

grant immunity to some of these witnesses who know firsthand what happened. Why do some Members want to block a full investigation? The Justice Department agreed to immunity for every witness on whom we voted. The Justice Department had no objection.

The only reason to vote against immunity is to keep those witnesses from telling the American people what happened. Why would some Members want to be involved in covering up that? The Members should stop voting to block immunity and stop putting up roadblocks so we can get to the truth. The American people deserve the truth. The American people have the right to know what happened and who was responsible.

DOES OUR CHINESE FOREIGN POLICY MAKE ANY SENSE?

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to China, the wheel is turning but the hamster is dead. Check this out. China rips us off for \$60 billion a year. Then they steal our nuclear and missile technology. Then they sell that technology and those missiles to our enemies. Then the White House, they panic, and they spend billions of dollars to protect America from Chinese missiles pointed at us by our enemies, missiles that were financed by American dollars.

□ 1015

Unbelievable.

Some of these foreign policy gurus must have fallen into the gene pool when the lifeguard was not looking, my colleagues.

If this is a policy, I am a fashion leader.

I want to say one last thing: I want to yield back any national security we have left, and if this policy with China makes any sense, then we all need a lobotomy.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULSHOF). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

DEMOCRATS STONEWALLING THEIR OWN JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight would like to grant immunity to Nancy Lee, Larry Wong, Irene

Wu and Kent La and get their testimony so that Congress can learn the facts about illegal campaign contributions in the 1996 presidential election. The Justice Department does not oppose the granting of immunity to these four key witnesses, but the Democrats on the committee refuse, refuse to grant immunity to these four witnesses.

How can this be defended? It cannot. This is the same people who cry partisanship whenever any investigation into the allegations of wrongdoing are investigated and the same people who are not only defending the White House stonewalling but now stonewalling their own Justice Department.

I must grant the Democrats this, they really do know how to play hardball, but this is the same people who have tried to destroy the reputations of Judge Robert Bork and Judge Clarence Thomas and now Judge Ken Starr are now the same people who stand silent and motionless in the face of massive evidence of White House stonewalling and round-the-clock spin.

Stop the stalling and stop the spin so the American people can get to the truth.

LISTEN TO THE VOTERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be here with my daughter for a day, Demika, who is a student at Brown Middle School; and I am here this morning because I wanted us to have a reasonable debate, Mr. Speaker, on this very important question of vouchers in schools.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important that we are reasonable because, if we are not reasonable, then we do not help those young people who, in fact, need to be educated. When one of our colleagues across the aisle compares public school education to communism, then we are unreasonable.

When the schools in D.C., private schools, cost on an average \$12,000, a \$2,000 voucher is not going to happen and not going to help children. In fact, it is \$3,200. Only 2,000 children are going to be able to be helped. This drains money from our public school system.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia has already voted against vouchers; and if I was to ask those in the District of Columbia, I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, they would ask us to help them educate their children, help them support public schools. I would ask that we listen to the voters of the District of Columbia and not vote for D.C. vouchers.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members of the House are reminded it is a

violation of House rules to call attention in debate to any guests of the House in the Chamber.

WHY ARE THE DEMOCRATS STONEWALLING THEIR OWN JUSTICE DEPARTMENT?

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, Democrats are saying the American people are tired of talking about White House scandals. Well, congressional investigators are even more tired of the stonewalling, lack of cooperation and extraordinary memory loss that seems to afflict Harvard and Yale Law School graduates whenever they are called to testify. I believe the American people are stunned by the evasions, the retractions, the utter devotion to spin over truth coming out of this White House.

Mr. Speaker, it is Democrats on the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight who are doing the stonewalling. Letters from the Justice Department say, and it has been said already, that Justice does not oppose granting immunity to four key witnesses in the campaign finance investigations, and I will just repeat that. The Justice Department does not oppose immunity, and yet the Democrats on the committee refuse to grant immunity.

I ask the American people to be the judge. Why would the Democrats be stonewalling their own Justice Department?

SHAMEFUL CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED

(Mr. HINCHEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, in the last several days, the Speaker of this House has launched an intemperate prejudicial attack on the President of the United States, demeaning himself and the office he holds by prejudging issues that may, in fact, come before this House. One can only conclude by these intemperate actions that the Speaker's basic intention is to draw attention away from the failure, his failure and the failure of the Republican leadership to address important issues that are of deep concern to the American people.

Yesterday, we learned that the Speaker personally made it impossible to reach a bipartisan agreement on a broad-based tobacco bill. He, in effect, told the chairman of the Committee on Commerce that he could no longer cooperate with Democrats to put together a bill that would make it difficult for children to become addicted to tobacco, demonstrating once again how deeply into the pockets of tobacco this Speaker actually is.