

In fact, American corporations are experiencing some of the greatest increased in productivity at the same time that they have continued to work under workplace safety standards as promulgated by OSHA.

Mr. Speaker, what is interesting is that in the same bill, while most of the other agencies are subjected to budget cuts of around 7.5 percent, we see that OSHA, that agency which protects our families when they go to work, to make sure that when they leave the house they will come back to the House in the same condition when they left, we see that the enforcement for OSHA is cut by almost 33 percent. A third of its budget is taken away from this agency that is given the obligation to protect American workers.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply unacceptable. We cannot go back to the days when American workers were chewed up in the mines in this country, in the factories in this country, in the places of manufacturing in this country. We still, even with the tremendous successes that OSHA has had in bringing down the injury rate and the loss of life in the American workplace, we still see that each day, some 6,000 Americans are injured on the job, and this costs American businesses billions of dollars a year, and that is unacceptable. But to now take off, to take off the ability of OSHA to enforce the laws, is to suggest that industries and businesses and manufacturers can engage in a race to the bottom where they can decide that they can cut the cost of doing business by having an unsafe workplace. That is not acceptable to America's workers, and it is not acceptable to America's families.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also goes on to say that OSHA cannot even promulgate regulations to try and protect workers who suffer from repetitive motion disorders because of the increased use in computers and some jobs in the assembly segment of American manufacturing. All of us are aware, we see people in the supermarket, we see people standing in line to go to the show, members of our own families, as they wear harnesses on their hands, they wear harnesses on their elbow, they go to therapy because they are trying to stay on the job.

At the same time that this Congress is asking for more ergonomic-sensitive furniture, components, machinery to protect their workers in the U.S. Congress, we are suggesting that we cannot promulgate the regulations to provide that same kind of protection to American workers in the American workplace. Yet we find that millions of Americans suffer from these kinds of disabilities that limit their ability to earn a living, to provide for their families. That is what OSHA is about. It is about Americans being able to go to work in a safe workplace, to earn a wage, to provide for their families. To the extent that they are disabled, to the extent that they are injured, to the extent that they suffer these kinds of

accidents, their capabilities of providing for their families are reduced. This budget cut in this bill is simply an attack on working families in this country and it should not be allowed to stand. The Republicans are wrong-headed in this effort and they should not be allowed to take this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I would just like to refer to earlier points you made in your statement that I think deserves a great deal of emphasis. You referred to the fact that our American workers cannot afford to be eaten up, and the fact that productivity has increased today. That is especially true in the coal mining industry.

WOMEN AND THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rose earlier to commemorate this wonderful stamp that is going to be coming out on August 26 that is going to celebrate women having had the right to vote for 75 years in this country.

I must say as we see these women in the stamp marching down the avenue with men who supported them demanding the right to vote, I would be a little leery if I were a Member of Congress, because I think after 75 years women are learning how to use that vote and women are going to be very angry about what this Congress is doing to women and children.

Last week we saw a good example where in the prior Congress there had been a unanimous consent on the Violence Against Women Act, that we really had to get aggressive and do that. It passed this House unanimously. There was not one vote against it. Last week, after first attempting to zero out the funds, we finally had to get excited and be very grateful because we got 50 cents on the dollar. We have ignored it all these years, we know violence is very critical, and it is especially bad when children are learning it in the home—when they are learning it in the home, good luck ever undoing it—so we really made that commitment but we really did not mean it, and if it had not been for the Congresswoman, we would not have even gotten 50 cents on the dollar, because they were quick to say, OK, well, we voted for it, but we do not have the to fund it and it will slip away.

We are seeing women's right to choose go down the chute, we are seeing all sorts of educational programs and opportunities in the workplace going down the chute, and we are seeing all sorts of things happening to children.

In fact, a mother from Denver sent me the poster for what they thing the Labor-HHS bill that we are going to be

taking up this week should be showing. Here it is. It is this wonderful child. I think what the Congress is saying to this child is, "Let them eat mud."

We are going after Head Start. Can you believe that? We have never made our commitment to Head Start. We are going after all sorts of educational programs that this child's future depends on and so forth and so on. We are going to attack their nutrition, attack their education, attack their chance to get ahead, attack a women's ability to move forward. I remind you that in the Budget Act, they put a 15-percent tax on child support enforcement. If the government collects child support, they are going to take 15 percent of that out. Yet we keep saying to these families, "Get up and get on your own."

How are you going to do that unless you were lucky enough to have picked the right parents? This child did not get a chance to pick my parents. I did not get a chance to pick my parents that I am aware of. If you are lucky enough to have picked the right parents, although I never knew you got that choice, then you are going to be OK. The idea that the government should try and create an equal playing field so you can utilize all of your abilities, be you male, female, be you black, white, be you Hispanic, Asian or whatever is really rapidly eroding. It is very rapidly eroding. If you do not think it is rapidly eroding, watch what we do this week. We are bringing the meanest bill to this floor, the most extreme bill to this floor that this Congress has seen since the end of the war. We are saying to this child, "You've got to pay for the debt." Obviously she caused it. Listen, she was not even here. She cannot even vote.

That is why I think as we get ready to celebrate women having voted for 75 years, maybe people better sit back and reflect. We may not have voted in any great numbers in 1994, but I have a feeling that women all over America are getting as angry as the mother of this child in Denver, CO and saying: What are you people doing there? You are not touching the B-2 bomber, you are not touching the space station, you are not touching really rich farmers, you are not touching the traditional pork. You are going after kids. You are going after the people who cannot fight back.

You may find that women unite this year and we do fight back. We have had the vote long enough. We now know how to use it, and I think this Congress better be careful. This war on women and children had better end or women and children will declare war on the Congress.

MASSIVE CUTS LOOM IN LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to rise in great dismay and almost shocked disbelief at the bill that we are being asked to consider this week which provides funding for programs in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

Most of the people who hold public office today, whether in local, State, or national capacities, have always made a very strong and vocal commitment to the importance of education, not just to the children that are here today but virtually for the future of this country. In order for us to be truly competitive in a world sense we have to be sure that the children of America are being given the fullest opportunity for education, for training, for career development, and certainly in meeting the changes that occur in our economy and in jobs throughout the Nation, we have to also be prepared to make sure that there are funds available for job retraining of workers who are displaced in a wide variety of industries, outcomes of such things as NAFTA and GATT, and simply the downsizing of our megacorporations.

So it is almost with a dismay and disbelief that I rise today to advise the people in the country about these massive cuts that are coming in the field of education. The budget that we are going to be asked to vote for this week cuts \$3.8 billion in education and about \$2.8 billion of this cut are going to affect the local schools directly. It is astounding that such a major cut would come from a field that everybody agrees is the most important responsibility of Government. But there you have it. Now, how do these cuts come into the budget category?

□ 1240

The first major cut is \$1.1 billion in title I, which is a special program that has been in existence since 1965.

I happen to have been here in the Congress in 1965, where the debate over 25 years finally came to fruition and the first federally financed Aid to Education was enacted. It was then called Public Law 8910; and that program has continued over the years. Although never fully funded, it has provided billions of dollars of assistance directly to our schools.

How is it determined what the schools are to get? It is targeted to economically and educationally disadvantaged children in our schools. In some instances, private schools are able to benefit by sending their children out to partake of the various programs that are located in the public schools.

We have a devastating impact. Our report shows that 1 million of our most disadvantaged children in our neediest schools that do not have the real property tax base or the financial wherewithal to pay for an adequate education are going to have these funds stripped away. I think this is the most egregious of all of the cuts that we are being asked to make this week.

Mr. Speaker, the other program which has had widespread support throughout the country is a program that we call Head Start. Time and again, people have stood on the well of this floor, Presidents have announced that we must achieve full funding of Head Start.

It takes into consideration the need to prepare disadvantaged children, particularly, at age 4 and 5 years of age to make it possible for them when they enter the public schools in first grade that they can achieve at a far more adequate and rapid pace.

This is a program that has bipartisan support and yet I am dismayed to report that the Committee on Appropriations cut Head Start by \$137 million, which means 45,000 to 50,000 children who are currently in the program will not be able to participate any longer. What a tragedy for these youngsters.

What makes up an adequate educational system in America? What produces quality education? It is not money in itself, it is the quality of the teachers, and so one of the important areas that we have funded in the past is teacher education, and that program is being totally eliminated, that is known as the Eisenhower Professional Development Program for teachers. I see that my time is up, and I will be back again on the floor.

EDUCATION CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise the same as Mrs. MINK in vehement opposition to the new majority's Labor, HHS, and Education appropriation bill. It is a bill that is so bad that we should not even try to amend it, even if we could, because I do not believe there are any amendments that could improve it, so let it come to the floor just the way it is and show the American people what the new majority is really all about.

Some have come to this floor and said that the new majority are mean spirited. Mr. Speaker, this goes beyond mean spirited. The Labor HHS bill is a cold-blooded attack on the American dream.

It is especially damaging for those at the very bottom of the ladder. The cuts in education are at the very heart of the American dream. Education has always been a plus, something to laud, in America. Without education, would we have had the major technical advancements that we have known? That came from people that were well educated in this country? I doubt it.

I do not believe even in the past people like George Washington Carver, who gave us more than just the development of so many things from the peanut, would have had the advantages that he did later in his life after he received the formal education.

Mr. Speaker, education, to me, has been at the heart of every advancement

of our Great Society. The new majority cuts and slashes. Their cut-and-slash tactics cut everything. They cut education, a second chance for people. They say they want everyone to speak English. Where do they think adults are going to learn English? They are going to learn in school.

They are slashing a program so that adults have to wait in line to get into the ESL classes. Community-based organizations, which take up much of the slack, are already short of funds to provide services, and the bill is cutting their aid even further.

Even though the Federal Government contributes only a small percentage of the education money that is spent in this country, they want to take that away.

With this legislation, Congress is ignoring the national leadership role that it has. When local school boards all over the country are having hard times paying for their schools, this bill is denying the very little help we do give. The no-tax phobia has school districts around the country desperate for funds. If we do not help, no one will.

Initiatives like California's proposition 13 and the two-thirds requirement for any new increase in funds for schools handcuff the ability of communities to implement a bond measure to raise taxes for those needs that they believe are priorities like schools.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been offended by taxes as long as the revenue is spent well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must grow up and the new majority must grow up and face the responsibility for a sensible society. Without taxes, there would be no local law enforcement, no local fire safety, no local sewage treatment, no health and safety protections. Taxes are a part of a civilized society.

If we think we have it bad, we ought to look at some of our neighboring countries. Some nations have more onerous taxes than we will ever have, but they do not have the advancements in technology that we do.

Taxes are a sacrifice made to investment in our country.

We hear our colleagues every day come to this floor and say, we have to run Congress like a business. I was in business for many years, but I got into politics and I saw other businesses around me fail because they would not make the sacrifice that we need to make to make an investment in our business. Well, we are now giving a tax break to the rich at the expense of an investment in the programs for the poor of our country.

The Labor, HHS, education bill is a disinvestment in the future of the children of this Nation that is irrational and unfair. Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the promise of a brighter tomorrow, a kinder and gentler America that we heard about not so long ago, a future for our children that people, and especially politicians, love to make in speeches?