

one of his lead professors was Dr. Madeline Albright's father. He speaks many, many languages. He is seen as a leading authority on Latin America. He teaches in Chile as well as at the University of Portland—in fact, he just came back from there.

I could go through all these things about him, but from a personal point of view he is very special to me. His sister, Marcelle, and I have been married now for 38 years, and he was present when we were married, as were his brother Rene and his father and mother, Phil and Cecile Pomerleau. Phil and Cecile are no longer with us, but I have a feeling they look down in pride at their son this morning, as we all do. He is a teacher, he is a mentor, a brother, a son, a beloved uncle—in our family he has been all of those and more.

He has been a very dear friend to me. I think of what Edward Everett Hale, a former distinguished Senate Chaplain, once said. He was asked:

Do you pray for the Senators, Dr. Hale?

And he said:

No, I look at the Senators and I pray for the country.

I am privileged to have a brother who not only prays for the country, but prays for this Senator. I consider it, in my 26 years here, one of the rarest privileges I have had to be able to see him on the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a comment about Senator LEAHY?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before Senator LEAHY and his brother-in-law leave, I want the good Father to know how much the Senate cares about you and Marcelle. You have expressed so well your feelings about your brother-in-law, but we want you to know how much the entire Senate on both sides of the aisle respects Senator LEAHY and your lovely sister.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2001—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 110) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, what is the time circumstance on this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 12 minutes a side. The time is evenly divided.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the 12 minutes on this side to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think it is important to note the situation escalating in the Mideast as a consequence of the tensions. It is unfortunate it would be at a time when we had hoped there would be an effort to get a firm peace agreement. As a consequence of that, I think it is important to bring to the attention of my colleagues a reality relative to the release of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at the recommendation of Vice President GORE to our President.

As you know, the President did release 30 million barrels of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. This was the largest single release of crude oil from SPR in the 25-year history of the reserve. The administration has claimed this has been a successful effort because the price of oil has dropped. Notwithstanding that, using SPR to manipulate prices is contrary to the law because we have not reauthorized SPR, and of course the success of this is determined in the long term, not the short term.

But I wish to bring to the attention of each and every Member some facts. Since the President made his announcement, there has been no new heating oil placed into the market and no measurable rise in inventories. It may surprise some of you, particularly those in the Northeast, to know that American consumers may, under the current arrangement, never see any of the product refined from the crude oil that we released from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Let me explain why because this is important.

In the arrangement, there was absolutely no requirement that those who successfully bid on crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve needed to refine it into heating oil. They may decide to make gasoline or some other product.

Second, there is absolutely nothing that prevents this product from being shipped to foreign markets, either in its crude form or as a refined product such as heating oil.

Guess what. That is just what is happening. We are shipping heating oil to Europe. Look at the Wall Street Journal this morning. Let me quote:

Europe's market for heating oil is 50 percent bigger than the U.S. heating oil market. Europe's stocks are even tighter and prices there are a few cents a gallon higher, so U.S. refiners have renewed incentive to ship heating oil across the Atlantic. . . . U.S. exports of heating oil to Europe have ballooned nearly six times, in the first 7 months of this year. . . .

That tells the story of the arrangement that the administration made to take the oil out of SPR and increase our heating oil supply. What has happened with it is it is going to Europe. I am not surprised by this, in the sense of the market going to the highest price where it can generate a return. But I am astonished about the claim of the administration and those who support the movement of SPR, and the re-

lease, that it was done because of concerns over supply for the benefit of the American consumer. The American consumer has not benefited. This is a spin being put on by the pundits.

I asked the Secretary of Energy pointblank at a hearing last week:

Is it possible as a result of oil being released from SPR that prices could fall but no new heating oil would find its way into the U.S. heating market?

Do you know what the answer was? It could happen. The irony is that we are going to release oil from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to provide product to a European market. That should not be lost on the American consumer or Members of this body.

Finally, SPR was created for one specific purpose: as a reserve in case our supply, our dependence on OPEC and other countries, is disrupted. We are 58-percent dependent on imported oil. We have a situation in the Mideast. Iraq is claiming Kuwait is stealing its oil, the same claim it made prior to the Persian Gulf war. Kuwait is now claiming Iraq stole oil during the gulf war. The entire Israeli-Palestinian peace process appears, unfortunately, to have fallen apart. All this leads to a reminder that we should not use our petroleum reserve for political purposes, and that appears to be what we have done in this arrangement.

Mr. President, how much time is remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask the Chair to advise me when I have 4 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as a consequence of the focus on energy between our two Presidential candidates, it is very appropriate that we identify differences.

The Vice President has said he has an energy plan that focuses not only on increasing the supply but also on working on the consumption side, but the real facts are the Vice President does not practice what he preaches. Let's look at the record over the last 7½ years.

The administration has opposed domestic oil exploration and production. We have had 17 percent less production since Clinton-Gore took office, and the facts are it decreased the number of oil wells from 136,000 and the number of gas wells has decreased by 57,000. These are wells that have actually been closed since 1992. There has been absolutely no utilization of American coal in coal-fired electric generating plants. We have not built a new plant since 1990.

The difficulty is the Environmental Protection Agency has made it so uneconomic that the industry simply cannot get the permits. We force the nuclear energy to choke on its own waste. We were one vote short in the Senate to pass a veto override. Yet the U.S. Court of Appeals has given the industry a liability case in the Court of

Claims, with a liability to the taxpayers of somewhere between \$40 billion and \$80 billion.

The administration threatens to tear down hydroelectric dams out West. What are we going to do there? We are going to take the traffic off the rivers and put it on the highways. We have ignored electric reliability and supply concerns. Go out to California, particularly San Diego, where they have seen price spikes and brownouts, no new generation, no new transmission. This has happened on the Vice President's watch.

Natural gas prices in the last 10 months have gone from \$2.60 to \$5.40 for delivery. That is the problem we are facing, and that is the record under this administration.

Let's not forget one more thing. The Vice President talks about cutting taxes. The Vice President himself cast the vote in 1993 to raise the gas tax 4.3 cents a gallon. He did not just cast the vote; he broke the tie, and that is the significance of the record with regard to a contribution to increase domestic energy in this country. Instead of doing something to increase domestic oil supply, the Vice President and the administration would rather blame big oil profiteering, and that is ironic. Where was big oil a year ago when oil was selling for \$10 a barrel? Who was profiteering then, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Who sets the price of oil? OPEC.

I thank the Chair and reserve the remainder of our time for Senator STEVENS, who wants to claim that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it seems to me the majority is crying because the price of oil has dropped. The President made a decisive step and said we are going to pump oil from our reserve. Immediately, the price of oil dropped. Today it is below \$30 a barrel. The majority seems so concerned that what the President has done has helped—the price of oil has dropped.

I suggest my friends in the majority talk to the Governor of Texas or maybe the man running for Vice President. They have connections with the oil industry. Maybe they could talk him into not shipping oil overseas if that is, in fact, what is happening. They are crying crocodile tears because what is happening here is good. We laid out in great detail yesterday what this administration has done to lower the price of oil to make sure the economy was in good shape.

I am also continually amazed at what the majority says about the Vice President: He broke the tie, so there is a 4-cent-per-gallon increase in gas; isn't that too bad?

Let's look at the history. Remember, the majority was saying all kinds of bad things would happen. The Republicans were saying all kinds of bad things would happen if, in fact, the

Clinton and Gore budget deficit reduction plan passed. It passed.

Prior to passing, listen to what the Republicans had to say.

CONRAD BURNS:

So we're still going to pile up some more debt. But most of all, we're going to cost jobs in this country.

He was wrong on both counts. There are 22 million new jobs and, of course, the debt is gone.

ORRIN HATCH said:

Make no mistake, this will cost jobs.

Wrong again.

PHIL GRAMM, the Senator from Texas:

I want to predict here tonight that if we adopt this bill, the American economy is going to get weaker, not stronger, and the deficit 4 years from today will be higher than it is today, and not lower. When it is all said and done, people will pay more taxes, the economy will create fewer jobs. Government will spend more money, and the American people will be worse off.

I am not going to go into detail, but we have 300,000 fewer Federal employees than in 1992. We have the lowest unemployment in some 40 years. We have created 22 million jobs. We have a Federal Government today that is smaller than when President Kennedy was President. I think those on the other side should realize, yes, the Vice President did cast a decisive vote, but it was so decisive that it put this country on the road to economic recovery.

I also suggest my friends should stop talking about nuclear waste. We know there is not going to be another nuclear powerplant built in America, but we also recognize that rather than spending time on nuclear waste, why don't they talk about alternative energy—solar, wind, and geothermal?

My friend from Alaska continually talks about energy policy. I respect his opinion, but I continue to believe he is absolutely wrong.

Mrs. BOXER. Will my friend yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to my friend from California from the time we have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend for setting the record straight and for doing such a good job because we do have to remember where we were when the Clinton-Gore administration took office.

In my State, there was suffering; there was no hope; people's dreams were set aside; the economy was in the tank; and there was double-digit unemployment. Today we are in the midst of the greatest economic recovery ever. It dates back to the vote AL GORE cast because he was the deciding vote on that budget. The Republicans predicted gloom and doom, deficits and debt, unemployment and the rest. Let's face it; they were wrong. We do not want to go back to those days of high deficits.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I appreciate the assistant Democratic leader

yielding me time because I want to talk briefly about the Violence Against Women Act, and then I am going to make a unanimous consent request, of which I believe the other side has been made aware.

The Violence Against Women Act, a landmark law that was passed in 1994, has now expired. We have to reauthorize it. It is crucial. It has expired.

Is this an important and worthy act? Yes, it is. Both sides of the aisle agree. We have seen a 21-percent reduction in violence against women. We have seen shelters for battered women and their families built. They have gone up from 1,200 to about 2,000. We see doctors trained to recognize domestic abuse and police men and women trained to recognize domestic abuse. So we are seeing, in the figures, a decrease in the violence.

But we cannot allow this law to die. The point is, it passed the House overwhelmingly. It is a clean bill. But there are political games going on over here. People want to attach all kinds of different things to the Violence Against Women Act. It can stand alone on its own two feet. Senator BIDEN wrote that act a long time ago. When I was in the House, he asked me to carry it. He has been joined by Senator HATCH. They have worked together now on this new reauthorization.

The last point I want to make before making my unanimous consent request is this: It may be called the Violence Against Women Act, but this act directly attacks the problem of children in these homes. We have to realize that children under the age of 12 live in approximately 4 out of 10 homes that experience domestic violence.

We look at Hollywood—and we are critical of what they are doing in terms of the R-rated films shown to kids—but the fact is, there is only one reliable predictor of future violence. If a male child sees one parent beat another parent, he is twice as likely to abuse his own wife as the son of nonviolent parents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes remaining.

Mr. REID. I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. We have a situation where we know if a child sees violence in the home, that child is very likely to repeat that violence. We have to protect these children by stopping the violence.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1248

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 834, H. 1248, an act to prevent violence against women, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator, under my reservation, this bill which has done so much good in the country, has it lapsed?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes. The Violence Against Women Act reauthorization has expired. We can't permit this to continue any longer. The House acted, and well over 400 Members voted to reauthorize it.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator telling me that right now the law is not in effect in our country?

Mrs. BOXER. In essence, the authorization has definitely expired. My friend is right. That is why I make this request in a most urgent fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Reserving the right to object, I rise on behalf of the leader, who is working now with Members on the other side. I do not know of anyone who disagrees with what the Senator from California has said. No one I know of disagrees with the bill. I certainly do not. However, there is a process underway. I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Who yields time?

Time runs equally against both sides.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. How much time is remaining on the minority side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 minutes on the minority side.

Mr. REID. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank Senator REID, once more, for yielding me some time.

I understand the Republican side of the aisle wants to attach different pieces of legislation to the Violence Against Women Act, and that is what is slowing it down. I know they want to see this act go forward. But I have to say to them, there is an easy way to do it.

I am very disappointed we had this objection this morning. We had a beautiful prayer—a beautiful prayer—given by Senator LEAHY's brother-in-law. If you heard what he said, he prayed that we in the Senate could work to do good works—to do good works. I know that is what we all strive to do every single day we get up in the morning. But it seems to me that good work such as the Violence Against Women Act is easy to do. We do not have to use it as a train to which we attach different pieces of legislation.

I see Senator WELLSTONE on the floor. He has worked so hard in the

area of the trafficking of women worldwide. Yes, we have no objection if we marry these two, if you will, pieces of legislation together because they make sense. One is talking about violence at home; one is talking about taking girls and putting them into sex trafficking. And it is a sin upon the world that this happens. We agreed to do this. It could have been done in a minute. We do not need to come on the floor and have a long period of time to discuss this. I am sure the Senator would agree; we could have a few comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I am very disappointed this morning that we haven't been able to do at least one good thing for the women and children of this country, and that is to pass the House bill, the Violence Against Women Act, to get it done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Time runs equally against both sides.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question of my friend from California in the minute we have remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. REID. With all this compassionate conservatism around, do you think it would be good if the Governor of Texas interceded in this matter?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes. I would call on the Governor to intercede with our friends on the other side. He was asked about the Violence Against Women Act on the campaign trail. He was unaware of it. He said he had not heard of it, although Texas has received about \$75 million, and they have built battered women shelters. Then when he studied it, he said he supported it, for which I am very grateful. But this is a golden moment for him.

Since we have passed the bill, I want to say to my friend from Nevada, intimate-partner violence has decreased by 21 percent. Again, we have seen the number of battered women shelters increase by 60 percent. Before there were more animal shelters than there were for women and children. So we should act. I hope my friends will reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the minority has expired.

Who yields time?

Time will run on the majority side.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think we are getting prepared, within a couple minutes now, to have a vote on the continuing resolution. I simply want to rise again to say I do not disagree at all with what the Senator from California is saying. But the fact is, there is a plan. There is a plan to operate under here. The Senate does not simply react because someone gets up and says it is time to do this. There are negotiations going on between the leader and Senators on the other side.

I am sure this will indeed be done. We have a lot of things that need to be

done. I would suggest that we ought to get the whole thing planned a little bit. I am a little surprised that this Senator is talking about objecting to moving forward because I think there have been quite a few objections coming from that side that has gotten us to where we are now. That is not really the point. The point is, we will handle this bill. The leader has prepared to do that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I hope we can now proceed to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 264 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Abraham	Enzi	McConnell
Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Allard	Fitzgerald	Miller
Ashcroft	Frist	Moynihan
Baucus	Gorton	Murkowski
Bayh	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Biden	Grams	Reed
Bingaman	Grassley	Reid
Bond	Gregg	Robb
Boxer	Hagel	Roberts
Breaux	Harkin	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hatch	Roth
Bryan	Hollings	Santorum
Bunning	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Burns	Hutchison	Schumer
Byrd	Inhofe	Sessions
Campbell	Inouye	Shelby
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Kerrey	Snowe
Collins	Kerry	Specter
Conrad	Kohl	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Levin	Torricelli
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Lugar	Wellstone
Durbin	Mack	Wyden
Edwards	McCain	

NAYS—1

Leahy

NOT VOTING—4

Feinstein
Helms

Jeffords
Lieberman

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 110) was passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A conference report to accompany H.R. 4578, an act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE AGENDA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the situation we are in right now is interesting. It is different from any similar period I can recall in nearly 26 years in the Senate. We are at the end of the fiscal year—we have actually gone beyond the end of the fiscal year—and nothing seems to be happening. I voted against the continuing resolution, not because I do not think we should keep the Government going—of course we should; it is unfortunate to close down the Government—but more to express my concern that we are not doing our business.

We have not passed our appropriations bills as we should. We all talk about how we make Government more efficient or how we make Government better. But imagine if you are running one of these Agencies or one of these Departments and you have to make the decisions for the year, and Congress, which has a mandate under law to pass the appropriations bills by September 30, we are here on October 5 and are nowhere near completing the bills.

Yet in a Congress that spends more time investigating than legislating, we are perfectly willing to have investiga-

tions and actually bring a lot of these Departments to a halt while we ask them question after question, even if the questions have already been asked, and yet we are unwilling to do our own work on time. It is not the way it can be done, and it is not the way it should be done.

I strongly urge Senators to consider next year when we come back, no matter who wins the Presidency, no matter who wins seats in the Senate or in the other body, that we spend more time trying to do things that actually help the country, that we set aside some of the partisanship and bitterness that has marked this Senate actually since impeachment time, which in itself was marked by partisanship when impeachment was rushed through in a lame duck House of Representatives and then passed over to this body. It appears in many ways we lost our footing at that time and never got back on course.

There are bills that have bipartisan support. There was one I was discussing on the floor a few minutes ago with the distinguished Senator from Colorado, the Campbell-Leahy bulletproof vest bill. This is a bill that provides money for bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers.

Senator CAMPBELL and I served in law enforcement before we came to Congress. We served at a time when much of law enforcement did not face the danger it does now, but we kept enough of our ties to law enforcement and so we know how difficult it is. We know that the men and women we send out to protect all of us are themselves so often the victims of the same criminals from whom they try to protect us.

Bulletproof vests are a \$500 or \$600 item. They wear out in 5 years. A lot of departments, especially small departments in States such as Vermont or rural areas like Texas, cannot afford these vests. I have letters from hundreds of law enforcement people from around the country who tell me that under the original Campbell-Leahy bill, they finally have a sense of security because they have bulletproof vests. We want to extend that for a couple more years. Yet we cannot even get a vote on it.

This is a bill which, if it is brought to a vote in this Chamber, I am willing to bet virtually every Senator, Republican and Democrat, will vote for. How can one vote against it? Yet there has been one hold on the Republican side of the aisle, and we cannot bring up this vital law enforcement piece of legislation.

I wanted to be sure—I am hearing from law enforcement agencies all across the country: Why can't you pass it?—so I actually made the point of checking with all 46 Democratic Senators: Do any of you have any objection to voting on this on a second's notice? They said: No, pass it by unanimous consent, if you want.

I ask whoever is holding it up on the other side not to continue to hold it up.

Mr. President, I return to ask the Republican leadership what is holding up enactment of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000? This is a bill I introduced with Senator CAMPBELL and others last April. The Senate Judiciary Committee considered and reported the bill unanimously to the full Senate back in June. I have since been working to get Senate consideration, knowing that it will pass overwhelmingly if not unanimously.

Unfortunately, an anonymous "hold" on the Republican side prevented enactment before the Senate recessed in July. I have been unable to discover which Republican Senator opposes the bill or why, and that remains true today.

We have been working for several months to pass the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000. It has been cleared by all Democratic Senators.

That it has still not passed the full Senate is very disappointing to me, as I am sure that it is to our nation's law enforcement officers, who need life-saving bulletproof vests to protect themselves. Protecting and supporting our law enforcement community should not be a partisan issue.

Senator CAMPBELL and I worked together closely and successfully in the last Congress to pass the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998 into law. This year's bill reauthorizes and extends the successful program that we helped create and that the Department of Justice has done such a good job implementing.

I have charts here that show how successful the Bulletproof Vests Grant Program has been for individual states. In its first year of operation in 1999, the program funded the purchase of 167,497 vests with \$23 million in federal grant funds.

For the State of Alabama, the program funded the purchase of 2,287 bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers in 1999. For the State of California, the program funded the purchase of 28,106 bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers in 1999. For the State of Colorado, the program funded the purchase of 1,844 bulletproof vests for police officers in 1999.

For the State of Idaho, the program funded the purchase of 711 bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers in 1999. For the State of Michigan, the program funded the purchase of 2,932 bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers in 1999. For the State of Minnesota, the program funded the purchase of 1,052 bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers in 1999. For the State of Mississippi, the program funded the purchase of 1,283 bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers in 1999. For the State of Missouri, the program funded the purchase of 2,919 bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers in 1999.