

changed in the past year. The poverty level for a family of three is currently \$13,330 annually. Sixty-seven percent of emergency client households have a yearly income of \$10,000 or less. Wanda, an emergency food client and mother of two, says, "My husband works but at the end of the month we just run out of money. I wouldn't know what to do if it weren't for the food pantry." For millions of American families, low wage jobs or inadequate government assistance are not sufficient to provide a family's basic nutritional needs.

HOW LONG HAVE PEOPLE DEPENDED ON EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE?

The study shows that most people seeking assistance are in a temporary hunger crisis and are not long-term dependents. Forty-four percent of Second Harvest clients have received food and grocery products for six months or less; eighteen percent for less than month.

WHAT ABOUT GOVERNMENT RESOURCES?

Food stamps. Forty-one percent of emergency food clients receive food stamps, 79 percent of those receiving food stamps say that they do not last through the end of the month. Eleven percent of food-stamp clients polled say their benefits have been discontinued, and 20 percent have seen a decrease in benefits. Of the clients not currently receiving food stamps, 40 percent have applied and are awaiting approval for benefits.

Sixty-four percent of client households with children participate in School Breakfast and Lunch programs, 31 percent of emergency clients with children participate in the Special Supplement Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC). Twenty-one percent of emergency clients with children participate in the Child- and Adult-Care Food Programs, and/or Summer Food Program.

Ninety-two percent of Second Harvest families with children receive no government assistance for daycare.

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

Twenty-eight percent of adults seeking food assistance have missed meals in the last month because there wasn't enough food, and (call out) 9% of clients' children have missed meals in the past month.*

"It's criminal that we live in a country that will allow a child to go hungry," says Rick Ellenberger, an elementary school teacher in Orlando. "Studies show that if children are not ready to learn by the time they are five or six years old, we've lost them."

The growing body of medical evidence shows that even short periods of under-nutrition can affect a child's behavior, cognitive development, and future productivity. "Children make up about one-third of our population, but they make up 100 percent of our future as a nation," states Dr. Joseph Zanga, President, American Academy of Pediatrics. "What opportunities have we lost because a child was not nourished properly? A scientist who discovers a cure for cancer? A politician or statesman who brings lasting peace to the world?"

HEALTH

Twenty-eight percent of emergency clients have had to choose between medical care or filling prescriptions and buying food. Thirty-seven percent have delayed medical care because they couldn't afford it. Thirty-six percent of emergency clients report that members of their household are in poor health, and 41 percent of the clients have unpaid medical or hospital bills. "My husband is so

frail that I must stay home and take care of him and the children," says Martina, whose husband is disabled due to being robbed and shot while leaving his job. Although the family receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and food stamps, it is not enough to support a family of four.

HOUSING

Thirty-five percent of people seeking assistance have had to choose between buying food and paying their rent or mortgage. And, 15.8 percent of emergency food clients are homeless, another 5 percent are living in marginal housing, such as living with friends. Stanley, a disabled caretaker whose partner works at a motel, says, "If it wasn't for the food pantry, we would starve at the end of the month. We pay the rent and utilities first and from then on it's a day-to-day existence."

America is the richest country in the world. And, yet tonight thousands of your neighbors will go to bed hungry. It may be your child's schoolmate who is under-nourished and has difficulty learning on an empty stomach. Or, it could be a co-worker, a working mother whose low-wage job doesn't make ends meet. Perhaps it's an elderly neighbor who has to make a decision whether to delay filling a prescription or buying groceries. "The faces of hunger are as broad and diverse as the faces of America," explained David Nasby, Director, Community Affairs, General Mills, Inc., and chair of the Second Harvest Board of Directors. "It may be the neighbor down the street who has encountered a tough situation or the child who is estranged from a parent. It's everybody. People you know and would never think hunger would touch. These personal low points have an impact on every single community."

Despite an economy that is thriving, unemployment is at a 30 year low, and a stock market that continues to reach historic highs, more than 21 million people in this country seek emergency food assistance through Second Harvest network at least part of the year. These startling statistics include eight million children, and more than three-and-a-half million elderly.

"Hunger 1997: The Faces & Facts" does not attempt to simplify a complex social issue. Instead, it is Second Harvest's hope that this research study will establish a clearer picture of hunger in America and its effects on all of us. No single strategy, tactic or program can solve the problem. It takes a combined effort of community involvement, government action, and charitable service to effect a solution.

Second Harvest's research shows the need is urgent. With its network of certified affiliate food banks comprising the largest domestic hunger-relief system in the country, the data collected for "Hunger 1997: The Faces & Facts" has contributed to the most comprehensive analysis of charitable hunger-relief efforts ever conducted on a broad, national scale.

"Hunger 1997: The Faces & Facts" research study was funded with generous grants from: The Aspen Institute Nonprofit Sector Research Fund; Chicago Tribune Holiday Fund; J. Willard Marriott Foundation; Mazon; A Jewish Response to Hunger; Nabisco Foundation; Sara Lee Foundation; Share Our Strength; and W.K. Kellogg Foundation. ●

NATIONAL BREAST CANCER SURVIVOR'S DAY

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise in support of the resolution designating April 1, 1998 as "National Breast Cancer Survivor's Day."

It is only proper, Mr. President, that we should set aside a day to honor the brave women and men who have survived this dread disease, which causes pain, suffering and even death for so many Americans.

Every year, Mr. President, 178,700 women and 1,600 men in the United States are stricken with breast cancer. Each of us must live with the knowledge that 1 in 9 American women will suffer from breast cancer in her lifetime. That means that virtually all of us will either be stricken by breast cancer or know someone who is.

I know in my case, Mr. President, I lost my mother to breast cancer some years ago. It was a painful experience for all of our friends and family as well as my mother herself. The pain caused by this dread disease is intense for everyone involved, and we must do everything in our power to eradicate this scourge.

Thankfully, Mr. President, we have made some progress in our battle with breast cancer. The 5 year survival rate for breast cancer victims has risen to 97 percent in cases of early detection.

Medical advances have helped more women are surviving breast cancer. Just as important, however, has been the fact that we as a nation are doing a better job of telling women about their options, and of emphasizing the importance of self-examination and regular visits to the doctor.

This is one reason, Mr. President, why I believe it is important that we honor breast cancer survivors in the manner called for by this resolution. By bringing breast cancer survivors together here in Washington, DC and elsewhere around the country, we can celebrate survivorship and publicize, not just the tragedy of breast cancer, but also the hope that is provided by research and early detection.

We need to get the message out that there are things women can do for themselves in the fight against breast cancer. We need to highlight the effectiveness of early detection and show our respect for the courage of women who have faced this disease and lived.

We have a long way to go, Mr. President, before we win our battle with breast cancer. But research, early detection and programs to make Americans aware of their options in dealing with the possibility of breast cancer all can help.

I salute the women of American who have faced breast cancer, along with the families and friends who have supported them during their time of trial, and I hope that all of us can join together, not only to mourn those who lost their battle with breast cancer, but also to honor those who have fought that battle and survived. ●

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1998

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 315, S. 1605.

*The United States Current Population Survey (CPS) defines this situation as "food insecure with severe hunger."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
A bill (S. 1605) to establish a matching grant program to help States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to purchase armor vests for use by law enforcement officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets, and the part of the bill intended to be inserted is shown in italic.)

S. 1605

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the number of law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty would significantly decrease if every law enforcement officer in the United States had the protection of an armor vest while performing their hazardous duties;

(2) the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates that more than 30 percent of the almost 1,182 law enforcement officers killed by a firearm in the line of duty could have been saved if they had been wearing body armor;

(3) the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates that the risk of fatality to law enforcement officers while not wearing an armor vest is 14 times higher than for officers wearing an armor vest;

(4) the Department of Justice estimates that approximately 150,000 State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers, nearly 25 percent, are not issued body armor;

(5) the Executive Committee for Indian Country Law Enforcement Improvements reports that violent crime in Indian country has risen sharply, despite decreases in the national crime rate, and has concluded that there is a "public safety crisis in Indian country"; and

(6) many State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, especially those in smaller communities and rural jurisdictions, need assistance in order to provide body armor for their officers.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to save lives of law enforcement officers by helping State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies provide those officers with armor vests.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ARMOR VEST.**—The term "armor vest" means body armor that has been tested through the voluntary compliance testing program operated by the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and found to comply with the requirements of NIJ Standard 0101.03, or any subsequent revision of that standard.

(2) **BODY ARMOR.**—The term "body armor" means any product sold or offered for sale as personal protective body covering intended to protect against gunfire, stabbing, or other physical harm.

(3) **DIRECTOR.**—The term "Director" means the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the Department of Justice.

(4) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term "Indian tribe" has the same meaning as in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)).

(5) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term "law enforcement officer" means any officer, agent, or employee of a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law, or authorized by law to supervise sentenced criminal offenders.

(6) **STATE.**—The term "State" means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(7) **UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term "unit of local government" means a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level.

SEC. 4. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) **GRANT AUTHORIZATION.**—The Director may make grants to States, units of local government, and Indian tribes in accordance with this Act to purchase armor vests for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers.

(b) **APPLICATIONS.**—Each State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe seeking to receive a grant under this section shall submit to the Director an application, in such form and containing such information as the Director may reasonably require.

(c) **USES OF FUNDS.**—Grant awards under this section shall be—

(1) distributed directly to the State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe; and

(2) used for the purchase of armor vests for law enforcement officers in the jurisdiction of the grantee.

(d) **PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Director may give preferential consideration, where feasible, to applications from jurisdictions that—

(1) have a violent crime rate at or above the national average, as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(2) have not been providing each law enforcement officer assigned to patrol or other hazardous duties with body armor.

(e) **MINIMUM AMOUNT.**—Unless all applications submitted by any State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe for a grant under this section have been funded, each State, together with grantees within the State (other than Indian tribes), shall be allocated in each fiscal year under this section not less than 0.75 percent of the total amount appropriated in the fiscal year for grants pursuant to this section, except that the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands shall each be allocated 0.25 percent.

[(f) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—A State, together with grantees within the State (other than Indian tribes), may not receive more than 5 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section.]

(f) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—A qualifying State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe may not receive more than 5 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section, except that a State, together with the grantees within the State may not receive more than 20 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section.

(g) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—The portion of the costs of a program provided by a grant under this section may not exceed 50 percent, unless the Director determines a case of fiscal

hardship and waives, wholly or in part, the requirement under this subsection of a non-Federal contribution to the costs of a program.

(h) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—Not less than 50 percent of the funds awarded under this section in each fiscal year shall be allocated to units of local government, or Indian tribes, having jurisdiction over areas with populations of 100,000 or less.

(i) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—Grants under this section may be used to reimburse law enforcement officers who have previously purchased body armor with personal funds during a period in which body armor was not provided by the State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe.

SEC. 5. APPLICATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall promulgate regulations to carry out this Act, which shall set forth the information that must be included in each application under section 4(b) and the requirements that States, units of local government, and Indian tribes must meet in order to receive a grant under section 4.

SEC. 6. PROHIBITION OF PRISON INMATE LABOR.

Any State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe that receives financial assistance provided using funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may not purchase equipment or products manufactured using prison inmate labor.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

In the case of any equipment or product authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act, it is the sense of Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003 to carry out this Act.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be agreed to.

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, as amended; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1605) was considered read the third time and passed, as amended, as follows:

S. 1605

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the number of law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty would significantly decrease if every law enforcement officer in the United States had the protection of an armor vest while performing their hazardous duties;

(2) the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates that more than 30 percent of the almost 1,182 law enforcement officers killed by

a firearm in the line of duty could have been saved if they had been wearing body armor;

(3) the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates that the risk of fatality to law enforcement officers while not wearing an armor vest is 14 times higher than for officers wearing an armor vest;

(4) the Department of Justice estimates that approximately 150,000 State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers, nearly 25 percent, are not issued body armor;

(5) the Executive Committee for Indian Country Law Enforcement Improvements reports that violent crime in Indian country has risen sharply, despite decreases in the national crime rate, and has concluded that there is a "public safety crisis in Indian country"; and

(6) many State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, especially those in smaller communities and rural jurisdictions, need assistance in order to provide body armor for their officers.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to save lives of law enforcement officers by helping State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies provide those officers with armor vests.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ARMOR VEST.—The term "armor vest" means body armor that has been tested through the voluntary compliance testing program operated by the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and found to comply with the requirements of NIJ Standard 0101.03, or any subsequent revision of that standard.

(2) BODY ARMOR.—The term "body armor" means any product sold or offered for sale as personal protective body covering intended to protect against gunfire, stabbing, or other physical harm.

(3) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the Department of Justice.

(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term "Indian tribe" has the same meaning as in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)).

(5) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term "law enforcement officer" means any officer, agent, or employee of a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law, or authorized by law to supervise sentenced criminal offenders.

(6) STATE.—The term "State" means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(7) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term "unit of local government" means a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level.

SEC. 4. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Director may make grants to States, units of local government, and Indian tribes in accordance with this Act to purchase armor vests for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—Each State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe seeking to receive a grant under this section shall submit to the Director an application, in such form and containing such information as the Director may reasonably require.

(c) USES OF FUNDS.—Grant awards under this section shall be—

(1) distributed directly to the State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe; and

(2) used for the purchase of armor vests for law enforcement officers in the jurisdiction of the grantee.

(d) PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Director may give preferential consideration, where feasible, to applications from jurisdictions that—

(1) have a violent crime rate at or above the national average, as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(2) have not been providing each law enforcement officer assigned to patrol or other hazardous duties with body armor.

(e) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Unless all applications submitted by any State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe for a grant under this section have been funded, each State, together with grantees within the State (other than Indian tribes), shall be allocated in each fiscal year under this section not less than 0.75 percent of the total amount appropriated in the fiscal year for grants pursuant to this section, except that the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands shall each be allocated 0.25 percent.

(f) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—A qualifying State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe may not receive more than 5 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section, except that a State, together with the grantees within the State may not receive more than 20 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section.

(g) MATCHING FUNDS.—The portion of the costs of a program provided by a grant under this section may not exceed 50 percent, unless the Director determines a case of fiscal hardship and waives, wholly or in part, the requirement under this subsection of a non-Federal contribution to the costs of a program.

(h) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Not less than 50 percent of the funds awarded under this section in each fiscal year shall be allocated to units of local government, or Indian tribes, having jurisdiction over areas with populations of 100,000 or less.

(i) REIMBURSEMENT.—Grants under this section may be used to reimburse law enforcement officers who have previously purchased body armor with personal funds during a period in which body armor was not provided by the State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe.

SEC. 5. APPLICATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall promulgate regulations to carry out this Act, which shall set forth the information that must be included in each application under section 4(b) and the requirements that States, units of local government, and Indian tribes must meet in order to receive a grant under section 4.

SEC. 6. PROHIBITION OF PRISON INMATE LABOR.

Any State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe that receives financial assistance provided using funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may not purchase equipment or products manufactured using prison inmate labor.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

In the case of any equipment or product authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act, it is the sense of Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003 to carry out this Act.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am delighted that the Senate has passed the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998, S. 1605. I thank Senator CAMPBELL for his leadership on our bipartisan legislation which is intended to save the lives of law enforcement officers across the country by helping state and local law enforcement agencies provide their officers with body armor, this issue. It has been a pleasure working with the senior Senator from Colorado to pass this vital legislation in the Senate. I also want to thank the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, for his strong support of S. 1605.

Far too many police officers are needlessly killed each year while serving to protect our citizens. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, more than 30 percent of the 1,182 officers killed by a firearm in the line of duty since 1980 could have been saved if they had been wearing body armor. Indeed, the FBI estimates that the risk of fatality to officers while not wearing body armor is 14 times higher than for officers wearing it.

Unfortunately, far too many state and local law enforcement agencies cannot afford to provide every officer in their jurisdictions with the protection of body armor. In fact, the Department of Justice estimates that approximately 150,000 State and local law enforcement officers, nearly 25 percent, are not issued body armor.

In countless incidents across the country everyday officers sworn to protect the public and enforce the law are in danger. Last year, an horrific incident along the Vermont and New Hampshire border underscores the need for the quick passage of this legislation to provide maximum protection to those who protect us. On August 19, 1997, Federal, State and local law enforcement authorities in Vermont and New Hampshire had cornered Carl Drega, after hours of hot pursuit. He had shot to death two New Hampshire state troopers and two other victims earlier in the day. In a massive exchange of gunfire with the authorities, Drega was killed.

During that shootout, all federal law enforcement officers wore bulletproof vests, while some state and local officers did not. For example, Federal Border Patrol Officer John Pfeifer, a Vermonter, was seriously wounded in the incident. I am glad that Officer Pfeifer is back on the job after being hospitalized in serious condition. Had it not been for his bulletproof vest, I fear that he and his family might well have paid the ultimate price.

The two New Hampshire state troopers who were killed by Carl Drega were not so lucky. We all grieve for them and our hearts go out to their families. They were not wearing bulletproof vests. Protective vests might not have been able to save the lives of those courageous officers because of the high-powered assault weapons, but the tragedy underscore the point that all of our

law enforcement officers, whether federal, state or local, deserve the best protection we can provide, including bulletproof vests.

With that and lesser-known incidents as constant reminders, I will continue to do all I can to help prevent loss of life among our law enforcement officers.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998 will help by creating a new partnership between the federal government and state and local law enforcement agencies to help save the lives of police officers by providing the resources for each and every law enforcement officer in harm's way to have a bulletproof vest. Our bipartisan bill would create a \$25 million matching grant program within the Department of Justice dedicated to helping State and local law enforcement agencies purchase body armor.

In my home State of Vermont, our bill enjoys the strong support of the Vermont State Police, the Vermont Police Chiefs Association and many Vermont sheriffs, troopers, game wardens and other local and state law enforcement officials. In January, I was honored to be joined by Vermont Attorney General William Sorrell, Vermont Commissioner of Public Safety James Walton, Vermont State Police Director John Sinclair, Vermont Fish and Wildlife Lieutenant Robert Rooks, South Burlington Police Chief Lee Graham, South Burlington Vermont Officer Diane Reynolds as we spoke about state and local law enforcement officers' need for body armor.

Since my time as a State prosecutor, I have always taken a keen interest in law enforcement in Vermont and around the country. Vermont has the reputation of being one of the safest states in which to live, work and visit, and rightly so. In no small part, this is due to the hard work of those who have sworn to serve and protect us. And we should do what we can to protect them, when a need like this one comes to our attention.

Our Nation's law enforcement officers put their lives at risk in the line of duty everyday. No one knows when danger will appear. Unfortunately, in today's violent world, even a traffic stop may not necessarily be "routine." In fact, the National Association of Chiefs of Police just reported that 21 police officers were killed in the line of duty last month, nearly double the toll for the month of January in both 1997 and 1996. More than ever, each and every law enforcement officer across the nation deserves the protection of a bulletproof vest.

Our bipartisan legislation enjoys the strong support of numerous nation law enforcement organizations including the Fraternal Order of Police, Police Executive Research Forum, International Union of Police Associations, National Association of Police Organizations and International Brotherhood of Police Officers. The bill also enjoys the support of 38 attorneys general

from across the country. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters of support for S. 1605 from all these national law enforcement organizations and the attorneys general.

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM,
Washington, DC, January 14, 1998.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: I am writing to you on behalf of the more than 270,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police to offer our strong support of legislation you plan to introduce in order to establish a grant program to assist local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body armor for their officers.

This legislation will greatly increase the number of officers wearing body armor—and it will save more lives. At the May 15, 1997 Peace Officers' Memorial Day, the F.O.P. honored the memories of one hundred and seventeen officers who were killed in the line of duty in 1996. This year we have already lost one hundred and sixty from our ranks.

While we know that there is no way to end the deadly risks inherent to a career in law enforcement, we must do everything possible to ensure that officers who put their lives on the line every day also put on a vest. Body armor is one of the most important pieces of equipment an officer can have and often means the difference between life and death. Hopefully, the bill you plan to introduce will increase the quality and number of armored vests available to America's law enforcement officers.

On behalf of the Fraternal Order of Police, I commend you for your leadership on this important issue and forward to working with you once it has been introduced. If I can be of assistance, please contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office, (202) 547-8189.

Sincerely,

GILBERT G. GALLEGOS,
National President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
POLICE ASSOCIATIONS,
February 13, 1998.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Russell Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: On behalf of the Executive Committee and the 80,000 rank and file law enforcement officers of the International Union of Police Associations, AFL-CIO, we are proud to endorse and support the "Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998" as introduced in the Senate by yourself and Senator Campbell.

Law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line everyday deserve state of the art body armor and because of your commitment to law enforcement, officers will have the protection that could mean the difference between life and death.

We commend you for your support and legislation and we pledge our continued assistance toward the enactment of the "Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998." Thank you.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR J. REDDY,
Legislative Liaison,
International Vice President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE
ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Washington, DC, February 25, 1998.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Ranking Minority Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: Please be advised that the National Association of Police Or-

ganizations (NAPO), representing more than 4,000 police unions and associations and more than 220,000 rank and file law enforcement officers enthusiastically and wholeheartedly supports S. 1605, the "Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998." I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in scheduling the markup of S. 1605, for Thursday, February 26, 1998 at 10:30 am.

As you know, far too many law enforcement officers patrol our streets and neighborhoods without proper protective gear against violent criminals. Today, more than ever, violent criminals have bulletproof vests and deadly weapons at their disposal. We cannot allow criminals to have the upper hand. This legislation is a necessary step in adequately protecting law enforcement officers, who put their lives on the line every day to serve our communities. This is why NAPO supports your effort to help state and local law enforcement departments provide officers with bulletproof vests.

Again, thank you for addressing S. 1605, which is a legislative priority for NAPO. I appreciate your hard work and commitment to the law enforcement community and if we can be of any assistance please contact my office at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

ROBERT SCULLY,
Executive Director.

POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM,
Washington, DC, February 20, 1998.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: I am writing to you on behalf of the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) to offer our strong support for S. 1605, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1997. This important piece of legislation would establish a grant program to assist local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body armor for their officers.

PERF, a nonprofit organization of progressive police professionals who serve more than 40 percent of the nation's population, is firmly committed to helping police obtain equipment necessary to ensure their safety as they protect the community. Between 1985 and 1994, more than 2000 police officers had their lives saved by bulletproof vests. This bill would greatly increase the numbers of officers wearing bulletproof vests and will ultimately save more lives.

PERF commends you for your commitment to officer safety and your leadership on this important issue. If we can be of any assistance in the future, please feel free to contact me or Martha Plotkin at (202) 466-7820.

Sincerely,

CHUCK WEXLER,
Executive Director.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
POLICE OFFICERS,
Alexandria, VA, February 10, 1998.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
United States Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: The International Brotherhood of Police Officers (IBPO) is an affiliate of the Service Employees International Union. The IBPO represents over 50,000 police officers at the federal, state, and local level, including IBPO Local 506, Brattleboro, Vermont.

On behalf of the entire membership of the IBPO I wish to thank you for your sponsorship of S. 1605, "The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998." This life saving legislation will provide protection to police officers across the country.

In the past few months alone, the IBPO family has dealt with the tragic deaths of police officers in Boise, Idaho and Atlanta, who

lost their lives in the line of duty. Every police officer who takes a call knows the dangers facing them. That is why this legislation is so crucial.

The number of police officers who do not have access to bulletproof vests is astounding. Almost 150,000 law enforcement officers do not have the ability to fully protect themselves. Simply put, passage of this legislation will save lives.

The entire membership of the IBPO looks forward to working with you on this important issue. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

KENNETH T. LYONS,
National President.

STATE OF VERMONT OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
February 26, 1998.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Senate Committee on the Judiciary.
Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Re: Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998
(S. 1605)

DEAR SENATORS CAMPBELL, HATCH AND LEAHY: As state attorneys general, we are writing to express our wholehearted support for Senate Bill No. 1605, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 1998. In our view, this bill will be an invaluable tool in helping to protect law enforcement officers throughout the country who risk their lives daily while serving their communities. This bill would provide much needed matching grants to state, local and tribal law enforcement agencies to be used to purchase armor vests for their officers. We were particularly pleased to note the provision for waivers of the grantee's matching contribution in the event of a fiscal hardship by a particular law enforcement agency.

As you are all too aware, state, local and tribal law enforcement officers often find themselves in deadly confrontations with highly armed and dangerous criminals. The statistics cited in your bill make it imperative that every officer in the country have ready access to body armor when it is needed. Your bill will assure that all police departments will have the resources to equip officers with body armor as standard equipment. The bill will also allow reimbursement to those officers who have had to purchase body armor at their own personal expense.

This bill will enable more officers to wear armor when they need it. It will definitely save lives. We appreciate your support for this bill and urge passage of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

William H. Sorrell, Attorney General of Vermont.

Gale Norton, Attorney General of Colorado.

Bill Pryor, Attorney General of Alabama.

Bruce M. Botelho, Attorney General of Alaska.

Grant Woods, Attorney General of Arizona.

Daniel E. Lungren, Attorney General of California.

M. Jane Brady, Attorney General of Delaware.

Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General of Florida.

Gus S. Diaz, Attorney General of Guam.

Margery S. Bronster, Attorney General of Hawaii.

Alan G. Lance, Attorney General of Idaho.

James E. Ryan, Attorney General of Illinois.

Jeffrey A. Modisett, Attorney General of Indiana.

Albert B. Chandler III, Attorney General of Kentucky.

Richard P. Ieyoub, Attorney General of Louisiana.

Andrew Ketterer, Attorney General of Maine.

J. Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General of Maryland.

Scott Harshbarger, Attorney General of Massachusetts.

Hubert H. Humphrey III, Attorney General of Minnesota.

Mike Moore, Attorney General of Mississippi.

Joseph P. Mazurek, Attorney General of Montana.

Frankie Sue Del Papa, Attorney General of Nevada.

Philip McLaughlin, Attorney General of New Hampshire.

Peter Vemlero, Attorney General of New Jersey.

Dennis C. Vacco, Attorney General of New York.

Heidi Heitkamp, Attorney General of North Dakota.

Betty D. Montgomery, Attorney General of Ohio.

Drew Edmondson, Attorney General of Oklahoma.

Hardy Myers, Attorney General of Oregon.

Mike Fisher, Attorney General of Pennsylvania.

Jose A. Fuentes, Attorney General of Puerto Rico.

Jeffrey B. Pine, Attorney General of Rhode Island.

Charles Molony Condon, Attorney General of South Carolina.

Mark Barnett, Attorney General of South Dakota.

Jan Graham, Attorney General of Utah.

Mark L. Earley, Attorney General of Virginia.

Christine O. Gregoire, Attorney General of Washington.

Darrell V. McGraw, Jr., Attorney General of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LEAHY. I urge the House of Representatives to support this bipartisan legislation and urge its quick passage into law.

RELATING TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THAILAND

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 319, S. Res. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 174) to state the sense of the Senate that Thailand is a key partner and friend of the United States, has committed itself to executing its responsibilities under its arrangements with the International Monetary Fund, and that the United States should be prepared to take appropriate steps to ensure continued close bilateral relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 1980

(Purpose: Relating to the relationship between the United States and Thailand)

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, Senator ROTH has an amendment to the

resolution at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], for Mr. ROTH, proposes an amendment numbered 1980.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 2 through 7 and insert the following:

"(1) the United States should enhance the close political and security relationship between Thailand and the United States and strengthen economic ties and cooperation with Thailand to ensure that Thailand's economic recovery continues uninterrupted; and"

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 1980) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, as amended.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 174), as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1981

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I understand there is an amendment at the desk to the preamble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], for Mr. ROTH, proposes an amendment numbered 1981 to the preamble to S. Res. 174.

Mr. CHAFEE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

In the preamble, strike "and" at the end of the sixth "Whereas" clause.

In the preamble, strike the colon at the end of the seventh "Whereas" clause and insert "; and".

In the preamble, insert after the seventh "Whereas" clause the following:

"Whereas Thailand's democratic reforms have advanced with that country's economic growth and development:"

Mr. CHAFEE. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 1981) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; that the motions to reconsider the above actions be laid upon the table; and, finally, that any statements regarding this legislation appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.