

we move responsibility back to parents, to the local level, the teachers and local administrators, we can make it work. Now we need to start implementing the steps to make that happen.

I thank the gentleman for sharing his time with me today.

Mr. NEUMANN. I appreciate the gentleman joining me for the hour.

Just to wrap-up what we have talked about this hour, we have talked about Social Security and how much more money is coming into the system today than we are paying back out to seniors in benefits; and we have talked about how that money is supposed to be in a savings account, but in fact today is being spent as parts of the overall budget process.

We talked about the Social Security Preservation Act, which would force our government to actually put the Social Security money aside in a separate fund, much like any pension plan in the United States of America.

We have also talked about the problems remaining after we reach a balanced budget, the problems of taxes being too high, the problems of Social Security being repaid; because even when we start putting the money aside today, there is still the \$700 billion that has been taken out over the last 15 years.

We talked about the problem of the \$5.5 trillion debt, and a second piece of legislation, H.R. 2191, called the National Debt Repayment Act, that literally repays our Federal debt, much like you repay a home loan.

That bill addresses all three of the problems. It takes two-thirds of any surpluses that develop, and dedicates it toward debt repayment, prioritizing the money that has come from the Social Security Trust Fund. By doing this, we can restore the Social Security Trust Fund, we can pay off the Federal debt, much like you may off a home mortgage, and give this country to our children debt free. It takes the other one-third of the surplus and dedicates it to tax reductions, hopefully across the board. Hopefully we end the marriage tax penalty.

But the bottom line in this thing is for our children, they get a debt-free Nation; for the workers, they get lower taxes; and for our seniors, they get the Social Security Trust Fund restored. That is bill number H.R. 2191, the National Debt Repayment Act.

I would like to close today just by encouraging my colleagues to join us on each one of these bills so we can get them passed out of here and do what I think is common sense for the future of this great country we live in.

UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will take up H.R. 856, the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, better known in Puerto Rico and throughout the states as the Young bill.

I think from the outset we should thank Mr. Young for the fact that the representative from Alaska has put forth a bill which, for the first time, provides for a congressionally sponsored plebiscite in Puerto Rico, asking the crucial questions, and the questions which are fair, not only to the people of Puerto Rico, but to all of the people in the United States that have been engaged in this relationship for all of these years.

For, you see, from November 19, 1493, to July of 1898, Puerto Rico was part of Spain. It was not an integral part of Spain; it belonged to Spain, it was a Spanish possession. It was not an independent Nation.

From July of 1898 to the present Puerto Rico, after the Spanish-American war, became again a possession of the United States. Now, under the current arrangement, Puerto Rico is known as a Commonwealth of the United States.

Now, what does that mean? Well, to people like myself who have studied these kinds of things for a while it means that Puerto Rico is, at best, a territory, but in reality a colony of the United States.

It is very simple to analyze that. Does Puerto Rico have the right to establish its own relationship with other countries, its trading agreements, its political relationships? The answer is no.

Does Puerto Rico share the same rights that the 50 States in the Union and their citizens share? The answer is no.

Puerto Ricans on the island, since 1917, have been American citizens, yet their citizenship is different than the citizenship of people who live within the 50 states.

If anyone in the House, anyone watching us on TV, was to move to Puerto Rico tomorrow, they would keep their American citizenship. They would be protected by the American Constitution. But by having legal residence in Puerto Rico, they could no longer vote for president. They could send one resident commissioner to the House, not a Congressman, not six Congressman, but one resident commissioner, who in turn is not allowed to vote on the House floor.

So if you picture that, the fact that your citizenship which is in effect here, by simply moving to the island, your citizenship becomes a second or third rate citizenship, it can only lead you to the conclusion that this relationship is something other than what a statehood relationship provides, or an independent nation's relationship provides, or that of an associated republic with the U.S.

□ 1430

Now, the Young bill proposes to deal with this head on. It says that some-

time before the end of 1998 Puerto Rico will hold a plebiscite, with the options of separate sovereignty, independence, free association, of statehood, integration into the Union, or remaining a commonwealth. Those will be the three options.

The bill further says, and this is where I really think the bill is very strong, it says that whatever the people of Puerto Rico choose for themselves we will take up within 180 days. The President shall present to the Congress a bill which will take in the wishes that came out of that vote.

There are many people who feel that this bill therefore commits the Congress, and therefore all of the American citizens, to give the people of Puerto Rico what they wish. I wish that was the case. But I think the strength of the bill is that it commits to dealing with the results. Some may consider that a weakness, but it is the first time that the U.S. has said to Puerto Rico, give us your wishes and we will deal with them.

The statehood option is very well understood. It becomes the 51st State. Some genius will have to figure out how to put 51 stars on the flag, and I am sure people have done that already. People will pay Federal taxes, they would send six Members to Congress, two U.S. Senators, and they would enjoy the full right of every other American.

Independence is very clear. The United States would grant independence to Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico, I am sure, would become and continue to be a very close ally of the United States, and provision would be made for those individuals who were American citizens up to the date of independence, those who served in wars and are receiving benefits from war, people who have Federal pensions, all that would be taken into consideration.

Under separate sovereignty there is also the possibility of discussing an associated republic status, which is somewhat like independence with some very close ties, actual structural ties to the U.S.

Then there is the commonwealth status. Therein lies a lot of the opposition, if not most of the opposition, to the bill. In 1952, Congress set up something called, and I firsthand apologize to the stenographer, I will use Spanish every so often, and we will work on that later for the proper way to write down those words, it set up something called *estado libre asociado*, state, free and associated. But it was not any of the three.

In 1952, it was presented to the people of Puerto Rico. The choice was, become a commonwealth or stay the same way. Well, commonwealth clearly at that point, in the history of Puerto Rico, was something better than what they had had, so commonwealth was accepted. But there were no other options presented at that time, such as independence or statehood.

Now, in 1993, the Puerto Rican people, on their own, held a plebiscite, "on

their own," meaning that it was not sponsored by the U.S., with no commitment for the results to be dealt with. In that referendum statehood and independence were options, and then commonwealth, as it is envisioned by many people as a future alternative to the present commonwealth status.

We have to be clear on that, because a lot of what will be said here next week is that we are being unfair to the commonwealth status by not including it. What the Young bill has done, it has for the first time in the history of this Congress said, this is what commonwealth is.

That has upset a lot of people, because they were living under the impression that commonwealth was something else. In 1993 they proposed, in the referendum in Puerto Rico, what they envisioned commonwealth to be, and that won the plebiscite 48 percent to 46 percent for statehood. In all honesty, I am surprised it did not get 85 percent. What it was was a wish list of what folks wanted the commonwealth to be, so there is obviously a concern that whatever they wished for they could never get from Congress.

So what this bill does is it outlines, it breaks down for the first time, it admits for the first time, that commonwealth is a unique relationship which does not either have the strength or the attributes of statehood, or the independence of being a free republic.

Folks who support the commonwealth status will tell us next week that this is unfair. My suggestion has always been, why do you not then ask to bring commonwealth to the next step, which is an associated republic, free association with the U.S., and call it that. But there is a problem. There are some people who do not want to use the word "republic" in Puerto Rico because that would mean breaking off from the U.S., and therein lies a lot of problems.

This has been going on for a long time. As I said before, in July of 1898 the U.S. comes into Puerto Rico. From 1898 to 1917 nothing is said about who we are, who they are or who we are as a people. In 1917 a vote is taken here saying that everyone who resides and in the future will be born in Puerto Rico is a U.S. citizen, but again I repeat, with all of those provisions that made that citizenship in some cases unique, but in my opinion less than what a citizenship should be.

Now for the first time we have the opportunity to make a decision. This bill is supported by the statehood party in Puerto Rico, and supporters of statehood. What is interesting about it is that it is also supported by the independence movement in Puerto Rico.

If Members know anything about Puerto Rico politics, if they know anything about world behavior in politics, they know that the people who want to integrate into the other nation are usually poles apart from the people who want to separate from the other nation. Yet, they agree on this bill.

Why do they agree on this bill? Well, in all honesty, I think the independence leaders are extremely courageous and are probably the heroes of this whole debate, because even though, whenever there is a vote in Puerto Rico, they have not gone past 6, 7, 8 percent of the vote, they are willing to roll some dice, so to speak. They are willing to find out, if statehood wins, if this Congress is willing to give statehood to Puerto Rico.

If it does not, then they feel they hold the upper hand, because they can go back to the island and say, you see, they are our friends, we have been together 100 years, but they really do not want us, so we must begin the process to separate; separate in a friendly way, but separate nevertheless.

Why is next week's vote important? Why should it be important to people who are not Puerto Rican? Why should it be important to Americans throughout this country? Is it in our best interests as Americans to continue to tell the world that democracy is the ultimate goal, that there have to be free elections everywhere, and continue to hold a colony in the Caribbean for 100 years? Is it in the best interests of the United States to go into the Caribbean and demand that some island nations hold "free elections" while next door we do not allow an election to take place?

How do we explain to some of the children in our country who, when faced in school with the issue of studying different parts of the world, have to ask questions as to what is Puerto Rico?

I have found out in my years of working in the school system of New York that one of the toughest questions for teachers to deal with was to explain to them the relationship between Puerto Rico and the U.S., because if we were not citizens, then it would be simple. They are just people over there that we have control over, period. But it is different when we are talking about citizens.

I told the Members what happened before, if we move from here to Puerto Rico. Well, it works in reverse. If the gentleman who represents Puerto Rico here, Mr. Barcelo, and who does not vote because he is not allowed to vote under our law, if he moves to any State of the Union, establishes residence within that State, he not only can vote for President and Congress, he can run for President and he can be elected to Congress.

I was born in Puerto Rico. Why is he different than I am in terms of my congressional powers, if you will? Because I represent New York, where I grew up, and he represents Puerto Rico. Yet, we are American citizens. We went to serve in the military in the same way.

Therein lies also part of what this debate is all about. Since citizenship came to Puerto Rico, over 300,000 Puerto Ricans have been called at wartime. In World War I, World War II, Korea,

Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, and all of the other conflicts we have been involved in Puerto Ricans served, not only Puerto Ricans from the 50 States but Puerto Ricans from Puerto Rico.

Now, picture this. You serve in the military, you go back, and for the next war you do not have a choice as to who your Commander in Chief will be because you cannot vote for him or her, but you also cannot stay out of the war as an independent nation, because you are told to be part of it. This is a question, more than anything else, of fairness.

Part of what we are trying to do here next week is to suggest to ourselves that we in Congress every so often in this country deal with issues in neat, round numbers. Is 100 years not kind of a neat number to deal with? Actually, I think it is a tragic number to keep a whole nation of people in a status other than a fair status. But if we want to deal with neat numbers, then July, 100 years to the date when the United States entered Puerto Rico. By then this Congress and the other body should have spoken out on the issue of letting the people vote.

Let me tell the Members how fair this bill is, and how it has set itself up so that there could be no controversy about the results. As I said before, a vote would be taken before the end of this year. That vote, the results would come back to the White House. The President would present to us in 6 months a bill to deal with the results. We would take a vote here. If they choose statehood or independence, we can reject it. If we approve what they request, then it goes back to the people of Puerto Rico for a yes or no vote. They can reject it.

When we look at that, we also make an argument against those people who support commonwealth who claim that this bill excludes them. Let me remind the Members again, the reason many of them feel that exclusion is because it does not allow to put in the bill what they wish commonwealth to be.

But it does not exclude the commonwealth status because, let us take it step-by-step, if the commonwealth status gets the majority, a majority of the votes, commonwealth wins. If none of the three options gets a majority of the votes, commonwealth stays. If statehood or independence wins and Congress rejects it, commonwealth stays. If independence or statehood wins, Congress accepts it, then it goes back to Puerto Rico, and if Puerto Rico rejects it the commonwealth stays. So commonwealth gets 5 shots at staying, while statehood and independence get one shot each at reaching that goal.

Now, the problem is not with being fair to commonwealth, the problem is that commonwealth is unfair in itself. We cannot have, and I cannot over-emphasize this, and I will until next Wednesday say it as many times as I can, we cannot have differing kinds of citizenship.

We cannot have a citizenship that allows you all the rights under the Constitution and have another citizenship that does not allow you rights under the Constitution. We cannot. We cannot explain why my cousins in Puerto Rico, who chose, for whatever reason, not to migrate to New York or to the other 50 States, do not have the same protection under the Constitution that I have. It makes no sense that you would lose yours if you went to Puerto Rico and set up your life down there.

So the big question, and I would hope—I am surprised, in all honesty, that the national media has not picked up on this issue yet. One could say it is because we have had other things taking attention away from us, but this is an issue that certainly belongs to the people in this country as much as it belongs to the people in Puerto Rico.

A lot of Members have said to me, you know, "That is a Puerto Rican issue." No, it is not just a Puerto Rican issue; it is a United States issue.

□ 1415

It was not Puerto Rico that invaded the United States. It was the United States that invaded Puerto Rico. Therefore, it is our issue. It is not Puerto Rico's constitution that prevails over the U.S.; it is the opposite. It is not Puerto Rico's laws that prevail over the U.S., it is the opposite.

The gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), when he is here, he can be here as an observer. He can watch us pass laws that affect his constituents on a daily basis and he does not have anything to say about it.

We do not always get our way here. When we are in the minority party, as my party is, we do not get our way most of the time, but at least we have the ability to negotiate, to move here and there, to speak out and every so often we get our way. That is what is beautiful about a democracy.

But the whole fallacy, and I am not suggesting that the gentleman be removed but, the whole fallacy of having a person elected in Puerto Rico in a campaign to represent the island here and then saying, "Just sit there and we will ask for your opinion, but you do not have a vote," that cannot continue to be. I think the question we have to ask ourselves by next Wednesday, and thereafter, is where do we want to go as a Nation in terms of this issue? What is it that we want to tell the world?

Is it the statement that for 81 years we have had citizenship that is not worthy of the rest of the Nation of our Constitution? Is it to say that for 100 years, 100 years Puerto Rico has been a territorial colony of the U.S. and that does not trouble us?

Now, I do not expect Americans, other than those who have a close relationship to Puerto Rico, as I said I do, to feel any great pain about the fact that before these 100 years we had 405 years with Spain. But I think if we look at the whole picture, we would

say we add 100 years to the longest running colony in the history of mankind. We should try to do something about it.

Now, there are people who are saying, wait a minute. We cannot pass this bill because somehow they will become a State and then we are going to have a State where people speak Spanish and people look different and people sound different.

Well, first of all, we Americans on a daily basis are looking very different from each and other we are sounding very different from each other. In fact, the English we speak sounds different from each other in different places.

But there is nothing to fear, because if for 100 years it worked somewhat, then certainly in the future it will work. If my colleagues come to me and give me arguments against statehood saying that statehood is not good for this reason or another, I ask that they please give me arguments that do not undo the relationship. Give me arguments that do not insult people by the way they speak or what language they speak. Give me arguments that do not undo of the things that happened in the past. Because when people were drafted from Puerto Rico to go to different wars or when they were allowed to join, I assure my colleagues, and I checked with my father, he was never asked what kind of English he spoke. They were never asked this question, and so many dying, never speaking a word of English in defense of this country.

But that is another issue. Someone will bring to the House floor an amendment on this bill. It is an amendment that could create a major problem for this bill, and it is a friend of mine, a colleague of mine. So I hope to change his mind over the next few days. The amendment that this gentleman wants to present says that Puerto Rico shall have English as an official language if it becomes a State. There are a couple of problems with that.

First of all, we are not dealing with a bill next week that says Puerto Rico will become a State. It just says they shall have a vote. And, secondly, we do not have an official language law in the country, so why would we single out a prospective State and say they shall be the only one to have it? It does not work that way.

Now, we are who we are as a Nation. We are Hawaiians, we are Eskimos, we are Mexican-Americans, we are Puerto Ricans, we are a lot of people who make up this Nation. At no moment does our integration into this Nation cause a problem.

Now that is one side of the coin. As far as independence goes, there are some people who may say we do not want to give independence to Puerto Rico because then it will be a problem and they will become a problem. What kind of a problem? If we have any faith in Puerto Ricans as a nation, if we have any faith in our involvement with them over 100 years, then we will know

that that is okay, that they will be a very productive and free society taking their place in the world.

What they cannot be, and what we cannot suggest that they become, is more of the same. What they cannot be is this lie, this lie called "commonwealth," this lie called "estado libre y asociado," State, free and associated. They cannot be all three. So we have to move to solve this problem.

Now I will be introducing an amendment to the bill, just one, to allow those of us who were born on the island and who reside outside the island to vote this one time on this plebiscite. The first thing I have to say is, and I know this sounds terrible, if my colleagues are going to look at my amendment, do not look at it with everything they have learned in this country about voting, because the first thing they will say is wait a minute. A guy who lives in California cannot vote in Boston. That is not right. He has got to vote in one place.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is a different vote. This vote is not about a State, because Puerto Rico is not a State. This vote is about a people who were invaded in 1898 and who, even though they have become as Americanized as anyone can become, remain to a very large degree a Nation of people. That they can be integrated into the union. Hawaii was. That they can remain a separate Nation. That can happen.

But they are a distinct people. We feel, so many of us who live outside the island, that the reason so many of us migrated from the island was due to economic conditions caused by that very same relationship. And so when a vote comes to determine once and forever the relationship and the status question, then in our opinion, all the children of that territory, all the children of the colony should be allowed to vote.

I have to say that it is painful to me, and I know of all the things I mention around this bill, one that I get criticized the most for, is that it is painful to me to know that because the plebiscite would be conducted under American law, people who recently arrived in Puerto Rico and became American citizens, which is a contract with the Federal Government, not with the Island of Puerto Rico, would be allowed to vote in that plebiscite on the political future of Puerto Rico. People who came from other countries. While those of us who were born there and reside outside would not be allowed to vote.

If we look at it, again, in terms of what American law says, of course my colleagues will never agree to my amendment. But if they look at it, as so many times we do in this House, some from here and some from here, you will realize that this vote is correct to allow all of us to vote.

But it is going to be tough next Wednesday or next week on the floor. There will be many amendments. Some trying to help the bill become stronger; many trying to weaken the bill or put

such controversy into it to defeat it. I do not know how many of my colleagues have notices, but there have been dozens of ads placed in area and in House newspapers speaking about the bill in favor or against.

Let me tell my colleagues what worries me and troubles me about those ads. The ads against the bill are trying to instill fear in Americans and their representatives here in Congress as to what Puerto Rico as a State would mean. Again, I have to, until Wednesday, keep saying this: This bill is not about statehood; it is about finding out if they want to be a State.

But the ads in the paper have been saying we cannot have these people as a State. Well, did I ever see an ad saying oh, no, it is World War II, we should not draft those people because they are not really good Americans. Do not draft them now. In Vietnam, the era that I served in, so many of the people from Puerto Rico that served there, did we ever see an ad that said: Do not draft them into Vietnam? No, that was not the case.

All of a sudden these ads are flourishing all over. And I personally will try to get to the bottom of who paid for those ads. They have a right to put them, but I think we should have a right to know where they come from. And I suspect that some of the ads are paid for by groups who are working closely with folks who would like the status quo to remain.

When we find out, we are going to have to let the world know that they took the opportunity during this debate to demean the presence of the Puerto Rican community and to suggest that we did not fit within the mold.

Mr. Speaker, not that we ever pay much attention to the U.N., with all due respect to the latest Iraq situation, but we are not famous for paying too much attention to the U.N. That is a fact of life. We kind of set the tone and the U.N. sometimes follows. But the U.N. did suggest that by the year 2000, every country should do away with its colonies.

How tragic it would be if the country that professes to be the strongest supporter of democracy refuses to step up to the plate next week and begin the process for ending the colonial status. Begin the process.

Why am I so supportive of this bill? Am I looking at the fine print to see if it is true that it favors one option or the other? Not necessarily, because what it does do, which I think is highly important to me, is it begins the process to reach a final conclusion. If they ask for statehood and it is rejected, that will have created, in my opinion, what I have coined, a term I have coined which is a "legislative confrontation" with the Congress of the United States. Not any other kind of confrontation; a legislative confrontation which will eventually lead to a final solution. Everyone should be in favor of that. Everyone.

We get a thousand letters a week here. Thousands, from groups throughout the Nation and citizens throughout the Nation writing their Members of Congress demanding action on legislation. Yet the letters are not coming in and the media is not reporting the fact that this is an issue that all Americans should be concerned about. Solve this issue and solve it now.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues if they say to me we do not want them anymore, go free, or, yes, we want them and we want to take them in, that is fine. But let me just say something very interesting here. In Puerto Rico, where they play very hard ball politics, politicians are always supposed to be for something. They are either for independence, for statehood, or for commonwealth.

I may have started a new movement in this country. I am not for anything; I am against something. I am against the colonial status that Puerto Rico has right now. If I wake up tomorrow and Puerto Rico is the 51st State, I will immediately greet those two Senators and six Members of Congress and begin to see how they can join me in bringing about the other things that I would like to see changed in this country.

And if tomorrow I wake up and Puerto Rico is an independent nation, I will immediately come to the House floor and remind my colleagues that after 100 years of an association, we should maintain close ties with that nation. It does not bother me.

Mr. Speaker, what bothers me every day is when I wake up and walk into this body and the pride that I feel, and I must say at the expense of getting a little dramatic, whenever I turn the corner and see the Capitol dome, I cannot believe that I, who grew up in a family where my father went to school for 2 years and my mother for 6, that I would be a Member of Congress. But I am immediately reminded, upon the minute I walk in here, that there are people in the place where I was born who, simply because all 4 million of them did not migrate to the United States. They do not enjoy the same rights I do.

No matter how often I try to say to myself, I only represent the Bronx in Congress, I represent the Yankee Stadium area, I represent the Bronx Zoo, I represent that wonderful area of the Bronx. I cannot stop thinking at all that I, indeed, represent, indirectly, 4 million people on the island of Puerto Rico because their representative cannot vote.

□ 1500

And this whole issue of how we are going to continue to do this for, what, another 50 years if we miss the opportunity next week to vote on this issue. If we go through 1998 without letting the people of Puerto Rico speak to us about their political future, I am heartbroken at the thought that my grandchildren will be discussing with your grandchildren and my colleagues'

grandchildren this issue of the status of Puerto Rico.

This comes at a dramatic time for me. We are almost in the month of March. In March, I came here in a special election, meaning that I replaced another Member of Congress not at election time.

I remember that day, as I stood right here, and I spoke to my colleagues after being sworn in by then Speaker Foley. I said that on March 28, 1950, my mother had arrived from Puerto Rico to join my father who had come here a year before and that on March 28, 1990, while their youngest son sat in the gallery, their oldest son was sworn in as a Member of Congress.

To the memory of my parents who are no longer with us and to a memory of all of those who were born on that island, how interesting it would be if, in March of this year, we in this House complete a process that will begin to give the people in Puerto Rico the opportunity to determine their political future.

I once again want to tell you that I have to really congratulate the gentleman from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG. What he has done has been courageous. What he has done has been an example for everyone to follow.

What he has done is to give us the opportunity for the first time, and I say "us", give the people in Puerto Rico the opportunity, but give the United States the opportunity to deal with a very serious problem because this hangs over our head. You may not pay attention to it, but this hangs over our head.

We cannot argue in some circles the way we used to, because France and England and everybody is getting rid of their colonies. The African nations can tell you that. The Asian nations can tell you that, Latin America, but not the United States.

I just want people to have these thoughts. There are concerns about what the final status would be, but I really think that that is unfair at this juncture to be concerned about what Puerto Rico would mean as a state. That is what all people are concerned about.

We tried this once before. In 1991, this House passed a bill and the Senate rejected it or did not act on it. The reason was, instead of discussing the bill, they began to discuss the possibility of statehood.

It presents a problem for some people. But we should discuss that problem in terms of allowing them to speak to us.

What is the problem? Well, some people say, if Puerto Rico was a state, it would be the 50th smallest state in size and the 24th largest congressional delegation populationwise. Well, right. Well, so?

That was the same place where you took a percentage of people to go to war. That was the same place where you gave citizenship in 1917. So that should not be an issue.

So the Young bill speaks to this. It speaks to this well.

I will spend all weekend trying to gather support for this bill. I will spend all the beginning of next week trying to get support for this bill. I will be on the floor the day the vote comes up, and I will be lobbying. I will be doing what people in my profession do well, trying to convince people that my position is the correct one. But I think it really is.

I am not asking this Congress to commit itself to anything, just to allow the people of Puerto Rico to tell us what they want to do. It is the least that we can do.

So, in conclusion, my colleagues, my friends, I think you have to really try to put yourself in the position of the 3.8 million American citizens who live on the island of Puerto Rico, try to look at their situation, try to analyze their citizenship, try to walk in their shoes, try to understand how it must feel not to be part of a world of free nations and not to be part of a union of 50 sovereign states. Something has to give.

I think that, as we speak in this country about family values and about morality and about what we teach our children, I think we, as a country, as a government, have to be careful that what we try to preach at home is not in total contradiction from what we preach in Congress. You cannot tell a child to be fair if our government is not fair. You cannot teach a child in school about democracy while we are not exercising everybody's right to self-determination.

Next week, I hope that we get a resounding victory for this bill. Let the vote take place, let it come back to us, and then let us deal with the results.

But let us leave here next week knowing that we stood up for democracy, that we stood up for self-determination, and that we honor those Puerto Ricans who lived their full lifetime as American citizens that were enjoying equality and, at the same time, at a point where we might be in the middle of averting military conflict with Iraq, let us honor the memory of all of those thousands of Puerto Ricans who died in American wars and who never got a chance to be equal citizens or free people in the world of free nations.

So I close with my belief that next week will be a historic moment. Let us give this bill and Mr. YOUNG the victory the bill and the gentleman deserve. More important, let us give the people of Puerto Rico the right to self-determination and the respect they deserve for having been loyal American citizens for all of these years.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1998

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1415.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1415.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. VISCLOSKY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. REYES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. ROTHMAN for 5 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. STOKES.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mrs. LOWEY.
Mr. ROTHMAN.
Mr. EVANS.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. HOBSON.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. REDMOND.

Mr. MICA.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SERRANO) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. HALL of Ohio.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. RUSH.
Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.
Mr. WEXLER.
Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mr. CLYBURN, in two instances.
Mrs. NORTHUP.
Ms. WOOLSEY.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. GUTIERREZ.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. DUNCAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 2, 1998, at 2 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7574. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tuberculosis Testing of Livestock Other Than Cattle and Bison [Docket No. 97-062-1] received February 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7575. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Risk Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Dry Bean Crop Insurance Provisions; and Dry Bean Crop Insurance Regulations (RIN: 0563-AB02) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7576. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Risk Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dry Bean Crop Insurance Regulations [7 CFR Part 433] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7577. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Risk Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—General Crop Insurance Regulations, Fresh Market Sweet Corn Endorsement; and Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Fresh Market Sweet Corn Crop Insurance Provisions [7 CFR Parts 401 and 457] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7578. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Risk Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's