

More taxpayers in this country—in fact, the estimate is that there are 29 million Americans in this country who will have their taxes lowered under this proposal, to the tune of about \$1,200 per filer. That is significant. I think that is a movement in the right direction.

In a conversation I had last week with Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan, I asked him, what things can we do to continue the economic growth cycle we are in? He said two things, one of which was lowering marginal rates. That is effectively what our legislation would do.

These are real choices. This is real relief for hard-working men and women in this country because it allows them to decide how they spend their savings. Instead of creating new Washington bureaucracies, new Washington programs, new Washington spending, we say that as a matter of principle and philosophy we believe the people of this country are better equipped to make those decisions in their living rooms, in their homes. We want to empower people in small town America to make those decisions on their own and to quit looking to Washington, D.C.

I encourage the Members of this body to take a hard look at cosponsoring this legislation, and work towards its passage.

URGING MEMBERS TO SUPPORT H.R. 856 AND ALLOW A VOTE ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, for half a century our Nation has been committed to political freedom and self-determination around the world. In his special message to Congress on Puerto Rico on October 16, 1945, President Truman said, "To this end I recommend that the Congress consider each of the proposals, and that legislation be enacted submitting various alternatives to the people of Puerto Rico. In that way, the Congress can ascertain what the people of the island themselves most desire for their political future."

Since then, Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Reagan, Bush, and Clinton all have supported self-determination for Puerto Rico. Moreover, both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms have supported self-determination by the people of Puerto Rico. But support is not enough.

Therefore, I come before the House to remind Members that next week we will be taking up H.R. 856, a bill submitted by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. DON YOUNG) and supported by yours truly and many Members on this side. In fact, it has bipartisan support.

This bill would allow, for the first time ever, a federally-sponsored plebiscite in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico where people can choose to remain a Commonwealth, choose state-

hood, or choose independence or free association. What I think is most important as we look forward to this vote is to fully understand that unlike some opponents' comments, the bill does not commit this Congress to any one option. In other words, this is not, I repeat, this is not, a pro-statehood bill. If you have a problem with statehood, or if you have a problem with independence, or if you have a problem with the Commonwealth status, this bill would only allow, this November, for a vote to be taken in the Commonwealth. Then 180 days later we take up the result. Then you can bring up the issue of whether you support statehood or not based on their requests.

So it is important as we look forward to next week that we do not allow some people to muddy the waters by suggesting that this bill favors statehood. But from 1493 to 1898, Puerto Rico was a colony of Spain. Now, from 1898 to this July 25th, 1998 will be another 100 years of colonial status.

I know that the minute some of us mention the word "colony" some people react to it and say, well, it is truly not a colony. It is a self-governing commonwealth. But the fact of life is that the government and the people of Puerto Rico cannot establish relationships with another government at this point. They cannot trade ambassadors, they cannot trade on their own, they cannot set up foreign affairs offices. Therefore, they are not an independent nation.

At the same time, they do not have six Members of Congress and two U.S. Senators who sit here, they have one Representative who does not have a vote in Congress representing 4 million people. So it is not a State.

I ask the Members, if it is not a State and it is not an independent nation, call it whatever you want, it is a colony. Even though we do not pay much attention to the United Nations, the United Nations has suggested that by the year 2000 every country in the world do away with, get rid of, or solve the problem of any colonies they may hold.

Next week is a historic moment during the commemoration of this 100-year relationship. By passing the Young bill, we will allow 4 million Puerto Rican citizens on the islands of Puerto Rico to make this decision for themselves, and then we will put forth our advice.

It is interesting to note that in 1917 Congress took a vote and gave the citizens of Puerto Rico American citizenship. Since then Puerto Ricans have fought in every war, have participated in every Democratic and Republican Convention, and yet have had very little representation, if any, at the Federal level. This bill will give us the opportunity, once and for all, to do in Puerto Rico what we preach to the rest of the world.

I ask the Members, as I ask them on so many other occasions, can we truly demand for the Cuban government to

hold "free elections" if we do not allow for 100 years a free election in Puerto Rico to determine its future? Secondly, can we promote democracy throughout the world and demand that people, as they should be, be free of all persecution, if we on one hand say "you are 4 million American citizens," and on the other hand say "but you do not have the same rights either as an independent nation or as a member of the union?"

Think of this. If any one colleague who is here with us today, or anyone watching this program, was to move to Puerto Rico with me, they would immediately lose all their rights. So I ask Members next week to vote for the Young bill, a way out of this problem.

CELEBRATING 9 YEARS OF A HAPPY MARRIAGE, AND URGING MEMBERS TO HELP END THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege this afternoon. While I acknowledge that every constituent within the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona is very important, I think my colleagues, and indeed, my constituents, will not mind if I talk about the one to whom I refer as my most important constituent, because, Mr. Speaker, it was on this date 9 years ago today that Mary Denice Yancey became Mary Denice Hayworth. In those 9 years I have been honored beyond compare.

The institution of marriage is many things: A sacred partnership, a friendship, a trust, a shared endeavor. Mary Hayworth, Mr. Speaker, has been my best friend and companion and helpmate for this Member, is often said to have the ability to put into words many things. It is essentially indescribable.

For those of us who endeavor to serve and embrace this public life, there are many challenges, challenges of spending time here in the Nation's capital as well as spending time in the district, challenges of family. We live in the Sixth District. Mary several days of the week basically has to take care of all the responsibilities of the household, and added responsibilities of a congressional spouse.

But I cherish her and I appreciate her, and I love her very much for all that she does for me and our family. Mr. Speaker, I think it is proof positive that miracles can and do happen that someone like Mary Denice Hayworth is there to help me and love me and encourage me.

You learn many things, as I mentioned earlier, through marriage. I remember one remark my mother made, and maybe it is something many of us have heard, "Oh, honey, I am so happy you are going to get married, because after all, two can live as cheaply as

one." I appreciated my mom's advice, but, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that mom is not a certified public accountant, and the fact is today, Mr. Speaker, as we know, for many people, two cannot live as cheaply as one, especially when it comes to tax policy in this country.

As the first Arizonan to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means, not only our personal experience with the institution of marriage but hearing from many of our constituents, we know what a challenge it is. Many people write us to say that marriage actually has proven to be a financial disadvantage, that tax policies have proven to serve as a disincentive to the institution of marriage.

Indeed, sadly, we have a tax code, Mr. Speaker, which has grown so expansive, so often working at cross purposes that, perhaps unintentionally we as a Nation have proscribed penalties against those very things that we should value as a society.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, on this special day in the Hayworth household I am pleased to rise not only to that point of purely personal privilege, but also to make this policy statement, that to really cherish families, that to really cherish the institution of marriage, we as a Congress, for our constituents, for our families, for the institution of marriage, should eliminate the marriage penalty that exists, should eliminate those things in the tax code which actually serve as a disincentive to the institution of marriage.

There are many tasks which confront us in this Congress, but we should remember that, in representing all families, we need to move to maximize the fact that those families across this country should hang on to more of their money, to save, spend, and invest as they see fit, not to have those funds confiscated by a government in Washington trying to redistribute wealth, because the families know best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEDIA BIASED AGAINST KENNETH STARR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today on Good Morning America, I saw the most biased, most slanted, least objective interview I have ever watched. The interview was conducted by a woman named Lisa McCree, and she was interviewing Monica Lewinsky's lawyer, William Ginsberg.

Before I went to law school, I got my undergraduate degree in journalism. While this does not make me an expert, it does cause me to notice words or expressions that others perhaps may overlook. Seldom have I seen any commentator make his or her view so obvious to color an interview while trying to at least give an appearance of objectivity.

I do not have the transcript, so I cannot quote word for word, but Ms. McCree's most obvious bias was in regard to Kenneth Starr, the Independent Counsel. Her every word, every nuance, every expression indicated that Judge Starr, in her opinion, had exceeded his authority, was unethical, and just a generally horrible person. Ms. McCree made it very clear that she seems to think that Judge Starr is almost the devil incarnate.

Then when it came to Monica Lewinsky, she kept referring to her by her first name, Monica this and Monica that, and once referred to her as this girl, wondering if Mr. Starr was going to prosecute this girl.

Well, first, Ms. Lewinsky is 24 years old. I used to be a criminal court judge trying the felony criminal cases all across this Nation. Many, perhaps even most, defendants in adult criminal courts are 24 years of age or younger.

Secondly, the polls tell us that a large majority of the people believe that the President had an affair with Ms. Lewinsky starting when she was 21. Thus, if Mr. Starr is trying to take advantage of Ms. Lewinsky, millions of Americans apparently believe the President took advantage of her in a much worse way when she was even younger than that.

I switched stations after this interview by Ms. McCree, and I saw Tim Russert.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to avoid personal references to the President.

Mr. DUNCAN. I saw Tim Russert of Meet the Press, and he was talking about the same subject. He asked, why all the smoke? Why all the cover-up? He asked what is the truth, Mr. President?

I was a criminal court judge for seven and a half years prior to coming to Congress. I tried the felony criminal cases. Offenses like subornation of perjury and obstruction of justice are very serious offenses. If anyone lied under oath in a major case, even at the deposition stage, that is very serious.

The American people have a right to know the truth. Yet, today, we learn that the White House is now hiding behind executive privilege. They do not want the Secret Service to testify. They do not want top officials at the White House to testify. Even the President's own press secretary says this is all going to be very hard to explain and that the people may have a hard time accepting some of what may come out. Judge Starr is doing exactly what he is required by law to do.

□ 1615

He has already gotten more convictions than any independent counsel in history, including convictions of some of the President's closest friends like Webster Hubbell, formerly the Number 2 man at the Justice Department, and Jim Guy Tucker, the former Governor of Arkansas.

Judge Starr was the Solicitor General of the United States. He represented the Federal Government before the Supreme Court. He was a judge of the Federal Court of Appeals. He was one of the most respected lawyers and judges in this Nation until he started going after the President.

If we had a conservative President in office, most of the media and most liberals would be attacking Mr. Starr for not being aggressive enough, yet Ms. McCree, in her interview, asked Mr. Ginsburg if Mr. Starr should be sued. Sued for what? For doing his job?

Bernard Goldberg of CBS Television, in a column in the Wall Street Journal a couple of years ago, said the very liberal bias of the national news media is now so obvious that it is hardly worth mentioning. This from a veteran news man like Bernard Goldberg.

Mr. Speaker, I think the thing that concerns me the most out of this whole situation is the message that we are sending to our young people. We seem to be saying that everyone is having affairs and that everything is all right and that there is not a real difference between right and wrong anymore. I can tell my colleagues that there is still a difference between right and wrong and not everyone out there is having an affair.

I can say that it is interesting to me that women rate a very high percentage of men as having affairs. But if the same women were asked: Do you think your fathers ever had affairs or your husbands, that percentage drops way down. And I think the truth is I know millions of people have had affairs, but far fewer than many people seem to think. We need to send a better message to the young people of this country.

TRIBUTE TO JULIE ROGERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, Southeast Texas said good-bye to Julie Rogers last week. Julie Rogers, and her late husband, Ben, displayed the finest example of citizenship throughout their lives that I have ever known.

"Extraordinary" is the only word our language provides us to describe the qualities Julie Rogers displayed throughout her 83 years. In an era where women were supposed to stand in the background, Julie's intelligence and talent stood out. She was born and grew up in Chicago. She finished college at age 16 and earned her law degree from DePaul University when she was only 19 years old.