

later, we got 12 more boxes of documents, and then we found out about the White House videotapes.

Ever since this investigation has gone on, they have tried to drag it out and drag it out and drag it out to keep us from getting at the facts; and we have to deal with that. They drag it out, and then they blame us for taking so long. They keep information from us, and then they blame us for taking so long. They try to keep us from talking to witnesses that want to talk to us, and then they blame us for taking too long.

The four witnesses that he voted against last week for immunity have been approved for immunity by the President's Justice Department, and yet all 19 Democrats voted to obstruct our investigation by not allowing that immunity to take place, even though the President's own Attorney General okayed us getting that immunity, and that is because they are trying to protect this administration and block every single thing that we are trying to accomplish.

Now, they said we have not accomplished anything, that this has been a waste of the taxpayers' money and time.

Let me just go through a few things.

The Democrat National Committee has returned \$3 million in illegal foreign contributions that would not have been returned had it not been for the investigations that have taken place. Do we want the Chinese government giving campaign contributions to people running for president in this country? Do we want them to have influence over our foreign policy or our defense policy? I think not. And yet millions of dollars in illegal foreign contributions have come into this country to the DNC and to the President's legal defense fund and been returned, but only because of the investigation we caught him and we had to send it back.

We had White House coffees where they were raising money, where they were renting out the Lincoln bedroom, doing all kinds of things to try to raise money in addition to taking money from foreign sources.

The White House had people running in and out of there who were known drug dealers. Jorge Cabrera was in to meet with the President on a number of occasions. Wang Jun, a convicted drug dealer; Grigory Louchansky, another felon, had access to the President of the United States.

Charlie Trie, one of the President's best friends in Little Rock, was indicted. He fled the country, took the fifth amendment. He finally came back. We had to force that issue.

John Huang, a personal friend of the President who ran the Worthen Bank in Little Rock, Arkansas, a part of the Riady group, John Huang has taken the fifth, but we understand now he is willing to, with limited immunity, talk to us.

But the Democrats will not help us to get the immunity we need to have

these people talk, and why do they do that? Because they do not want those people to talk. They do not want the American people to know the fact about these illegal contributions and how foreign entities were buying influence in this government. They do not want the people to know that, because it is explosive and we are bent, hell bent, to get to the bottom of it and to get the facts out.

Because the American people have a right to know if their government is for sale, if their foreign policy is for sale, if their defense capability is for sale. And, if it is, those who are responsible need to be brought to justice, and that is what we are all about.

Now people, like my colleague from California, keep trying to defend their position. It is indefensible, and we are going to stay after until we get the facts out and get the truth out.

TAXPAYERS FORCED TO FUND PARTISAN INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I yield to Mr. WAXMAN from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to make it very clear what has been happening in this investigation. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) has unlimited and unprecedented authority. He can unilaterally issue subpoenas, he can force people in for depositions, he can make people give up information, and then he can also disclose anything he wants to the press. His staff can leak it to the right press people to get the maximum story, and then get their spin on it. Democrats have never been in a position to stop their investigation, to hinder it in any way. They do not even ask us what to do, they just go ahead and do it. The only time we have any say on anything is when there is a question of immunity.

Now, we hear the Speaker and the chairman of the committee coming to the House floor to complain that we are stopping their investigation. Well, the fact of the matter is that after over a year and a half, they have asked, through depositions and otherwise, for information about Democratic campaign abuses, and they have received over 1 million and a half pages regarding Democrats. They have gone after Democrats, at taxpayers' expense, doing research for opposition campaign purposes. This is what this is all about. It is a government-funded Republican campaign to smear Democrats. It is not a legitimate investigation about campaign finance abuses.

These people, by the way, who are complaining today are the same ones who did not want us to have campaign finance reform even considered by the

House, until they were forced by some of their own Members to bring it up.

Madam Speaker, I want to point out that this Burton committee has been incompetent. They have blundered, these are not just my statements. I want to read the statements, a series of editorials from the New York Times. The New York Times called it a "parody of a reputable investigation", useless and unprofessional, and a "rogue operation". The Washington Post earlier last year already noted the "investigation runs the risk of becoming its own cartoon, a joke, and a deserved embarrassment". The Los Angeles Times called it a "partisan sideshow". The former chief counsel, the Republican chief counsel of the committee, quit last year, and he said, he was unable to conduct an investigation that complied with the standards of professional conduct that he had been accustomed to when he was in the U.S. Attorney's Office. He resigned because he said this whole investigation was incompetent and unprofessional.

Madam Speaker, they have blundered, they have handled it in a partisan way, they have handled it incompetently, and what do they do? They come to the House floor and want to point fingers. They want to blame everybody but themselves. They want to point a finger at the administration, they want to point a finger at me, they want to point a finger at the Democrats, for their incompetence and their blunders.

Oh, how I wish we really had a fair investigation. We pleaded with the Republicans, let us do a fair investigation. I even wrote an editorial in the New York Times, suggesting that if it helped, we ought to appoint some independent investigator to look at the Clinton administration issues, so we could then look at Democrats and Republicans in a fair way. We were told to forget it. They had the subpoena power, they had the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to spend; they were going to do what they want to do, and that is what they have been doing for the last year and a half. It has been a series of embarrassments for them, and now, to get out of that, they are saying that we should go along and help them with immunity.

They can send this investigation to another committee. They can go to the Committee on House Oversight chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) where they have stacked it so they have two-thirds of the vote, and they can vote immunity, and then Chairman THOMAS can do the investigation. Fine. If that is what the Republicans want to do, send it to another committee. It could not get any worse. It could not get any worse if they had somebody else trying to do this investigation.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), is just not the person for the job. We do not put somebody in to investigate

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