



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1995

No. 111

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RADANOVICH].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 11, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable GEORGE P. RADANOVICH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority and minority leader, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall exceed beyond 9:50 a.m.

WHY FORMAL RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST VIETNAM IS WRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] is recognized during morning business for 1 minute.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, today President Clinton will formally recognize Communist Vietnam. While American diplomats toast the brutal Hanoi regime, this White House ignores the wishes of hundreds of POW/MIA families and thousands of Vietnamese-

Americans who fled their country to escape Communist tyranny.

In 1992, candidate Clinton promised never to lift the trade embargo on the Hanoi communists unless and until there was a full accounting of American servicemen. Mr. Clinton then turned his back on our POW/MIA families claiming that Hanoi had changed. What change? Vietnam is one of the world's worst human rights abusers. Thousands are imprisoned for political and religious beliefs and Buddhist monks are once again threatening to immolate themselves on the streets. Hanoi continues to torture our POW/MIA families with the slow and selective release of information about their husbands and fathers.

Mr. President, if you want to know why you are wrong listen to what my colleague SAM JOHNSON—7 years a prisoner of Hanoi—told the Washington Post about Vietnamese communists: "They have always lied to us, and they are still lying to us. I see normalization as an attempt on their part to get access to American markets. They are not to be trusted." Mr. President, is breaking faith with hundreds of brave American families really worth the profits of the big multinationals bankrolling your reelection campaign?

OSHA'S NEW ATTITUDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am holding a copy of the administration's newest initiative regarding OSHA. It is bound in red, white, and blue, and is filled with lots of rhetoric about changing the way OSHA thinks.

In past Congresses I, and many of my colleagues have criticized many of OSHA's ridiculous regulations.

We watch OSHA deny the regulations exist at the same time they are scrambling to change them.

I want to believe this is an honest attempt at reform. I would like to believe that OSHA tuned in to C-SPAN one day and said, "By golly, those Republicans are right. We've got to change our emphasis."

But I do not think that is how it happened.

November 8 happened.

For OSHA, this document is a matter of self preservation.

I brought another document to the floor with me today.

This is the one the administration would like you to forget.

In the 103d Congress, the administration's idea of OSHA reform was H.R. 1280.

OSHA supported the Comprehensive OSHA Reform Act of 1994.

The legislation which increased penalties, regulation, and paperwork.

This is dated October 3, 1994.

Let's compare these documents:

In 1994, OSHA wanted to impose \$62 billion in new costs on the private sector. In 1995 OSHA is backing down from strict new standards on ergonomics.

In 1994, OSHA wanted to redefine occupational safety health standards in order to justify costly new mandates. In 1995, OSHA plans to "improve, update, and eliminate confusing and out of date standards."

In 1994, OSHA wanted to mandate even more paperwork requirements on even more businesses. In 1995 OSHA wants to decrease redtape and paperwork.

In 1994, OSHA was willing to put their ideas into law. In 1995 OSHA is not so willing.

These two documents represent one of the great flip-flops of this administration.

If the administration wants to change OSHA's approach, why don't they put the change into law?

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H6739

OSHA's new approach means nothing if we leave them the ability to change back to their old gestapo attitude whenever the political climate will tolerate it.

Meanwhile, OSHA's absurdities continue:

We heard about the specially designed rubber gloves used by Secret Service officials at the White House.

It was OSHA which cited serious violations of workers safety at Secret Service guard stations.

In speaking with over 15 guards at our own capitol buildings, I failed to find a single officer who had ever been cut or injured, or that had ever heard of an officer being cut or injured, while searching someone's belongings.

They do have rubber gloves, but are allowed to use them at their discretion.

But that's not all. Back in my home district, a dental office was recently cited with 11 violations, all of them serious and most of them for paperwork violations.

One violation included the office's written hazard communication.

The office took the OSHA approved guidelines from another dental office and used them.

OSHA cited them because they had scratched out the name of the dentist that originated the booklet and wrote in their office name.

To come into OSHA compliance the office had to retype the 65 page document, word for word.

In other citations, OSHA took the word of a disgruntled employee and made citations based on her accusations.

The dentist was cited for bloodying gloves while working on one patient, and then using the same gloves, still bloodied, on another patient.

It is difficult to believe that any dentist, or any patient for that matter, would allow that to happen.

He was also cited for putting used gloves in the same container as new gloves, even though OSHA found no evidence of either of these practices actually occurring.

It's time for OSHA to use a little common sense. It's time for real, permanent, and radical OSHA reform.

THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT IS BEING DERAILED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as time evolves we are seeing more and more about how things look and how things really are. I must say, as one of the people who has been very concerned about the Violence Against Women Act, because I think living rooms in America and kitchens in America are the classrooms of violence for many of our young people, I was so proud when this body passed the Violence Against Women Act, and what

did it pass by? It passed by 411 to 0, and you really cannot do any better than that. So, after 200-and-some years of this Republic, we finally decided that we would go right to the core of where a lot of this violence was starting, in the home, and we also realized that, if children see every single dispute solved, every single dispute solved with violence at home, they are not going to be able to be given a conflict-resolution course for a couple of hours in school to change their behavior. So, going in and really saying for the first time this country was going to take this seriously I thought was marvelous.

Well, now we see that, while we passed the bill, apparently they are taking all the money out. There was to be \$161 million appropriated for such things as shelters for victims of domestic violence, for families; a hotline for the very first time. We have never had a national hotline on this issue. Also for rape crisis centers \$161 million was to go out this year to begin those things, and, believe me, that money is really needed because to say to the victims of these kinds of acts that you have to privatize it or you are going to have to pay for it yourself, good luck. Part of the reason they have not been able to get out of the violence at home, or whatever, has been because of the economic dependence they have on the batterer, whether it be male or female, so that is very essential.

Well, what happened? It appears, it appears that \$161 million is now \$1 million, that they took \$61 million out. Now that is an outrage. At that point we ought to just say the act has been canceled. I say to my colleague, "Let's be real honest about this. Don't brag about your vote if you vote to absolutely gut this."

There was also \$100 million put into the crime trust fund for this, and that was to help train police and judges and to do more aid in the States and localities to get their laws tougher and so forth. I say to my colleagues, "Well, guess what? If that's all zeroed out, don't brag that you voted for the Violence Against Women Act because obviously that didn't happen."

Now there will be people saying, "Oh, well, it is just women." No, it is not. It is men and women; let me make that perfectly clear. Violence against men or violence against women in the home is wrong. Violence against children in the home is wrong. Instead you see everybody now moving to say that Government should back out of all of that and we should just again go back; the home is totally off limits, and you can batter children, batter spouses, do whatever.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like we are doing something, but we are not because we take all the money away. I hope that people in this country wake up and realize that because, if we ever want to get crime on the streets under control, we are not going to do it until we go to the source. We have had study after study showing that, if a person

grows up in this violence, they are going to be violent.

Second, imagine the horror for the many, many Americans living in this type of situation. If you are afraid to be on the street because of crime, but you cannot even go home because you are also afraid to be there, what a nightmare.

So what a wonderful feeling it was a year ago when we all came together in a huge, bipartisan manner, and we voted that out, and we got the bill signed, and we got the details in order, and we really thought the train was moving, and now we find the whole train has been derailed, and they are going to drop a little token, \$1 million, in the box and say "Isn't that wonderful? Look what we have done."

Let me tell you what you have done. You have done nothing. You have done absolutely nothing, and we will be back to business as usual on one of the most important crime generators and violence generators in this country.

And let us be perfectly clear about this. It is easy to tell you about other things, but the most important thing is the home and the family, and if the home and the family is the roots of violence, if the home and the family is absolutely torn asunder, then you are never going to get off square one when it comes to fighting crime.

THE MEDICARE CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the most important act of this Congress over the next 3 months will be the reform of Medicare. I would like to take a few minutes this morning to talk about what is at stake for America's seniors.

The Medicare Program is in trouble. In April, the trustees of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds issued an alarming report. The report concluded that next year the trust fund that finances Medicare will begin spending more than it takes in and will be bankrupt in 7 years. This will put the health care of 36 million Americans in jeopardy.

Remarkably, this report received almost no coverage by the media. Uncomfortable as it might be, the trustee's report cannot be ignored. The trustees include the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Treasury, as well as the Social Security Commissioner and two other public trustees, one Republican and one Democrat.

The reason for the crisis is clear. Medicare spending is growing at an alarming rate. This year alone, it will increase from \$176 billion to \$196 billion, a growth of 11 percent. This will be nearly three times the level of spending in 1986. It is obvious that any Federal program that triples its level of spending in a decade is headed for trouble.