

courts, including the United States Supreme Court, is under some circumstances to adopt a default means of interpretation. When, for example, the issue arises in the context of a critical or critically important question of constitutional meaning, courts impose a "clear-statement" rule under which Congress, or some other entity, will not be understood to have meant to say something having great bearing on its powers or on the Constitution without saying it clearly, perhaps expressly. For example, when the issue is whether by the terms of a statute Congress has waived the sovereign immunity of the United States, the Court will not apply ordinary rules of statutory construction but will require the clearest possible expression of congressional intent; any waiver must be unequivocal. E.g., *United States Dept. of Energy v. Ohio*, 503 U.S. 607 (1992); *Library of Congress v. Shaw*, 461 U.S. 273 (1983). Of course, the particular issue with which we deal is highly unlikely to present itself as suitable for judicial resolution, but subsequent Congresses and private parties may resort to such rules of construal.

Congress has been highly protective of its powers in this area, especially of the use of United States military forces abroad, since the great debate in this country with respect to the undeclared war in Indochina, which eventuated in the adoption, over a presidential veto, of the War Powers Resolution. P. L. 93-148, 87 Stat. 555, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541-1548. In view of the hesitancy of Congress to act in respect of the Gulf War and of the close votes in both Houses, how likely is it that Congress would have authorized the President to use United States military forces to effectuate a United Nations Resolution or a series of Resolutions that were to be adopted sometime in the future? It is, of course, possible for Congress to authorize something on the basis of an occurrence not yet having resulted. But with respect to the commitment of United States forces abroad? Again, Congress might do so, but ought we to conclude that it did so in 1991 on the basis of contestable language susceptible to more than one interpretation? Might a clear statement of Congress' intent to do so be required before such a construction is adopted?

In short, to conclude that P. L. 102-1 contains authorization for the President to act militarily in 1998 requires the construction of an interpretational edifice buttressed by several assumptions. We must conclude that Congress in 1991 intended to base its authorization of United States military action upon the future promulgation of United Nations policy developed in the context of circumstances unknown or at most highly speculative in 1991. We must conclude that Resolution 687 did authorize member states to act to implement its goals and not merely reserved to the Security Council a future determination of what it might authorize. We must conclude that Resolution 1137 did authorize member states to act to end Iraqi recalcitrance and not merely expressed the aspiration of the Security Council to do something in the future. And we must conclude that Congress in 1991 was so confident of United Nations policy in the future that it would have authorized the future committal of United States military forces to achieve what the Security Council wished to achieve.

We have examined legislation enacted later by Congress in the same year that bears on Operation Desert Storm, in particular P. L. 102-190, 105 Stat. 1290, and P. L. 102-25, 105 Stat. 75, and find nothing bearing on what Congress might have thought it was doing in P. L. 102-1. Certainly, there is nothing in those Acts to be construed as additional authorizations.

In the end, it is for the Congress to determine what the 102d Congress meant in adopt-

ing the joint resolution that became P. L. 102-1. How, if Congress' interpretation is different from that of the President, Congress is to give effect to its determination presents another question altogether.

JOHNNY H. KILLIAN,
Senior Specialist, American
Constitutional Law.

TRIBUTE TO GOLD MEDAL WINNING U.S. WOMEN'S OLYMPIC HOCKEY TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, America's two newest sports heroes are the pride of every American. I rise today to pay tribute to a group of talented, hard-working women who have written a new chapter in America's glorious Olympic history, the U.S. women's Olympic hockey team.

Minnesota is the birthplace of hockey in America, Mr. Speaker, and the first ever gold medal in women's Olympic hockey was won by a spirited, never-give-up American team that included two Minnesotans. Jenny Schmidgall of Edina, Minnesota, and Alana Blahoski of St. Paul, Minnesota, along with 21 other members of the U.S. women's team, brought home the gold from the 18th Olympic winter games in Nagano, Japan. The American women's team won all six of its games.

Mr. Speaker, what a marvelous Olympic tournament it was, and what a remarkable team won the gold medal. As a proud Minnesotan and a patriotic American, my heart burst when Jenny Schmidgall was awarded her gold medal and spontaneously blurted out our national anthem. Our hearts as Americans burst in pride when our women's hockey team, every single member, raised their hands to the sky in saying our national anthem with all the strength left in their souls.

Mr. Speaker, after losing to Canada four times in the world championship since 1990, the U.S. women's Olympic hockey team defeated Canada 3 to 1 last week to claim the gold medal. It was the second time the Americans had defeated their fiercest rival in four days. It was also the first U.S. hockey gold medal since the 1980 miracle on ice at Lake Placid.

Mr. Speaker, great joy swept over Minnesota as the U.S. women held hands, waved American flags, and accepted their well-earned gold medals. As her parents, Wayne and Terri Schmidgall of Edina, would be quick to tell you, Jenny Schmidgall had prepared long and hard for her moment in the land of the rising sun. Jenny graduated from Edina High School, in the heart of our Third Congressional District, this past spring, and will be skating for the University of Minnesota next year.

In fact, that is the reason Jenny's picture did not make the Wheaties box,

because she is still an amateur, and NCAA rules are about as arcane as some of the rules around here, and she was not allowed to be pictured.

But anyway, when Jenny skated at Edina's Lewis Park, she was known as little Gretzky. She grew up learning the game at Lewis Park at Edina while following her hockey playing dad onto the ice.

There was magic in the air at the Big Hat arena in Nagano the day of the gold medal game. Jenny's parents got to the game and learned that their seats were not with the rest of the parents down below in the lower bowl but, rather, in the upper deck away from the rest of the parents of the women's team.

But all that changes when Wayne Gretzky, the great one himself, tapped Dwayne Schmidgall on the shoulder, and seeing Schmidgall's Team U.S.A. jackets and asked if she had somebody playing in the game. Gretzky told them, by the way, he hoped their team would win and left when the score was one to nothing in favor of the Americans.

In this first Olympic women's tournament, Jenny Schmidgall scored two goals and had three assists. She also helped set up the first U.S. goal in the gold medal game. As her mother Terri said, holding back tears, and I am quoting now, "When you know all the hard work that went into this and see them this way, it's really something."

Mr. Speaker, it is really something. All the women on Team U.S.A. have stories to tell, stories like Jenny Schmidgall's. They all followed others onto the ice at an early age and often met with resistance when they tried to join in the boys' games. But showing great American ethic that makes our nation shine, these women would not take no for an answer. They practiced. They persevered. Last week, they realized their dream. They brought home the gold.

Mr. Speaker, one sign held up above the U.S. team's bench in Nagano said it all: "U.S. Women, the Real Dream Team." Now the women of the 1998 U.S. Olympic ice hockey team are stirring new dreams in the hearts and minds of girls throughout America. They stirred our passion over the past fortnight halfway around the world, and they will live in our hearts forever.

Congratulations to Jenny, to Alana, and to the other 21 members of the U.S. women's ice hockey team as well as your wonderful coaches, managers, trainers, and other officials. You have made America proud.

PUERTO RICO'S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, 1998 is a centennial year. We think

of centennial years as occasions to celebrate. In 1976, for example, the country joyfully celebrated the bicentennial anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. On this centennial, we recall that 100 years ago, the United States defeated Spain in the Spanish-American War and, as a result, acquired Puerto Rico as a possession.

It is a bittersweet anniversary for many of the 3.8 million U.S. citizens living in Puerto Rico. Make no mistake. The people of Puerto Rico are proud to be citizens of the United States, and they have affirmed, repeatedly, their desire to be an integral part of this great Nation.

In the poll booth, 95 percent of them have voted continuously for strengthening their rights of U.S. citizenship. And on the battlefield, in every war the country has engaged in during this century, Puerto Ricans have pledged their commitment to the Nation and its democratic ideals with their lives.

There is one regret. Despite a progression from military rule to a federally appointed civil government in 1900, the granting of U.S. citizenship by statute in 1917 and the adoption of a constitution for local self-government in 1952, Puerto Rico continues to be an unincorporated territory of the United States, or as it is called in international forums, a colony.

The residents of Puerto Rico are subject to the authority and plenary powers of Congress under the territory clause of the U.S. Constitution. We may not vote in presidential elections, and we have no voting representation in Congress.

The economic, social, and political affairs of the people of Puerto Rico, in great measure, are controlled and influenced by government which is in no way accountable to them. In 1898, Puerto Rico became a colony of the United States; a century later, it remains a U.S. colony. Puerto Rico has a dubious distinction of being the longest standing colony of over 1 million inhabitants in the whole world.

Only the Congress has the power to end this chapter of colonialism. Only Congress has the authority to create the opportunity for the full exercise of self-determination by the people of Puerto Rico.

□ 1245

And Congress alone bears the political responsibility and the moral imperative to act.

H.R. 856, the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act is status neutral. It does not promote, endorse or advocate one political choice over another. Instead, it seeks to create Constitutionally-sound and Congressionally approved definitions of political status options for the residents of Puerto Rico; it proposes a timetable for referendums on status and it makes provisions, should they prove necessary, for a smooth transition to and the implementation of a new political status.

For nearly five decades, the Commonwealth status has been misrepresented to the voters of Puerto Rico. In 1950, when the Congress passed the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act, which authorized the people of Puerto Rico to draw up a constitution and reorganize a local self-government, the intent was to establish a provisional government until the issue of status was resolved. But when Commonwealth was "sold" to our people, it was billed as a bilateral pact that could only be altered by mutual consent, implying that the new status conferred political and economic autonomy and sovereignty to the island.

The United States Government became a party to this misrepresentation in 1953 when it notified the United Nations that it would no longer submit reports regarding the status of Puerto Rico because the island had achieved a "full measure" of self-government under the new "constitutional arrangement."

Unfortunately, the misinformation campaign continues unabated. Since the creation of the so-called Commonwealth, Puerto Ricans have voted in two referendums on status. But in the most recent of these, the 1993 plebiscite, the definition of Commonwealth on the ballot "contained proposals to profoundly change, rather than continue the current Commonwealth of Puerto Rico government structure," observed the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and several other colleagues in a 1996 letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

What is more, as our colleagues explained, "Certain elements of the Commonwealth option, including permanent union with the United States and guaranteed U.S. citizenship, can only be achieved by full integration into the U.S. leading to statehood. Other elements of the Commonwealth option on the ballot, including a government-to-government bilateral pact, which cannot be altered, either are not possible or could only be partially accomplished through treaty arrangements based on separate sovereignty."

To perpetuate this farce, this rhetorical slight of hand that disguises Puerto Rico's true status as a colony, defrauds the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico of their right to self-determination. It leaves them disenfranchised, in a state of political limbo.

Mr. Speaker, we are 8 years into the decade that the United Nations General Assembly has dedicated to the eradication of colonialism, and we act as if we were frozen in time. Does this country and does this Congress really want to celebrate 100 years of colonialism? This centennial gives us no joy. In order for all to celebrate, Congress must act. It is time to pass H.R. 856.

THE YEAR 2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 21, 1997 the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to continue the conversation I began a few weeks ago about the 2000 Census. As I have said, I believe we need to work together to ensure that we have the best, most honest Census possible. But I believe we are a long way from realizing that type of Census.

As everyone involved in the decennial Census knows by now, I have concerns that we are headed for a failed Census. Today, I want to discuss what I believe are the serious mistakes the Clinton Administration has made to date, and what I believe they need to do to start correcting them in time to save the 2000 Census.

The biggest mistake, indeed a colossal mistake, was made right from the start. They decided to ignore Congress. They thought they could just go ahead and design any methodology they wanted and just say to Congress: This is what we are going to do, and you just pay for it. That is not how our system works on any issue.

Mr. Speaker, we expect the Decennial Census to cost almost \$4 billion. In other words, we spend real money on the Census. As a general rule, Congress does not give the executive branch \$4 billion and say, hey, do whatever you want with it, you know best.

Under our system, Congress controls the purse strings. So when the administration wants to spend tax dollars, they come to Congress and justify what they want to do. This gives Congress the ability to shape how the money is spent.

Congress plays an even larger role in the conduct of the Census. We do this for one basic reason: the Constitution mandates that it is the Congress' responsibility to direct the manner in which the Census is taken. Let me quote from the Constitution itself: Quote: "The actual enumeration shall be made within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such a manner as they, meaning the Congress, shall direct by law." End quote. In other words, the Constitution places the responsibility for the Census on the Congress, not the executive branch.

For reasons I do not fully yet understand, the Clinton Administration used the "Hillary Health Care Model" for designing the 2000 Census. They decided to design a complicated, untested Census plan that was created by "experts." And since the idea was sanctioned by well-meaning experts, they just figured there was no reason to explain it or to sell it to average Americans and certainly no reason to work with the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, remember the secret health care task force that designed the original Health Security Act? They were all well-meaning, hard-working individuals with great educations and they designed the ultimate graduate school seminar project. The plan was over 1,000 pages long. They had thought