

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT
OF 2000

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, in 1994 we passed the original Violence Against Women Act, creating programs that addressed the many forms of domestic violence all-too prevalent in the United States today. The bill helped communities create shelters, build partnerships among law enforcement agencies to respond to violence against women, and provide legal assistance to battered women. The bill also established a domestic violence hotline that receives hundreds of calls daily from people concerned about violence in their families. Now, we have the opportunity and responsibility to reauthorize this legislation to give women and children a way out of violent and unhealthy situations.

For groups that strive to combat domestic violence, the original Violence Against Women Act was a turning point in their battle. In my state, the West Virginia Coalition Against Domestic Violence stands as an outstanding example of the great work that groups devoted to the noble cause of stamping out domestic violence can do when Congress acts appropriately. With the added funding provided by the Violence Against Women Act, the Coalition was able to quadruple its staff, increase the budgets of its shelters to meet their day-to-day needs, and increase services to under-served parts of the population of West Virginia. Many of the women who escape from violent homes cannot afford legal services, but thanks to grants authorized under the Violence Against Women Act, thirteen civil legal assistance programs are now in place around West Virginia providing free representation for women.

The Coalition also computerized its entire network, enabling instant communication with offices in other parts of rural West Virginia. By creating a database that compiles information on offenders from all over the state, they were able to work with regional jails, sheriffs, and other law enforcement agencies to use this valuable resource. I am proud to say that several other states have used West Virginia's system as a model, helping to combat domestic violence within their borders.

Passing the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 not only sustains existing programs, but creates several new initiatives that extend help to different groups and communities. The bill establishes a new formula for calculating some of the grants, enabling small states like West Virginia to continue to expand their services. In addition, it augments current policies with protections for older and disabled women, and builds on legal assistance programs to further expand coverage.

Perhaps most importantly, the passage of this legislation conveys the important message that the federal government considers domestic violence to be a serious issue. Those of us in Congress share in this concern with the people we serve. We can take some pride that by acting to address these problems, we may have moved some State governments to improve their services to abused spouses and children, and to increase the penalties meted out to the abusers.

By paying attention to this enormously important issue, and by enhancing the current legislation, we are taking steps in the right direction. Although the measures in the original legislation have helped to alleviate the problem, we must continue to wage a persistent fight as long as anyone feels unsafe in their homes.

FY 2000 SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, on the Friday before the July 4 recess, the Senate passed the military construction appropriations bill, which included the supplemental spending package, by voice vote. Although there were a number of meritorious items in that bill, if there had been an up or down vote, I would have voted against it for a number of reasons.

I was extremely disappointed in the Conferees' decision to drop the \$5 million in emergency methamphetamine cleanup funds from the supplemental package.

There was strong support for this provision from both Democrats and Republicans. And it was included in both the House and Senate supplemental packages.

So, it doesn't make sense why it was suddenly dropped—especially when we're talking about dangerous chemical sites that are left exposed in our local communities. Without this provision, the bill provides hundreds of millions to help a foreign country fight a drug war, but turns a blind eye to one of the biggest drug problems right in our own back yards. That is unacceptable.

Our failure to fund the cleanup of these labs is all the more disappointing because this bill is bloated with pork. There is \$700 million here for the Coast Guard alone, including \$45 million for a C-37A aircraft for the Coast Guard. The C-37 is a Gulfstream V executive jet. It's not even your average corporate jet, but one of the most expensive, top-of-the-line crafts.

Why should the American taxpayers pay \$45 million so the Coast Guard officers can fly in luxury, when the military has trouble keeping its planes aloft because they lack spare parts? There is a drug crisis in this country and an immediate need for funds for peacekeeping operations, but that's no

reason to buy luxury jets in an emergency spending bill.

Mr. President, without the meth funding, states and local communities will have to bear the burden of cleaning up these highly toxic sites that are found every day in Iowa and throughout the Midwest, West and Southwest.

In recent years, the Drug Enforcement Agency has provided critical financial assistance to help clean up these dangerous sites, which can cost thousands of dollars each.

Unfortunately, in March, the DEA ran out of funds to provide methamphetamine lab cleanup assistance to state and local law enforcement. That's because last year, this funding was cut in half while the number of meth labs found and confiscated has been growing.

In late May, the Administration shifted \$5 million in funds from other Department of Justice Accounts to pay for emergency meth lab cleanup. And I believe that will help reimburse these states for the costs they have incurred since the DEA ran out of money. My state of Iowa has already paid some \$300,000 of its own pocket for cleanup since March.

However, we've got months to go before the new fiscal year—and the number of meth labs being found and confiscated are still on the rise. My \$5 million provision in this emergency spending package would have provided enough money to pay for costly meth lab cleanup without forcing states to take money out of their other tight law enforcement budgets.

If we can find the money to fight drugs in Colombia, we should be able to find the money to fight drugs in our own backyard. We should not risk exposing these dangerous meth sites to our communities.

So I urge the Senate to support adding the \$5 million in emergency meth cleanup funds to the FY 2001 Foreign Operations spending bill or another appropriations vehicle. It is unfair to force our state and local communities to shoulder this financial burden alone.

NOMINATION OF MADELYN
CREEDON

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to that of my colleagues on behalf of Madelyn Creedon's nomination. She has been selected by the President to become the first Deputy Administrator for defense programs in the new National Nuclear Security Administration, NNSA, at the Department of Energy. I had the privilege of working closely with Madelyn while she served on the minority staff for the Strategic Forces Sub-Committee. I have great respect for her ability and judgment, and I'm confident she will do an excellent job for General Gordon and the country. In addition to being skillful and reliable,