In Castro's new economy, where foreign investors call the shots, workers get the short end of the deal.

While the regime collects all the hard currency produced by foreign investors, the Cuban worker, already denied his civil and human rights, is paid by the State.

Not in hard currency, but in Cuban pesos, at the official rate of one peso per dollar, although, in reality, the real exchange rate is more like 25 pesos to the dollar.

As one foreign investor put it, ''you pay $500 for an employee, and he receives the equivalent of $20.''

In Cuba, Mr. Speaker, independent labor unions, worker strikes, and collective bargaining are prohibited.

Instead, there is one State-controlled puppet union, the Cuban Workers Central, which reacts to every whim of the Cuban tyrant.

For example, in 1992, when Cuban ports worker Rafael Gutierrez attempted to establish an independent labor union, the Cuban Workers Trade Union, he was arrested and detained at State security headquarters, for subversion and distribution of enemy propaganda.

Mr. Gutierrez was later released, but was not able to find employment due to the regime's persecution against him.

In 1994, Mr. Gutierrez was denied a visa by the Cuban regime to speak at the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions Human Rights Commission, where he would have condemned the regimes' human rights violations.

Finally, tired of the repression against him, Mr. Gutierrez was one of the thousands of Cubans who sought their freedom, aboard a rickety raft, and was one of the refugees held at the Guantanamo Naval Base.

More deplorable and tragic is how the Cuban regime is now using its repression of workers' rights to attract foreign investment to the island.

Last August, Miguel Taladrid, the regime's Deputy Minister of Foreign Investment and Economic Cooperation, stated that, ''The current system is more convenient. We are free from labor conflcits; nowhere else in the world could you get this tranquilty.''

Unfortunately, the regimes' promotion of its repression of the Cuban worker, is having the desired effect on investors.

A businessman from the Dominician Republic had this to say, ''The main reason why I chose to invest in Cuba, rather than in the Dominican Republic, was the assurance by the Cubans that I would not have to negotiate, or be forced to sign, collective agreements with trade unions.''

He added that, ''The Cuban Government is attracting European investors by promising cheap labor and the absence of free trade unions.''

This tragic scenario of workers' rights in Cuba is apparently alien to some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, who hosted and expressed their great admiration for Castro during his recent trip to New York City.

My Democrat colleagues from that great city all have excellent lifetime voting records supporting workers' rights in the United States, according to the AFL–CIO. One of them has 100 percent lifetime AFL–CIO record, while the other two have a 95 and 94 percent rating.

Apparently, my colleagues are all for worker rights, except, of course, when those rights might interfere or harm their relationship with their good buddy, Fidel Castro.

For not a peep was heard from them, condemning the repression of workers' rights in Cuba by Castro.

Maybe we should not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues would not want to tarnish their sweet relationship with the tyrant.

After all, they spend a lot of time and effort to assure that the tyrant received a warm greeting in New York City.

One of our colleagues made a heart-warming gift to Castro: a pair of boxing gloves claiming that, ''Fidel is No. 1.''

Yet another one could not contain himself and repeatedly hugged the tyrant and applauded Castro's rhetoric of being for the working people of the world.

Apparently, my colleagues do not care much for those like Mr. Gutierrez and others who dared to challenge the regimes' repression, for never did they bring up the subject of workers' rights to Castro.

The same congressional colleagues oppose the U.S. embargo against Castro and, instead, promote free and open trade with the tyrant, as an instrument to push him from power.

Oddly, some of them did not promote these views in Haiti or South Africa, where some supported economic embargoes against the undemocratic regimes of those two countries to help bring freedom and democracy.

My colleagues might be for workers' rights in the United States, and Castro might give the impression that he supports working people of the world, but neither my colleagues nor Castro show much concern for the working people of Cuba.

If an award were to be given for hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, my three New York Democrat colleagues who cheered Castro in New York would win hands down.

Today is trick or treat day. But our New York colleagues got an early start on Halloween. They treated Castro well; they tried to trick the people of the United States and Cuba. But freedom-loving people will not be fooled. Democracy must come to my enslaved native homeland.

VOTE AGAINST H.R. 1833, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I must say, as I stand here to discuss the bill H.R. 1833, it is appropriate we do this, I guess, on Halloween, because this is such a ghoulish issue and it is so very distressing to me that this body is moving forward to deal with this issue.

In America, it is wonderful because most people when they become pregnant have no problems. But not all people. Last year, this country was fortunate in that it only had to have about 600 late-term abortions. But let me tell you, every one of those was terribly critical, dealing with the life of the mother or fetal abnormalities that could not be treated in utero, that could be incompatible with life, totally incompatible with life and could harm the mother and her future ability to go on and have a normal family.

Luckily, most people are not going to be affected by this bill. But let me tell you, for anyone who is going to be affected by this bill, they are going to be outraged.

As the gentlewoman from New York talked about, when any family has decided to have a child and is very excited and very enthusiastic about it, and these are the people we are talking about, and they suddenly get toward the end and find some horrendous, awful thing has derailed their dream, if they find the Congress of the United States has started practicing medicine without a license and has decided that the safest procedure a doctor might recommend cannot be given, a procedure that would allow that family to go forward and have another child without really threatening the reproductive organs of the woman or her life is no longer allowed by order of the U.S. Congress, that the fact that her life cannot be taken into account or anything else, I think that family is going to be totally outraged, has every reason to be totally outraged. You have got to really ask, why do we think we have that power?

What we are going to be doing as we deal with this issue is we are really attempting to demonize women who are put in this position and demonize doctors who are trying to treat them. We are trying to say, this is a procedure that is so awful and so terrible that only demons would get into this.

Well, let us think about this. Is trying to save the life of the mother something that you would demonize someone for? If you have a fetus with abnormalities that are not correctable, that are incompatible with life, and we are talking about very severe things, like absence of a head, brain outside the head, one heart, one chamber of the heart, these types of things, where the fetus can die in utero and then start decomposing and cause all sorts of life-threatening things to the mother.

□ 0915

Are we just saying to her, ''Well, risk it. You risk it, and that is what you are going to do?'' If we pass this bill, we are really rolling back the tremendous progress this country has made on safe motherhood. If you look at earlier years, we were running 800 deaths per 100,000 births. We are now down to 8, but part of that is because we have allowed doctors and families, when they get into these awful, awful, awful conflicts to sit down and decide what the family wants to do and what medical professionals think is the best to do, and we are going to take that away. We are going to take that away if we vote on the bill 1833. We are going to say to them, we know better, and we are going go to back, rolling back the safe motherhood progress that we have made in this country.

You are going to hear all sorts of things on this floor. I beg people to, please, look at the doctor's testimony about how the charts you see are inaccurate and wrong, how the terms you hear are not medically accurate terms, and they do not describe accurately what transpires, how the person that they base all of this on was really fraudulent; it was a person who never participated in these events. We have letters and documentation on all of that.

So here we are taking this urban myth, blowing it up, trying to demonize, trying to undo and get Congress involved in something that is a great, great tragedy, and if we pass this bill, we are only going to make these tragedies much greater.

I plead with my colleagues to find their spines, to stand up and to really not get involved in this demonization of women, doctors, and their families who have nothing but terrible choices to make.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT CRISIS

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, as we hear the words and the heated rhetoric from the White House regarding the budget deficit crisis, regarding President Clinton's positions on the budget, I thought it would be important for us just to step back, because things move so quickly in Washington and have moved so quickly in the past few years, I think it is important we step back and take a perspective and take a long look at what the President's position has been on budgets, on taxes, and on fiscal matters since he first got elected in 1992.

First of all, we really can go back even to the campaign. Remember when he was campaigning through the snows of New Hampshire and his campaign was in crisis because of some political scandals that were shaking him up. The response was to go to the New Hampshire voters in 1992 and say, ''I am proposing a tax break for middle class Americans.'' I do not know how many people remember that, but he did it, and when he was pressed, Bill Clinton, the candidate, held up his plan. He said, ''Others talk about it. I have got a plan right here that is going to give middle class Americans tax cuts.''

It helped him survive the crisis in New Hampshire, moved beyond New Hampshire, eventually got elected as President of the United States, and in large part ridiculed George Bush for breaking his ''no new taxes'' pledge. Well, all of America sat around and watched President Clinton after he got elected take to the airwaves for the first time and said, ''Oops, I made a mistake. Instead of giving middle class Americans tax relief, I am actually going to tax you more than any President in the history of the United States ever has. I am going to propose Btu taxes, I am going to propose taxes on senior citizens, going to increase their taxes on Social Security up to 85 percent, I am going to lower the earning limits for senior citizens from $34,000 to $14,000, so senior citizens cannot remain productive after they retire without being penalized by the Federal Government.''

Of course, the Republicans at that point did not go out and say that President Clinton wanted senior citizens to die like the administration is now saying that we want senior citizens to die simply because we have got the guts to save Medicare for him, but it just showed how the President flip-flopped back and forth, back and forth, and fast forward 2 years to the speech he made a few weeks ago. I know the House Democrats absolutely have to love when Bill Clinton, after yanking them along for the ride said, ''It may surprise you, but I think I raised taxes too much also,'' and then blamed it on the Republicans. Now I went back over that vote tally, and there was not a single Republican on the House or Senate side that voted to raise the taxes, but somehow Bill Clinton flip-flopped again and said, ''Yes, I know I raised taxes too much on you, but it was those Republicans' fault.'' I am a bit baffled, but that is OK. Bill Clinton was baffled.

The next day he flip-flopped it again and blamed it on talking after 7 p.m. at night, and said, ''My mom always told me do not go out and speak after 7 p.m. at night, because you never know what you are going to say.'' I have a question for the President: What is he going to do when all the Presidential debates coming up next year are going to be after 7 p.m.? So what is he going to do? I mean, if I were running against the President, I would turn to him and say, Mr. President, it is past 7 p.m. Do we believe you on this issue, or is your mom right again, or are you just making it up as you go along? It would be funny if it were not so frightening.

This is a question of leadership. And you do not have to go back 2 years to look at the multiple flips-flops on the budget issue, go back 2 months, look at the first budget he proposed after the election, the Clinton 1 budget. It was voted down 99 to 0 in the Senate. It was voted down 99 to 0 because it continued sky rising deficits.

He said the balanced budget is not necessary. He proposed a second budget. It was voted down 96 to 0, and soon after the polls showed that 88 percent of Americans wanted a balanced budget this year and wanted tax cuts also, miraculously he flip-flopped again, which leads us to what happened last week where he said that he thought he raised taxes too much on Americans, but it was the Republicans' fault.

I mean, now what do we do as Americans? When our President speaks on budget issues, when he speaks on tax issues, when he speaks on deficit issues, what do we believe? Where do we go for leadership from the White House? It is absolutely frightening, because he continues to flip-flop and continues to look at the polls instead of looking at what is in America's best interest.

I ask him to follow the Republican Party's lead, balance the budget, balance it now for the sake of future generations.

PRESERVE ROE VERSUS WADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about H.R. 1833, a bill which would criminalize some late-term abortions.

First of all, I would like to say, H.R. 1833, Mr. CANADY's bill to criminalize specific late-term abortions is a cruel attempt to make a political point.

Make no mistake about it, ladies and gentlemen, the Canady bill—with all of the emotional rhetoric, with all of the graphic pictures, with all of the exaggerated testimony—is the first frontal attack on Roe versus Wade by the new majority. Plain and simple. The new majority wants to do away with Roe; the radical right wants to do away with Roe; and the Canady bill is the first step.

So let us be honest about what this debate is really about.

Next, I want to talk about who will be harmed by the Canady bill. This legislation seeks to prohibit a wide array of abortion techniques which are used in the late stages of a pregnancy when and if the life of the mother is in danger or a fetus is so malformed that it has no chance to survive.

The procedures which the Canady bill seeks to prohibit are used very, very rarely. In fact, less than 600 times per year, for all late term abortions and, less than 100 a year for this procedure. These particular abortion techniques