

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.

Well, if that is a little bit difficult to understand, then let us look at this chart instead. On this chart, this shows how much each family gets. Families with more than \$200,000 per year of income would get, on average, \$5,000 of tax reduction. And 49 million families, about 45 percent of all Americans, that have under \$30,000 of income per year, they would get on average \$57 a year, or about \$1 per week would be their share of this tax cut.

Now, they claim they are not going to make the deficit larger, so we are going to be debating this next week the so-called rescissions bill, a \$17 billion rescissions bill.

Well, Madam Speaker, in NEWT GINGRICH's America, Republican will cut infant mortality prevention and prenatal nutrition and children's foster care and safe and drug-free schools for children, education for disadvantaged children, and domestic violence prevention and shelters for homeless families. But they will not do it with my vote.

Next week, in NEWT GINGRICH's America's these radical-right Republicans will cut vocational and technical education and Americorps, the National Community Corps, school dropout prevention, college scholarships and summer jobs. But not with my vote.

And next week, in NEWT GINGRICH's America, these Republican extremists will cut rental assistance for low-income families and public housing maintenance and safety and home heating assistance for 6 million American families, every one of who happens to lie in this lower category. But not with my vote.

In NEWT GINGRICH's America, to go back to this we are going to take \$16 billion of cuts, over \$300 for every single family in this category, and transfer it to families in this category.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ELIMINATION ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, French economist Jean-Baptiste Say is famous as the author of Say's Law, sometimes summarized as "Supply creates its own demand." In economic circles, this law is still the subject of debate.

Here in Washington, however, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been proving Say's Law for the past 30 years. We keep increasing spending on public housing, and the problem just gets worse.

Contrary to popular belief, housing assistance was not cut during the Reagan years. Discretionary Federal assisted housing outlays have grown from \$165 million in 1962 to \$5.5 billion in 1980 and \$23.7 billion in 1994, result-

ing in 55 percent more families being assisted today than in 1980.

Has this dramatic growth solved the problem? No. Today, after HUD's budget has grown by over 400 percent in 15 years, only 30 percent of the families eligible to receive housing assistance are doing so.

And what kind of housing are they receiving? The 1992 report on severely distressed public housing found many public housing residents afraid to leave their own homes due to prevalent crime while others were living in decaying conditions that threatened their safety and health.

According to HUD's own statement of principles issued January of this year, "the rigidly bureaucratic, top-down, command-and-control public housing management system that has evolved over the years has left tens of thousands of people living in squalid conditions at a very high cost in wasted lives and Federal dollars."

Three decades of HUD and homeownership is down, homelessness is up, and millions of low-income Americans are condemned to live in substandard housing which would be unacceptable if it were owned by anyone else.

Say's Law indeed.

Quite simply, HUD has failed its mission of providing decent, low-income housing to America's poor. On the other hand, it has done an excellent job of providing jobs to over 4,000 Washington bureaucrats who oversee the hundreds of programs within the Department.

For these reasons, I have introduced legislation to abolish HUD by January 1, 1998, and consolidate its needed existing programs into block grants and vouchers.

If it is truly the job of government to subsidize low-income housing, then let's do it without the middle man. Rent vouchers allow low-income people to choose their own home, rather than have some bureaucrat choose it for them. Block grants give money directly to the States and local governments—that much closer to the taxpayers who pay the bills.

These reforms are in line with the recommendations recently outlined by HUD itself. The administration's own reform plan proposes eliminating all direct capital and operating subsidies to existing public housing authorities and converting these funds to rent certificates.

For years, conservatives and liberals alike have been championing similar reforms, and it's good to see the current administration jumping onboard.

On the other hand, the administration's effort falls short of the bottom line. Bill Clinton proposed to consolidate HUD's 60 public housing programs into three general funds. He then requested an increase in HUD's budget.

Madam Speaker, America's poor do not just suffer from a surplus of bureaucrats telling them where to live and what to do. They also suffer from excess government that destroys jobs and opportunity.

With \$200 billion deficits projected into the next century, it isn't enough to just consolidate many little programs into a few big programs. We have to reduce the size of Government overall. We need to eliminate entire departments. We need to abolish HUD.

It is time to admit that Uncle Sam makes a lousy landlord and end this 30-year experiment in socialist domestic policy. As Bill Clinton said in his State of the Union Address, "The old way of governing around here actually seemed to reward failure."

Let us stop rewarding HUD's failure by abolishing HUD and eliminating the unnecessary bureaucracy. The alternative is to continue investing in instant ghettos and Federal bureaucrats.

That's a solution we have tried for 30 years, and it just has not worked.

#### VA RESCISSIONS

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

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, the strength of our national defense has always depended not only on the size of our armory, but in the people who serve. Stock piles of bullets, bombs, and ships are of no use without the brave men and women who are willing to put aside personal hopes and dreams for a time to serve the common good. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to these Americans; and one of the ways we have done this is to provide health care services to our veterans. Unfortunately, these services are now the subject of proposed budget cuts.

The rescissions that target Veterans' hospitals, and more specifically remove funding for ambulatory care facilities at Veterans' hospitals, will reduce access to general health care for our veterans, and will make it more difficult to deliver important preventive health care services at these facilities.

The construction of the ambulatory facility at the VA hospital in Hampton, VA is also considered a top priority by the 177,000 patients that currently receives its services. As the fourth oldest hospital in the system, the VA Medical Center in Hampton provides outpatient and inpatient care to veterans who have defended our country in its time of need. This veterans' facility and the others across the country are able to return the favor by meeting health care needs of these dedicated veterans.

The six projects under attack in the GOP rescissions, are not new projects. Several have been under consideration for congressional funding since 1989. The funding has been approved in the past. It is only now, as the new majority looks for ways to finance tax cuts, that the ambulatory care facilities are at risk.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans who use these facilities are not wealthy, or