

short, the bill that will be signed into law will be numbered S. 768 but will contain the text of H.R. 3380 as passed here today.

I want to thank Representative CHAMBLISS for his leadership on this important issue and Representative SCOTT for all of the work that he and his staff have put in on this bill. I also want to thank several of the representatives of the Department of Defense and Justice who have spent a great deal of time working with the staff of the Subcommittee on Crime on this bill and whose input has been invaluable in developing the legislation. From the Department of Justice, Mr. Roger Pauley, Director for Legislation, Office of Policy and Legislation. From the Department of Defense: Mr. Robert Reed, Associate Deputy General Counsel; Brigadier General Joseph Barnes, Assistant Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army; Colonel David Graham, Chief International and Operational Law Division, Office of The Judge Advocate General; Colonel Donald Curry, Special Assistant for Legal Issues and Installations, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Legislative Affairs; Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Miller, Deputy Chief, International and Operational Law Division, Office of The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army; Lieutenant Colonel Denise Lind, Criminal Law Division, Office of The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army; Major (promotable) Gregory Baldwin, Legislative Counsel, Office of the Chief, Legislative Liaison, U.S. Army.

Finally, I want to thank the members of the staff of the Subcommittee on Crime who have worked so hard to craft this legislation: Glenn Schmitt, Chief Counsel; Rick Filkins, Counsel; Bobby Vassar, Minority Counsel; Iden Martyn, Minority DOJ Detailee. I know Mr. SCOTT joins me in thanking all of them for their hard work.

The issue of crimes committed by persons who accompany our Armed Forces abroad has been the subject of bills introduced in Congress for over 40 years. It's high time we acted to fix this problem. H.R. 3380 will do just that. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3380, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4942, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. LINDER (during consideration of motion to instruct on H.R. 4578), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-790) on the resolution (H. Res. 563) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4942) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and

other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4033) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4033

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 Grant Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. 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;

(2) according to studies, between 1985 and 1994, 709 law enforcement officers in the United States were feloniously killed in the line of duty;

(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) according to studies, between 1985 and 1994, bullet-resistant materials helped save the lives of more than 2,000 law enforcement officers in the United States; and

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

SEC. 3. MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ARMOR VESTS.

(a) MATCHING FUNDS.—Section 2501(f) (42 U.S.C. 37961(f)) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) by striking "The portion" and inserting the following:

"(1) The portion";

(2) by striking "subsection (a)" and all that follows through the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting "subsection (a)—

"(A) may not exceed 50 percent; and

"(B) shall equal 50 percent, if—

"(i) such grant is to a unit of local government with fewer than 100,000 residents;

"(ii) the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance determines that the quantity of vests to be purchased with such grant is reasonable; and

"(iii) such portion does not cause such grant to violate the requirements of subsection (e)."; and

(3) by striking "Any funds" and inserting the following:

"(2) Any funds".

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Section 2501(g) (42 U.S.C. 37961(g)) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended to read as follows:

"(g) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Funds available under this part shall be awarded, without regard to subsection (c), to each qualifying unit of local government with fewer than 100,000 residents. Any remaining funds available under this

part shall be awarded to other qualifying applicants."

(c) APPLICATIONS.—Section 2502 (42 U.S.C. 37961-1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) APPLICATIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH PURCHASES.—If an application under this section is submitted in conjunction with a transaction for the purchase of armor vests, grant amounts under this section may not be used to fund any portion of that purchase unless, before the application is submitted, the applicant—

"(1) receives clear and conspicuous notice that receipt of the grant amounts requested in the application is uncertain; and

"(2) expressly assumes the obligation to carry out the transaction regardless of whether such amounts are received."

(d) DEFINITION OF ARMOR VEST.—Paragraph (1) of section 2503 (42 U.S.C. 37961-2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "means body armor" and inserting the following: "means—

"(A) body armor"; and

(2) by inserting after the semicolon at the end the following: "or

"(B) body armor which has been tested through such voluntary compliance testing program, and found to meet or exceed the requirements of NIJ Standard 0115.00, or any subsequent revision of such standard,".

(e) INTERIM DEFINITION OF ARMOR VEST.—For purposes of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by this Act, the meaning of the term "armor vest" (as defined in section 2503 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 37961-2)) shall, until the date on which a final NIJ Standard 0115.00 is first fully approved and implemented, also include body armor which has been found to meet or exceed the requirements for protection against stabbing established by the State in which the grantee is located.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(23) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(23)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ", and \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the H.R. 4033, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) be permitted to control my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. LOBIONDO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to come before the House today in support of H.R. 4033, the Bulletproof Vest Reauthorization Act of 2000. This noncontroversial, bipartisan legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and myself in March, and it passed out of the full Committee on the Judiciary by voice vote on July 7.

To me, this is a very simple issue and one that I know well. I firmly believe that when a police officer is issued a badge and a gun they should also be issued a bulletproof vest. When police officers put their lives on the line every day protecting our neighborhoods, they deserve the highest level of protection and security, which only a bulletproof vest can provide.

When I first introduced the original bulletproof vest bill during the 105th Congress, I modeled the program after a Vest-a-Cop and Shield-the-Blue programs established in Southern New Jersey many years ago. When I was first elected to Congress, then Sergeant Rich Gray, an Atlantic County police officer in Pleasantville came to me telling me of a program that they had put together in Atlantic County, New Jersey.

Sergeant Gray, who is now Chief Rich Gray of the Pleasantville Police Department, and a very dedicated group of police officers decided that it was time to do something about those who were defending our citizens every day who did not have protection. They started a program called Vest-a-Cop. That Vest-a-Cop program began to grow in Atlantic County and it was really the genesis for the idea that I had and subsequently found out that my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), had from his jurisdiction in Indiana.

At that time, the Vest-a-Cop program was actually raising money in a variety of different ways. They were reaching out to the community asking people in the community to understand the needs of police officers and asking people in the community to contribute. We had Scouts who were basically baking cookies and cupcakes and selling them. We had events of all different kinds that were providing vests one and two and three at a time.

This program is one that we modeled after that, and we realized that doing it piecemeal was not going to really cut it and protect our officers for what they needed.

The current bulletproof vest partnership program has enabled police jurisdictions across the Nation to purchase over 180,000 bulletproof vests over the last 2 years, 180,000 vests that probably would not have been purchased otherwise. However, due to the tremendous popularity of the program, and actually the program became much more popular than we ever anticipated, we were not able to meet all of the demands. None of the jurisdictions received the full 50/50 Federal-State match this year; and, in fact, the De-

partment of Justice reported that jurisdictions with under 100,000 residents received a disproportionately low share of Federal funds. An average of only 22 cents on the dollar came from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what we in this House originally intended, and this legislation helps correct that.

The bill before us today will extend and improve the current bulletproof vest program. First, the annual authorization will be doubled from \$25 million to \$50 million per year through the year 2004, extending the program for 3 more years. That is critical to enable all the officers across the Nation to be able to take advantage of this program which saves lives.

Second, language was included in the bill which will guarantee that smaller jurisdictions receive a fair portion of the funding.

Finally, those jurisdictions and corrections officers who have been waiting for the national stab-proof standard to be approved by the Department of Justice will be able to purchase state-approved bulletproof and stab-proof vests under this standard. That is a very big improvement from where we were on the last go-around.

The stab-proof issue is of particular interest to me because it hits very close to home. Corrections Officer Fred Baker in my district in New Jersey was stabbed to death while on duty at Bayside State Prison. Officer Baker was not wearing a vest at the time. We can only speculate as to whether his life would have been spared had he had the opportunity to wear a vest, but many of us believe had he had that opportunity that Officer Baker would be alive today.

If Officer Baker had the chance, I am sure he would not have hesitated to put that vest on.

It is critical that Members vote in favor of this legislation. According to the FBI, an average of over 100 officers are assaulted every day and in 1999, 139 officers were slain while in the line of duty. There are still thousands of officers on duty who do not have access to these life-saving vests. This is an opportunity for us as Members of Congress, who talk so very often about the importance of law enforcement to us, who talk about what we want to do to provide law enforcement the opportunity to help protect themselves as they keep our citizens safe, this is our opportunity to do something.

This common sense bill has gained the support of 264 bipartisan cosponsors, as well as major law enforcement organizations across this Nation. I would like to commend all of those who were involved in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I would first like to thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), who put up with my pleas and pestering for so very long about the importance of this bill; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

I would also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), for his help in this effort. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) was influential on the Committee on the Judiciary as we were moving this bill through; and saving for last, my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and I have worked on this bill from the very beginning. This is probably a great example of a partnership to be developed to move legislation that is meaningful and can do something in a very positive way and save lives. That is the bottom line here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. First, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) for their hard work and dedication in bringing this bill forward. I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and their staffs for their cooperative and bipartisan spirit in developing this bill and moving it expeditiously along the way.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act will reauthorize and double the funding for this lifesaving program. I can think of no better way to show our gratitude and respect for the brave men and women who put their lives on the line every day to serve and protect the citizens of this country than to fully fund a program which may well save their lives and protect them from grave harm.

Regrettably, as has already been mentioned, we have had more requests for funding than we have had funding, and this bill will allow us to meet those requests. With a proven track record of having saved thousands of lives since their inception, we should not only ensure that all officers subject to harm from gunfire have access to bulletproof vests but also all officers subject to stab wounds, such as correctional officers, are provided with vests that can save their lives. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) at the subcommittee markup to allow funding for stab-proof vests as well as bulletproof vests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2115

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for

yielding me this time. I also thank, in fact, all the people that have put forth effort in this.

Mr. Speaker, I used to be a police officer; and I can tell my colleagues something. On the street, the cheapest life insurance policy an officer can get is a bulletproof vest. It does not give 100 percent protection. They can still take a head shot or a shot in an artery in the leg. But it guarantees a lot better odds than they have without it.

I remember the days when I was cop on the street unit and the vests we put on; it is like it was yesterday. It was like putting on a bucket filled with concrete. They were miserable. When the officer bent, they would not bend so it looks like they twisted their neck as they tried to go around. The cops did not like to wear them. The other problem was that when they were on the force for a while, like several of my colleagues, bless their hearts, they never thought it would happen to them. They just read the stories. We were in small communities.

The third problem we had, which the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) recognized, was the fact that in small communities we did not necessarily have the resources. I remember going to the big cities, how much we admired the equipment that they had. I mean, I am not that old, but this does show my age. We still had a fire truck that we winded on the front. We had to crank it. So bulletproof vests, that really meant something to us.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent bill. And clearly the technology has advanced. I had an opportunity not long ago, in fact, one of our surgeons at the hospital, one of our military surgeons who recently retired, his hobby was research on bulletproof vests. Believe it or not, they would take cadavers and take vests and try different things. The advancement that we have seen in technology could just mandate that these be put on every officer out there.

Mr. Speaker, I know the statistics. The statistics of over 2,000 officers saved. I will tell my colleagues what else it does. It not only has saved 2,000 lives, but it gives a lot of officers some confidence to go into situations that they would not otherwise have. Now, it is true that it may give some overconfidence, but the fact is there are a lot of situations where officers feel they are outgunned. But having the right kind of equipment, they can go in there quick.

As a police officer, they often find themselves in a situation. They were not paid to sit on the street and watch what was happening; they were paid to get in the way of danger and go in and stop it. They can go in with more boldness when they have the protection that this bill offers.

This is an excellent bill. And the way a bill should be measured, and obviously it sounds great, but there really

must be accountability on a bill. When we measure the accountability of this bill, we see the dollars we spend out and what we are getting in return. Clearly, the return that we have gotten is such that it easily justifies the additional appropriation and the additional authorization that this bill asks for.

Mr. Speaker, I commend both of the gentlemen for their efforts in this regard. And I can tell these gentlemen that they will never get a thanks, because people will not think of them. But there will be many families in the future that will thank them for the saving of a life of their loved one.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the original cosponsor of the legislation who has done so much work to bring this bill forward.

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4033, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000. I would like to recognize the over 260 of my colleagues who have joined as cosponsors of this bipartisan legislation designed to save the lives of police officers. Foremost among them, I would want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) who has proven that he is an indispensable leader on this vital issue and that his commitment to police officers is absolute.

I would also express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking Democrat, who have lent their powerful voices to this important cause and who have been indispensable and tireless in ensuring that this legislation is brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, after me, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE), will also speak and I will recognize his tireless efforts as well to secure many of the cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, studies show that between 1980 and 1996, there were over 2,182 felonious deaths of police officers due to firearms and that of those deaths, 924 of the officers were not wearing bulletproof vests. The Federal Bureau of Investigations has estimated that the risk of fatality from a firearm for officers not wearing body armor is 14 times higher than those wearing the armor. The gentleman from Colorado alluded to the 2,500 police officers whose lives have been saved from gunfire since its introduction in the mid-1970s.

But despite these statistics, tens of thousands of law enforcement officers do not even have access to a vest. In order to alleviate this problem, in 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and I introduced the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act. This

law provided a program which authorized \$25 million per year to pay up to 50 percent of the costs of bulletproof vests for local and State law enforcement agencies.

In order to ensure that smaller jurisdictions received a fair share of the funds, the money was to be distributed evenly with half going to jurisdictions under 100,000 residents and half going to larger jurisdictions. In each of the first 2 years of this program, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act has provided over 3,000 law enforcement agencies with funding to purchase over 90,000 bulletproof vests and body armor.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that we are talking about reauthorizing legislation today, but I would also want to add my "thank you's" to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) who chairs the subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), who is the ranking Democratic member, for ensuring that in each of the first 2 years of this Act the full appropriation was granted.

However, in the most recent year of the program, funding was insufficient to provide any law enforcement agency with the full matching grant requested under the program. And, in fact, the average grant award represented only 30 percent of the cost of the vest, a 20 percent shortfall on the Federal side. For many smaller agencies, the shortfall is devastating and could end up taking away funding from other important departmental programs.

Mr. Speaker, we must honor our commitment to provide these agencies with the full 50 percent of the cost of these vests, and in order to do so H.R. 4033 doubles the yearly authorization for the program to \$50 million. The original authorization of this program also included a provision to allow the purchase of stabproof vests for corrections officers and sheriff's deputies who regularly face violent criminals at close quarters in our Nation's jails.

Unfortunately, the Department of Justice decided that requests for funding for stabproof vests under the program were not valid until a national standard was developed for such vests by the National Institutes of Justice. After 2 years of development, NIJ continues to delay the implementation of such a standard. In order to address this issue, we supported an amendment to this bill offered by the gentleman from Florida (Chairman MCCOLLUM) during subcommittee consideration which will allow States to develop their own stabproof vest standards until the NIJ makes good on their promise.

And, finally, this bill would take extra precautions to ensure that those small agencies which are often most in need of additional funding for vests would receive the entire grant for which they apply. The program has fallen short of giving many of these agencies a full grant and, therefore, H.R. 4033 includes a provision which ensures that smaller jurisdictions, again

those under 100,000 residents, will receive all of the funding they request before money is allocated to larger jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, in this age of cross-country drug and illegal firearms trafficking, even rural and small town police officers increasingly find themselves faced with dangerous, well-armed criminals. We must protect the Crown Point, Indiana, police officer who unknowingly pulls over an armed drug dealer on Highway 231 as much as the New York City police officer involved in an orchestrated drug raid.

Our legislation is intended to reauthorize a highly successful program in order to make sure that every police and corrections officer who needs a bulletproof vest gets one. It was clear to us that every officer on the street should have a vest and that the need to supply officers with vests is important enough to warrant direct Federal assistance.

Mr. Speaker, at the heart of this effort is our desire to save the lives of police officers. When we make this commitment we offer protection, not just to the officers but to every community in America, we prevent the suffering of families of fallen officers, we prevent the loss of leaders in our community. Perhaps most importantly, we give those who protect us the ability to do their job better, more confidently, and with the knowledge that their entire Nation is behind them every day, even in the most dangerous of situations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair advise how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). The gentleman from Virginia controls 12½ minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for yielding me this time, and I particularly thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VIS-CLOSKY) for their work in getting this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it was not that many years ago in West Virginia that I heard the story at Christmastime of a young wife who was using her Christmas savings to buy a bulletproof vest for her law enforcement husband. That just shocked me, to be honest, that when they got the badge and they got the gun and they got the uniform, they did not get the vest.

So that began to open a lot of our eyes, I think. Then when I began looking around and I was watching families and churches and FOP lodges and others holding bake sales to buy bulletproof vests. No one should have to hold a bake sale to protect their life or protect the life of their loved one, and particularly when we ask that loved one to take extraordinary steps for society.

This Congress took some steps in the early 1990s with an amendment that I offered on the DOD bill that permitted for the first time police departments to buy equipment at the lowest possible discount price, but yet they still had to pay the full amount, even though it was the lowest price, because they were buying in volume.

This legislation took a much more important step to say that there would be a grant to assist local governments and municipalities in the cost of procuring that bulletproof vest. This legislation tonight now continues that process.

It is estimated that 2,000 police officers in the past 10 years have been saved by having bulletproof vests. That alone demonstrates how important this is. And, of course, this legislation takes important steps because it includes correctional officers, a very, very dangerous profession as well.

I am very grateful that this legislation is moving. It is getting dark outside and somewhere tonight in West Virginia, as is true in every State across the country, somewhere tonight a State trooper is going to walk up on a strange car on a lonely rural highway and he or she is not going to know what is in that car or what may be coming at them from behind that car door. Somewhere tonight a deputy sheriff is going to answer a domestic violence call and will not know whether there is a shotgun waiting behind that front door. And somewhere tonight a municipal officer is likely to be preparing for a drug raid. Once again, when they go down that alley, they do not know what is coming at them. This protects them much more than they had before.

So as we ask them to go out and to answer our call, so it is that we should answer their call. I thank those who have made it possible to bring this legislation to the floor and to protect the men and women who serve us so well in our law enforcement community.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) very much for yielding me this time, and I thank the authors of this legislation. My compliments on saving lives.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Houston City Council, one of the issues we were concerned with was law enforcement and the protection of our officers and the protection of our community. This legislation helps to partnership with local communities, rural and urban centers, small towns and villages where they cannot afford to have the resources for these bulletproof vests.

These vests save lives and they secure our law enforcement officers as they work to secure us. This is a strike for a positive response to the needs of

our law enforcement. It is good legislation. It is a good Federal-local partnership, and I would ask my colleagues to support this effort to save the lives of our law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing time for discussion on this important subject matter, for few issues will command more attention than that of providing for the safety of our Nation's law enforcement officers.

Everyday a many law enforcement officers leave their homes—leaving behind their parents, children, wives and siblings—to faithfully uphold and enforce the laws of America. Every time they leave home there is a void, a void of certainty as to whether the faithful officer will return. When that officer hugs and kisses his or her family before leaving for work, they often ask themselves whether this is the last hug, the last kiss or the last time they will say to their children—Have a good day at school!

When our officers leave for work, their families anxiously await their return; asking each time the phone rings—is this that dreaded call! Yet, our officers devotedly show up for work everyday, not just for the protection of their own families but for the protection of everyone who depend on them—all of America!

We have the opportunity to say to our local protectors, that we are just as concerned with their safety as they are concerned with our safety and the safety of our friends and our families. We have the opportunity to make available a device that has been found to reduce the likelihood of death by a firearm of one of our officers by 14 times.

The bulletproof vest is credited for saving the lives of over 2,000 police officers since it was introduced in 1970. It is a small piece of equipment. However, the benefits of its use are too large to be measured. We will never be able to measure the value of a police officer's life or the joy the officer's family feels when he or she returns home from a job which involves the ultimate risk—the risk of dying. Furthermore, we must be aware that we will never be able to measure the value of the comfort we'll feel under the blanket of protection that our police officers provide.

By supporting this increase in funding for the Bulletproof Vest Grant Program, we will send a message to those brave men and women and their families that Congress and our Nation support and recognize the hard work and danger they endure to guarantee the safety of all of America's people. We all know that the support of others makes any job completed or any goal achieved more rewarding. What amount of support could be greater than the support of a Nation such as ours?

As the technology of the world advances daily, we must ensure that these advancements are available to our Nation's peace officers. America's police officers must have access to the best safety equipment to combat the improved, sophisticated weapons of the crime world.

Three-thousand-five-hundred-and-eleven jurisdictions applied for the Bulletproof Grant. Two-thousand-six-hundred-and-sixty-eight of these jurisdictions received the 50–50 matching grant they expected. The increased funding provided by H.R. 4033 will not only ensure that the other 843 jurisdictions that applied for the grant in the past will receive the 50–50 matching funds they expected, H.R. 4033 will also make available funding for additional

grants for other jurisdictions. Thus, more of our police officers will be protected while providing our communities with security.

This bill provides that each qualifying jurisdiction that serves under 100,000 residents will receive a full 50–50 matching grant for body armor purchases. This provision ensures that police officers in our small towns and rural areas that operate under limited budgets are provided the same level of protection available to officers in our larger cities who have larger budgets to purchase safety equipment.

Our officers that patrol our neighborhoods are not the only ones who will receive additional safety equipment. H.R. 4033 provides money to purchase body armor for our correction officers who work in the closed sectors of our county and state jails.

So, as we enjoy the protection provided by our police officers, let us remember that we have a duty to make their jobs as safe for them as possible. I ask that all my colleagues support H.R. 4033, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank those who have worked so hard on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), all of those on the Committee on the Judiciary, and all of my colleagues who co-sponsored this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, many times in this House when there are good ideas that come before us, we do not get a chance to act on them. I think, to reiterate what I mentioned earlier, this is a great example of a positive partnership. These are ideas that generated within our districts from citizens and police officers and law enforcement officers and corrections officers who were in the real world every day, as we heard our other colleagues talk about.

□ 2130

Instead of having to have local community groups raise money a little bit at a time, the officers in New Jersey in the second district, officers like Dominic Romeo in Cape May County, in the City of Wildwood, Sergeant Rich Gray, Shield-the-Blue, the corrections officers PBA-105, all those who are associated with the Vest-a-Cop program can look to us here in Washington and realize that we have joined together in a very special way, in a very bipartisan way, to generate legislation that means a great deal to law enforcement across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of this body to vote for this legislation and show their commitment to law enforcement officers by voting for H.R. 4033.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4033, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TERRORISM ACT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3485) to modify the enforcement of certain anti-terrorism judgments, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3485

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

SECTION 1. ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN ANTI-TERRORISM JUDGMENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act".

(b) DEFINITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1603(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3) by striking the period and inserting "; and";

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(C) by striking "(b)" through "entity—" and inserting the following:

"(b) An 'agency or instrumentality of a foreign state' means—

"(1) any entity—"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) for purposes of sections 1605(a)(7) and 1610 (a)(7) and (f), any entity as defined under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1), and subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) shall not apply."

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1391(f)(3) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "1603(b)" and inserting "1603(b)(1)".

(c) ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS.—Section 1610(f) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking "(including any agency or instrumentality or such state)" and inserting "(including any agency or instrumentality of such state)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys due from or payable by the United States (including any agency or instrumentality thereof) to any state against which a judgment is pending under section 1605(a)(7) shall be subject to attachment and execution with respect to that judgment, in like manner and to the same extent as if the United States were a private person."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(3)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), upon determining on an asset-by-asset basis that a waiver is necessary in the national security interest, the President may waive this subsection in connection with (and prior to the enforcement of) any judicial order directing attachment in aid of execution or execution against any property subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.

"(B) A waiver under this paragraph shall not apply to—

"(i) if property subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vi-

enna Convention on Consular Relations has been used for any nondiplomatic purpose (including use as rental property), the proceeds of such use; or

"(ii) if any asset subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations is sold or otherwise transferred for value to a third party, the proceeds of such sale or transfer.

"(C) In this paragraph, the term 'property subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations' and the term 'asset subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations' mean any property or asset, respectively, the attachment in aid of execution or execution of which would result in a violation of an obligation of the United States under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, as the case may be.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, all assets of any agency or instrumentality of a foreign state shall be treated as assets of that foreign state."

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 117(d) of the Treasury Department Appropriations Act, 1999, as enacted by section 101(h) of Public Law 105-277 (112 Stat. 2681-492) is repealed.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any claim for which a foreign state is not immune under section 1605(a)(7) of title 28, United States Code, arising before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. PAYGO ADJUSTMENT.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall not make any estimates of changes in direct spending outlays and receipts under section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)) for any fiscal year resulting from the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO IMPROVE LITIGATION PROCEDURES AND REMOVE LIMITATIONS ON LIABILITY.

(a) GENERAL EXCEPTIONS TO JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY OF FOREIGN STATE.—Section 1605 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) If a foreign state, or its agency or instrumentality, is a party to an action pursuant to subsection (a)(7) and fails to furnish any testimony, document, or other thing upon a duly issued discovery order by the court in the action, such failure shall be deemed an admission of any fact with respect to which the discovery order relates. Nothing in this subsection shall supersede the limitations set forth in subsection (g)."

(b) MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Section 1605(a)(7)(B)(i) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) the act occurred in the foreign state against which the claim has been brought and the foreign state has not had a reasonable opportunity to arbitrate the claim in a neutral forum outside the foreign state in accordance with accepted international rules of arbitration; or

(c) EXTENT OF LIABILITY.—Section 1606 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: "No Federal or State statutory limits shall apply to the amount of compensatory, actual, or punitive damages permitted to be awarded to persons under section 1605(a)(7) and this section."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any claim for which a foreign state is not immune under section 1605(a)(7) of title 28, United States Code, arising before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from