

the community as a great team until Jim's death.

Next week, the campus and the community will officially dedicate the new James C. Kirkpatrick Library at Central Missouri State University. Jim Kirkpatrick's legacy of service continues.

#### ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PUERTO RICAN CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning with a heavy heart. While I congratulate my colleagues for the fine manner in which they debated the deployment of American troops to Kosovo on the floor, I must also point out a great injustice in our American democratic system.

Last Thursday, throughout the discussion on the floor, precisely at this podium where I now stand, what my esteemed colleagues debated was the reaffirmation of the Congress' power as the sovereign representative body of all Americans.

On a bipartisan level, the debate reflected important concerns about the authority that Congress exercises on the issues that affect our Nation and our standing in the world. It is to this House's great credit and a decision that in my estimation marks a significant turning point in Congressional relations that my colleagues overcame party differences and acted in unison to enable our troops to join NATO forces in Kosovo.

The deployment of American troops to any conflict is an issue of critical importance to all Americans. It is critical not only for the soldier who is the individual facing the greatest danger and may be called upon to sacrifice his or her life, but also for every one of the American families, the wives and husbands, parents, and children, or even the friends.

In short, it is critical for all who will sacrifice the companionship of their loved ones, who will be sent to a far-away place to defend liberty and freedom according to the best interests of our Nation.

I have the deepest admiration for our troops who place themselves in harm's way and do so willingly, because they commit their lives to our Nation in defense of democracy. This is what patriotism is all about. From the depths of my heart, I salute our troops for their commitment to their fellow citizens and our Nation and ask God to protect them and bless them wherever they are.

Throughout the debate of the House, I feel deeply troubled by the fact that, in all likelihood, the troops to be deployed to Kosovo will include many American citizens from Puerto Rico and yet I, as their sole representative

in the Congress of the United States, was unable to vote in the decision that could place their lives in peril.

How is it possible that the Nation that acts as the supreme defender of freedom, liberty, and rights everywhere in the world maintains a policy that does not extend those rights to all of its citizens? The ugly reality is that some of the soldiers who defend our American democracy do not possess the right to vote by virtue of living in a territory.

To me, it is tragically clear that what the United States is telling these soldiers is that, yes, you must place your life on the line to defend American values. Yes, you must go to a foreign country as a member of the peace-keeping troops. Yes, you must fight, if called to fight, and you may even die, but, no, your opinion does not count because the Congressman that represents you cannot exert the right to vote that may place your life in harm's way.

Last Thursday, I heard many of my colleagues affirm the Congress' power as the sovereign representative of the body of all Americans and was saddened that this representation is not equal for all Americans.

It is not a proud moment for our country when we muzzle American citizens and hold them in abeyance. After all, is this not the reason our troops are going over there? How come we continue to ask them to defend rights that they themselves do not possess despite a century of partnership and 83 years of American citizenship?

Can we as a democratic nation afford to continue to support discrimination, disenfranchisement against the 3.8 million Americans in Puerto Rico? The American soldiers from Puerto Rico and their loved ones commit their lives to the cause of freedom and democracy as willingly and patriotically as any one of their fellow citizens in the 50 States. Should we not affirm their full rights in Congress?

Madam Speaker, I call on all of my colleagues to join us in our quest to eliminate disenfranchisement and discrimination against the American citizens in Puerto Rico. No less is possible and no less can be expected from our democracy.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I wish that I did not have to rise this morning on this topic, and yesterday I am shocked by the emperor's new clothes mentality that engulfs our Nation's Capitol on issues as vital as our national security.

For, indeed, Madam Speaker, from the same crowd who would have us believe that there is another definition

for the word "alone," from the same bunch who would say, well, that depends on what the meaning of "is" is, today, Madam Speaker, we have a new definition of "swiftly".

For according to the weekend talk shows, to hear Secretary of Energy Richardson and National Security Advisor Berger talk, they claim that this administration acted swiftly to try and counteract the intelligence breaches and espionage at our national laboratory at Los Alamos. Yet, this is the same crowd that, in the previous year, in an afternoon was able to clear out the White House Travel Office on a spurious charge of messing with the petty cash drawer, and yet it took this administration 3 long years to react to the first reports of an intelligence breach, Mr. Berger, notified in 1996 of the problem, apparently failing to take action.

Indeed this morning, Madam Speaker, on the front page of the Washington Times the report is as follows, "Security remains weak at U.S. nuclear labs despite the uncovering in 1995 of Chinese espionage efforts, says a recently retired U.S. counterintelligence official. His detailed firsthand knowledge contradicts President Clinton's claims that security has been tight." Quoting now, "Security at the Department of Energy has not improved." This former official told the Washington Times, indeed.

In yesterday's New York Times, columnist Bill Safire asked this question, "Why, if Secretary Bill Richardson were so 'seized of' this secret issue last August when he was named, did he demote the expert, Trulock, and put in charge a CIA man from his UN embassy staff, Larry Sanchez, who knew nothing about the agency's worst problem?"

Safire also writes, "It would be outrageous indeed to suggest that American officials were consciously betraying our national interest. But the confluence of these facts in election year 1996, combined with the urge to disregard or derogate any intelligence that would stop the political blessings of a 'strategic partnership' with China, led to Clinton's denial of a dangerous penetration."

Madam Speaker, indeed, the distinguished senior Senator from my home State, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, in a major foreign policy speech yesterday spoke more on this topic, this curious timing of illegal campaign contributions to the Clinton-Gore campaign in 1996. My senior Senator said, and I quote, "Sadly that charge grows more credible every day. And if it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt it will bring more of history's shame upon the President than his personal failings will, indeed greater shame than any President has ever suffered."

Madam Speaker, we acknowledge the obvious. We acknowledge that, sadly, in this town at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, there are some people who are beyond shame. Madam Speaker, our Vice President who last week