

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.