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?

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste