

about campaign finance abuses when he himself is being investigated on the issue of his possible campaign finance abuses.

#### DOUBLE STANDARDS ARE INAPPROPRIATE FOR OUR MILITARY PERSONNEL

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

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, before I give remarks, I think the American people can see that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is perhaps one of the most partisan Democrats here in this body. I think he takes pride in that, and I applaud that because there really is not anything wrong with partisan politics; this is a political body, so that is what this is about.

Madam Speaker, I rise as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel here in the people's House on behalf of the American people and the 1.2 million active military personnel worldwide and those in the Reserves. I am here to send a message to this administration, and in particular to the President, on his conduct as Commander in Chief.

The message is that military personnel look to the Commander in Chief to set the high standard of ethical behavior and morality. Military personnel are required to set a high example of conduct in order to set an example to those they lead. Adherence to high moral standards is the fabric of good order and discipline in the military. When military leaders fall short of this ideal, then there is confusion and disruption.

Today, many see a double standard in the military. There is a double standard because the Commander in Chief has allegedly conducted himself in a manner that would be a court-martial offense for military personnel for sexual assault and sexual harassment regarding the allegations by the Democratic staffer in the White House, Kathleen Willey.

What about the double standard in the White House of those claiming that the Air Force general did not qualify as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff because he had a relationship with a woman pending a divorce, and then we look at the President's own admitted adultery.

What about the Secretary of Defense? William Cohen stated in an interview recently that the President's alleged conduct is having no effect on troop morale. I respectfully disagree. This is not just my concern.

Let me share with my colleagues a letter I received recently from a retired Army officer with 30 years of service, Colonel John Hay. What he stated was, "From the earliest days of service, our new enlisted men and women and officers are taught the necessity of military ethic, chain of com-

mand, standards of conduct and principles of leadership; all enforced by the Uniform Code of Military Justice. These standards and values instilled early and continued throughout a career in the military are necessary to maintain the essential trust between the military and the Nation's civilian command authority. These military ethics, values and standards of conduct are generated by the fact that the activities conducted by the Armed Forces are official acts of the Nation. Since ours is a Nation that conducts itself within a set of stated high values, the manner in which our forces perform their duties must be carried out with the same set of high values. Thus, the consistent support of the Nation can only be maintained by expecting and enforcing the highest ethical standards upon every echelon of the military chain of command from the President, as our Commander in Chief, down to and including every individual soldier, sailor, marine and airman."

The Founding Fathers were concerned about the ethical standards of the military leaders. Madam Speaker, it was John Adams that included the first naval regulations, language that called for naval officers to have high moral and ethical standards. This language was codified for naval officers by Congress in 1956 and for the Army and the Air Force in 1997 in last year's bill.

This language calls for officers to "show themselves a good example of virtue, honor and patriotism and to subordinate themselves to those ideals, and to guard against and to put an end to all dissolute and immoral practices and to correct all persons who are guilty of them."

Madam Speaker, there is frustration and confusion in the military. Over the last 18 months, I have traveled to a number of military installations and training centers, not only here in the United States, but all over the world, as I have conducted extensive review in sexual misconduct and sexual harassment in the United States military. I have heard the questions from military personnel about the behavior of the President as the Commander in Chief. As a Member of Congress and as an officer in the Army Reserves, I myself find these questions disturbing.

Each of the services is recruiting young people all across the Nation. At boot camp they are infusing these young men and women with moral values of honor, courage and commitment. They are teaching self-restraint, discipline and self-sacrifice. Therein lies the understanding of deserving honor. Military leaders are required to provide a good example to these young recruits, yet when they look up the chain of command, they see a double standard at the very top.

That is why I have decided to include in my chairman's mark on Thursday for the military personnel section to the National Defense Authorization Act language that will apply John Adam's original guidance on ethical

conduct for military officers to our national command authority, in particular the Secretary of Defense and the President, while acting as Commander in Chief.

I hope this language sends a loud and clear message to the administration. They are being watched. From the 18-year-old recruit to the admiral, they all look to the Commander in Chief to set the tone and serve as an example of high moral and ethical behavior.

Madam Speaker, I believe that it is worthier to deserve honor and hold it with humility than to have it, shamelessly flaunt it, and not deserve it.

#### SELF-DETERMINATION FOR PUERTO RICO: A DREAM DEFERRED

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. Madam Speaker, 100 years ago, in 1898 the United States acquired Puerto Rico as a territory. Since then, every time the Congress has considered extending the right of self-determination to the people of Puerto Rico, nativists have raised their voices in protest. Their message is a message of fear.

Less than 2 months ago, March 4 of this year, the House just passed a bill 209-to-208, by scarcely one vote, allowing the people of Puerto Rico to have an act of self-determination. The reason this vote was so close is because of the campaign of fear-mongering that was carried on in this House.

Nativists fear that Puerto Rico will be asked to join the Union as a State. In the nativist mindset, the 3.8 million American citizens of Puerto Rico do not belong in this Union because they do not walk, talk and look like the nativist of the hour. In the mid-1800s a nativist was a Protestant, white Anglo-Saxon male, born in the United States of Protestant parents. Perhaps the profile of a nativist today is the same.

Whoever they are, nativists are prejudiced. And the brand of prejudice they practice is the cultural equivalent of racism. Nativists resist the acculturation, that intercultural borrowing between diverse peoples which results in new and blended social and cultural patterns, even though America's history is a history of acculturation. How else, after all, did we arrive at the image of a great melting pot?

Nativists must think this melting pot business has gone on long enough and it has come time to put an end to it. They are willing to slander people in defense of their image of American cultural purity.

Just listen to what nativists say will happen to the United States if Puerto Rico becomes a State. "Granting statehood to a land that is alien to us in most ways," declares Don Feder of the Boston Herald, will be a milestone on "the road to national dissolution." Columnist George Will implies that the