

both Israeli companies and U.S. companies that supply raw materials used in the manufacture of Israeli inputs, such as nylon yarn.

I am bringing this matter to your attention because the legislation to be considered by the Finance Committee should not damage U.S.-Israeli trade. Protecting against such harm can be accomplished by providing in the legislation that Israeli-origin inputs will, for purposes of CBI preferences, be treated no less favorably than U.S. inputs. Such a provision would ensure that restrictive consequences of the proposed legislation would not adversely affect U.S.-Israeli trade.

The legislative measure that we are asking you to support is consistent with previous trade measures approved by your Committee and enacted into U.S. law to preserve U.S.-Israeli trade under the FTAA. Such a provision would preserve the status quo in U.S.-Israeli trade, a goal that has been endorsed previously on a number of occasions by the Committee. It is not intended to create any new benefit for Israeli products.

In sum, our objective is to ensure that the CBI trade bill does not withdraw the practical benefits of the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement and our mutual goal of expanding bilateral trade. I would very much welcome the opportunity to review this issue with you.

Sincerely,

OHAD MARANI,
Economic Minister.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not think that it is the intent of the CBI legislation to undermine our trade with Israel. Preserving our existing trade with Israel will not in any way lessen the trade benefits we extend to the CBI countries. And it is critically important that we consider our existing trade agreement with Israel as we develop further trade measures. I urge my colleagues to address this issue as this bill moves forward, so that we do not prejudice our trade with Israel under the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at the time Senate Report No. 623 was filed, 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.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, November 10, 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. 623, the Dakota Water Resources Act of 1999.

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), and Marjorie Miller (for the impact on state, local, and tribal governments).

Sincerely,

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

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE S. 623—Dakota Water Resources Act of 1999

SUMMARY

CVO estimates the implementing S. 623 would cost \$131 million over the 2000-2004 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. Starting in fiscal year 2002, S. 623 would affect direct spending; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. CBO estimates, however, that changes in direct spending would not become significant until 2007. S. 623 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). The state of North Dakota and local governments in that state would probably incur some costs as a result of the bill's enactment, but these costs would be voluntary.

S. 623 would amend the existing authority for construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit (GDU) of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, administered by the Bureau of Reclamation (the Bureau). S. 623 would authorize the appropriation of about \$688 million (in 1999 dollars) for the Bureau to complete the GDU. Adjusting for anticipated cost growth, CBO estimates that implementing this legislation would require the appropriation of \$793 million over the 2000-2017 period. Most of the outlays from such funding would occur after 2004. We estimate that enacting the bill would reduce offsetting receipts (a credit against direct spending) by less than \$200,000 a year between 2002 and 2006, but would result in increased offsetting receipts of about \$7 million a year starting in 2007.

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact on S. 623 over the next five years 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 SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION¹					
Estimated Authorization Level ...	0	24	33	47	31
Estimated Outlays	0	16	27	41	47

¹ Most of the costs of implementing S. 623 would occur after 2004. In addition, to the bill's discretionary costs, it would increase direct spending by less than \$200,000 a year over the 2000-2004 period. (That estimated annual effect would continue through 2006, but S. 623 would reduce direct spending by about \$7 million a year after 2006).

Assuming appropriation of the necessary funds, CBO estimates that implementing S. 623 would cost \$131 million over the 2000-2004 period, \$450 million over the 2000-2009 period, and \$793 million over the 2000-2018 period. Initially, the bill would have no significant impact on direct spending, but after 2006, S. 623 would increase offsetting receipts by about \$7 million a year.

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

Estimates of funds needed to meet design and construction schedules were provided by the Bureau. CBO adjusted those estimates to reflect anticipated cost growth during the construction period, as authorized by the bill. For purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that S. 623 will be enacted during fiscal year 2000 and that the authorized amounts will be appropriated. Estimates of outlays are based on historical spending patterns for similar projects.

SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION

Red River Valley Water Supply Project.—S. 623 would authorize the appropriation of \$200 million (in 1999 dollars) for the Bureau to construct facilities to meet the water quality and quantity needs of the Red River Valley. Based on information from the Bureau, CBO expects that construction would

begin during fiscal year 2004 and would be substantially completed in 2007. Assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts, CBO estimates that design and initial construction would about \$75 million over the 2000-2004 period.

Municipal, Rural, and Industrial Water Systems.—The bill also would authorize the appropriation of \$200 million (in 1999 dollars) for the Bureau to make grants to North Dakota to construct municipal, rural, and industrial water systems. The bill would authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200 million (in 1999 dollars) for the Bureau to construct, operate, and maintain, on a nonreimbursable basis, municipal, rural, and industrial water systems on certain Indian reservations. CBO estimates that implementing both of these provisions would cost about \$45 million between 2000 and 2004.

Operation and Maintenance.—During construction of the Red River Valley Water Supply Project, operation and maintenance costs of the GDU would be covered by using funds appropriated for construction. Once the facility is completed in 2007, S. 623 would authorize the appropriation of amounts necessary for the Bureau to operate and maintain a certain portion of the facility. Based on information from the Bureau, CBO expects the facility to be put into use in 2007. At that time, we estimate that an additional appropriation of about \$3 million would be required each year for operation and maintenance.

S. 623 also would authorize the appropriation of additional amounts necessary for the operation and maintenance of wildlife mitigation and enhancement facilities, including wildlife refuges. Based on information from the Bureau, CBO estimates this work would cost about \$1 million annually starting in 2001.

Natural Resources Trust.—S. 623 would authorize the appropriation of \$25 million for the Secretary of the Interior to make annual contributions to the Natural Resources Trust, a nonfederal corporation (currently known as the Wetlands Trust). The amount to be contributed in any fiscal year would equal 5 percent of the amount appropriated in that year for the Red River Valley Water Supply Project and for non-Indian municipal, rural, and industrial water supply systems. CBO estimates this provision would cost \$6 million between 2000 and 2004.

Recreational Projects.—The bill would authorize the appropriation of \$6.5 million for the Bureau to construct, operate, and maintain new recreational facilities, provided that the Secretary of the Interior has entered into agreements with nonfederal entities to provide half of the cost of operating and maintaining any such facilities. CBO estimates that implementing this provision would cost about \$1 million between 2000 and 2004.

Oakes Test Area Title Transfer.—S. 623 would authorize the Secretary to convey the Oakes Test Area, an experimental irrigation facility in North Dakota, to the local irrigators. The Bureau currently spends less than \$200,000 annually to operate and maintain the facility. These amounts are subject to appropriation and are reimbursed by users of the facility. Reimbursements are deposited in the Treasury as offsetting receipts and are unavailable for spending without appropriation action. Based on information from the Bureau, CBO expects that the title transfer would occur during fiscal year 2002. Starting in that year, this provision would yield annual discretionary savings of less than \$200,000.

DIRECT SPENDING

Offsetting Receipts from Repayment Contracts.—Under current law, the GDU water

supply features are not expected to be put into service, and thus will not generate offsetting receipts from repayment contracts. According to the Bureau, under S. 623 the unit would be placed into service during 2007 and the agency would start to collect repayments from project beneficiaries in that year. Repayments would be deposited in the Treasury as offsetting receipts and would be unavailable for spending without appropriation. CBO estimates that these receipts

would total about \$7 million a year starting in 2007.

Oakes Test Area Title Transfer.—CBO estimates that under the bill, the Secretary would transfer ownership of the Oakes Test Area to local users in 2002. This transfer would reduce offsetting receipts that are collected from irrigators under current law to reimburse the Bureau for operating costs. Thus, CBO estimates that this provision would reduce offsetting receipts by less than \$200,000 a year starting in 2002.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. The net changes in outlays that are subject to pay-as-you-go procedures are shown in the following table. For the purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, only the effects in the budget year and the succeeding four years are counted.

	By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Changes in outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-7	-7	-7
Changes in receipts										Not applicable

Estimated impact on state, local, and tribal governments: S. 623 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA. Under current law, and under the amendments made by this bill, the state of North Dakota and local governments in that state would provide some of the funds necessary to construct and to operate and maintain the authorized facilities. All such spending would be a condition of federal assistance and would be voluntary.

Estimated impact on the private sector: This bill would impose no new private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Megan Carroll; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Marjorie Miller.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, November 17, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,690,918,151,426.47 (Five trillion, six hundred ninety billion, nine hundred eighteen million, one hundred fifty-one thousand, four hundred twenty-six dollars and forty-seven cents).

One year ago, November 17, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,586,021,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred eighty-six billion, twenty-one million).

Five years ago, November 17, 1994, the Federal debt stood at \$4,752,752,000,000 (Four trillion, seven hundred fifty-two billion, seven hundred fifty-two million).

Ten years ago, November 17, 1989, the Federal debt stood at \$2,918,126,000,000 (Two trillion, nine hundred eighteen billion, one hundred twenty-six million) which reflects a doubling of the debt—an increase of almost \$3 trillion—\$2,772,792,151,426.47 (Two trillion, seven hundred seventy-two billion, seven hundred ninety-two million, one hundred fifty-one thousand, four hundred twenty-six dollars and forty-seven cents) during the past 10 years.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the Chair.

Madam President, what is the matter before the Senate?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The period for morning business has expired. The normal business before the Senate would be the bankruptcy bill.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

HAPPY BIRTHDAY WISHES FOR THE HON. TED STEVENS

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I want to call attention to the fact that today, November 18, 1999, is the birthday of the very distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, my friend. I would like to say lifelong friend; I just haven't had the pleasure of knowing him all of my life. The day after tomorrow, I will be 82 years old, if the Lord lets me live. So I can't say he is my lifelong friend, but he has been my friend over all the years he has served in the Senate.

I wish him a happy, happy birthday. He is a Senator who doesn't look up to the rich. He doesn't look down on the poor. He is a good man on the inside and on the outside. And he is a man who sticks by his principles.

He is a Republican. I am a Democrat. But neither he nor I puts political party above everything else. We know that political party is important, but there are other things in this life that are even more important. He recognizes that. His handclasp is like the handclasp of our ancestors. His word is his bond, as was the word of our ancestors.

I could say much more. I will simply say he is a Christian gentleman, a gentleman first, last, and always. My wife Erma and I extend to him our very best wishes on his birthday and our prayers and hopes that he will enjoy many, many more happy birthdays.

He is rendering a tremendous service to his country and to his State. I hope the people of Alaska realize what a treasure this man is. He works for Alaska every day in the Senate. We know that. He is effective. He is forceful. He is genuine.

Erma and I join in wishing him a happy birthday and expressing our

good wishes also to his lovely wife, Catherine, and to his children.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I thank Senator BYRD for yielding me the time. I join in wishing a very happy birthday to our friend from Alaska. He makes the Senate a better place. He keeps us lively. He works hard. He makes sure we get our job done, and he does it with a lot of alacrity sometimes. He will get right up in your face and make sure you understand. That helps to clear the subject up in many instances.

He is a great guy. I am honored to be able to serve in this institution with the great Senator from Alaska who does so much for our country and certainly for his State of Alaska. I will not tell his wife, the lovely, charming wife to whom he is married, what his age is today because I assume she doesn't know what his actual age is. We will keep that a secret. But happy birthday to our great friend.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the majority leader yield because I think this is the most appropriate time to add my wishes as well.

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DASCHLE. I wish to identify with the warm and generous remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. I agree entirely with his comments and with the views he has expressed. I think he and I speak for our caucuses in our admiration collectively for the Senator from Alaska. We may not always agree, but there isn't anyone who cares more deeply about this institution, about his State, and represents himself more effectively on the Senate floor and with his colleagues than the Senator from Alaska.

It is an honor for me to be one of those who have had the good fortune of working with him. I respect him immensely, and I, too, join in wishing him the happiest of birthdays. I wouldn't be surprised at all if Catherine knows exactly how old he is today.