

face deadly threats that can strike at any time, even during routine traffic stops. Bulletproof vests save lives. It is essential the we update this law so that many more of our officers who are risking their lives everyday are able to protect themselves.

In the last Congress, we created the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program in part in response to the tragic Drega incident along the Vermont and New Hampshire border. 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. This madman had just 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 lost his life.

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, who was seriously wounded in the incident. If it was not for his bulletproof vest, I would have been attending Officer Pfeifer's wake instead of visiting him, and meeting his wife and young daughter in the hospital a few days later. I am relieved that Officer John Pfeifer is doing well and is back on duty today.

The two New Hampshire state troopers who were killed by Carl Drega were not so lucky. 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 used by this madman. We all grieve for the two New Hampshire officers who were killed. Their tragedy underscore the point that all of our law enforcement officers, whether federal, state or local, deserve the protection of a bulletproof vest. 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 Grant Act of 2000 will provide state and local law enforcement agencies with more of the assistance they need to protect their officers. Our bipartisan legislation enjoys the endorsement of many law enforcement organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police and the National Sheriffs' Association. In my home State of Vermont, the 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.

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." Each and every law enforcement officer across the nation deserves the protection of a bulletproof vest.

Mr. President, I look forward to President Clinton signing this life-saving legislation into law.

FAILURE TO PASS AN INTERSTATE WASTE BILL

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, one of the many items that the Senate failed to address during this Congress is legislation that would allow the states to protect themselves from unwanted out-of-state garbage. Three separate bills were offered in the Senate on this issue and each had merit, at least as a point of departure. In fact two of the bills incorporated elements that easily passed the Senate a few years ago.

The Environment and Public Works Committee held a hearing on these bills but failed to move any of the bills forward. This is more than disappointing. For a state like Virginia that is now importing over 7 million tons of municipal solid waste each year, with no way to limit the growth of this unwanted import, it is important that the committee and the full Senate act on legislation.

Seven million tons of imported solid waste represents 280,000 truck loads of waste moving into the Commonwealth of Virginia each year. The traffic this generates is reason alone to authorize additional state controls. But there are other reasons. Cheap landfill disposal due to an over abundance of capacity, has made us less vigilant about recycling. And although new federal landfill standards protect our environment better than the old standards, today's landfills are much larger than yesterdays, and we are not yet certain that all the engineering improvements we have made are enough. We may not know if these new landfills leak for a few more years.

Transporting waste hundreds of miles for disposal is also a senseless use of diesel fuel, and when we are already facing a shortage we should seek to conserve our fuel resources. We are misallocating fuel that could be used to heat homes this winter and using it to haul trash up and down the east coast. I understand from the Federal Highway Administration that the large trucks used to transport waste get about 6.1 miles per gallon. An out of state delivery of trash to Virginia landfills can amount to 680 miles round trip and 68 gallons of gas. If only half the trips to Virginia are that long, over 500,000 gallons of diesel fuel will be used to ship waste several hundred miles. This is a waste.

During this Congress, I introduced one interstate waste bill and co-sponsored two others, and if members of the Senate propose other ways to deal with this problem, I am more than willing to work with them to develop something that is workable for all parties. But at this time unless a state chooses, as some have, to simply stop siting land disposal capacity, they lose all control in terms of how long that capacity will last and what kind of traffic it will receive.

When we come back next year I will try again to move legislation. I will meet with the exporting States and I will continue to work toward a goal of wiser use of our resources, and that includes recycling, minimizing waste in the first place and certainly finding a way to dispose of it without moving half way across the country.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF SOLID WASTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is outrageous that another Congress has passed without the enactment of legislation which would resolve the problem of the interstate transportation of solid waste. The people should not be dumped on any longer. They should have some control over their own jurisdictions and over their own land. It is up to us to give them that authority. I just heard that Toronto Canada is thinking about sending its waste to Michigan and the people of Michigan have nothing to say about it.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that, under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution, unless Congress acts, states and municipalities are powerless to stop trash from being brought into their jurisdictions—powerless to protect their citizens' safety, the environment and their quality of life. So our states and municipalities rely on us to pass this protective legislation, and we let them down—again. The Senate has expressed its will on this issue over and over again—A majority of Senators support this legislation. We passed it by an overwhelming vote of 94-6. But the House has not acted. There are a few people over there who oppose it who have managed to displace the will of what appears to be a clear majority of House Members.

What will it take? The problem is getting worse. Total interstate waste shipments continue to rise and there is a finite amount of landfill capacity available. Michigan, my State, imports over 12 percent of all of the solid waste it disposes of in landfills. Michigan counties and townships have plans for waste disposal. They have invested in it. They have made significant commitments to waste reduction and recycling. They have spent a lot of money on these investments to dispose of their waste locally. Those plans and those good faith investments are totally undermined when contracts to bring in waste from other states and countries are entered into without consideration by State, county, or local

governments of the impact of those contracts for importing waste into those areas. When you import waste in that way, without consideration of plans, and without consideration of the efforts that local governments have made to dispose of their own waste, it totally disrupts those efforts and those expenditures. It is not right. States and local governments have a right to do that planning and to make those investments in order to dispose of their own waste and, should they see fit, not to see their own plans displaced by the import of waste from other places.

I want to commend all the Senators who have been involved in this effort for so many years. Our previous vote of 96 to 4 shows that this truly is a bipartisan effort and it will continue to be.

Our States are counting on us to give them the authority to protect their citizens and the environment. I can assure you that, when Congress returns in January, I will be ready to fight this battle again until we pass legislation to prevent our states from being dumping grounds.

RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT OF 2000

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, just before the August recess, the Senate passed the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000, S. 2869. I had some serious concerns about this bill as originally introduced. As my colleagues know, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH and my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, came up with a bipartisan compromise that addressed many of the concerns I had about the initial bill. Specifically, I was concerned that the bill would have unintentionally impeded the ability of states and localities to protect the health and safety of children in a variety of ways. I am relieved that the new Senate version has a much more limited scope. Because the bill that was passed applies only to zoning decisions, landmark designations and institutionalized persons, it will not have any impact on child welfare systems, including the ability of states and localities to protect the health and safety of children. I see the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts on the floor and I would ask my colleague, as one of the authors of this new legislation, if my understanding of this legislation correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. DEWINE. Since the definition of "land use regulation" is limited to "a zoning or landmarking law, or the application of such a law," am I also correct in understanding that this legislation will not affect the ability of states and localities to enforce fire codes, building codes, and other measures to protect the health and safety of people using the land or buildings, such as

children in childcare centers, schools, or camps run by religious organizations?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, the Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. DEWINE. Am I also correct that the legislation will not affect civil rights laws that protect young people?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank my friend and colleague from Massachusetts for clarifying these points, and for working to pass legislation that does not compromise the health and safety of children and their families.

RECORD THIRD QUARTER NET PROFITS FOR BIG OIL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to announce that Big Oil is beginning to release its third quarter profit reports and while the news is great for investors, it's not so great for American consumers. As American families have been paying sky-high prices at the gas pump and are bracing for record-high home heating costs this winter, the oil industry has been savoring phenomenal profits. Something is wrong when working families are struggling to pay for basic transportation and home heat while Big Oil rakes in obscene amounts of cash by the barrel.

The overall net income for major petroleum companies more than doubled in the third quarter of 2000 relative to the third quarter of 1999. Let me illustrate the phenomenal profits of the oil industry for the past year when gasoline prices soared and heating oil stocks fell.

In the third quarter of 2000, Chevron Corporation reported net profits of \$1.53 billion, Exxon Mobil Corporation reported net profits of \$4.29 billion, and Texaco reported net profits of \$798 million. Compared to the third quarter of 1999, the profits in the third quarter of 2000 increased 163 percent for Chevron, 96 percent for Exxon Mobil, and 106 percent for Texaco. I ask unanimous consent that a chart of these statistics be printed in the RECORD.

Not surprisingly, these multi-million and even multi-billion dollar profits are making record profits. Exxon Mobil executive Peter Townsend is quoted as saying: "We've got a lot of cash around here. It's coming in pretty fast, flying through the door." And according to Fadel Gheit, an analyst with Fahnstock & Company: "The fourth quarter could beat the third."

There is no doubt that Big Oil reaped record profits while American consumers and small business owners dug deeper into their pockets to pay for soaring gasoline prices. And more record profits for Big Oil at the expense of consumers and small business owners are expected this winter when heating costs go through the roof. Mr. President, that is outrageous.

Even more disturbing are the recent press reports that the major oil compa-

nies are not using their record profits to boost production and lower future prices, but are instead cutting back on exploration and production. Listen to this from a report in the Wall Street Journal: "Exploration and production expenditures at the so-called super majors—Exxon Mobil Corp., BP Amoco PLC, and Royal Dutch/Shell Group—fell 20 percent to \$6.91 billion in the first six months of the year from a year earlier. . . ."

The investment firm UBS Warburg in London estimated this month that the surplus cash of the top 10 global energy companies will total \$40 billion this year and grow to \$130 billion by the end of 2004. The companies, Warburg predicts, will use about two-thirds of the surplus to repurchase stock to bolster market price, and one-third to reduce debt. Indeed, last week Texaco and Chevron agreed to merge with Chevron paying \$35.1 billion to acquire Texaco.

Well I for one have had enough of Big Oil making record profits at the expense of the working families and the small business owners who pay the oil bills, live by the rules and struggle mightily when fuel and heating costs skyrocket.

On September 27, 2000, I introduced S. 3118, the Windfall Oil Profits For Heating Assistance Act of 2000. My legislation imposes a windfall profits assessment on the oil industry to fund heating help for consumers and small business owners across America.

In true arrogance to the needs of Americans struggling to heat their homes, John Felmy of the American Petroleum Institute has publicly stated: "The profits aren't owned by consumers, they're owned by the shareholders. The companies have to do what's appropriate for owners of the enterprise."

The oil industry is made up of corporations formed under the laws of the United States. These oil industry corporations have a responsibility to the public good as well as their shareholders. To reap record windfall profits and then cut back on exploration and production to further increase future profits is poor corporate citizenship and an abuse of the public trust by these oil industry corporations and their executives.

In response to the energy crisis of the 1980s, Congress enacted the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act of 1980. This windfall profits tax, which was repealed in 1988, funded low-income fuel assistance and energy and transportation programs.

Similar to the early 1980s, American families again face an energy crisis of high prices and record oil company profits. This past June, gasoline prices hit all-time highs across the United States, with a national average of \$1.68 a gallon, according to the Energy Information Administration. This winter, the Department of Energy estimates that heating oil inventories are 36 percent lower than last year with heating oil inventories in New England estimated to be 65 percent lower than last