

been repeated time and time again by the Democrats and it is false. The tapes were not altered.

Once the tapes were made public, reporters were allowed to listen to and record the appropriate sections of the tapes in their entirety. These sections included the statements about Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Hubbell that have been complained about. How can anyone argue that there was an intent to deceive when reporters were allowed to listen to the comments I have been accused of deleting?

Finally, in an effort to end once and for all these charges of selective editing, I have released the tapes of these 50 conversations in their entirety, even though I did not want to because there is personal stuff in there that I did not think should be in the public domain, but the integrity of the investigation had to be maintained.

What I find most unfortunate is that this incident has detracted from the important facts about the Hubbell tapes that it appears that Mr. Hubbell and his wife were under a great deal of pressure to keep their mouths shut. This is something that absolutely must be investigated. It is something that the American people absolutely have a right to know. She felt she was being squeezed by the White House, and he felt he had to roll over one more time. He had to roll over one more time.

And when we have over 90 people fleeing the country or taking the fifth amendment, we have to wonder if Mr. Hubbell is only one of a number that are scared to talk, that are afraid to say anything because of pressure from the White House.

This brings us to tomorrow's committee meeting. Tomorrow we will try to break through this stone wall one more time by granting immunity to four witnesses. The Justice Department has agreed to immunity. The Justice Department has agreed to immunity. They have been thoroughly consulted. The Justice Department has already immunized two of these witnesses themselves. There is no reason to oppose immunity. Yet 19 Democrats on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight voted in lock step against immunity. They voted to prevent these witnesses from telling the truth to the American people.

I want to tell the American people a little bit about who these witnesses are. Two of these witnesses were employees of Johnny Chung. They were involved in his conduit contribution schemes, bringing money from illegal sources into the DNC. They were involved in setting up many of his meetings at the White House and with other government officials.

Kent La is a very important witness. He is a business associate of Ted Sioeng, one of the people that had fled the country. He is the U.S. distributor of Red Pagoda Mountain cigarettes. Ted Sioeng has a major stake in these cigarettes. This is the best selling brand of cigarettes in China. This com-

pany is owned by the Communist Chinese Government. It is the third largest cigarette selling in the world. This company is owned by the Chinese Government, and it is a convenient way to funnel money into campaigns in the United States by Ted Sioeng, Kent La, and others.

Ted Sioeng and his associates gave \$400,000 in contributions to the Democrat National Committee. Of that amount, Kent La gave \$50,000. Was that money from Red Pagoda cigarettes from the Chinese Communist Government? We need to find out. The American people have a right to know.

Every witness that we have spoken to says that "If you want to understand Ted Sioeng, you have got to talk to Kent La." And that is one of the people we want to talk to, but we have to get immunity for him first. Kent La has invoked the fifth amendment. He will not testify without immunity. But the Democrats on our committee will not grant him immunity. The Democrats have voted to block immunity. I cannot, for the life of me, understand why they want to do that.

This is not a partisan issue. Ted Sioeng did not just give money to Democrats, he gave to both sides. He gave \$150,000 to Republican causes as well as the Democrats. So this is not a partisan issue with Kent La and Ted Sioeng. It seems very clear that most of this half a million dollars donated by Ted Sioeng and his associates came from profits of selling Chinese cigarettes around the world. Kent La is the one individual who can tell us if this is true or not. I do not understand why my colleagues want to keep this witness from testifying and protect a major Communist Chinese cigarette company, especially when the gentleman from California, who has been such a forceful advocate of reducing smoking here in the United States, is one of those voting against immunity.

We have a number of good members on my committee on both sides of the aisle. I think we have conscientious members, both Democrat and Republican, who are outraged by some of the things that have happened during the last election. I hope all of my colleagues are thinking long and hard about their votes, and I hope that they will reconsider and support immunity tomorrow.

Now, in conclusion, I have tried throughout this discussion to try to make clear to the American people and my colleagues that this is an investigation that has faced countless obstacles, stone walls. We have faced obstruction from the White House. We have faced stalling from the Democrat National Committee. We have faced non-cooperation from foreign governments. We have had over 90 people take the fifth amendment or flee the country because they did not want to testify because of criminal activity.

However, we will continue. There are very serious allegations of crimes that have been committed, and the Amer-

ican people have a right to know. I hope that tomorrow we will start to tear down the stone wall by granting immunity to these four witnesses and getting on with the investigation. None of this should be covered up. The American people have a very clear right to know if our government was compromised. They have a right to know if foreign contributions influenced our foreign policy, if it endangered our national defense. These are things the American people have a right to know, and we are going to do our dead level best to make sure they get that right and they get to know it.

PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF CAMPAIGN REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, the leadership issued a statement committing that campaign reform legislation would be brought to the floor and fully debated under an open rule permitting substitutes amendments. The statement provided that the base bill would be H.R. 2183, the bipartisan freshman bill.

The leadership statement further provided that substitutes would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to consideration of the legislation.

While the Committee on Rules will not actually vote on a rule until next week, it is necessary to lay the ground work in order to carry out the commitment by the Republican leadership.

Since the House will not be conducting business on either this Friday or next Monday, any Member who has an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the campaign reform bill should submit it for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the close of business this Thursday, May 14. That is two days from now, two full days.

At the same time, a brief explanation of the substitute should be submitted to the Committee on Rules so that the Committee on Rules will be able to compile a list of all the substitutes that are filed and make those available to the public. Filing substitutes this Thursday means that Members who want to offer perfecting, second degree, amendments to those substitutes will have time to prepare them.

□ 1715

Under an open amending process, any Member may offer any perfecting amendment that complies with the rules of the House to any of the substitutes; that means any germane amendment.

If any Member wants to offer a perfecting amendment which does not comply with the rules of the House to any of these substitutes, that means any nongermane amendment, then they are going to have to submit that

by noon on Tuesday, May 19, to the Committee on Rules in my office upstairs.

May 19 is the next day the House will be conducting business after the filing of those substitutes, but it is actually 5 calendar days after the filing of those substitutes. This should allow sufficient time for preparation of perfecting amendments.

I want to stress that only the perfecting amendments to be filed with the Committee on Rules are those which do not comply with the rules. So if Members have perfecting amendments that are germane, you do not have to file them, although it might be a good idea to receive priority recognition if they were to file those with the desk. But if they are nongermane to those substitutes, then you should file 55 copies with my Committee on Rules upstairs by May 19.

I would hope that there would be very few of those. Perfecting amendments which do comply with the rules, again, in the House do not need to be filed with the Committee on Rules.

I hope Members will call the Committee on Rules to get a clarification of what I just said. It is very important.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO HAVE DIED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 422) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that law enforcement officers who have died in the line of duty should be honored, recognized, and remembered for their great sacrifice.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 422

Whereas law enforcement officers work daily in communities across the Nation, assisting individuals in the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness;

Whereas law enforcement officers are, most often, the first contact individuals have with their representatives of government, and they perform the duties and responsibilities of that important liaison role with wisdom and compassion;

Whereas law enforcement officers are expected to perform duties above and beyond those of the average person, including duties such as rescuing individuals from a multitude of life-threatening incidents and assisting families during times of great personal sorrow;

Whereas law enforcement officers engage in a variety of tasks, from visiting with home-bound elderly citizens, mediating domestic disputes, and providing counsel to youngsters on our streets, to retrieving lost pets and bringing a spirit of friendship and compassion to an environment often lacking in these essential qualities;

Whereas law enforcement officers daily encounter individuals within our society who reject all moral values and ethical codes of conduct in pursuit of criminal activities;

Whereas law enforcement officers risk their health, lives, and future happiness with their families in order to safeguard communities from criminal predation;

Whereas in the course of their duties, law enforcement officers may find themselves not only in harm's way, but also victims of violent crime; and

Whereas 159 law enforcement officers throughout the country lost their lives in the performance of their duty in 1997, and more than 14,000 men and women have made that supreme sacrifice to date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the contributions made by law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty should be honored, their dedication and sacrifice recognized, and their unselfish service to the Nation remembered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution being considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, police officers who have died in the line of duty sacrifice not only their own lives, but the lives of their spouses, children, parents, and friends. In fact, the whole community suffers the loss when a police officer dies.

H. Res. 422 expresses the sense of Congress that contributions made by law enforcement officers should be honored, and their unselfish service to the Nation should be remembered.

Mr. Speaker I could not agree more, and I believe we in Congress should go even further. That is why on Thursday in this week, the Subcommittee on Crime will hold a hearing to specifically highlight acts of heroism and valor by police officers who engage in such acts as a matter of their official duties.

Following this hearing, I expect to introduce legislation to honor our Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers by creating a national medal to recognize their acts of bravery. Mr. Speaker, many other countries have such a medal, and I believe the United States is sorely lacking in this regard.

Our police officers are at war every day against criminal elements which threaten the sanctity and security of this country. A national medal is the least which we in Congress can do to thank them for their sacrifices.

I am proud to support this resolution that is before us today, and I hope that many Members who support this bill will cosponsor the legislation produced shortly, creating the medal for public safety heroism by our officers.

I must say the resolution that we are here to debate today is exemplary. The

gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), my good friend who has been so instrumental in this, I want to commend him in bringing this forward.

I think it is an exceedingly important matter for us to dedicate this week when we have a special law enforcement service that, every year, we have to honor those who have given their lives and have been slain in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time for the proponents of H. Res. 422.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. We have heard a lot of talk this year about the falling crime rate. Violent crime is down more than 16 percent in the past 5 years. We are very pleased with that, of course, across this country. This is a remarkable accomplishment.

I might observe that many of us believe that the President's crime program and community policing have contributed to that result. But in the midst of celebrating, we must not forget the terrible price paid by the people most responsible for this achievement, police officers.

We at the Federal level talk a lot about law enforcement, about crime, and about bringing down the crime rates in this country, but we know full well that it is not at the Federal level that we fight crime, not even, frankly, primarily at the State level, but the local level, at the municipal level.

There were 159 police officers, Mr. Speaker, killed in the line of duty just last year; 159. The even worse news is this number was a huge increase from 1996, during which there were 116 line-of-duty fatalities. It is clear that it is getting more dangerous to protect the rights of citizens in this country.

I believe this resolution is absolutely correct. It honors those law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice, who have, in Lincoln's word, given their last full measure of devotion to the cause of protecting the rest of us from harm. For that devotion, the police officers of this country have earned the undying gratitude of their fellow Americans.

Just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, we considered a bill to provide more bulletproof vests for officers. That is a crucial initiative, and I hope it will be signed into law within the month. But even with those vests, even with those vests, police officers will still have to walk out of the door each morning prepared, if necessary, to put their lives at risk in the name of justice, to put their lives at risk in the name of peace and good order, to put their lives at risk so that others of us might have safer schools, safer neighborhoods, safer