

Even if the employer makes a good-faith effort to provide rescue services, he or she could still be hit with a prohibitive fine if it does not meet with OSHA's ambitious standard.

Mr. Speaker, now OSHA claims that the employers' compliance with this proposed revision will not be based solely upon a rescue service's actual performance during any single incidence, but rather upon the employer's total effort to ensure that the prospective rescue service is indeed capable in terms of timeliness and training and equipment of performing an effective rescue, but what we have seen in the past is that OSHA implements a rule or a standard that sounds very reasonable in the Federal Register or before a congressional hearing; however, when a rule is enforced out in the field, it is used as a big stick to harass hard-working Americans.

Is this just another way for OSHA to fine hard-working Americans and collect more money for the Federal Treasury? Not until a great outcry is heard does OSHA consider providing a clarification of its standards or rules in order to ensure that it is not used to harass hard-working Americans. OSHA has shown again and again that regulatory excess is an addiction and they just cannot seem to kick the habit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in this case, OSHA's enforcement of its rules does not cause more problems than it is intended to prevent. You can be sure that I will be watching and listening just in case this is not true.

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

BE ALL YOU CAN BE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to take the well today wearing this ribbon which was given to me by the Girl Scouts, because the Girl Scouts today are asking adults to wear this ribbon and be the best that they can be. I think that that is a good motto for all of us as Americans. We probably ought to do it everyday, but this is a special day and I, as an ex-Girl Scout and a mother of a Girl Scout, am very, very proud to be here and be talking about that.

So I got to thinking, well, now, if you took this and applied it to the Federal Government in Washington, why do people get so frustrated with this and what would "be the best we could be" mean at the Federal level?

Well, it seems to me that one of the things that we don't do at the Federal

level is model what the average family does at their kitchen table. At the average family kitchen table when times get tough, the last thing they do to make budget ends meet is cut the children. They will try to hold the children harmless from budget cuts absolutely as long as possible, and yet this week, the first thing we are going to do as we try to find the first round of budget cuts, and these are just for big tax cuts and they are for disaster relief in California, we are going to cut children. That is going to be our very first thing, our very first budget cut act. Heaven only knows what we will do to them when we get to the next round where we are dealing with the deficit.

Now I remind you that children did not cause this deficit, nor are they asking for big tax cuts. They would just like a school lunch, thank you, and they did not cause the disaster in California or other places. But I think the thing that is really harming and the reason I think our priorities are so wrong right now is that while this body has been discussing risk assessment, risk assessment, risk assessment, and we were doing this all across the board when it came to regulations, and many people agree, yes, we should look at that, but why are we not looking at the risk assessment on the next generation of children which will people America's 21st century if we continue on with these budget cuts?

Now, what are some of the things that we know? When I chaired the Committee on Children, Youth and Families, we had all sorts of CEOs from corporate America join us looking at the cost-effectiveness of Federal dollars spent for children, and the best money you can save is investing in a young child, because you are saving it later on, saving it later on.

We got all sorts of incredible numbers that are a big surprise. If you vaccinate every child—and as you well know, America is way behind in vaccinating children, many Third World countries do a much better job—the studies we have been showed is that it is \$14 to the taxpayer later on. So one dollar for a vaccination, every one dollar spent on that saved \$14 later on. That is not a bad deal. I have never been able to invest my money like that in any other area.

When you put children into Head Start, for every dollar we spent on Head Start, you could show a \$6 saving in special education that the taxpayer would pick up. For feeding children, for every dollar you spent in WIC and for every dollar you were spending in child nutrition programs, you way more than made the money back in not having to spend it in Medicaid.

You know, we go around all the time, too, saying children must say no to this, children must say no to this, we must give them things to say yes to, and that is what we are doing. We are taking a lot of the same "yes to's" away.

We are totally taking away summer jobs. We are taking away many of the

youth programs. We are cutting back many of the others so that localities are going to be really strapped, and I must say, as the prior gentlewoman from Oregon said, when you are taking 63 percent of these cuts out of a group of programs that only make up 12 percent of the discretionary budget. I think we are going down real heavy on the kids.

This is not across the board. We are not going after \$600 toilet seats. Oh, no, those are sacred cows. We are not going after other things. No no, those are sacred cows. Why? Because they have political action committees that can come protect them with all sorts of money for campaigns. They can organize and they can vote.

Children don't vote. They don't have political action committees, and I think if we are going to be the best that we can be, we have got to reconsider these cuts this week because I think it is really—maybe you think it is penny wise, but it is long term and pound foolish.

RESCISSION CUTS ON JOBS PROGRAMS

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about two programs. First this week we will be considering a rescission bill and the activities that I was involved in over the weekend, but also talk a little bit about the School Lunch Program. But first let me talk about the rescission bill that Congress will be voting on this week.

This last Saturday in Houston, I had the opportunity to, at 8 o'clock in the morning, to go to our city hall in the city of Houston and see hundreds of young people and not so young people who were there at 8 o'clock on a Saturday morning getting prepared to go out and work in the community.

The rescission bill we are going to vote on this week will definitely cut part of the national service, the Americorps Program that serves Houston, and I have served Houston Program in Texas. We started with really no program last year and we have become such a great serving institution for the community.

Let me talk about the Corporation for National Service on a nationwide basis and then bring it down to how it affects Houston: AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve, and the Senior Corps. They work full or part-time in local organizations addressing community needs. We have 60 of them in Houston that serve Houston, 60 positions. I wanted more but we couldn't do it as a startup, 33,000 more with 1995 moneys and 47,000 more with 1996 moneys, but again, the rescission bill will cut us back.

This would complete the contract that a bipartisan Congress made with our young people with the National and Community Service Fund Act of 1993, but we cannot do it if we pass the rescission bill this week with those cuts.

Learn and Serve America, elementary and high school and college students participate in activities that address community needs and they enhance their own academic skills. Approximately 375,000 elementary and secondary school and college students participate, growing to over \$588,000 if we had the 1996 funds.

The Senior Corps, Americans 55 or older serve in local communities on a part-time basis and they provide, for example, modest stipends for foster grandparents, and I have received a lot of mail and phone calls this week from senior companions, 480,000 seniors participate today, and if we could take it out of the rescission bill, we would be able to increase that just a small amount to 510,000.

The cuts in the Americorps is wrong and should not be because it is one of the best programs we have. If we are really going to reform welfare, we need to make sure we reform it by giving people that job experience and those jobs.

Let me talk about another example of the Saturday I was with the Summer Jobs Program that is sponsored by Houston, works at the cooperative effort in a number of our local governments. We have 2,000 jobs in my district that are summer jobs that are part of that program, 6,000 in Harris County alone. And my concern, by the rescission bill that cuts those 6,000 jobs, we are going to lose out and three or four individuals who were there Saturday who were graduates of the Summer Jobs Program.

We have a young lady, Marilena, who now works at a radio station in Houston who got her start in the Summer Jobs Program. Wilbert, who now is a supervisor for the city of Houston in waste water, got his start in a summer jobs program. Laquista is a young lady who made the news in Houston who got her start working at a summer jobs program and now is supervising clean-up in our community for the city of Houston. Arti, who not only works in my office, but is also a student who got her start in the Summer Jobs Program.

Too often we hear that the majority party now says that there is no benefit to these summer jobs program, but there is a benefit, and Saturday morning I had four people who were graduates who are now productive citizens today because of the Summer Jobs Program. And to cut out 2,000 young people in my own district or 6,000 in the county or thousands all over the United States for a 6-week Summer Jobs Program is wrong because what we are doing is we are having some short-term savings that provides for some short-term tax relief; but in the long term, the American people in our country

will lose the values of those talents of those young people whether it be in the Summer Jobs Program and productive citizens or whether it be in the Americorps and Serve Houston where we are losing not only their talents now in helping our community, but we are going to lose the experience they are getting now through Serve Houston and through Americorps for the future of our country.

We cannot be penny wise and pound foolish and lose that effort right now. And that is my concern, that the Congress this week needs to make sure that we do not cut these programs out of the rescission package. We do not need to cut those programs now and say we are going to provide for additional tax cuts now and cut out those 2,000 young people in my own district who have a summer job for 6 weeks.

□ 1300

THE RESCISSION BILL

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was in Twinsburg, OH, in my district, Ohio's 13th District in northeast Ohio, visiting the community center and meeting with parents, children, teachers, and nurses and talking about the Women, Infants and Children's Program and the School Lunch Program.

Some of the people I met with, some of the parents, were unemployed. Most of them were working part-time or full-time, generally for minimum wage. Often many of these parents, basically all of those parents' children were getting school lunches, because their income was not high enough that they paid full price for these lunches.

Those parents, those teachers, those children, especially those nurses, could simply not understand why extremists in this body, in Congress, want to cut school lunches, want to cut senior nutrition, want to cut programs like Women, Infants and Children; Programs that have been in effect, in terms of the School Lunch Program, for literally five decades, started by Harry Truman in 1946.

Other programs, like WIC, that have been in effect and working for a couple of decades. Programs that help young people grow, help pregnant women, help those children with nutrition and counseling. The WIC program, especially. And this was what was called a WIC center in Twinsburg.

The WIC Program is not just a giveaway program. It is a program where working class mothers come in with their children, come in while they are pregnant and get some nutritional supplements and are counseled, generally less educated women are counseled about nutrition while they are pregnant to make sure they have a healthy baby. The, after the baby is born, for

the next 5 years they come into WIC regularly and are counseled about nutrition and can get immunized, either there or are directed where they can get immunized in the first 2 years of the baby's life; all the things that we need for the future of this country.

These people did not understand why the extremists in Congress want to make these cuts. What they did understand is that School lunches, Children's nutrition Programs, programs like counseling for WIC, immunizations, all these things are the investment for the future and they make sense for this country.

They do understand that, OK, we might save a few dollars making cuts now, but in the end, long term, we will pay more money for welfare for children as they get older and have bad nutrition and did not have the advantages when they were younger. They are more likely to be on welfare and more likely to be in prison. And these young families did understand that. That that simply is bad public policy long term.

I am a deficit hog. I voted for budget cut after budget cut after budget cut in this body. But we should not be stupid about it. There is no reason to make cuts that affect our children and affect our future the way that cutting school lunches and cutting programs like WIC and nutrition programs like that would mean.

Three weeks ago this body passed an increase in military spending of \$3.2 billion. The extremists here are cutting nutrition, children's long-term-for-the-future programs on the one hand and increasing military spending \$3 billion on the other hand, for a military in a country where our military budget is larger than the next nine countries in the world. Yet we are increasing military spending, cutting school lunches and WIC Programs, and at the same time the extremists in this body want to see major tax cuts for the wealthiest taxpayers.

Just recently the Republican leaders in the Committee on Ways and Means have called for an end to the alternative minimum tax. You may remember about 10 years ago President Reagan and most of the country were outraged that many large corporations in this country were able, through all kinds of use of accountants and lawyers and all their tax breaks and loopholes, literally to avoid paying any Federal tax and sometimes actually getting the government to pay them money through some rebate programs.

Many large corporations fell into the category. So Congress and President Reagan enacted something called the alternative minimum tax to make sure that every large corporation in this country did, in fact, pay some corporate income tax to the Government. They want to eliminate that alternative minimum tax. On the one hand we are increasing military spending, we are eliminating a tax on major corporations—these are corporations that