When faced with honest choices, the American people will not accept the Federal Government paying for programs that are primarily the responsibility of the States at the expense of sacrificing our commitment to Social Security and Medicare, as well as to numerous other commitments the Federal Government has made under law and under the Constitution of the United States of America. That is absolutely unacceptable, and the American people have a right to be upset. We need to be doing better.

As the appropriations legislation is finalized in negotiations, I hope that we in the Senate can inject some common sense into the dialog, taking into account our priorities as a Federal legislative body, and weighing the extent to which we should or should not maintain our involvement in various programs that are more properly the responsibility of State and local government. Even now, however, I fear we are primarily driven to compete with the President for political oneupsmanship in the area of education which, while ranked first as a national priority according to polling data, is not the primary responsibility of State and local government.

Medicare, Social Security, and national security—these are the primary challenges before us. As fiscal stewards of our Nation's economy, we cannot afford to continue maintaining our involvement in so many other areas, spending at such a pace as we have and it has been enormous. We must define our responsibilities. We must prioritize. We mut exercise fiscal discipline and restraint and insist that we work harder and smarter and do more with less.

The current budgetary path that we are on is both dangerous and irresponsible and downright misleading.

I am sad to say that many of the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bills with which we have invested so much of our time, despite our best intentions, are flawed by the use of budgetary gimmicks that I cannot help but say overshadow the labors of so many of my colleagues who are shouldered with the difficult task of constructing a budget that both meets all of the perceived demands placed on this body and keeps us out of the red. That is why we must prioritize.

In the meantime, I cannot condone the sleight of hand that allows us to postpone making the kind of tough choices that are required to balance our books, and because of that I have voted against a number of these spending bills—bills that, to be sure, would benefit Ohio in a number of ways.

We have committed over $17 billion in emergency spending in these bills, and that does not even count the billions of dollars of other spending that's being hidden. We are plastering—and I mean plastering—this spending over with something called directed scoring. Instead of using CBO numbers—that is, the Congressional Budget Office numbers—we have been selectively using numbers from the Office of Management and Budget, the agency for which the President is responsible, whenever they allow us to spend more.

Incidentally, does anyone remember the last time we did not have an emergency for which we had to account? Let's end the charade and admit we use emergency spending to avoid the balanced budget spending caps and, while we are at it, admit we are spending every dime of the projected on-budget surplus in fiscal year 2000.

When I go back to Ohio, people say to me: What about the tax reduction? You guys are having a tough time just balancing the budget.

I want to say this: If we do not have substantially more revenues in fiscal year 2000 than what is currently projected, CBO will announce in January that we are using Social Security to balance the 2000 budget. We have to pray the dollars come in a lot more, but if the dollars do not come in more, then CBO is going to announce in January this budget uses Social Security.

It is time to bite the bullet and make the hard choices. Nobody else but us can exercise the fiscal responsibility that is needed. If we cannot do it now, with the lowest unemployment we have had and a booming economy, the question I have is, When will we ever be able to do it? If we fail to make the tough choices now, we will soon be facing a train wreck that will make it impossible for us to respond to the needs specifically delegated in the Constitution to the Federal Government and fail to keep the sacred Social Security and Medicare covenant we have with the American people. Let's get back on track so when we return to Washington at the start of the new millennium, which is just around the corner, we can say with confidence we have, indeed, been the stewards of a government the American people deserve.

I yield the floor.

NOTICE OF OBJECTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I have informed the Minority Leader in writing that I will object to any motion to proceed or to seek unanimous consent to take up and pass H.R. 2260, the Pain Relief Promotion Act of 1999, when it is received from the House.

BRING ON THE WRITE STUFF

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, according to recent results from the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), only about a quarter of fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders write well enough to meet the ''proficient'' achievement grading level, and a measly one percent of students attained the ''advanced'' grading level. Approximately six out of ten pupils reached just the ''basic'' level—defined as ''partial mastery'' of writing skills by the National Assessment of Educational Progress exam.

What startling results, Mr. President! How do we expect our nation to forge ahead in a global economy with a ''partial mastery'' of writing skills? From the typical thank-you note to a cover letter for a job opening to a simple exchange with friends over the Internet, writing is a skill essential to everyday existence, no matter what path in life one may choose to pursue. The power of words and the blending of thoughts in a succinct, clear, and grammatically correct manner is often a daunting endeavor, and one that is too easily dismissed with a poor letter grade or a critical evaluation by a mentor or coworker.

The path to becoming a solid writer is a long and arduous road. I continue to improve my writing skills each day through reading and through practice. As the old saying goes, ''practice makes perfect.'' Well, Mr. President, this dictum does not just apply to perfecting your baseball swing or your tennis serve. It is an edict we all ought to follow with a little greater will and fortitude in all of life's quests.

What makes someone a better writer? Lots of things, I say, but perhaps a strong foundation is the most critical, and often the most neglected, step along the way. Today's children are ripe with great ideas and creativity, but without proper instruction and strong reading skills, bright promise fades into fractured thoughts and misspelled words on paper. Based upon the results of the 1998 NAEP test, students who did well tended to be those who planned out their compositions and had teachers who required practice drafts. Moreover, youngsters from homes filled with books, newspapers, magazines, and encyclopedias had higher average scores.

So often, we hear students gripe about burdensome summer reading lists, and even more shockingly, we witness parents encouraging their children to buy the ''Cliff Notes'' of the book to provide them with the basic character and plot summaries while avoiding the hefty task of reading the novel from cover to cover. What nonsense! Perhaps, the greatest benefit of a child's summer agenda is reading. Skimming and reading shortened versions or the so-called ''Cliff Notes'' rob children of wonderful learning experiences.

Reading is an essential ingredient to enhancing one's writing skills. From enjoying the morning newspaper over a cup of coffee to reading an educational magazine or a novel, one can benefit greatly from this endeavor. Given the expansive English vocabulary, there is much to learn from different styles of writing. How often does a person come across an unfamiliar word or phrase in reading? Quite often, I suspect. But how often does the person actually interrupt their reading to consult the dictionary for the word's definition or origin? Not very often, I venture to guess. An appreciation of the soaring majesty of the English language is the

key to unlocking one's own writing skills and letting one's own words take wing.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor this year of S. 514, legislation to reauthorize the National Writing Project. The National Writing Project (NWP) is the only federally funded program that specifically works to improve a student's writing abilities and provide professional development programs in the area of writing instruction for classroom teachers. This program operates on a ''teachers teaching teachers'' model, meaning that successful writing teachers conduct workshops for other teachers in the schools during the school year to improve overall writing skills. It is critically important that our nation have skilled teachers in the area of writing, and this program goes straight to the heart of that. West Virginia is home to three federally funded National Writing Projects, including programs at West Virginia University and Marshall University.

The act of writing is itself an art, one which not only requires creativity, but one that can also glisten with beauty. Calligraphy, for example, is a beautiful form of writing, very popular in formal invitations and for special events. And while most of us are not gifted calligraphers by nature, we all ought to take a little more pride in the presentation of our writing. A beautifully worded poem or essay can be easily tarnished by poor penmanship. Conversely, good penmanship can enhance the overall beauty of one's writing by simple finishing touches, beginning with the dotting of our i's and the crossing of our t's. It is very easy to become sloppy in one's writing, but we must not forget that appearance does matter, and a good essay that is illegible will have little impact.

Sadly, today's young generation seems to be more happily occupied with a telephone in one hand and a television remote control in the other than with a book or a newspaper. I fear that the entertainment luxuries of the twentieth century have misplaced the old-fashioned art of reading and writing. Computer electronic mail too often has become a replacement for a hand-written thank-you letter to a deserving colleague or peer. Reading from Plutarch's ''Lives,'' Homer's ''The Iliad'' and ''The Odyssey,'' or a Shakespearean play has taken a backseat to video games and Hollywood movies.

I challenge all of us to set higher standards in our reading and writing skills, and to help our young people do the same. Put down the remote control and pick up a good book. Write a poem for a friend on her birthday. Poetry is a wonderful gift—such heartfelt thoughts on paper tend to last much longer than a piece of clothing exhibiting the latest fashion trend. Embrace the English language and take pride in each word that you place on paper—after all, your writing is a reflection of you.

I yield the floor.

CBO COST ESTIMATE FOR S. 1377

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at the time Senate Report No. 106–177 was filed to accompany S. 1377, the Congressional Budget Office report was not available. I ask unanimous consent that the report which is now available be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Senate.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 6, 1999.

Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 1377, a bill to amend the Central Utah Project Completion Act regarding the use of funds for water development for the Bonneville Unit, and for other purposes.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Hadley, who can be reached at 226–2860.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE, OCTOBER 6, 1999

S. 1377: A BILL TO AMEND THE CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACT REGARDING THE USE OF FUNDS FOR WATER DEVELOPMENT FOR THE BONNEVILLE UNIT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

(As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on September 22, 1999)

CBO estimates that enacting S. 1377 would have no impact on the federal budget. The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would have no significant impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

S. 1377 would authorize the appropriation of up to $60 million for the Secretary of the Interior to acquire water rights for instream flows and to complete certain other projects, if such funds are not needed for the projects currently authorized by the Central Utah Project Completion Act. Based on information from the Department of the Interior, CBO expects that the department will use all available funds for purposes authorized under current law, assuming appropriation of such amounts. Thus, the bill would neither affect funds already appropriated nor increase the total amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for the Central Utah Project.

The CBO staff contact is Mark Hadley, who can be reached at 226–2860. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CBO COST ESTIMATE FOR S. 986

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at the time Senate Report No. 106–173 was filed to accompany S. 986 the Congressional Budget Office report was not available. I ask unanimous consent that the report which is now available be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Senate.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 18, 1999.

Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 986, the Griffith Project Prepayment and Conveyance Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Megan Carroll (for federal costs), who can be reached at 226–2860, and Marjorie Miller (for the state and local impact), who can be reached at 225–3220.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE, OCTOBER 18, 1999

S. 986: GRIFFITH PROJECT PREPAYMENT AND CONVEYANCE ACT

(As reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on October 6, 1999)

SUMMARY

S. 986 would direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau) to convey the Robert B. Griffith Water Project (Griffith Project) to the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA). The transfer would occur after the SNWA pays about $121 million to the Bureau to meet its outstanding obligations under an existing repayment contract with the federal government. A substantial portion of the Griffith Project is located on federal land administered by the National Park Service (NPS) and the Bureau of Land Management. Under S. 986, the SNWA would retain rights-of-way across this federal land at no cost.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 986 would yield a net increase in asset sale receipts of $112 million in 2000, but that this near-term cash savings would be offset on a present value basis by the loss of other offsetting receipts over the 2001–2033 period. Because the bill would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. CBO also estimates that implementing S. 986 could cost up to $50,000 a year in appropriated funds over the 2001–2004 period. S. 986 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). The project conveyance, and any costs associated with it, would be voluntary on the part of the SNWA. The bill would impose no costs on any other state, local, or tribal governments.

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact of S. 986 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING [1]					
Estimated Budget Authority	−112	9	9	9	9
Estimated Outlays	−112	9	9	9	9

[1] S. 986 also would authorize additional spending, subject to appropriation, of up to $50,000 a year over the 2001–2004 period.

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

For this estimate, we assume that S. 986 will be enacted early in fiscal year 2000. Based on information from the SNWA and