

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