

Castro revolution, the sons and daughters of the revolution as Castro has called them, and they are now his main adversaries.

Madam Speaker, I call on the President to understand that dialogue and concessions are not the answer. Tougher sanctions are, and that is where U.S. policy should be directed.

The stronger religion grows, the harder it may be for Castro to keep his monopoly on power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GUTIERREZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### AMERICAN POLICY ON CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, back in December, my office began to get reports from within the Clinton administration that advisers, foreign policy advisers to the President, were advising him to send a gesture of friendship to Castro. After I got the third report from within the administration that foreign policy advisers to the President were pressuring the President to do that, to send a gesture of friendship to Castro, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN and I sent a letter to the President, where we expressed our deep concern about those reports, and I have got that letter here and I would like to read it if I can.

"Mr. President"—this was back in December—

We have received deeply disturbing reports from within your administration concerning efforts by Mr. Morton Halperin to achieve the implementation of a policy initiative by the White House that would benefit the Cuban communist dictatorship.

These reports are made even more alarming by the fact that Mr. Halperin is the member of your National Security Council staff, whose nomination to a sensitive Department of Defense position had to be withdrawn when the Democratic-controlled Senate would not confirm him. Throughout his career, Mr. Halperin has shown faulty judgment in relation to threats emanating from Castro's Cuba. After Castro's incursions into Angola and Ethiopia, for example, Mr. Halperin inaccurately wrote that "every action which the Soviet Union and Cuba have taken in Africa has been consistent with the principles of international law. The Cubans have come in only when invited by a government and have remained only at their request."

"As you know, Mr. President"—we continue in the letter, in December—

On August 5th of this year, approximately 30,000 Cubans spontaneously took to the streets in Havana demanding freedom. Despite a terrible crackdown by the regime, Cubans throughout the island are demanding democracy in ever-bolder forms of action.

Sugar production and Castro's ability to purchase oil are at an all time low, the sanctions you implemented last August 20th are having a strong effect, and numerous signs point to the inevitable collapse of the communist tyranny.

Any gesture along the lines being sought by Mr. Halperin at this time, such as authorizing U.S. business to engage in the unrestricted sale and financing of medicine, medical supplies, medical equipment or food to Castro; lifting your August 20th sanctions, banning charter flights and remittances; allowing financial transactions or travel for so-called academic, cultural and scientific exchange, public exhibitions or performances or activities of alleged religious organizations; loosening travel restrictions to allow unrestricted travel by U.S. citizens or allowing business or tourist travel; allowing the establishment of U.S. news bureaus in Cuba or Cuban news bureaus in the United States; or ceasing to regulate financial transactions related to the establishment of news bureaus in communist Cuba; entering into so-called negotiations with the government to settle U.S. property claims or any other friendly gesture toward Castro at this time of almost unprecedented repression would constitute a form of the complicity with the ferocious oppression of the Cuban communist dictatorship against its people.

We hope that you will remain firm in the enforcement of our sanctions against the Cuban dictatorship by resisting the pressures of those who would throw in the moribund Cuban totalitarian regime.

He very courteously answers in January, stating, "I assure you that our Cuban policy will remain focused on bringing about a peaceful transition to a democratic regime and will be guided by the Cuban Democracy Act." Basically, he goes on saying that we won't be pressured. Then he says, please be—"Please be assured as well that I have confidence in the advice that I am being given on Cuba. That advice has and will continue to reflect the administration policy and the principles of the Cuban Democracy Act. I look forward to working with Congress in pursuit of our common objective of a free and Democratic Cuba."

Now, today the Washington Post on the front page has an article, Clinton may ease sanctions on Cuba. Talk about a direct leak. President Clinton's foreign policy advisers are recommending, this is not—we hear it is possible, there are reports, no, beginning of the article, front page of the Washington Post, President Clinton's foreign policy advisers are recommending he take steps towards easing relations from Cuba by revoking some economic sanctions adopted against the Nation in August, administration's officials said yesterday.

□ 2015

This is the Washington Post today. So how does one reconcile the letter from the President, where he says, I am not yielding to pressure, we are going to maintain our sanctions, please be assured that I have confidence in the advice I am getting, and this article.

We need to continue talking about this. This is very serious, very serious. This is not the time to throw a lifeline

to Castro. It is the time to go the other direction and to help Cuban people to gain their freedom.

#### THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Republicans in Congress have begun their assault on one of the most important workers' rights acts of the 20th century, the Davis-Bacon Act. This important law protects the American standard of living by ensuring that workers on federally-funded construction projects are paid at the wage rates that prevail in their communities. To repeal the Davis-Bacon Act would be a slap in the face to the American worker.

The Davis-Bacon Act was passed in 1931 and signed by a Republican President. It was the first Federal wage law to provide prevailing wage protection to nongovernment workers.

Now, Republicans in Congress are threatening to repeal this historic legislation. At a time when the number one concern of middle-class working families is a declining standard of living, repealing the Davis-Bacon Act would be devastating. The very heart of this law is protecting the American standard of living.

But you do not have to take my word for it. Just look at what has happened in States that have present repealed prevailing wage laws. Economists at the University of Utah have written a comprehensive study of the effects of repealing prevailing wage laws in nine States during the 1980's.

The University of Utah study found that the repeal of prevailing wage laws had a destructive economic impact. From their analysis of these repeal States, authors of the report project that the Federal Davis-Bacon Act would hurt the national economy in the following ways:

Federal income tax collections would fall by \$1 billion per year because of the decline in construction earnings. As a result, the Federal deficit would dramatically increase.

Each construction worker would see his or her annual earnings fall by \$1,477. The total national loss due to this reduction in construction earnings would be \$4.6 billion each year.

A massive increase in cost overruns and use of expensive change orders. In the case of Utah, which repealed its State prevailing wage law in 1981, cost overruns on State financed roads tripled over the next decade due to the low-ball bidding practices. The lack of a prevailing wage will encourage similar overruns at the national level.

Prevailing wage laws were designed to achieve a simple goal: to prevent government from using its purchasing power to undermine the wages of workers. It is a law that works. It works for

our workers, for their families, our communities, and our economy.

American workers are already on an economic treadmill, working longer hours and earning less, struggling to buy homes, struggling to send their kids to college. The Davis-Bacon Act helps many American workers to keep pace. To repeal it now would turn up the speed on the economic treadmill and put the American dream out of reach for too many working families.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here tonight with several of my colleagues who are going to address this very, very important issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TIAHRT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### DAVIS-BACON: PROTECTING THE AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I join with several of my colleagues tonight to discuss the Davis-Bacon Act, an act which for more than six decades has protected the standard of living of all Americans. We are going to hear in the debate that comes up as there are efforts to repeal this act that somehow the Davis-Bacon Act merely helps a few union workers, that it is a special interest law for only a few.

Mr. Speaker, Davis-Bacon benefits all Americans. It does help union workers who have negotiated good wage rates across America. But it helps non-union construction workers also because prevailing wages in almost 75 percent of communities across the country are based on nonunion pay scales and because Davis-Bacon extends the same protections to non-union workers as it does to union members.

Davis-Bacon benefits communities like my own in San Diego, because wages in our city are protected from cutthroat out-of-State lower wage labor and our economy is enriched because our working people maintain the purchasing power to keep our own small businesses thriving and our own retail operations going.

Contractors in our community are helped because they have a level playing field on which to compete and our taxpayers are benefited because they can rely on quality and the productivity, the timeliness, the reliability that more than compensates for the additional wage cost.

All our citizens, Mr. Speaker, are benefited because all the construction projects we rely on, whether they be bridges or schools or dams, nuclear waste removal sites, military installa-

tions, superhighways, all are built to the highest specifications by the most qualified, well-trained workers. That is why Davis-Bacon protects the standard of living of all Americans.

Now, we are going to hear in the debate that follows in a few days, in the months ahead, that eliminating Davis-Bacon will save the government billions of dollars, that Davis-Bacon adds to the cost of government at a time when we can ill afford that.

Mr. Speaker, the facts say otherwise. In fact, eliminating Davis-Bacon will not save the government money. Lower wages, it turns out, does not mean lower cost. And why is that? As has been shown in comparison after comparison, high-wage states complete the work of the Davis-Bacon contracts with 56 percent fewer hours worked. High-wage states, as contrasted to low-wage states, build 74.5 more miles of roadbed and 33 more miles of bridges for \$557 million less, and at the same time workers received a wage package more than double that in those low-wage states.

In addition, if Davis-Bacon were repealed, construction employees would be misclassified as independent contractors and the government would be cheated out of billions of tax dollars.

As my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, [Mr. DeLAURO], pointed out, nine States have already repealed their little Davis-Bacon acts because they have found out that tax collections actually fell because of lower rates. The Federal Government, it has been estimated, will lose nearly a billion dollars a year because of the decline in construction earnings. That is simply not a very smart way to address our deficit problem.

In addition, construction injuries increase by 15 percent in non-Davis-Bacon States, and that results in enormous loss-of-work days and productivity.

So, Mr. Speaker, not only does Davis-Bacon benefit all Americans; repealing it will not reduce any cost. It may, in fact, raise the cost of doing business.

My own district in San Diego has a majority of residents who are either African-American or Hispanic. They always ask, is anything I propose or anything that I favor harmful or of benefit to ethnic minorities?

Mr. Speaker, Davis-Bacon protects all working people, regardless of race or ethnicity. The intent of the act is to mandate that a fair and liveable wage be paid to every worker to stabilize local wage rates.

Mr. Speaker, we must not repeal Davis-Bacon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### REPEAL OF DAVIS-BACON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a number of us are taking the floor tonight in an attempt to respond to some of the misinformation used to justify the repeal of the Davis-Bacon, a law that requires fairness for our workers. The Davis-Bacon Act provides a process in which the Federal Government and many local governments must pay workers in a specific area the same wage on federal contracts as any other contract. There are several arguments put forth by the Republican majority or at least some of the Republican majority, because I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from President Reagan in 1981 showing his support for Davis-Bacon Act.

WE AGREE WITH PRESIDENT REAGAN JUST SAY "NO" TO REPEAL

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, September 29, 1981.

Mr. ROBERT A. GEORGINE,  
President, AFL-CIO,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: I want to acknowledge the Building and Construction Trades Department letter of September 11 concerning efforts to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act. I have asked the Secretary of Labor to respond directly, but I want to assure you and your General Presidents that I will continue to support my campaign pledge do not seek repeal of the Act.

With best wishes,

Very sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

The arguments revolve around the act being racist, as barring minorities from earning prevailing wages and adding costs to Federal contracts for multiple reasons.

Let us take the issue of Davis-Bacon being racist Federal law. This argument is based on language that was passed, was discussed when this original bill was passed in 1931. I would submit to the House that many things said in 1931 and the early 1930s on this House floor could not be used today, but that still means that Davis-Bacon is not a racist law.

A Congressman Upshaw from Georgia in 1927 asked Congressman Bacon if this bill was based on preventing a large aggregation of Negro labor, and Congressman Bacon vehemently stated that any influx of labor, union or non-union, regardless of race, being paid below prevailing wage would be detrimental to a local job market. Stating that Davis-Bacon is racially biased also assumes that minorities are not earning a prevailing wage. That argument that repealing Davis-Bacon helps minority workers goes against documented proof to the contrary.

I would also like to insert into the RECORD a resolution from the NAACP in its July 1993 convention supporting Davis-Bacon and the continuation of Davis-Bacon.