 days been such a disappointment to me, and I think to the average American, than on environmental issues. I think many of us knew that he was not a real environmentalist and he was not going to be what we would like to see in terms of a real environmental President, but the reality has been much worse.

The reality has been that he has determined in the last 3 months or so in these 100 days to roll back the clock on a lot of environmental protection measures that were very important and that were certainly the backbone for progressive legislation and improvements to the environment that we have seen in the last 30 years since Earth Day. I just want to give you an example, if I could, of why I say that, and I will start, if I could, with some of the energy-related issues.

The Bush Administration in the first 100 days has signalled to the rest of the world that it does not really care about global climate change. We know that the President basically has said that he is not going to adhere to the Kyoto climate treaty. There was a real question about whether or not this administration would even participate in any further talks on climate change. Although Mrs. Whitman, the EPA Administrator, did say over the weekend that they would continue to talk, it is clear that they have no intention of proceeding with the Kyoto Treaty and basically have told all the signers to that treaty to forget it.

The President has also told the Congress that emission controls will not include carbon dioxide. During the course of his campaign, he said that he would address air emission controls for a number of pollutants to try to improve air quality, but we were told about a month ago that that would not include carbon dioxide, which is certainly one of the most important pollutants and one of the ones that has the most negative impact on air quality.

President Bush has also made it quite clear to the general public that his energy goals will stress more production of fossil fuels, most notably drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and he will not stress conservation, increased technological efficiency, or the use of renewables. The budget that the President sent us a couple weeks ago specifically cut research on renewables, solar power, wind power, in half.

I mention these as just an example, because I think that the issue of energy and source of energy and whether there is going to be enough energy is certainly a crucial one. We know that the price of gasoline continues to go up. We are told it might be, who knows, $2.00, $2.50 a gallon possibly by the summer.

So we need to have an energy policy. But to suggest that sort of the backbone of the energy policy is drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and we are not going to address global climate change, we are not going to address carbon dioxide, that the only answer is more production rather than use of renewables and conservation, I think is an egregious mistake.

Let me talk about some other environmental issues. I think personally that one of the most important areas where we need to make progress is by cleaning up hazardous waste sites and also by making sure that our drinking water is safe. Yet we were told just a few weeks ago by this administration that the standards for arsenic in water, which are very high, meaning very weak, I should say, 50 parts per billion, would stay in place, and that the new standards that had been suggested by the Clinton Administration to reduce that 50 parts per billion down to 10 parts per billion would not be implemented, that we needed another year or so to study the issue before we could possibly improve on the standards.

That was a major, I think, disaster, because it affects drinking water quality. It affects the water that we drink, one of the basic proponents of life. I think it was also symptomatic of what we are going to see from this administration with regard to environmental concerns.

In my subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Subcommittee on Environmental and Hazardous Materials, we had the EPA administrator, Mrs. Whitman, come in and testify a few weeks ago, the day after the President indicated that he was not going to enact stronger arsenic standards, and she talked about the fact that there was a huge backlog of infrastructure needs for safe drinking water; in other words, money that the Federal Government would need to give to the States or to the towns to upgrade facilities so not only would you have hopefully better standards for drinking water, but you would also have good pipes and good process for bringing it to your house so that you can drink it safely.

When we got the Bush budget proposal a couple weeks ago after that hearing, lo and behold, we find that the amount of money set aside for safe drinking water is level-funded. In other words, it does not even meet the authorization level or any of the future needs that the EPA administrator talked about.

So what we are seeing now is that not only is the President implementing either through regulatory action or inaction methods that would cut back on environmental protection, but he is not providing the money in the budget to do anything significant about our energy needs or about our environmental concerns.

Another example with regard to environmental concerns is the Superfund. My state has more Superfund sites than any other state. There is a great need around the country to continue cleanups pursuant to the Superfund program of very severe hazardous waste conditions.

What does the President Bush's budget do? It suggests we are going to provide the money to clean up about 65 sites this next fiscal year, whereas in the last 4 years under the previous administration we had targeted about 85 sites per year to clean up. So cutbacks in the money for the Superfund program.

Nothing in the budget to provide the corporate tax that would fund the Superfund program, so in another year or two there would not be any money in the Superfund trust fund to continue to pay for cleanups.

The list goes on and on. We just passed last year in the last few days of the Clinton administration the Beaches Act. This was a bill that says that each State has to test their water quality before they let anybody swim on the beach and they have to close the beach if it does not meet certain standards and post signs saying you cannot use the beach because the water is dirty and authorize $30 million annually to pay for that program, to give grants to the States so they would be able to use it to do the water quality monitoring. Very important.

The summer is almost here, another couple of months. People do not want to swim in dirty water any more than they want to drink polluted water. Lo

and behold, the budget comes out, and instead of the $30 million that is authorized, we see $2 or $3 million appropriated for the Beaches Act.

This is what we are seeing over and over again. We are seeing an effort to cut back on environmental programs, to not provide the money for environmental programs, to eliminate progressive regulations that were put in place by the Clinton administration. And if I had to look at environmental and energy issues alone, without looking at anything else, I would say that this first 100 days of the Bush administration has been a total failure and totally out of sync with what the American people want and totally in tune with what the special interests want. Because, after all, what average citizen or what good government group or what citizens group would say that they do not want safer drinking water or they do not want to spend up money to clean up hazardous waste sites or do ocean water quality monitoring? Nobody. The only people against these things are the mining interests, the oil interests, the polluters, who obviously have the President's ear because they were the major contributors to his campaign.

So when the President promised to be a compassionate conservative, I do not think that that meant that he was going to cut back on environmental protection. When he said that he would unite the country behind a common agenda, I would assume that that common agenda would be protecting the environment, because it is very important to most people. But, no, that is not what we are seeing. Then he said he would promote prosperity with a purpose and be a reformer with results and leave no child behind. Frankly, I think a lot of children are going to be left behind if they have to deal with some of these environmental concerns.

□ 1500

Now, I want to go to the next area that I think is just as important in evaluating the President's 100 days, and that is health care. During the course of the campaign, probably the number one issue that we heard about from both President Bush and his Democratic opponent was health care. The President said that when he was the governor of Texas, he let a Patients' Bill of Rights for HMO reform become law. He actually did not sign it, but he said that he supported the Texas Patients' Bill of Rights to try to improve and reform HMOs. The President said he would agree to have something like what they have in Texas, the Patients' Bill of Rights HMO reform, enacted into Federal law, that he had no problem with the Texas legislation, and if we could do that nationally, that would be fine, he would support it.

President Bush also said during the course of the campaign that he wanted to expand Medicare to include a prescription drug program for seniors, because we know that seniors increasingly cannot afford the price of drugs; the price of prescription drugs continue to go up. It is a bigger part of their household budget, their weekly and daily expense, and we need to do something about it. President Bush said during the campaign, oh, yes, I recognize that we must address this issue, and I would be in favor of expanding Medicare to include a prescription drug benefit.

The President also recognized during the campaign that there were an increasing number of Americans who had no health insurance, something like 40 million, now maybe it is 45 million Americans who have no health insurance, no health coverage. He said that he wanted to go about improving the situation with regard to that as well and maybe come up with some sort of tax credit or some kind of program through community health clinics to improve the situation for those who have no health insurance.

Now, again, I would maintain that that entire health care agenda has not only fallen flat on its face in the last 100 days, but it has not even been addressed effectively by President Bush in the first 100 days. It almost disappeared from the radar screen. We do not hear about it any more.

Let me just develop that a little bit on the three health care issues that I mentioned, first with regard to a Patients' Bill of Rights. Within days of the inauguration of President Bush, a bipartisan group of Senators and House Members, Democrats and Republicans, got together and introduced a bill in both Houses, Senator MCCAIN and Senator KENNEDY in the Senate, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), a Republican, introduced a new Patients' Bill of Rights bill with a lot of cosponsors, including myself; both Houses, within days of the inauguration, exactly the same as the Texas bill that President Bush had talked about during the campaign. No difference. I would defy anyone to suggest that it was any different in any significant way from what exists now in the State of Texas and is working very well.

What have we heard? We have heard statements from the White House that they do not like that bill, it not acceptable. They do not really say why. We have heard statements from the White House saying, we are going to come up with our own proposal, but we have not seen it yet. We have heard statements from the White House suggesting that maybe they like some of the other proposals that have been put out there by those who are not as oriented towards reforming HMOs, but not even any real suggestion as to which of those bills they like.

So in this case, with the Patients' Bill of Rights, I would maintain that basically, the President has taken it off the radar screen. A Patients' Bill of Rights, HMO reform, was so crucial during the campaign that this was one of the first things that President Bush was going to address. But we are almost at the 100 days on Monday, and he has not, to my knowledge, done anything significant to suggest that he even wants to come to common ground on this issue, or even make some suggestions about what we should do in an effective way.

This Patients' Bill of Rights, the bipartisan bill that was introduced within the few days after his inauguration that was like the Texas bill, should have moved in both of these Houses and been on the President's desk already. The only reason it has not is because the President has not signaled what he wants or what he wants to do about it.

This is a very important issue for Americans. People are denied care all the time by HMOs. People die, people have serious injuries, they are denied care, they do not have a way of addressing their grievances, they cannot go to court, they cannot go to an outside independent agency that would review why the HMO denied a particular operation or a particular medical device. I get these calls every day in my district office in New Jersey. We are not addressing it, and the President has not addressed it in a meaningful way during his first 100 days.

Let me go to the second health care issue. I see I am being joined by some of my colleagues, which is great. Let me just go to the second health care issue, and then I would like to yield some time to one of my colleagues. Medicare prescription drugs. During the course of the campaign, the President said over and over again, this was a high priority, something that he wanted to address. He was not always clear as to exactly what he wanted to do. Most of the time he talked about a benefit primarily, if not exclusively, but primarily for low-income seniors, not an expansion of Medicare that would provide a benefit to all seniors, but just to low-income seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I will be honest that I have been very critical of that, because I think that since Medicare has always been for everyone, because we do not have an income test for Medicare; it does not matter how poor or how wealthy one is, one still gets it, I felt very strongly and continue to feel very strongly that a prescription drug benefit should be universal for every Medicare recipient. It should be affordable and it should be simply latched on to Medicare and handled by Medicare in the way that we traditionally do.

But even if one disagrees with that, the fact of the matter is that I have not seen anything significant coming from this administration other than in a suggestion that in the budget there should be something like $150 million to pay for a Medicare benefit, and we have already been told by everyone, including our Republican colleagues, that that is not sufficient. But leaving that aside, we do not see any movement here. There has not been any

movement to mark up a prescription drug bill in the House, in the Senate, in any committee, and the President is not pushing for it. It is not a priority. All we heard from this President during the first 100 days is that he wants a big, fat tax cut that is going to primarily benefit wealthy Americans, corporate interests, and actually is at the expense of the middle class and the little guy because it would take so much money away that we would be dipping into the Medicare Trust Fund, into the Social Security Trust Fund, and frankly, we would probably put ourselves back into a deficit situation and hurt the economy.

So that is the legacy. I could go on and on, but I would like to yield to some of my colleagues. The legacy of this first 100 days is no attention to health care concerns, ripping apart environmental protection, actually being negative in terms of the environmental agenda, and just devoting all the time and the resources of the President to a huge tax cut that I think will hurt the economy and certainly not benefit the average American.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding me time.

President Bush's 100 days, first 100 days. The President has hit that traditional landmark of his first 100 days. These 100 days have seen a charm offensive from the White House. He is able to pay lip service to the people, organizations and ideas.

He can create a classic photo opportunity as evidenced with his recent appearance at the Boys and Girls Clubs in Wilmington, Delaware and other clubs throughout the country while a candidate. But as he posed with those children at these clubs, he took a red pen to their funding in the budget and completely eliminated Federal aid for the Boys and Girls Clubs.

He bragged throughout the campaign about both his wife's and his support for reading and libraries, and then he snatched 70 percent of Reading Is Fundamental's budget.

Is this compassionate? It is surely conservative. And, it highlights the hypocrisy of compassionate conservatism hidden behind a smirk screen.

President Bush has assembled a cabinet of special interests. The average personal worth of the members of the cabinet is $11 million. He spent his first 100 days bowing to the special interests and corporations in America that financed his run for the White House. According to Democracy 21, President Bush received $35 million from 103 soft money donors during the election. He is paying those people back with ambassadorships and placements to Federal posts and ignoring the working people of America.

As President Bush pushes his huge tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, he is cutting social programs that people rely upon on a daily basis. The other body limited the tax cut at about the same time the Texas State Legislature was lobbying Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson for aid because of the shortfall caused by the tax cut Governor Bush gave to the people of Texas. We say ''no, thanks'' to the shortfalls and deficits and demand funding for programs that make our families and children safer, smarter and healthier.

Bush's budget cuts also cuts the unemployment administration and benefit coverage at a time when both the general unemployment rate and the unemployment rate of workers eligible for unemployment insurance are expected to grow from 2001 to 2002.

He cuts work force training and employment programs 9.5 percent, or $541 million, in training and employment services.

He cuts Section 8 housing assistance vouchers by more than half, supported only 33,700 new vouchers across the country. The proposal also cuts tenant protection by $62 million and completely cuts tenant protection vouchers provided to disabled persons displaced from public housing designated for the elderly.

The public housing construction and repairs are cut by $700 million, or 23 percent, after HUD found $22.5 billion in unmet capital repair needs in public housing. Let us get back to that again. Mr. Speaker, $22.5 million in unmet capital repair needs, and that program was cut by $700 million, or 23 percent.

The Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, which funds antidrug and anticrime law enforcement and security in public housing. In 2001, this program was funded at $309 million. Specifically in the 11th Congressional District, I had a conversation with the head of the Public Housing Authority and she said to me, the elimination of the drug-elimination program funds from her budget was like eliminating the entire Police Department from the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority budget.

He went on to cut the Digital Divide Program of the Commerce Department, which provides computers and Internet connections to low-income and underserved areas by 65 percent.

He froze the Ryan White AIDS program at the 2001 level at a time when the drug cocktail and therapies has the number of people seeking AIDS treatment more than doubling since 1996.

He cut the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention by $109 million, or 2.6 percent below the 2001 freeze level. Areas specifically cut are chronic disease and health promotion activities, such as diabetes, cancer and arthritis.

He cut health professional training programs by $123 million, or 60.3 percent.

He cut Community Oriented Policing Services, the COPS program, which has placed over 100,000 new police officers in communities, by $172 million.

He cut the small business budget by 43 percent.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to just talk about a few other things that he cut. He closed the AIDS office. He closed the Race Relations office. He closed the Women's Bureau office. He provided for more arsenic in water. He went on to talk about maybe salmonella in hamburger in school systems is okay, and came back around and changed his mind. He changed the Kyoto Treaty, where all countries across America had agreed to CO_2 levels. Then add to all of that naming some of the, in my opinion, most unqualified people to head some of the departments within the United States Government, those who are not sensitive to the issues affecting all Americans.

So what I say is do not let the Bush smirk screen fool us. He eagerly reverses programs that will keep our communities and families safe and does it with a smile and a quip. We will have increasingly dangerous streets without the safety programs the President has cut, more people looking for housing assistance, a decreased ability to count on our drinking water, and other environmental programs. He likes to disarm his opponents with charm and allow his hatchet men to do the dirty work, but we know who is sending those hatchet men and whose work they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, do not be fooled by the Bush smirk screen.

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio.

If I can comment briefly, and then I would introduce another colleague. I want my colleagues here, both Democrats and Republicans, to understand that the reason that we are doing this today and pointing to the first 100 days is not because we dislike the President personally or because we are hoping that he fails. Just the opposite. I hope that he succeeds, and I wish him the best.

Mr. Speaker, personally he seems like a very nice person. The problem is that the policies that he is implementing are not policies or an agenda that is helpful to the country, whether it is economic development of the country or it is environmental or health concerns. I think we have an obligation regardless of party affiliation to point out these problems because we do not want it to continue.

My hope is that public pressure is brought against the administration on environmental issues and health care issues so that the President changes course and actually has an agenda and implements policies, together with Congress, that are positive and that help the average American.

I just think that it is necessary for us to speak out and point out where the shortfalls are because otherwise it is going to continue. I certainly do not want what I have seen for the first 100 days to continue for the next 3½ years of this administration.

I yield to my colleague from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would note that we are having a Special Order at 3:15 in the afternoon, and that seems to be typical in this Congress. The Republican agenda is tax cuts, and then tax cuts and then tax cuts, all of them directed and weighted to the wealthiest people of the country. But other than that, there is not much of an agenda.

We have learned a couple of things in the first 100 days of the George W. Bush administration. The first thing is that the word ''compassionate'' was a political slogan for use during the campaign. You cannot find any compassion in the President's budget. Once he gets to the point of putting down numbers, there is nothing compassionate about his particular brand of conservatism.

Second, he came to Portland, Maine, in my district to pitch his tax cut. As he has done all across this country, he said that in effect the tax cut comes from leftover money. He says after we have funded our priorities, there is a huge surplus in this country and it should go back to the people because it is the people's money. In other words he basically was saying this money is not needed to run the programs that benefit people in their districts, in their States right now. That is not true. It is absolutely not true, and once you have the budget you can see that it is not true.

The tax cuts do not come from leftover money. What he gives back to the American people in tax cuts, he takes from them in budget cuts. Let us talk about a few of these that he is clearly going to try to get through.

For example, let us take law enforcement. By and large Democrats and Republicans have agreed that we need to fight crime in this country. We need to help local communities fund law enforcement. That is why we have had this program for a 100,000 police officers. That is why we have tried to encourage community policing across the country. The President's budget cuts the COPS program by 17 percent. All of these cuts, some of which I am going to run through, there is not time to run through them all, what they do is they will grow dramatically over time because the tax cut grows dramatically in each successive year. That is why the budget cuts have to be so severe.

The Bush budget cuts funding for land management programs by $2.6 billion including the Department of Interior, the EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers; and these funds have helped parks and wildlife refuges in Maine.

The Bush campaign said that he would leave no child behind. The Bush budget leaves many of America's children behind. How does that happen? On the one hand he says we are going to add $1 billion more for special education. On the other hand he pulls back $1.2 billion for school construction and renovation. In my State of Maine it means we get $4.5 million more in special education funds, whereas full funding would be $60 million for the State of Maine. And he takes back $5.5 million. We lose $1 million, and yet the President is saying education is one of his top priorities.

This makes no sense. It makes no sense at all. This is the one chance we have had in decades, in fact since the special education law was passed, this is our one chance to pass special education. And if the President's tax cut passes, that chance will be gone for a decade.

It is absolutely clear that the priority is tax cut first, tax cut second, tax cut third; and education, prescription drugs for seniors, Social Security and Medicare, the environment, they are so far down on the agenda that you cannot even see them.

The President says we have an energy crisis. He favors more drilling in ANWR, but his budget cuts funds for renewable energy resources programs and energy conservation programs. What sense does that make?

Mr. Speaker, I think that certainly in my State it is clear that his budget cuts are aimed directly at the heart of Maine municipalities. The cuts in special education or the reduced fund for education overall, the reduced funding for law enforcement, inadequate funding to separate storm and sewer drains, all in all this tax cut is way too large, way too weighted for the wealthiest people in this country; and that is what he is asking the country to judge him by.

A tax cut of the size that the President has proposed will not allow funding for special education. Half the size would allow us to make dramatic progress in a variety of different areas. It would, for example, help with some of those mandates that we really struggle with all of the time. It would allow full funding of a Medicare prescription drug benefit. I want to say something about that, an issue I have worked on for some period of time.

When you look at what the Republicans are trying to do, both in the House and in the other body, and when you look at what the President is proposing, there is no way it works for rural States. I do not care whether you are a Republican, Independent, Democrat, in rural America the privatization of Medicare which is what the Breaux-Frist reform plan is all about, will not work. We learned last August from the Congressional Budget Office that traditional fee-for-service Medicare is cheaper than the services provided to Medicare beneficiaries by managed care companies, by HMOs. Yet the President continues his train down a track that provides that we are going to make sure that at least half, maybe more, of Medicare beneficiaries are served not by Medicare but by Aetna or United or the private insurance companies that have gone in and provided some HMO coverage to Medicare beneficiaries in other parts of the country, not in Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I know this: Medicare does not pick up and leave a State when it is not making money. Private insurance companies do. HMOs do. They pick up and they leave States. Not only that, in any given year if they are not making enough money, this will increase the premium. If they are not making enough money, they will decrease the benefit. What kind of system is the President laying before this Congress? We can already see in this first 100 days what the President's agenda is. It is easy to find. If you want to know his policies on energy or the environment, just look at those policies advocated by the oil industry, by the coal industry, by the gas industry. That is where you will find perfect agreement.

If you want to know his policies on health care, look at the pharmaceutical industry and the health insurance industry. They are the same policies as the President has.

If you want to know his policy on privatizing Social Security, it is the same policy that Wall Street brokerages have been advocating for years because it will make them lots of money. This administration is captured by the special interests of the country. The President talks about running the government like a business. Well, at the rate we are going, the government will be nothing more than a business. It will pay no attention to those values that we deal with every day here because in this Congress, in the people's House, our job is not just about commercial values, it is about making sure that people have a chance to get ahead. That is what this country is all about. In a wide variety of areas, whether education, health care, the environment, we can only do, we can only improve our collective well-being through the Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments. Abraham Lincoln said in 1854, ''Governments exist to do those things which a community of individuals cannot do, or cannot do so well by themselves.'' That message has been lost on this administration. Lost on this administration.

Mr. Speaker, we need to move in this country from thinking not just about me, not just about our individual welfare, but to thinking about the common good, an old-fashioned phrase, but one that still has meaning and one that the people of America still understand. They know. The people in my State know. Here is a headline from yesterday's paper: ''Local Advocates Rally Against Bush Budget Cut.'' People in Maine know we have an interest in making sure that the young people growing up in public housing projects have a chance for a better life.

The President has zeroed out a $60 million grant to the Boys and Girls Clubs of this country. A small portion of that money goes into Portland, Maine. Let me tell you what it does. It funds four study centers, after-school study centers for kids. They come out

of school, they have a place to go. They have tutors, and materials to work on. They can improve their education and do better in school.

Four different areas in Portland. It helps pay for a satellite Boys and Girls Club, a peer leadership program through which young people are able to develop leadership skills. It helps fund the Institute for Practical Democracy, a place for girls; and a variety of other programs. One woman who works with these children said if we eliminate this, we eliminate opportunities for our kids. The truth about the Bush tax cut is that it is taking money out of the hides of our kids. It is taking money out of the hides of our seniors. It is taking money out of the hides of the municipalities and communities all across this country, and it is taking money away from our ability to protect and preserve our environment.

Mr. Speaker, there is no free lunch in this country. Revenues are related to expenditures, even though the administration would argue the tax cut as if it were totally separate from the programs that American people and American communities have come to depend on. We need to do a better job, and we can.

A tax cut half this size protects and preserves the kinds of programs which make a difference in the lives of Americans all across the country. This budget and tax cut are bad for my State of Maine. They are bad for the country. They are bad for working men and women all across the country, and it is our hope that they will be rejected.

Mr. Speaker, we may not change the administration; but it is our hope that in this Congress and in the other body we will be able to change the direction to one that is more balanced, more sensible and fairer for ordinary Americans.

□ 1530

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). If I could just comment a little on what the gentleman from Maine said because there were certain points that I just feel were so well articulated.

I am so pleased that the gentleman kept stressing that there is no free lunch. He started out that way and he concluded that way. Because I do believe that, if we listen to the President in the first 100 days, he is constantly giving the impression that there is this huge surplus and there is all this money that we can spend for everything. The gentleman from Maine and I know that is not the case. Most people know that is not the case.

When the President's budget came out, it was vividly shown that, in order to achieve this huge tax cut that was mostly going to the wealthy and to corporate interest, that we had to make significant cuts and even raid other programs, like Social Security and Medicare. So there is no free lunch.

The other thing that I maintain is that, when we look at the President's tax initiative, although it is geared toward the wealthy and the corporate interests, it really does not help anyone ultimately, because I am very concerned that if we actually put it in effect that we would end up in a deficit situation again.

When I talk to wealthy Americans, of course, a lot of them do not support his tax cut. Many of the wealthiest people in the country have come out against it. I think the reason is that because they understand that, if we go back into a deficit situation, it is going to hurt the economy. We are going to end up with high interest rates. We are going to have a situation where companies that want to start new production, new techniques will not be able to borrow any money. That is what we had for the period of time going back before the previous administration. We do not want to go back to that. Nobody benefits from that.

The last thing that I wanted to comment that I thought the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) pointed out so well, a lot of times we talk about programs, and we use that term ''program,'' and I worry that I do not even want to use the term ''program'' because it almost has like a bad connotation, Federal program. But the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) talks about the COPS program, which I thought was so much on point.

I mean, I had the same phenomenon that he pointed out where he had the newspaper and there were local citizens' rallies. In Asbury Park, which is one of my communities, one of the poorest communities that I represent, the police and some of the local officials just spontaneously, I did not know anything about it, had an event or press conference. They were talking to the press about the COPS program and how important it was to their city and how they had been able to hire extra police and the money was coming from the Federal Government to pay for it and this was helping with their fight against crime. They could not imagine what was going to happen if this program effectively ended.

Although there is some money in the budget for it, it has been cut so much that there will be no new police hired.

So I just would like to point out that we are talking about real things here. This has a real impact. We are not up here talking about the 100 days in some abstract way because we dislike the President or he is of the other party. We are just very concerned about what is happening to the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for putting this special order together and bringing us together to talk on this first 100 days of President Bush's presidency.

Actually, I am going to talk about energy. But it is clear to me, when we look at the energy policies that have been brought forward or not been brought forward since President Bush's election that in his first 100 days in office, President Bush has made it very clear that the only promise that he intends to keep is his commitment to leave no special interests behind. Nowhere is that more clear than in his actions and in his inactions surrounding energy and the environment.

In spite of all of his campaign promises and catchy speeches since taking office in January, President Bush has made it clear that our environment is not one of his priorities.

On the campaign trail, however, Bush vowed to strengthen carbon dioxide regulations to keep factories from polluting our air further. Within 2 months of taking the oath of office, he went back on his word, refusing to toughen carbon dioxide standards, making it easier and more effective for big industry to pollute.

Shortly after breaking his word on CO_2s, President Bush repealed tough new regulations that would have reduced the arsenic in our drinking water. Instead of acting to protect the water that our children drink, the President acted to protect mining companies from having to clean up their act and keep our water clean.

In these first 100 days, the President also unilaterally withdrew U.S. support from the Kyoto Treaty, seriously undermining our role as a world leader in environmental protection.

Most alarming to me as a Californian and as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Science is the President's lack of commitment to environmentally smart solutions for our energy crisis.

All Americans want and deserve reliable, affordable energy. Increasing our reliance on fossil fuels is not the way to solve our energy crisis or protect us from future problems. A serious Federal commitment to renewable energy sources, energy efficiency, and conservation is the only real solution.

But let us face it. The President and his Vice President are oilmen. Enron and other power companies were among Bush's campaign's biggest donors. The bottom line is that Bush-Cheney and their campaign contributors have a lot to gain from maintaining the stranglehold fossil fuels have on our power supply.

Despite the fact that the President stood before this country and said in his State of the Union Address that he was committed to renewable energy research, he has done nothing in his first 100 days except move to further increase our reliance on fossil fuels.

In fact, in his budget, President Bush slashed the funding for renewable energy research by $200 million. Under the President's plan, 50 percent of the geothermal technology development funding would be cut, 54 percent of the solar energy budget would be cut, and 61 million dollars would be cut from energy efficiency research funding.

Once more, the President's budget ties future funding for renewables to

Federal dollars raised from drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That is an outrage. Destroying one of the most pristine expansions of wilderness in our country for a limited supply of oil is not a solution to the California or our Nation's energy crisis. It is one more environmental problem. It is a problem that he would leave for the future generations to solve.

So while Californians suffer through more blackouts and the Nation struggles to pay skyrocketing energy bills, President Bush has his billionaire oilman Vice President meeting in secret to craft a national energy policy. If it is anything like the Bush budget, and one can be sure it will be, it will be heavy on oil and nuclear energy and light on safe, sustainable energy sources like wind, solar, and geothermal.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) knows as well as I do that 100 days may be a good benchmark for politicians and pundits to assess new presidencies. But it is only a fraction of the time that our President actually spends in office. If President Bush continues this pattern for the rest of his term, big business may be smiling, but the American people will not be.

Over the next 3½ years, President Bush may make good on his commitment to leave no special interests behind. But after 4 years of his antienvironment pro oil company stance, the American people will be ready to leave President Bush behind.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), and I know how important the energy issue is obviously in California and around the country.

The gentlewoman mentioned the issue of renewables. I know that, in the budget, the research on renewables was cut about half. I think she mentioned that. It is so unfortunate because a lot of new technology is out there that is already being tried. The United States is the leader in these new technologies. If we think about it, here we are, the country that could take the leadership role, whether it is global climate change or whatever, and export a lot of these technologies, actually make money and create jobs; and this administration does not want to attend to it. It is just so unfortunate because it is so backward looking.

There are just ways of doing things that could create more jobs, solve the energy crisis over the long-term and at the same time make for a better quality environment, and he just does not listen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) very much for yielding to me.

Let me first of all just congratulate the gentleman on his leadership in the environmental area. I know that the State of New Jersey cares a lot about the environment, too. He has been a real leader when it comes to renewables and coastal resources and protecting them. So I just want to congratulate the gentleman for all his hard work in that area and thank him for participating today.

I wanted to talk about the 100-day period and talk a little bit about budget priorities. It seems to me that, as President, one puts in one's budget the thing that one cares about, and one cuts the things that one does not care about. Looking at a budget is a real test of where the country is going to head under this President.

So I think the budget speaks louder than words more than anything. I think one can have a lot of talk and one can have action, but the budget reflects where one wants to take the country. That is where I think this budget that has just come out, and by the way, I think it is very interesting that we had all of these votes on tax cuts and overall budget resolutions without ever seeing a budget. I mean, that is the most devastating thing is to not even be able to see a budget before one votes on the revenue side of the picture.

So let us take a look at what this budget reflects on environmental issues. First of all, we have cuts across the board in various agencies that deal with the environment. Let us take the Environmental Protection Agency. This is an agency that enforces the law, that works very hard to make sure that air quality and water quality and toxic waste standards are all met. Those things are very, very important to Americans. Cut EPA 8 percent in the President's budget.

Now, my understanding from talking to some of our members on the Committee on the Budget is these cuts this year even get more severe in succeeding years. So we are talking about serious deep cuts to a very important agency like the Environmental Protection Agency.

Now, in my home State, we have a couple of national laboratories and they are real jewels and they do a lot of great research. But in the past, many, many years ago, they had nuclear waste which they disposed of in improper ways. So there has been a 10-year program to try to get that cleaned up.

Well, basically in this budget what the President is telling places like Los Alamos is we are going to slow that cleanup down because they cut the nuclear waste cleanup budget for the Department of Energy.

One of the other big items in this budget that I think is a very, very important issue is research on alternative and renewable forms of energy. If one looks in that Department of Energy budget for solar, wind, other alternative and renewable sources of energy, big cuts in those budgets. To me, that just does not make any sense.

Now, let us jump to the campaign trail for a minute, because President Bush talked a lot on the campaign trail about how he was for full funding of the land and water conservation fund. This is a fund that helps the Federal Government, States, localities, cities try to do everything they can to protect parks and to expand parks and to refurbish recreation areas. That is what the land and water conservation funds.

President Bush said in his campaign full funding of land and water conservation fund. The Congress passed by a very, very big margin a bill that, over the next 10 years, put significant monies; and there was another big huge cut to the tune of $260 million in land and water conservation fund monies going into parks, going in to help people with recreation areas.

□ 1545

This is a shared relationship. This is something that the Federal Government does with a city and a county. They put up half the money, we put up half the money, we go into it together to create a park and a community.

One other department I want to mention because it is very important in the West is the Department of Interior. The President's budget once again has big cuts in the Department of Interior. What we have here, and I think it is a very sad situation, we have a lot of talk about how we are going to take care of the environment. We are going to move towards clean air and clean water. Yet when we look at this budget blueprint, we end up finding out that this President wants to cut in all of these crucial areas, from the Environmental Protection Agency to nuclear waste cleanup in DOE, to research on alternative and renewable forms of energy, to the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Department of Interior. I find it deplorable that this administration would cut so deeply into those vital environmental programs.

I again applaud the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for his efforts on this issue.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank my colleague from New Mexico. I just want to mention to my other colleagues, I think we only have another minute or two but they can do 5 minutes after this. I appreciate them coming down and joining us.

I just wanted to comment briefly on what the gentleman from New Mexico said because he talked about open space, which again is so important in the State of New Jersey. Essentially he is right. What the President has proposed for the budget, you could not possibly even fund existing open space and land and water conservation programs, let alone anything new. We have a lot of needs. We had a bus trip last week. We went around the State. I was with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) at the Great Falls in Paterson which he is trying to get designated as a national park. There is no way that you can do that or provide the funding for the Great Falls or any

other new area for open space or historical preservation with this budget. We need to point this out.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the 100 days is over on Monday. Obviously there is going to be a lot more talk about it over the next few days before we get to Monday. The bottom line is that if you look at the first 100 days of this administration, it has been a failure on so many fronts. It is also not in tune with what the President said during his campaign. We are not pointing this out because we want him to be a failure. We are pointing it out because we want the agenda to change and be more proactive and helpful to the average American. We feel that there is a broad bipartisan consensus on a number of these environmental and health care and education initiatives.

There is no reason why we cannot move forward in a positive way. The President in his first 100 days has basically, I think, failed to carry forth with the agenda that he promised in the campaign, which would be good for the average American. Whether it is CO_2 emissions or open space or education, there is a lot of rhetoric but there is not much action and certainly no indication of funding in the budget to carry out what he promised. We will continue to point this out because we want it to change and we think that this country can move in a forward fashion on a bipartisan basis.

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