

that debate, I continue to be guided by the words of one of this Nation's great humanitarians, the former Vice President of the United States, Hubert Humphrey, who said, "The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children, those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly, and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

This bill, which we will take up this week, Mr. Speaker, I believe represents a monumental failure of this test. Over the next 7 years, it will cut education and training \$36 billion.

Now, my Republican friends are fond of saying that this is a plan that will reward future generations. But what about this generation, the children in Head Start, the children in title I, the children in the kindergartens and first grades of this country? What price will they pay, Mr. Speaker? And what price will we as a nation pay for this failure of vision?

Mr. Speaker, I have served on this committee with responsibility for the children and workers of this country for 18 years, and during that time, particularly in the field of education, Republicans and Democrats have worked together on common ground to strengthen the basic fabric of this complex and diverse Nation. We have worked to provide opportunities for those willing to use the tools of education and work to achieve the rewards of American citizenship.

Education has always risen above partisanship as a shared priority, and it is sad, Mr. Speaker, to say that I believe this bill breaks that covenant between Democrats and Republicans.

#### WHAT IS NEXT IN HAITI?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important on a day when we are going to devote in this chamber very serious deliberative debate on the subject of whether we are going to get involved and to what degree in a hostile situation in a place called Bosnia, that it is important that we also review where we have troops now that are somewhat in harm's way and doing American business overseas in another area where we have a major investment that has been very, very troublesome, although not as attention-getting because the atrocities are nowhere near as bad as the genocide we are seeing in Bosnia, the former Yugoslavia.

The place I speak of is Haiti, of course. I was there for the 25th of June elections and for the International Republican Institute as the chairman of the Election Observation Team, and I was personally much maligned for the way that we operated down there, and the IRI was much criticized for the re-

port we issued as a result of those elections.

Curiously enough now, all the observers who have watched those elections and judged what is going on in Haiti have come over to the report that we issued and basically been much harsher and critical about the process in Haiti than even the IRI report. I guess it is difficult to be out in front of the pack sometimes, but what is important now is to find out where we are going next.

The commentary in the Washington Post yesterday, which I will quite because it is notable that the Washington Post has come around to this point of view, says, quote, "Early hopes, including our own, that Haiti was getting up momentum and building an electoral system turn out to have been wrong." That is a very strong admission from the Washington Post, which generally is very favorable to the Clinton administration's policy games.

It follows a little bit after the OAS commentary that came last week that said that it would be hard to call what happened in Haiti full, fair, free election. Larry Pasullo, who used to work for the Clinton administration as their top expert on Haiti, who was fired because they did not like the message he was bringing back, has made comment recently after looking at what happened in Haiti that there has been no real change there. We still have one-man rule. It is just a different man, and we are not sure we have democracy blooming at all.

Dr. Pastor of the Carter Institute, who has recently come back, I think put the final nail in the coffin. Quoting from the New York Times of last week, the Carter Center, normally a strong supporter of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti, said today that last month's elections in Haiti were riddled with fraud and that the Clinton administration should not back a series of reruns and runoffs that many Haitian political parties are threatening to boycott.

So it seems that just about everybody who gave it a fair assessment understands there is a mess.

Now, we have sent a very high-level delegation down to Haiti. It is curious they would be going to Haiti rather than Bosnia, where the trouble seems to be a little more intense. But, nevertheless, we have sent the first team apparently down to Haiti to negotiate.

Again, what has happened is that observers are saying we are acting with a very heavy hand. This is supposed to be a democratic nation emerging in democracy, making its own decisions with all the institutions of democracy, including a fair, free, political program and election process.

Even the Washington Post has come up, and I will quote again yesterday's editorial, "Hence, the dispatch of a high-level American team the other day to move Haitian electoral reform along." It is an intrusive way to do delicate business, but the alternative is worse. To say that it is intrusive to go

down there and tell the Haitians how to run their own country is a bit of an understatement, even for the Washington Post.

What has happened in Haiti is that, finally, they have fired the incompetent who was running the electoral council down there, and the opposition parties have all called for the removal of the total election council and replaced them with nonpartisan people.

Unfortunately, President Aristide has not listened to the other political parties in the country. He has only listened to his own party, and he has replaced the president of the election council with one of his party partisans, who has no credibility with the others, and, consequently, nothing has happened except we have changed seats one more time.

We have now still got all of the people except the Aristide people calling for a totally new electoral council and totally new elections. That is not a step forward by any means.

On other fronts down in Haiti where we have invested over \$2 billion, \$2 billion of American taxpayers' money in the last year or so, we have found that things are not going well either.

We had a delegation of business people who came to my office and the office of many others last week, and they said that, basically, there is nothing conducive to economic development going on. All of the money we are sending is just being squandered away one way or another. It is not going to meaningful programs.

We are still pouring money in, but the good things that need to happen, the reform of the judiciary system, the encouragement for business, the regulations that allow for stability and certainty in the banking sectors, those types of things are not happening at all. So, consequently, the score card is not good, and it is a dim situation.

This is not an "I told you so." But it is a good question for the administration. Where are we going and what is next in Haiti?

#### CUTS IN LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today, when the leadership brings to the floor the Labor-HHS bill, or maybe it will be tomorrow, it will bring a bill to the floor which has declared war on the American worker. The cuts contained in the bill add up to nothing more than total disregard for the morale and working conditions of the American worker.

Just to review some of the cuts, at a time of globalization, technology causing a reduction in the work force as well as downsizing in corporate America, at a time when the American worker is faced with that uncertainty,

this bill cuts \$446 million in the program for dislocated worker assistance.

At the same time, it cuts \$47 million in safety and health enforcement. It cuts employment standards by \$25 million, collective bargaining, \$58.8 million. It does serious damage to the National Labor Relations Board by cutting it by 30 percent, over \$50 million. How can we be doing this to the American worker at a time when we are struggling to be competitive in the world?

America works because we have always had a high regard for the backbone of America, the working class people in our country. We have respected their need for a living standard, not a minimum standard of wages but a living wage. We have respected their need for safety in the workplace. We have respected their need to bargain collectively for unfair labor practices up until now.

All of our competitors who compete with us in a favorable way for them respect their workers. That is why they succeed.

So what we are doing is not only bad for the individual worker, not only bad for our work force, it is bad for our country internationally as we try to compete. Please stop this war on the American worker. Vote against the Labor-HHS bill.

#### RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT

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 would like to share with you this morning a story of a friend of mine named Tom.

Tom owns a ranch north of Colorado Springs. A few weeks ago, he was on his way from the ranch to his place of business, and as he got out toward the road, he found—I have forgotten the exact number—but it seems like it was a dozen barrels, 50 gallon drums, some of which were turned over, some of which had spilled liquid onto the ground. Others had liquid in those barrels.

And his initial reaction was to go back to the house, get the tractor and the forklift and lift those barrels up and take them back to the house and decide what to do with them.

Then he thought again and said, no, we ought to do the right thing about this. We ought to call somebody in charge and have them come and take a look at what we have got here. Do not know what it is. We ought to take a look at it.

So he called the officials, and within 2 hours, every agency known to man was out there, practically, some in moon suits. There were ambulances. There were fire departments. There were sheriff's deputies. There were highway patrolmen. Everybody you could imagine was out there on Tom's

property, and they were trying to figure out what it was and what to do with it and how it got there.

And in the course of all this activity, someone happened to mention to Tom, we do not know what it is, but the way, if there has to be a cleanup, you have to pay for it.

Tom says, "What do you mean I have to pay for it? I am the victim. Someone dumped this on my property. What do you mean I have to pay for it?"

They said, "Oh, yes, that is the law. You have to pay for it."

He said, "Aren't you going to investigate? Aren't you going to find out who dumped this on my property?"

Well, maybe we will find that out. Maybe we will not.

So he did his own investigation, and he discovered the name on one of the barrels of a local oil and gas company. He went to the local oil and gas company. He discovered that they had sold the barrels sometime around Christmastime to a salvage company.

He went to the salvage company. He discovered that the salvage company had sold it to a soldier who was getting ready to be mustered out at Fort Carson.

He discovered from a little more investigation that there was a practice of buying barrels, getting a U-Haul trailer, filling the barrels with water, driving the U-Haul trailer up onto a scale, getting a weight slip, and then taking the weight slip to the Government, because the Government will pay you for that last move when you leave the fort.

So it was a fraud on the Government that was being perpetrated. The scale happened to be half, three-quarters of a mile from Tom's ranch. So he weighed the barrels and brought them and dumped them on Tom's property. It was water that was in the barrels, but it cost him about \$1,500, if I remember correctly, to find out through the analysis that it was water, and they said initially that it could have cost him up to \$22,000, maybe even more, depending on what was in those barrels.

So with a little work and common sense, Tom had solved his mystery. He had saved himself \$22,000 or more and proven himself a better and more conscientious investigator than the Government agencies charged with dealing with the hazardous waste.

All of this was due to a Federal law, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. In those States which have not adopted statutes dealing with the cleanup of hazardous waste, RCRA says the cleanup costs fall to the owner of the property where the waste was found, and this is called corrective action.

Now, Tom, the victim, admits that he could have, if he had had to, paid for the cleanup. But he wonders, what if those barrels had been dumped on the property of an elderly couple getting by on a fixed income? Tom may have been able to handle the cost. The elderly couple might have bankrupted as a result of it.

Friends, this is a dumb law. This is an unjust law. This is a law that punishes the victim. It is the kind of law that sets neighbor against neighbor and makes people question whether we have any idea what we are doing here in Washington.

It seems only fair that, in these cases, some efforts should be made to find the polluter and make them pay instead of dumping the bill on the property owner; and, frankly, if the dumper cannot be found, maybe this is a Government responsibility for us to pay for the cleanup. To do otherwise is to undermine the quick cleanup of these kinds of problems.

Our Nation's environmental laws are based upon the idea that people want a clean environment and are willing to make certain sacrifices to see that that happens. To do that, you have got to give people some assurance they are not going to be punished for doing the right thing.

My friend, Tom, could have just simply taken those barrels back to the barn and never said anything about it. He wanted to do what was right. He could have been punished severely for doing what was right. Given what he has been through, do you think he is ever going to do it this way again? We must change this kind of nonsensical law.

#### WORKER PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, the health, safety, and lives of our fellow Americans are severely jeopardized by the drastic cuts in the enforcement budget of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The Labor-HHS appropriations bill makes a 33-percent cut in Federal OSHA enforcement activities.

Protecting American workers must be a priority. We cannot, we must not be indifferent to their safety.

We are speaking of real people. We are speaking of life-and-death situations: people such as Hector Noble, age 31, who was killed when he fell 30 feet from a balcony as he cleaned windows because the guardrail had failed; José Makina Moji, 46, who was killed in a 25-foot fall from a scaffold. The scaffold had not been inspected by OSHA. Juan Figueroa, age 21, who was crushed to death when the machine he was working with overturned; and Angel Colon Canter, age 50, who was killed by an oven rotating system while he was cleaning a bread oven. He forgot an instrument inside the oven, and when he tried to get back inside the oven to retrieve it, the rotation system caught and punctured him, causing his death.

In all these instances the employer was either indifferent or he was too greedy to invest in his worker's safety