



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1995

No. 170

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GOODLING].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 31, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable WILLIAM F. GOODLING 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 debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for 5 minutes.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1833 which would ban second- and third-term abortions in the case of severe threats to the life and health of the mother and cases of severe fetal anomaly.

Proponents of the bill attempt to exploit one of the greatest tragedies any family faces by using graphic pictures, sensationalized language, and distorted truths. Families facing a late-term

abortion are families that want to have a child. These couples have chosen to become parents and only face the decision of abortion due to unavoidable circumstances.

Unfortunately, medical testing is still not sophisticated enough to detect fetal anomalies until late in the pregnancies. Also, some illnesses such as diabetes or kidney failure can suddenly flare up and put the health and life of the mother at risk. The decision to abort at this stage in a pregnancy is agonizing and deeply personal.

This bill is not about choice. It is about necessity. As the mother of three grown children, I thank God every day that my children were born healthy and strong. However, not everyone is so lucky.

Yesterday my office received a call from Claudia Ades, a woman who lives in Santa Monica, CA. She had heard about the bill and called to ask me if there was anything we could do to defeat it. As Claudia said so passionately, "this procedure saved my life and the life of my family."

Three years ago, Claudia was pregnant and happier than she had ever been in her life. However, 6 months into her pregnancy she and her husband discovered that the child she was carrying suffered from a number of severe fetal anomalies, including acute brain damage, a very malformed heart. It was doubtful that the child would survive birth; and, if it survived, its short life would be filled with pain and suffering.

After speaking to a number of doctors, Claudia and her husband finally had to accept their view that there was no way to save this pregnancy. They chose to go to Dr. James McMannus because his procedure would allow Claudia to get pregnant in the future and would allow them to have a family. "This was a desperately wanted pregnancy," Claudia said yesterday, "but

my child was just not meant to be in this world."

Who here cannot sympathize with the pain that Claudia and her family faced? Those of us with healthy children can only imagine the horror that Claudia felt when she received the news about her child's condition. It is the news that all mothers pray every day they will never have to hear.

But in those tragic cases where families do hear this horrible news, who should get to decide? If, God forbid, this ever happened to me or somebody in my family, I would want the decision to be mine just as any of you would.

The one thing that I know for sure is that the decision should not be made by the Congress of the United States. At that horrible, tragic moment the Congress, the Government, just has no place in the home, in the hearts, in the decisionmaking of these agonizing families.

I beg my colleagues to think very carefully, to vote against H.R. 1833. This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. This is not a pro-choice or an anti-choice issue. This tragedy can strike any family regardless of party affiliation.

Defeat this bill so that women in Claudia's situation can get the best medical care possible. Defeat this bill because it is the right thing to do.

WORKERS' RIGHTS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in his desperate effort to hold on to power at any cost and by any means necessary, Cuban tyrant Fidel Castro has turned the Cuban economy into a slavlike system.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H11459

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 conflicts; nowhere else in the world could you get this tranquility."

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

A businessman from the Dominican 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 ex-

pressed 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 heartwarming 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.