

with their children and the bad schools in which they were trapped, applied for a meager 1,000 scholarships that would enable those mothers and those fathers to move their children to a better school of their choice.

□ 1030

The people of Washington, D.C., especially those who are not at the top rungs of the socioeconomic ladder, want their children to have the same opportunity as the wealthy people who have their children in Sidwell Friends.

We have a bill that we will bring to the floor here in a few days, a bill that would allow 2,000 scholarships for the very poorest families in America, from among those who apply to be chosen at random, so that those parents can use those scholarships to take their child to that school where the child can succeed.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, I have met some of those children who up to this point have been the lucky recipients of the private scholarships, privately funded scholarships made available to their families. By over 60 percent, these bright young boys and girls say they like math and science the best. If we put a bright young mind in a school where they are encouraged, where somebody cares and takes the time, and yes, indeed, offers a little discipline along with that encouragement, we see a bright, happy child.

We will bring that bill to the floor. We will pass that bill. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle can find compassion for the children that overrides their desire to comply with unions, and I hope when we send that bill to the President and he picks up that pen, he will realize he has the lives of 2,000 beautiful children in his hands. He can sign the bill and give them the opportunity, or he can veto the bill and satisfy the unions.

BEFORE WE SPEND OUR FEDERAL SURPLUS, WE BETTER MAKE SURE WE REALLY HAVE ONE

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, every day we hear all kinds of talk now about how we are going to spend the Federal surplus. Before everyone gets all giddy about all this extra cash, however, we had really better take a closer look.

Alan Sloan, the Wall Street editor of Newsweek, recently wrote in the Washington Post, "But get a grip. There is no surplus. If you do math the normal way, instead of Uncle Sam's way, there is nothing resembling a budget surplus on the horizon." Mr. Sloan wrote that all the talk about a surplus comes because we are using Federal budget accounting instead of real world accounting.

As he pointed out, "Virtually the entire difference between Federal math and real-world math involves Social

Security's retirement and disability funds, whose surpluses are masking the deficit in the rest of the budget."

If we were not using the Social Security and many other trust funds to offset or mask the size of the deficit, we would still have a huge deficit on top of an already horrendous \$5.5 trillion national debt.

Mr. Speaker, before we begin celebrating and spending our supposed, alleged surplus, we had better make sure that we really have one. We are very far from it right now.

PRESIDENT CLINTON TURNING HIS BACK ON TAX REFORM

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, President Clinton turned his back on fundamental tax reform by reforming the tax code. He said that getting rid of the current tax code and replacing it with a better one is irresponsible.

The President is finally revealing his true liberal self. As we enter a new century, we need a new tax code. We need a tax code that encourages savings and investment. We need a tax code that is simple, so that our citizens do not need to hire accountants and lawyers to comply with the rules. We need a tax code that takes less money from working families. We need a tax code that gives the American people a break, not manipulates their lives.

For 40 years, the Democrats in this Congress built a tax code that was riddled with loopholes, ridiculous rules, and hard-to-understand regulations, all to control our lives. It is time to tear that system down and build a better, simpler, and fairer tax code for the next century.

THE SOLOMON ENGLISH LANGUAGE EMPOWERMENT AMENDMENT

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in just a few minutes this House will begin debate on something that is probably the most important issue that we will take up on the floor this Congress during this entire year. It is the question of whether or not to start in motion the wheels that will begin to admit Puerto Rico as a State to this Union.

I would just hope that all Members, and because of their interest for their constituents, would pay particular attention. I would suggest that they come over here. This debate is going to take 7 or 8 hours on this floor, but it is very, very important.

I will be offering an amendment that will begin to emphasize that based on this premise, for the past two centuries we have forged a Nation out of our dif-

ferent peoples by emphasizing our common beliefs, our common ideals, and perhaps, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, our common language.

Our English language has permitted this country to live up to our motto, our national motto, and that motto is *e pluribus unum*, and it means "out of many, one." The English language is the reason that we have survived these last 200 years. Think about it.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 856, UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 376 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 376

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 856) to provide a process leading to full self-government for Puerto Rico. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed ninety minutes equally divided and controlled by Representative Young of Alaska, Representative Miller of California, Representative Solomon of New York, and Representative Gutierrez of Illinois or their designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 5(a) or rule XXI are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 3 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII. Consideration of that amendment shall be preceded by an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of that amendment and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Solomon of New York and a Member opposed to that amendment.

(b) Consideration of the amendment printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 2 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII shall be preceded by an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of that amendment and shall not exceed thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by Representative Serrano of New York and a Member opposed to that amendment.

(c) Amendments specified in subsections (a) and (b) of this resolution 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. Consideration of those amendments, and all amendments thereto, shall not exceed one hour.

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 an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during 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 postponed question 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 substitute 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 one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. 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 myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 376 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 856, which is the the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act. The rule provides 90 minutes of general 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. SOLOMON), 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 XXI prohibiting 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. However, the Committee on Rules decided 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 a 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 general debate on 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 a 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 American people, and 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.

□ 1045

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. I am pleased to note that the Members who appeared yesterday before the Committee on Rules agreed to offer a finite and limited number of amendments. That means that those in opposition to the bill will probably 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, that they would be dignified in their remarks, and that we would speak to the issues and not get into a lot of superfluous 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. SOLOMON), my very dear friend, for yielding me the customary half-hour.

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 on 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 say, 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

Philippines did. And since 80 percent of the voters of Puerto Rico go to the polls, we can be assured that their decision will represent a very strong majority.

Once they make that decision, no matter what that decision may be, I believe we should support them. And I am not the only one who feels that way.

Mr. Speaker, eight years ago I was an original cosponsor of the legislation which passed the House to allow Puerto Ricans to vote on the status of their relationship with this country. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that bill died in the Senate, but it did have the support of the majority of this House.

Self-determination also had the support of one of America's most popular Presidents. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a statement by the idol of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), President Reagan. He supported Puerto Rican self-determination in a statement dated January 12, 1982, which I would like to put in the RECORD.

In his statement, President Reagan says: "Puerto Ricans have fought beside us for decades and have worked beside us for generations. We recognize the right of the Puerto Rican people to self-determination. President Reagan also said that he believed that statehood would benefit both the people of Puerto Rico and their fellow American citizens in the States."

President Clinton supports the legislation, as did every Republican President since Dwight Eisenhower. Mr. Speaker, it is a good idea whose time is long overdue. After 83 years of American citizenship, this country owes these people the right to make their own decision. We owe them self-determination. They are American citizens, Mr. Speaker, and they should be treated as such.

Unfortunately, in addition to Puerto Rican self-determination, which is a very popular idea, there is another issue which is being linked to the bill, the issue of whether the United States will pick an official government language. Although English is certainly the de facto language of our country, the Framers of our Constitution deliberately refused to establish a national religion or a national language. People come from all over the world to live here, and are not linked to one another by common language. They are linked to one another, Mr. Speaker, because of their love of freedom, their love of liberty.

President Reagan said, and I would like the gentleman from New York, my dear friend, the former Marine to hear this, Mr. Reagan said, and I quote, "In statehood, the language and culture of the island, rich in history, would be respected, for in the United States the cultures of the world live together with pride."

In fact, when the Constitution was drafted, there were nearly as many people speaking German in this country as there were speaking English.

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 involving non-English 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 saving many lives in the 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 Roll Call Thursday, February 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:

[The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, Jan. 12, 1982]

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 reaffirm that support, still confident in my belief that statehood would benefit both the people of Puerto Rico and their fellow American citizens in the 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 mistake our intent in this. The status of Puerto Rico is an issue to be settled by the peoples of Puerto Rico and the United States. There must be no 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) my 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 Rican people 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 surprisingly, one-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 trying to force 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 astute 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 Congressman Solomon, 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 that 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

one. It means patriotism, it means pride, it means volunteerism. But above all it means that we speak a common language in this country.

We are a melting pot of the entire world, of every ethnic background in the entire world, and we are proud of that. But had we let these various languages become a part of our American culture, this democracy would not be here today. And if my colleagues do not believe it, come up to my congressional district which borders on Canada, and see how we are faced with a situation in Quebec that literally tears that country asunder. We just cannot allow that to happen. And that is why at the appropriate time I will be offering an amendment that will clarify the English-first language in this country.

Having said all of that, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), one of the men I respect most in this body, chairman of the Committee on Resources, and the single representative from the great State of Alaska.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for consideration of the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, H.R. 856.

The proposed open rule is consistent with the process which is followed by the Committee on Resources in the development of this bill to resolve the United States political status problem with Puerto Rico.

This was an effort to reach out and include as many sectors as possible in a fair manner in which the facts were openly aired and examined without respect to special interests or local political considerations.

I can confirm that as the chairman of the House committee of jurisdiction for territorial affairs, the committee followed and completed every legislative step in the development of this initiative during the past 4 years from 1995 to the present time.

Five extensive hearings with the broadest participation possible were held in Washington and Puerto Rico. Testimony was heard from individuals with many different views on the future relationship of Puerto Rico and the United States. Special attention was given to allow the three principal parties in Puerto Rico, each representing the status of commonwealth, independence, or statehood, to present their preferred definition with their respective status options.

Subsequent deliberations by Members of Congress were complete and exhaustive. All the issues have been raised and debated.

Once Members examined the complexity of the problems, they realized that this bill is the most viable way to address the problems facing the United States due to failure to permanently resolve Puerto Rico's status.

The bill's self-determination process in H.R. 856 is a carefully crafted three-

stage process, a three-stage process leading to full self-government for Puerto Rico as a separate sovereign nation or a State of the Union if the majority of the people are ready to change the current form of local self-government as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

□ 1100

Congress and the Americans of Puerto Rico will be required to vote in each of the three stages of the bill. I want to stress that. Congress and the Americans of Puerto Rico will be required to vote in each of the three stages of the bill, an initial referendum, a 10-year transition plan, and the final implementation act. If there is no majority for change, then the status quo continues and United States citizens of Puerto Rico are consulted again by referendum at least once every 10 years.

The Committee on Resources overwhelmingly approved and reported it twice, first in the 104th Congress and now in the 105th Congress. I firmly believe it is appropriate and necessary for the full House to now consider the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, H.R. 856.

In carrying out congressional responsibilities under the Constitution for territories, Congress will be able to directly respond to the request of the Legislature of Puerto Rico to the 105th Congress to define the status choices and authorize a process to resolve Puerto Rico's political status dilemma. I support this rule, and I will discuss in debate the merits of all amendments that come before us.

I want my colleagues to understand this is nothing new. This is a project I worked on, my committee has worked on, the people of Puerto Rico have worked on for the last 4 years. It is time to act. It is time for this Congress, this House, to pass this legislation for America, for the people of Puerto Rico. This rule is a good rule, and I urge passage of the rule but, more than that, the defeat of some amendments and final passage of this legislation, long overdue for the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Maybe I did not make myself clear. I am not insinuating in any way that former President Ronald Reagan is for this bill. All I want to do was to read a statement he put out in a press release. Once a President speaks, use of that language is never unauthorized because that is his statement. It is history. Once again, he said, in statehood, the language and culture of the island, rich in history, rich in tradition, would be respected, for in the United States the cultures of the world live together with pride. Ronald Reagan.

The reason I wanted to make it so plain is because I know my dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), idolizes President Reagan, and rightly so. I just wanted to be sure he knew what the President's thoughts were when he did address the Puerto Rican situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and in strong support of the bill which we are dealing with today. This is indeed a historic moment because, make no mistake about it, this is the first time that a rule has come on this floor accompanying a bill of this nature that will, in my opinion, begin a process to end what I and many other people consider, and all should consider, the present colonial status of Puerto Rico.

In order to do this, we have to put forth a process. This rule puts forth a process for the debate, and the bill puts forth the process for ending the colonial status. We have to immediately attack that which is being said either with a lack of information or viciously to defeat the bill, which is that this bill leads Puerto Rico towards statehood. How can it do that if this Congress is not committing itself at this point to any of the three options?

What this Congress is saying is, we will allow you in consultation with us to take a vote, and then the results of that vote will become our consideration here on the House floor. Some may be afraid that the vote would come out against the option they favor. That is democracy. Some may be afraid that the option somebody favors will never be dealt with. We can only find out. But I assure my colleagues that nothing will happen unless we approve this rule and approve this bill. In fact, I often tell people, I have a 31-year-old daughter and a 4-year-old granddaughter. I suspect that if this bill fails today, my grandchildren, as adults, will still be discussing the colonial status of Puerto Rico.

As we get close to the year 2000, and once in a while we listen to the U.N., the U.N. has suggested that all countries unload their territories and colonies before 2000. The greatest democracy on Earth still holds close to 4 million people in that kind of a situation. I do not care if statehood wins. I do not care if independence wins. I do care every day when I get up and I realize that the children of Puerto Rico are all members of a colony. It is good for the U.S. Government to change this. It is good for the Puerto Rican people to change it.

So I congratulate the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for bringing this bill, and I congratulate my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for this rule. I will not agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) on everything today, and I will not agree on many things during the session with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), but we agree on this beyond anything else, and that is why I was proud to add my name as a co-prime sponsor early on.

Rican Government is controlled by statehood supporters who know from past balloting and current polling that they would lose a fair up and down vote on statehood.

The statehood supporters have maneuvered the Committee on Resources into constructing a ballot that will not reflect the will of the people. This is because the definition of "commonwealth" in the bill describes a colonial status that is unacceptable to commonwealthers, leaving them no choice but to boycott the election since they oppose all 3 options offered by the bill.

Back in Puerto Rico, statehood supporters are gloating about how the definition being used in the bill will guarantee a victory for statehood even though they know the majority of people do not support statehood. They are right about the outcome of this bill, but they are wrong to do this to the people of Puerto Rico.

The phony pro-statehood majority produced by this bill then sets in motion a mandatory statehood vote in Congress next year and two more votes in Puerto Rico. But even then, that far down the road to statehood, H.R. 856 still does not provide the people of Puerto Rico an up or down vote, a yes or no vote as to whether or not they want to become a State.

Why are we so afraid to treat the people of Puerto Rico as we have every other State that has entered the Union? This is what we have done to every other people who wanted to join the Union. We have given them a yes or no vote on statehood. Why are people now trying to maneuver it so the people of Puerto Rico do not have this opportunity? Because they know that the people of Puerto Rico, given the opportunity, will vote "no" on statehood.

Mr. Speaker, the fair way to handle this is the way we have always done it, is to give the people a chance for an up or down vote. If this is a first step toward statehood, if this is a first step toward treating the Puerto Rican people as all other citizens of the United States, they should be treated just as every other group trying to join the United States were treated. H.R. 856 rejects the simple, fair way that was good enough for everybody else and substitutes a skewed ballot with fore-ordained results. We should not stand for this unfair, undemocratic process. We should reject H.R. 856 while accepting the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the bill. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for providing the only thing

that is fair about this bill, that is, to provide a rule that will provide a free and open debate. That is what this bill needs.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about self-determination. This is legislation that has been drafted by the statehood supporters. They were the ones who provided the definition for the commonwealth, indeed denying access to the democratic process by not allowing 48 percent of the people of Puerto Rico to participate in this debate. Forty-eight percent of the people of Puerto Rico supported commonwealth 5 years ago when the last plebiscite was held. But here we are presenting to the House floor legislation that will favor the statehood for Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake. By voting on this legislation, we are imposing statehood to the people of Puerto Rico. It is a shame that today by providing in the commonwealth definition that citizenship is statutory, it is shameful, it is a lack of respect to the people of Puerto Rico, it is a lack of respect to the men and women who have died, who have fought defending this country, and it is to say to even the supporters of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, you cannot support the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico because we will take the citizenship away from you. This is not about self-determination. This is about making Puerto Rico the 51st State of the Nation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman who represents the northern part of Puerto Rico, that is, Providence, Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me the time. I appreciate the chance to address the point of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) about this bill because it was addressed earlier by the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) about the fact that this process was not fair. It is ironic that this process was not fair because it did not include the commonwealth definition. Yet in the bill itself, the commonwealth has an opportunity to vote for the status quo in this legislation.

But let me address the issue that she brought up. The reason why this is so awful to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and people of Puerto Rican descent is the same reason it is awful for people who feel that we ought to have statehood for Puerto Rico. That is, without statehood the people of Puerto Rico are put down.

Just as she said, without statehood, the people of Puerto Rico can have their citizenship denied, because it will be up to this Congress in its constitutional authority, given the fact that Puerto Rico is a territory under the territorial clause of this United States Constitution, that at any time this Congress can take away the citizenship of the people of Puerto Rico. At any time the people of Puerto Rico can

have the Solomon language imposed on them.

The irony with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) saying "I wish this was in Spanish" is that the only way to guarantee the people of Puerto Rico that they have a right to speak their own language is if they get to become a State. Because if they are a State, they have the rights under the 10th Amendment of the United States Constitution. They reserve the power to decide what their local language will be, just as every other State in this Union is able to do.

The irony is, unless Puerto Rico becomes a State, they will not be able to decide what their language will be, they will not ever be able to vote for the things that we vote on regularly that affect them. The irony in this debate is that we keep hearing that this process is unfair.

Let us understand. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) said that we already had a referendum. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the problem is it does not matter what Puerto Rico does. The whole purpose of this debate is that the Congress has to give its approval so that Puerto Rico can decide.

They cannot decide now. They never had the decision. Those plebiscites were not sanctioned by the United States Congress. And because they were not sanctioned by the United States Congress, they have no meaning. Why? Because, once again, Puerto Rico is under the territorial clause of the United States Constitution, meaning until they become a State or until they become an independent nation, they cannot choose for themselves.

That is why we are putting this bill forward, because we believe they ought to be able to decide for themselves. That is what this debate is all about. I want to commend the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY). I want to thank them for having this debate and allowing this debate to come on the floor.

I need to repeat this. We can argue until we are blue in the face about any other issue. Just understand this. Puerto Rico is under the territorial clause of the United States Constitution. I am a member of the Committee on Resources. The Committee on Resources has jurisdiction over territories and commonwealths and Native American reservations. Have my colleagues ever heard of that before? It is called the territorial clause. We have to vote on a bill to allow the people of Puerto Rico the right to make a choice.

I am really looking forward to this debate because the fact of the matter is, if we understand the simple fact that this is simply about giving the congressional authority to the people of Puerto Rico so they can make up their own mind, then I think this debate will become clearer.

Let me just conclude by saying with respect to English as the mandatory

Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallely
Ganske
Gedjenson
Gekas
Cephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton

Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
LaTourrette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northrup
Nussle
Oberstar
Oliver

Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Santolin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souders
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky

Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman

Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wise

Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—41

Aderholt
Archer
Bachus
Bryant
Carson
Chabot
Costello
Crane
Duncan
Emerson
Goode
Goodling
Graham
Hall (TX)

Hefley
Hilleary
Istook
Jenkins
Jones
Kingston
LaHood
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Metcalf
Norwood
Obey
Petri
Regula

Riley
Rogers
Royce
Salmon
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith, Linda
Spence
Wamp
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker

NOT VOTING—19

Chenoweth
Doolittle
Ewing
Frank (MA)
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Harman

Kennedy (RI)
Luther
Poshard
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Scarborough
Schiff

Shimkus
Stark
Tiahrt
Torres
Townes

□ 1209

Messrs. ARCHER, GRAHAM, HEFLEY and RILEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Ms. DELAURO changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."
So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 27, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2369, WIRELESS PRIVACY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1998

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-427) on the resolution (H. Res. 377) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2369) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3130, CHILD SUPPORT PERFORMANCE AND INCENTIVE ACT OF 1998

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-428) on the resolution (H. Res. 378) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3130) to provide for an alternative penalty procedure for States that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, and to provide for a

more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to House Resolution 376 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 856.

□ 1212

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 856) to provide a process leading to full self-government for Puerto Rico, with Mr. DIAZ-BALART in the chair.
The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.
Under the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) each will control 22½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).
(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Mr. Chairman, this is a very historical moment, one that is long overdue. In debate on the rule, there were some statements made that I think should be clarified before I go into the full text of my presentation today, why I support this legislation.

The Northern Marianas were mentioned and other territories were mentioned, and how they came into this great united part of our United States, even as territories are separate governments. But, for instance, the Northern Marianas, the Government of the United States and the Government of the Northern Marianas will consult regularly on all matters affecting the relationship between them. At the request of either government, and not less frequently than every 10 years there shall be an additional consultation taken.

Mr. Chairman, over 100 years ago, this Congress was passionately discussing the 400-year-old colonial grip that Spain had on the islands adjacent to and south of Florida. Just over 2 weeks earlier, on February 15, 266 American servicemen lost their lives in Havana harbor with the explosion of the United States warship, the Maine.

□ 1215

The monument to these gallant men stands highest above all else in Arlington National Monument. Many others lost their lives in the ensuing Spanish-American War amid the cries of "Remember the Maine." But why?

This Congress declared war and sent Americans in harm's way in the defense of the sacred ideal: self-determination. America won the war, and assumed sovereignty over Cuba, Puerto Rico, and some of Spain's Pacific possessions. All but one are no longer territories. Only Puerto Rico still stands, after 100 years, a territory.

Mr. Chairman, Congress promptly delivered on its promise of self-determination to the people of Cuba by providing for a process which permitted Cuba to become a separate sovereign after a few brief years.

In contrast, the Rough Rider who had charged up San Juan Hill to ensure the United States' victory in the Caribbean had become President of the United States and urged Congress to grant United States citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico in his 1905 State of the Union address. Quote, "I earnestly advocate the adoption of legislation which will explicitly confer American citizenship on all citizens of Puerto Rico. There is, in my judgment, no excuse for the failure to do this."

I believe President Teddy Roosevelt's words are even more true today to this bill as when he spoke them in 1905.

Our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico, now numbering some 4 million, have been loyal to this Nation and have valiantly fought in every major conflict. We have all benefited in ways that cannot be calculated from the bravery, the loyalty, and the patriotism of over 200,000 Americans from Puerto Rico who have served in our Nation's Armed Forces.

It is clear that a heavy price has been paid by Puerto Rico for this country, which has yet to fully deliver on the promise of the U.S. General Miles when he landed in Puerto Rico 100 years ago this year:

"In the continuation of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States, in the cause of freedom, justice and humanity, their military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico. They come bearing the flag of freedom. They bring you the encouraging strength of a Nation of free people whose greatest power consists of justice and humanity for all those who live in their community. The principal objective will be to give the people of your beautiful island the largest extent of freedom possible. We have not come to wage war, but to bring protection, not just for you but for your property, in order to promote your prosperity and in order to obtain for you the privileges and the blessings of our government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any of the laws and customs present that are wise and beneficial."

The Congress provided Puerto Rico with increasing levels of self-govern-

ment for the first half of this century, culminating with the authorization in 1950 for the process of a development of a local constitutional government.

By 1952, Congress conditionally approved a draft constitution submitted by the legislature of Puerto Rico. After those changes were made by Puerto Rico, the new constitutional government of the territory became effective under the name declared by the constitutional convention as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The establishment of local constitutional self-government did not alter Congress' constitutional responsibility under the Territorial Clause for Puerto Rico. However, it was under the first years of the commonwealth that President Eisenhower established the Eisenhower Doctrine regarding Puerto Rico which is still in effect today and is reflected in the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act.

After the local constitutional government of Puerto Rico was established, Puerto Rico was removed from the United Nations' decolonization list, prompting questions as to whether Puerto Rico was still a territory under the sovereignty of the United States and subject to the authority of Congress. President Eisenhower, a Republican, acted decisively by sending a message to the United Nations that he recommended that the United States Congress grant Puerto Rico separate sovereignty if requested by the Puerto Ricans through the legislature of Puerto Rico.

While the legislature has never petitioned for separate sovereignty, the legislature sent joint resolutions to Congress in 1993, 1994, and 1997 requesting congressional action. Keep that in mind, because I have heard time and again that the Congress, by doing this, is dictating to the Puerto Rican people. But the legislature sent to this Congress in 1993, 1994, 1997 requesting congressional action to define the political status and establish a process to resolve, establish the process to resolve Puerto Rico's political status dilemma.

Although in recent years the Puerto Rican legislature formally requested the Congress to resolve Puerto Rico's political status, U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico had been advocating action for over a decade. I remember the submission to Congress in 1985 to 1987 of over 350,000 individually signed petitions for full citizenship rights. This incredible grassroots effort was led by Dr. Miriam Ramirez of the nonprofit, nonpartisan civic organization, Puerto Ricans in Civic Action.

Mr. Chairman I believe this initiative influenced the then president of the Senate to include in his first State of the Union address as President on February 9, 1989, the following request: "I've long believed the people of Puerto Rico should have their right to determine their own political future. Personally, I strongly favor statehood. But I urge the Congress to take the necessary steps to allow the people to decide in a referendum."

Mr. Chairman, about the same time as President Bush requested Congress authorize a political status referendum in Puerto Rico, the three presidents of the three principal political status parties in Puerto Rico asked Congress to help resolve Puerto Rico's political status, as Puerto Rico has never been formally consulted as to their choice of ultimate political status.

While Congress has yet to formally respond to the request of the President, the leaders of Puerto Rico, and the petitions of the Americans in Puerto Rico, this bill will do just what has been asked by the people of Puerto Rico in numerous years and numerous times by the president of the Senate, by the Presidents in the past in their platforms.

The United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, H.R. 856, establishes in Federal law for the first time a process to resolve Puerto Rico's political status. I remind my colleagues it will not happen overnight, regardless of what we do here today. This is just a process that will take place.

My colleague who was speaking on the rule said that the public is not aware of this action today. May I remind my colleagues that if we were to pass this bill today, and I hope we do pass this bill today, it must be passed by the Senate and the people of Puerto Rico must also pass it in 1998. It comes back to the Congress in 1999, and by 1999 we again in Congress must act. We must pass a bill approving the transitional stage. Then it goes back to the people of Puerto Rico. And, by the way, the start of the transition period begins in the year 2000.

But this more than anything else is a bill that establishes the right to determine for the first time in 100 years their self-determination. It is a fair and balanced process that has been developed with an enormous amount of input. Mr. Chairman, I resent certain Members saying that this has not been fair. We asked all of those people involved, all three parties, to submit what their definition should be in this bill. We have in my substitute recognized commonwealth. We recognize independence. We set forth a process which will create a State.

Mr. Chairman, if it does become a State, I am one of the few people, along with the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) that has gone through this process.

I have heard some statements here today about English language only. When Alaska became a State, that was not a requirement. We had 52 different dialects in Alaska. People speak English. They also speak many other languages. It was not a requirement. Hawaii has two official languages. They have English and Hawaiian. New Mexico has two official languages, English and Spanish.

The concept of the amendments that will be offered to this bill, especially the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), he is my

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

