SEC. 3. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering the amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 4 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone using further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponement of a vote that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a separate proposition made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except an objection to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLONOS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield my time to him.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 378 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 856, which is the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act. The rule provides 90 minutes of pull-down debate, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), myself, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLONOS), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), or their designees.

The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1, which shall be considered as read.

The rule also waives clause 5(a) of rule XV governing Appropriations in a legislative bill against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The Committee on Rules understands this waiver to be technical in nature, and further understands that the Committee on Appropriations has no objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. I request unanimous consent to single out two significant policy amendments for particular treatment for debate on this floor. The committee determined that these amendments should receive a specified debate time and time certain to close debate on those amendments and any amendments thereto.

These two amendments are the Solomon amendment, which clarifies the official role of English in government activities and the Serrano amendment, which relates to eligibility of mainland U.S. citizens of Puerto Rican descent to vote in a referendum.

After the amendment is offered to the bill, there will be an additional period of general debate on the Solomon amendment, and then 1 hour of consideration of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides that the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) will have 30 minutes of additional general debate time, similar to the Solomon amendment, and 1 hour of consideration for the amendment process; in other words, amendments offered to that amendment.

The rule further provides that both the Solomon amendment and the Serrano amendment shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, but there will be second degree amendments allowed to it, similar to an open rule process.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides that the Chair is authorized to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that appeared today.

The rule also allows for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members are well aware, this is an extremely controversial issue. It is controversial among the Americans, it is certainly controversial among the people that reside on the islands of Puerto Rico. Members of the House are divided on this issue, and not necessarily by party.

However, despite our differences over the substance of the legislation, many of us have agreed that the fairest way to consider this very controversial and difficult issue is under an open rule, and I commend Chairman YOUNG for his cooperation in bringing this matter to the floor under these considerations today.

The gentleman is an outstanding Member of this body, and even though he and I will tangle somewhat on the floor, we will remain good friends when we leave here. He and I very rarely ever differ. He and I have fought hundreds of battles on this floor in the last 20 years on the issue of property rights, individual property rights of individual Americans, and we will continue to do that as long as the two of us are left standing on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I admonished Members who appeared before the committee yesterday to comport themselves in a dignified fashion and to exercise restraint in determining which amendments to offer and how many would be offered. Rather, I am pleased to note that the Members who appeared yesterday before the Committee on Rules agreed to offer a limited and limited number of amendments. That may, in the opponent to the bill will certainly offer 10 or 12 amendments at the very most. Then there are several amendments by those that might be supportive of the bill itself, that might have some perfecting amendments as well. But other than that, we would expect that this debate would continue through the day, but under no circumstances would carry over into tomorrow.

So we would hope that Members would come here to allow those that would be dignified in their remarks, and that we wouldn't get into a lot of superficial conversation. I would urge support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLONOS), my very dear friend, for yesterday night the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule, and I commend my Chairman for allowing the rule to come to the floor in this position.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico has been an issue for many, many decades. This year marks the 100th anniversary of Puerto Rico's being part of the United States.

Eighty-three years ago, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of World War I, Congress extended American citizenship to the residents of Puerto Rico with all of its rights and responsibilities, including being subject to the military draft. Since then, over 200,000 Puerto Ricans have served in this country's various military endeavors. Puerto Ricans presently abide by all American laws passed by this Congress. They are also required to serve in juries. They pledge their allegiance to the flag of the United States.

This bill we consider today, Mr. Speaker, is a bill giving 3.8 million people of Puerto Rico their long-overdue right to self-determination. Contrary to what some people think, this is not a statehood bill. It simply allows the people of Puerto Rico to decide for themselves what kind of relationship they will have with the United States rather than having it forced upon them.

Under this bill, Puerto Rico has several options. They can be integrated into the Union, as has Hawaii, or they can remain a separate Nation as the
English is already the primary language used in business, government, cultural affairs in the United States. But if we require English in all governmental functions, people who call 911 and cannot speak fluent English might be in a lot of trouble. So rather than mandating English and prohibiting technicians from doing their jobs in life-threatening situations, we should listen to our speakers. I suggest we recognize the primary role of English in our national affairs, but allow the use of languages in other governmental functions when it is appropriate.

I think what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that people should be allowed to speak whatever language gets the job done at 911, in police departments, and with emergency and medical technicians. In doing so we would not only be respecting the wishes of our Founding Fathers but also probably with, and surprise a process. So I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I would like to just read one other statement which is attributed to Ronald Reagan. It appeared in the Roll Call on page 26. And I quote again from Ronald Reagan who said this January 12, 1982. He said "In statehood, the language and the culture of the island, rich in history and in tradition, would be respected, for in the United States, the cultures of the world live together with pride." Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, to support the bill, and to defeat the English-only amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT
When I announced my candidacy for this office more than two years ago, I pledged to support statehood for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, should the people of that island choose it in a free and democratic election. Today I remain confident that the people of Puerto Rico would benefit both the people of Puerto Rico and their fellow Americans in 50 states. While I believe the Congress and the people of this country would welcome Puerto Rican statehood, this Administration will accept whatever choice is made by a majority of the island's population.

No nation, no organization nor individual would wish to set such an intention in this. The status of Puerto Rico is an issue to be settled by the peoples of Puerto Rico and the United States. It will be the only interference in the democratic process.

Puerto Ricans have borne the responsibilities of U.S. citizenship with honor and courage for more than 64 years. They have fought beside us for decades and have worked beside us for generations. Puerto Rico is playing an important role in the development of the Caribbean Basin Initiative and its strong tradition of democracy provides leadership and stability in that region. In statehood, the language and culture of the island—rich in history and tradition—would be respected, for in the United States the cultures of the world live together with pride.

We recognize the right of the Puerto Rican people to self-determination. If they choose statehood, we will work together to devise a union of promises and opportunity in our Federal union of sovereign states.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to respond to the gentleman from Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) very, very close friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, yes, I did serve in the United States Marine Corps back during the Korean War. I did not have the privilege of serving in combat, but I served with a great many Puerto Rican citizens of the United States, and to this day they are some of the greatest friends that I have.

Unfortunately, they are divided on this issue just as the rest of the Puerto Ricans are. Those that are still alive, some of which I talked to just in the last 48 hours. It breaks down where one-third of them are for statehood, one-third of them are for commonwealth, and surprise a third of them are for independence. I did not think that would be that high, but that is the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I take a little umbrage at the gentleman, my good friend, pointing to the ads that appeared in Roll Call, and not just in Roll Call but in the Washington Times and all kinds of papers. Millions of dollars have been spent by lobbyists to support a particular issue on this Congress, and I do not think the Congress is going to listen to that today because they are a pretty studious body.

But concerning my hero Ronald Reagan and, yes, he is my hero and he will forever be, even in spite of his physical condition today. It is so sad. But President Reagan, yes, he did. He supports self-determination, but he does not support this bill or its deliberately skewed language favoring statehood.

Mr. Speaker, let me read this letter that I just received dated February 27, and it is from the Ronald Reagan Foundation. It says, "Dear Congressmen, Senator, thank you for your request to clarify President Reagan's participation in the current debate on Puerto Rican statehood. As I am sure you understand, President Reagan is no longer participating in campaigns of any kind." Despite the unauthorized use of his name, appearing in that Roll Call, "photograph and quotes in a recent ad in the Washington Times and Roll Call, he is not now nor will he ever be taking any position on H.R. 856, the issue of statehood for Puerto Rico, or self-determination for the Puerto Rican people." And it goes on to say, "I hope this clarifies the issue." Mr. Speaker, I was not going to get into a debate on this during the rule because I was hopeful that we could move on to the general debate time itself so that we would not be interrupted by other votes. But there are many things that have held this country together over the last 200 years. Many of them, as I quoted before, 'e pluribus unum' means out of many
Puerto Rico and Statehood

By Ronald Reagan

When I formally announced my intention to seek the Republican presidential nomination in 1980, my televised speech to the nation included a commitment to not only support statehood for Puerto Rico if the people of the island Commonwealth desired statehood. It also included a commitment that, as President, I would initiate statehood legislation, which really means that I would take the lead in persuading the people of Puerto Rico — the mainland United States — all American citizens — that statehood would be good for all of us.

A number of people, including close friends, wondered about my remarks. Not that they opposed the statehood idea. They just thought that it seemed odd that I would put such an emphasis on an issue that strikes them as routine, when U.S. foreign policy positions everywhere seem to be collapsing. But then I remind my friends that in 1976, when many U.S. foreign policy positions were collapsing, I was putting great emphasis on the Panama Canal.

By this observation I mean to suggest that we cannot expect our foreign policies to be enjoying prestige around the world — attracting support instead of collapsing 00 when we are having serious problems with our closest neighbors. The American people lost the debate over the Canal when, despite their opposition to the treaties, President Carter pushed them through. We were going to win the applause of the Third World, remember?

Now it is no longer our neighbors who are being pulled away from us in the world-wide tug of war. Now — at least in this hemisphere — the pivot of the struggle is among out fellow citizens in the Puerto Rico Commonwealth.

Yankee Imperialism

Fidel Castro hardly lets a speech go by without denouncing "Yankee imperialism" in Puerto Rico and calling for its total independence from the United States. The idea is not confined to blustering speeches at Havana's Third World conferences or in the United Nations. Early in December, it came out of the point of a gun. A few miles from San Juan, two Navy employees were assassinated by the Soviet-made machine guns of terrorists who represent the tiny independence movement on Puerto Rico.

While the world watches the Iranian drama unfold, comrades of Cuba and its allies have now established a beachhead of violence on American shores.

Our keen "peacefully coexisting" competitor, the Soviet Union, is not unaware of the importance of Puerto Rico in the great global context of ideas. As a "Commonwealth" Puerto Rico is now neither a state nor independent, and thereby has an historically unnatural status. There is this raw nerve to rub, and our Marxist-Leninist competitors rub it. They've long thought of the island economies of the Caribbean as easy marks. I don't suggest that the Kremlin strategists expect to snap Puerto Rico into the Communist orbit any time soon, only that they find it convenient to use its unnatural status, creating tensions around the idea of American "colonialism." "Yankee Imperialism." We can't merely defend ourselves against this attack. We must ourselves attack, not with terror, but with statehood.

It is not only that the fact of Puerto Rican statehood would deny Mr. Castro a raw nerve. But, in cementing itself to us as the 51st state, with unbreakable bonds, Puerto Rico would represent a positive bridgehead into the Caribbean, Latin America and the developing world.

The geopolitical concept of Puerto Rico's exposed position on the front lines of geopolitics isn't new on my account, by any means. It is at the heart of the old Republican Statehood Party on the island, the New Progressive Party. It is understood by Gov. Carlos Romero Barcelo and San Juan Mayor Hernan Padilla, the two young, dynamic advocates of statehood. I know it is profoundly understood by Luis Ferre, the 77-year-old President of the Senate, who was governor of Puerto Rico when I was governor of California. To these men, statehood is an historical imperative.

It is as simple as this: if we in the United States cannot design a model for a political economy that is sufficiently attractive, if we can't win over our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico, how can our model succeed as an instrument of foreign policy anywhere in the world?

If we cannot design a model for a political economy that is sufficiently attractive, if we can't win over our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico, how can our model succeed as an instrument of foreign policy anywhere in the world?

The one thing I can say for sure, because it is a part of human nature, is that you cannot arrange a marriage unless both spouses believe the union will be greater than the sum of its parts. Because of this, I don't believe statehood will be achieved until a great majority of Puerto Ricans — not just a simple majority — feel the pull of statehood with passion.

Some Puerto Rican leaders here argue that the people of Puerto Rico must sacrifice in order to enjoy statehood, especially by means of greater tax burdens. Yet Puerto Ricans already face higher tax rates and they have shed a disproportionate share of blood, relative to mainland citizens, in our wars. Thus, an American President will have to work with Governor Romero to integrate the two separate fiscal systems in a way that increases opportunity for the average island citizen, and thereby makes statehood an attractive proposition rather than an increased burden. Governor Romero has already been moving in this direction, systematically lowering tax rates in preparation for merger.

In the 1980s, the American President must understand that for U.S. foreign policy to succeed it must be magnetic, as opposed to expansive. This means we must once again make economic policy an essential ingredient of foreign policy. This is behind my idea of Statehood for Puerto Rico.

Foreign Policy Failures

At the heart of our foreign policy failures of the last 25 years, I believe, has been the attempt to export "economic expansion" through dollars, rather than ideas. While the rest of the world waited for us to assist in the development along the lines of our own "land of opportunity," we responded with ideas that were never part of our own development: high tax rates, plenty of public debt, devalued currencies and less rather than more democracy in the guidance of state-capitalist systems.

Locking back on it, it should be no wonder that GI Joe was turned into the Ugly American.

And now, in our backyard, the Cubans are handing out AK-47 rifles even as they advertise their system — all over the region — as the path of progress. And we sit on our thumbs. The "Cuban Model" has been a disaster. Cuba is incapable of providing its people with the essentials of life. It is totally dependent on the U.S.S.R. which, in turn, depends on us for its food. Yet, with noisy propaganda and active support of violent revolution borne of economic failures, the Soviet-Cuban offensive in Latin America continues to slice off one piece of salami at a time.

An American counteroffensive must rely on the greatest weapon we have: the hope of a better life, achieved by adopting America's recipe for prosperity. It must advertise the proven secrets of economic growth, upward mobility for the poor, and, ultimately, political stability — even as we return to this recipe ourselves: reasonable tax rates, modest regulation, balanced budgets and stable currency.

Instead of letting our competitors pick the battleground of violent revolution, we should pick a peaceful battleground of competition between economic systems. Instead of reacting with force to revolutionary situations, we should preempt those situations with a positive foreign policy. We can build from a bridgehead in Puerto Rico. To show the world that the American idea can work in Puerto Rico is to show that our idea can work everywhere.

Mr. Reagan is a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination.