

good friend and we talk about what good friends we are, it is a poison pill amendment. America is a melting pot. It is a group of people coming together under one flag. We all speak different languages at different times. Some of us are more fortunate to speak more than one language, but we must always recognize the cohesive part of the United States, and that is being an American. English will come. But to pick out one part of this bill and to say this is a requirement before it ever happens is a poison pill amendment to this legislation.

Let us talk about history again. This is the last territory of the greatest democracy, America. A territory where no one has a true voice, although our government does an excellent job, but there are approximately 4 million Puerto Ricans that have one voice that cannot vote. This is not America as I know it. This is an America that talks one thing and walks another thing. This is an America that is saying, if Members do not accept this legislation, "no" to who I think are some of the greatest Americans that have ever served in our armed forces and are proud to be Americans but do not have the representation that they need.

This legislation is just the beginning. It is one small step of many steps. It is a step for freedom, it is a small step for justice, it is a small step for America. But collectively it is a great stride for democracy and for justice.

This legislation should pass. The amendment of the gentleman from New York (MR. SOLOMON) should be defeated. We should go forth and show the people of America, show the people of Puerto Rico, that our hearts are true, so that the rest of the world will follow the example of the great United States and free their territories and free the people so they can have self-determination. This is what this bill does, and that is all it does.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ).

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I would love to be able to speak for 30 minutes, an hour or two hours on this subject, but there are so many other people that want to speak on this subject, and many of my colleagues have heard me over and over on this, that I am going to yield some of the time that I would have been allotted so that other Members of this Congress can address the House in support of this bill which is a very, very important bill for the people of Puerto Rico, for the 3,800,000 U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Resources of

the House of Representatives had an obligation to report to this floor a fair and accurate plan for the citizens of Puerto Rico to choose their status. I believe that this committee has met that obligation.

Mr. Chairman I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the committee, for leading us through what has been a difficult process. I also thank the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), our friend, for all of his help in this process.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Puerto Rico, if this bill is passed, will be given the opportunity by the Congress of the United States under the laws of this Nation to choose their status. They can choose to continue in the commonwealth arrangement, they could choose to become an independent nation, they could choose to become one of the States of the United States of America.

Our obligation was to see that when this process went forward to the people of Puerto Rico, that it was a fair process, that it was an accurate process. We had had an earlier plebiscite where the parties wrote their own definitions and the people voted, and the Congress has done nothing because the Congress knew in fact those definitions, whether they were of statehood or of commonwealth, were, in fact, not accurate and would not be supported by the Congress of the United States and did not reflect the laws and the Constitution of this country.

In the committee, I was very distraught at beginning of this process because I felt that those who support commonwealth were not able to present their definition to the Congress, to the committee. I worked very hard so that that definition could be offered. I offered that definition. It was turned down overwhelming on a bipartisan basis. It was something called "enhanced commonwealth." It was sort of a make-believe status of commonwealth.

□ 1230

The suggestion was that if you voted for commonwealth, you would then be empowered to pick your way through the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States and pick and choose which laws you wanted to apply and not have apply, and that you did not have to live under the power of the Congress of the United States or of the Constitution of the United States. That simply was unacceptable to the overwhelming majority of the committee. I believe it is unacceptable to the overwhelming majority of this House. Someone can certainly come forward and offer that amendment this afternoon, should they choose, and I believe it would clearly be unacceptable to the people of this country.

So what we put forth is a definition of commonwealth that recognizes their current status today, that they live in a commonwealth arrangement. It says Puerto Rico is joined in relationship

under the national sovereignty of the United States. It is the policy of the Congress that this relationship should only be dissolved by mutual consent. That is the situation that we have.

We went on to say that in the exercise of the sovereignty, the laws of the commonwealth shall govern Puerto Rico to the extent that they are consistent with the Constitution of the United States. There is no other way to do business, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, treaties and laws of the United States, and the Congress retains its constitutional authority to enact laws that it deems necessary relating to Puerto Rico.

That is the burden of commonwealth. That is why some people do not like it. Some people would prefer independence over commonwealth, and some people would prefer statehood. There is a certain burden to commonwealth. We cannot pretend that there is not. But the people of Puerto Rico ought to be able to choose that. They have to be able to choose the status that they want.

That is what this legislation does. It enables the people of Puerto Rico to make their choice; not our choice, their choice. And hopefully under this legislation, the Congress would then honor that choice after the President and others have worked out a plan to enable that choice to go forward. That is what this legislation does. Nothing more, nothing less.

I think it is an important piece of legislation. I think it is recognized that the people of Puerto Rico are entitled to and must have a free and fair vote on this matter. I would hope that my colleagues would support this legislation to allow that to happen.

Mr. Chairman, the House today considers H.R. 856, a complex bill that has, at its core, a very basic concept: the right of a free people to determine the political system under which they live.

Puerto Rico has been a part of the United States for a century. Its residents, whether they live in San Juan, Mayaguez, New York or San Francisco, are United States citizens. H.R. 856 gives those 4 million Americans the right to decide their future status relationship to the rest of the United States: to become an independent nation, to become a state, or to remain in commonwealth status.

Unlike some of my colleagues who have worked on this issue over the past decade, I do not have a personal preference. I believe status should be determined by the governed. Our obligation is to present fair and accurate status options to the voters of Puerto Rico—options that reflect Constitutional and political reality—and to honor the choice made by a majority of the voters.

During much of the consideration of this legislation by the Resources Committee in this Congress and the previous Congress, I could not support the legislation because I did not believe that the very sizeable number of Puerto Rican voters who support the Commonwealth option were treated fairly. Originally, this bill did not even contain any Commonwealth option.

But I am pleased to say that Chairman YOUNG worked closely with me and with others to ensure that each of the political parties

was heard, and that we ultimately agreed on definitions that are fair and accurate. They are included in Mr. YOUNG's substitute, and I support that substitute strongly.

Rarely have we seen more intense lobbying on an issue. It is obvious that opinions are divided on Puerto Rico's status and on this legislation. But let them address some of the misconceptions and misrepresentations that are being circulated about this bill, because Members should not be confused and should not be deceived into voting on this subject based on inaccuracies.

No one in this Chamber is more qualified than I to speak about how we addressed the Commonwealth issue. I so strongly advocated inclusion of a Commonwealth option that I was accused of being pro-Commonwealth. The definition of Commonwealth supplied by that party, which is similar in many respects to the definition on the ballot during the 1993 referendum in Puerto Rico, is not accurate and is not acceptable to the Congress. It is not acceptable that Puerto Rico would be eligible for full participation in all federal programs without paying taxes; it is not acceptable that Puerto Rico would pick and choose which federal laws apply on the island; it is not acceptable that Puerto Rico would be free to make its own foreign treaties.

I appreciate that this is what the supporters of "enhanced Commonwealth" want. But the Congress is not prepared to give such unprecedented rights to Puerto Rico while denying them to every state in the Union. Nevertheless, I offered that definition in the Resources Committee so that it would be clear what is and is not acceptable to the Congress. It was overwhelmingly, and bipartisanly, defeated. And Congress should not offer an option to the voters of Puerto Rico that we are not prepared to embrace.

The definition of Puerto Rico now included in the substitute by Mr. YOUNG may not be utopian, but it is historically and Constitutionally accurate.

There are some who argue that this bill is unfair because it fails to recognize that Puerto Rico is a "nation." Puerto Rico, like many other areas of the United States, has a unique history and unique culture; that is in part what makes our country so remarkable and enduring. But Puerto Rico is not a nation in any sense under U.S. law or international law. Our refusal to recognize Puerto Rico as a "nation" in H.R. 856 is not a slight; it is accurate.

There are some who oppose this bill because they do not want America to "wake up tomorrow" and find out Puerto Rico is going to be the 51st state. This bill provides for a plebiscite to choose among three options, only one of which is statehood. Even if that option is chosen, there is a transition period of up to a decade during which a plan for achieving statehood would be developed, and then voted on in the Congress and in Puerto Rico. And Congress also will vote on an admissions act. So no one should be under a misimpression that this legislation railroads statehood.

Some have raised concerns that admitting Puerto Rico at some point in the future will cost some states seats in this House. I personally support increasing the size of the House to 441 seats to accommodate the 6 new seats Puerto Rico would occupy. In any event, that is a statutory decision to be made by the Congress, just as Congress increased

the size of the House permanently when other multi-Member territories were admitted in the 19th and early 20th century.

There are those who argue that Puerto Rico would cost the federal government money were it to become a state. I would hope that the financial status of citizens would not be an issue in determining whether they are accorded the full rights of citizenship. I thought we had resolved that issue by declaring the poll tax and property ownership unconstitutional. And we should be careful about applying such a standard: as of FY 1996, 29 states—more than half—received more federal expenditures than they paid in taxes. Let's not impose a standard on Puerto Rico that we wouldn't apply to other states.

I also have noted some questions as to why the bill calls for periodic referenda should either permanent status—*independence or statehood*—not be selected. Let us be clear that the bill authorizes additional referenda, it does not mandate them. The purpose of the referenda is to determine a permanent status, and commonwealth is generally recognized not to meet that test. Should the voters of Puerto Rico decide to continue as a commonwealth, they could do so indefinitely.

Lastly, let me address what has unfortunately become a centerpiece of this debate: whether we should, in this legislation, mandate English as the official national language.

The House voted on that legislation in 1996; the leadership could bring it before the full House again at any time. But this is not the time or place to do it. The Solomon amendment declares English to be the national language, but it imposes a series of additional unconstitutional burdens on the people of Puerto Rico, requiring that "all communications with the federal government by the government or people of Puerto Rico shall be in English"; requiring that "English will be the sole official language of all federal government activities in Puerto Rico"; imposing English as the "language of instruction in public schools."

We don't need to single out Puerto Rico like this, to inflame this debate and insult the 500-year-old culture of 4 million Americans. We have a reasonable alternative amendment that is going to be introduced by Congressmen DAN BURTON, BILL MCCOLLUM, DON YOUNG and myself that takes a different, and fairer, approach. The Clinton Administration supports our substitute.

Our amendment says Puerto Rico, if it becomes a state, will be treated exactly like every other state. If Congress decides that English is to be the official language and passes a comprehensive law to that effect, then Puerto Rico will be covered just like every other state. But let's not single out Puerto Rico in a divisive and unconstitutional manner for special treatment.

Our amendment also calls for Puerto Rico to promote the teaching of English because that language is clearly the language that allows for the fullest participation in all aspects of American life. And we call for inclusion in any transition plan of proposals and incentives for promoting English proficiency in the schools and elsewhere in Puerto Rico. Surely, we can reasonably address this issue in an equitable manner without passing a confrontational and unfair insult to our fellow countrymen and women.

The time has come to tell the people of Puerto Rico that the rest of the nation of which

they are a part is prepared to hear their views and respond to their desires. That we will stand by our historic and legal tradition that inclusion in America is not dependent on one's background or ethnicity, but on a common allegiance to this nation and its Constitution. After being a part of the United States for 100 years, after sending its sons to war five times in this century, it is time that this Congress recognized the right of Puerto Rico to determine its future in a democratic fashion. That is the purpose and the policy contained in H.R. 856, and I call on the House today to pass this bill, and defeat the divisive Solomon amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In April of 1775, hundreds of brave men stormed the bridges of Lexington and Concord, setting in motion a revolutionary struggle for liberty that culminated in my hometown of Saratoga, New York, in the greatest victory for individual freedom and democracy in all of human history. That blood-stained victory of our forefathers has left the legacy that you and I and all of us call America.

Liberty and justice and democracy, these are words that do more than describe our Nation's ideals and principles. They are the very essence of this country of ours. These ideals are able to thrive and to dominate the political and economic landscapes of the United States because of the people's devotion to its unit as a Nation, to an idea that there is something unique, something distinct about being an American.

Throughout my military service, my small-business career and the last 31 years in public office, I have dedicated my life to further the principles of freedom and democracy and self-determination throughout this world. Like all of my colleagues, I have been blessed to live in this most free and democratic Nation in the world, and sometimes you ought to travel overseas into the former Soviet Union and see how much they respect this democracy of ours. It was a product of blood and sweat and commitment to principle, of those who have gone before us.

While serving in the United States Marine Corps during the Korean era, I was privileged to serve side by side with so many Puerto Rican Americans, great people, great personal friends of mine, and to be stationed for a time on the island of Viacus in Puerto Rico where I made some of my closest friendships that today still exist, and during that time I was able to gain a personal affection for the people of Puerto Rico and for their love of liberty and their distinct culture. As a result Puerto Rico and its people hold a very warm space in my heart.

Today the House considers a bill which may lead to a dramatic and permanent change in the lives of these U.S. citizens. It is billed by its supporters as a bill to permanently resolve the political status of Puerto Rico through a process of self-determination. But however lofty and worthy the objectives of this bill, it is a flawed measure