

also reducing the legislative and executive branch appropriation by 20 percent, which would save \$3 billion over the next 5 years. The American people spoke clearly last November—they want to downsize the Government. We should understand that message. And that process needs to begin at the top with Congress and the President. To be credible, we must not only eliminate wasteful spending but we must also be willing to look at good programs and prioritize our limited financial resources so we get the most important served. I do not pretend to think that we can correct decades of neglect and abuse overnight. While these 75 proposals which I offered are not a cure-all, they will hopefully serve as the first shot in the coming budgetary battle between the defenders of the status quo and those of us who came here to make a difference.

The debate is between the habitual big spenders in the District of Columbia and those newcomers who have dared to suggest maybe the Federal Government should stop the waste, fraud, and abuse of the precious tax dollars. There is no one in America who has come forward to claim or even to imply that every Federal dollar spent is a dollar well spent. On the contrary, there are tens, if not hundreds, of millions of Americans who know we are not handling their tax dollars as wisely as possible and they are asking us to do better. There is no excuse for us not to do better. We can start now, we can start today. I urge my colleagues to look at my list of spending cuts, and if they do not like my list, make your own. There are plenty of places to cut spending.

CUTS IN VETERANS' BENEFITS CALLED CALLOUS AND UNCONSCIONABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Madam Speaker, last week the House Appropriations Committee voted to drastically cut \$206 million in funding for programs that serve our Nation's veterans. I do not think this is the proper way to demonstrate our commitment to individuals who have made the ultimate sacrifice in serving this Nation and protecting our lives and property.

It is especially callous that these cuts come from funds earmarked for medical equipment and ambulatory care facilities. The Veterans' Administration currently has an unmet need of necessary medical equipment exceeding three-quarters of a billion dollars. The bill passed by the Appropriations Committee would increase that unmet need by at least \$50 million.

How can we even consider such reductions when information we hear daily tells us of new and emerging medical conditions being experienced by

our veterans. Just when our veterans' medical centers and medical teams are recognizing and attempting to address these problems, the Republican-controlled House wants to slash funds that would be used to purchase such types of equipment as cat scanners, x-rays, EKG machines, and other vital equipment. Already, due to budget constraints, the VA is not able to replace and improve medical equipment nearly as often as the private sector.

Even more shocking is the \$156 million reduction in construction projects. These funds are targeted for ambulatory care facilities—a crucial aspect of the VA's medical care agenda at a time when our aging World War II veterans are requiring more medical assistance. Clearly, this is not the time to cut back on ambulatory care facilities.

If the rescissions have been recommended by the Republicans on the committee to offset the costs of the California earthquake and other natural disasters, it will create another disaster for thousands of our veterans. If these actions are intended to offset the cost of future tax cuts—including capital gains for middle-class families and affluent investors—it is unconscionable.

These cuts are ill-considered. The veterans of this Nation have dutifully served this country. We owe them the same full measure of devotion they gave in protecting this Nation with their lives.

THE ROLE OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, this past week in a press conference with the President's Presidential press secretary, we heard him say that, "Prime Minister Rabin is calling. I think it is fair for us to say because he is upset and alarmed by the action taken in the House of Representatives to cut back on funding in the fiscal year 1995 supplemental bill for debt forgiveness for Jordan."

While he said that, we do not know if that is why Prime Minister Rabin was calling. We have learned that very often what this White House says has no relation to the facts, but that is what he said.

He further said the President told the Prime Minister in candor that we face a very tough audience on Capitol Hill. "This is an example of the tilt toward isolation that you now see in the Republican-dominated Congress."

That is vintage Bill Clinton, blame the other guy, "I didn't do it, I am trying to help you, the devil made me do it, the dog ate my lunch, the dog ate my homework."

Madam Speaker, the President's entrance into the Middle East is to first

make it partisan and to politicize foreign affairs. It is most shameful that it is done in one of the most troubled areas of the world. Why does he do this? Because for 2½ years this Nation has lacked a coherent global vision, a global view.

What are our U.S. national security interests? When I look across world, I see our friends in NATO, the former Soviet bloc, it is absolutely in the interests of the United States that the former Soviet-bloc nations discover that capitalism and freedom work.

I see our increasingly important trading partners on the Pacific rim and, of course, the tinderbox for the world, the Middle East. And where are our troops that are supposed to be the shield of the Republic and the shield of our foreign affairs? Our troops are in Rwanda, Somalia, Haiti, Cambodia, Macedonia, northern Iraq, hardly a reflection of a coherent world view.

The peace process today in the Middle East has been carried out without United States leadership. This is the first administration of the last four that has shown no interest in leadership in the Middle East peace process.

The PLO agreement was reached, not in the United States, but in Oslo. Of course, the great handshake took place on the south lawn, but we were not involved until after the agreement had been reached.

The Jordanian-Israeli agreements were bilateral. The agreements were signed on the south lawn, but we were not there in the leadership. But lacking any domestic agenda this year, the President has decided to weigh in on the Middle East and has done so by politicizing it and making it partisan. He can do something about this right in his own administration. Israel is a nation that is in a defensive posture, with armed aggressors all around her, and is building a defensive ARROW missile system for protection to shoot down incoming ballistic missiles. We now have an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that has been in effect since 1972—and an ABM agreement—that is negotiating further agreements with former Soviet-bloc nations for reasons that absolutely escape me.

We are the only Nation that can add to the technology required for a bullet to intercept a bullet. We have done that with the ERINT missile, called the PAC-3, built by Rockwell. But this administration, under what I presume to be simply bureaucratic inertia, has chosen to limit further technological advances in this intercept missile technology to 3 kilometers per second, precisely what we have now. I do not know why we would want to limit any future technology, since there is not a nation in the world competing with us in this technology, why would we ask them to agree with us to limit what we can do?

Mr. President, if you want to do something about the Middle East and for the future safety of this very vulnerable friend in this troubled part of the world, abolish the Arms Control

and Disarmament Agency, get out of ABM, and let her protect herself.

VETERANS' RESCISSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, you know, we keep calling these cuts rescissions. But let us face it. These are not rescissions, but rather a retreat, a retreat from recent promises to fund programs during this fiscal year, a retreat from long-standing promises to serve veterans. And, just as an army in retreat turns its back and runs, those who support this package are also turning their backs.

Obviously, the Appropriations Committee has done a disservice to all Americans affected by those cuts. But, let us consider how shameful it is to do a disservice to people who have already given their service to this country. That means America's veterans. These cuts are financing 14 years of failed, phony, fiscal policy from the GOP—two sets of Republican budget-busters that are squeezing working families like a vice.

In 1981, a Republican President began to cut taxes for the wealthy and build up our defense. And in 1995, a Republican Congress wants—sound familiar?—to cut taxes for the wealthy and build up our defense. To quote that same Republican President, "there they go again."

Let us see how flawed these rescissions are.

Just look at the decision to cancel improvements at the VA hospital in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Now I do not know whether any member of the Appropriations Committee has traveled to the facility in San Juan. But I have. I can speak firsthand of the overcrowding and long delays as patients try to access the services supposedly available to them. I can attest to the urgent need for the proposed renovation of the hospital. But rather than break ground on a new veterans' facility, the Republicans would prefer that we break a promise.

And, it is not just happening in San Juan, but at 5 other facilities in the VA system affected by these cuts—areas where more than 1 million veterans reside. Furthermore, these cuts show that these rescissions are not just an abandonment of compassion, but an abandonment of reason. That is because, rather than produce the great savings that the Republicans so grandly advertise, these rescissions would cancel exactly the kind of services—like outpatient care—that rein in the escalating costs of medical care.

In addition, I want to state two simple facts about outpatient care, or ambulatory care: first, it saves lives; second, it saves money. You would think that the Republicans would at least care about one of those facts.

You know, many of us have accused the Appropriations Committee of using a hatchet or a meat ax to make these cuts when a scalpel would have been better. Well, it turns out that VA surgeons will not even be using scalpels pretty soon, since the Republicans will not let them buy any new ones. As I said earlier, these Republican rescissions are really a retreat.

When they were young, these veterans were sent overseas, to lands far from their home. And if they wanted to, these service men had plenty of reasons to retreat. But rather than retreat from battle, they endured. Rather than shirk from duty, they stood up for principles. I want to encourage this House to show the same determination. I want this House to show the same willingness to carry through on principle.

Rather than retreat, I urge the House to muster up the courage to fight, to fight for what is right, to fight for, not against, the American family, to fight for those who fought for us, to reject this rescission package.

OSHA'S NIGHTMARES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, I have for you today a couple of OSHA nightmares which illustrate OSHA's overbearing enforcement policies. Although OSHA eventually dropped the charges in both cases, I think they still provide valuable insight into the mentality of an out-of-control agency.

In the first OSHA nightmare, a Maine dentist, Dr. Jeffrey Grosser, was fined \$17,500 as the result of an OSHA office inspection. The fines included an \$8,000 infection control citation and a \$7,000 citation for improper hazardous materials information and training.

OSHA charged that Dr. Grosser's employees "were exposed to the hazard of being infected with hepatitis B and/or HIV through possible direct contact with blood or other body fluids." However, Dr. Grosser's only employee is a receptionist who does not work with patients. For that, Dr. Grosser incurred an \$8,000 infection control fine.

So what, you may ask did Dr. Grosser do in the case of the \$7,000 fine?

In this instance Dr. Grosser was charged \$7,000 for not providing hazardous materials information and training.

What were the hazardous materials in question?

Chemical developer used in a self-contained x-ray machine and bleach used to mop the floor. That's right, ordinary household bleach.

Madam Speaker, in the second OSHA nightmare, Dr. Steven Smunt was fined \$4,400 for citations that included removing his eyeglasses when administering anesthetic to a child, and inadequately labeling a first-aid kit that had a "first-aid" sticker on it.

The sum \$4,400 is a lot of money no matter what line of work you're in. Regulatory actions like this can only end up hurting consumers. This is particularly the case when this Nation is trillions of dollars in debt, and we are spending the money hard-working Americans send to us on OSHA nonsense like this.

But, Madam Speaker, some people continue to believe that our regulatory reform efforts are wrong-headed. They think that all our regulations are fine and wonderful. Some people just do not get it. In this Sunday's Washington Post, Jessica Matthews wrote that our regulatory reform package was too drastic and based on false premises. Well Ms. Matthews, maybe it is OK with you that OSHA tried to declare bricks a poisonous substance. Maybe it is OK with you that OSHA wants you to get an environmental impact statement everyday you come to work, and maybe it is OK with you when OSHA writes new rules that cost an industry \$2 billion but produce no measurable improvement in worker safety. Or maybe it is OK with you that regulations in this country cost us \$500 billion annually—nearly \$10 thousand for the average family of 4—maybe that is OK with you, but it is not OK with me, and it is not OK with the American people.

OSHA is one agency that has turned a reasonable and important mission into a bureaucratic nightmare for the American economy. Common sense was long ago shown the door at OSHA. OSHA is one agency that needs to be restructured, reinvented, or just plain removed.

SPENDING CUTS? NOT WITH MY VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized during the morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, in just a couple of weeks we are going to be beginning debate on the cornerstone of the Republican Contract on America, and that is a tax cut of \$200 billion over 5 years. Never mind that those tax cuts are going to add to the deficit, never mind that these tax cuts make balancing the budget harder. But let us examine what these tax cuts actually do.

In this first chart that I have here, this chart shows who benefits from the tax cuts. If you look at this, 50 percent of the tax cuts go to 10 percent of the families, with over \$100,000 of income per year—50 percent of the cuts to 10 percent of families.

At the lower end, the first two categories, which represent 71 million families or two-thirds of all families in the United States, they get less than 20 percent of the tax cuts.