health care—from government policy development to evaluations of program effectiveness, from pediatric care to end-of-life care, and from hospitals to physician offices.

In addition to his service to the people of Utah and Nevada, Jamie has led and supported initiatives to evaluate and improve the quality of medical care delivered to all Americans. He has served as a member of the board of directors of the American Health Quality Association, an association representing a national network of organizations and individuals striving to improve the health care delivered in every state in our nation.

Mr. Cannon has also chaired numerous committees and task forces at the national level, providing leadership and direction to other health business executives committed to improving the quality of clinical medicine.

In addition to providing a legacy of health care quality leadership regionally and nationally, Jamie has also influenced the lives of many others in the community. He is a devoted husband, father of ten children, son and brother. Throughout his life, Jamie has also given generously of his time to those in need through lay service in his church.

Jamie's genuine care and concern for others is apparent in every interaction. His boundless optimism and belief in human goodness engenders trust, rekindles hope, and nurtures vision in all those around him.

Mr. Cannon's leadership and service are respected and admired by his peers, employers, business associates, friends and neighbors, and family. I am proud to know Jamie. He deserves the recognition and appreciation of Congress, the Nation, and particularly the citizens of Utah and Nevada.

With honor and pride I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing and expressing appreciation to James Q. Cannon for his many contributions to quality health care in our country.

WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight the concerns of some of my constituents who are participating in an adult basic education program conducted by the ARC of Northern Rhode Island.

Earlier in this session, John Mullaly, on behalf of his classmates, wrote to me to express his concerns regarding the use of the word ''handicapped''.

Mr. President, individuals who live with disabilities are one of the nation's great untapped resources. They have much to contribute, and they deserve to be fully integrated into every aspect of society. I am proud that so many of my colleagues share this point of view and that 70 senators have joined in cosponsoring S. 331, the Work Incentives Improvement Act, legislation that allows individuals with disabilities to join the workforce while maintaining their health benefits under Medicare or Medicaid.

As we debate this and other related legislation in the Senate, I hope that my colleagues will also consider the vocabulary we use. Mr. Mullaly and his classmates have suggested that we replace the term ''handicapped'' with the phrase ''persons with physical/mental challenges''. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Mullaly's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ARC OF NORTHERN RHODE ISLAND,
February 2, 1999.

Senator JACK REED,
Providence, RI.

DEAR SENATOR JACK REED: We are students of Adult Basic Education at the ARC of Northern Rhode Island. We believe that everyone should be treated equally and be given the chance to be the best that he or she can be. No one should suffer discrimination. We know you agree with this. We are trying to educate the general public and we need your help.

We are trying to tell them that it discriminates against us to refer to us as ''handicapped''. It is not an appropriate word because it puts a stigma on us and a limit as to what we can do. It is incredible what we can do and we would prefer to be referred to as persons with physical/mental challenges. We will take the challenge! That term gives us inspiration to meet our goals. What are our goals? To be the best we can be, to give others love, kindness, and inspiration. Also, to protect the rights of others like us, and to educate the public.

Will you help us? Will you work towards using the new terminology on signs in public places? We would also like suggestions from you on how we can help bring this about and protect the integrity of all concerned.

Sincerely,

JOHN MULLALY, SPOKESPERSON,
Adult Basic Education Classes.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on March 23, 1999, the Committee on Environment and Public Works filed S. 507, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, accompanied by Senate Report 106–34. At that time, the analysis prepared by the Congressional Budget Office was not available, and therefore was not printed with the report. The analysis subsequently has been received by the committee and I now ask unanimous consent, pursuant to section 403 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act, it be printed in the 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, April 14, 1999.

Hon. JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 507, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Victoria Heid Hall (for the effects on outer continental shelf receipts) and Gary Brown (for all other federal costs), both of whom can be reached at 226–2860, and Marjorie Miller (for the state and local impact), who can be reached at 225–3220.

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN,
Director.

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 507—Water Resources Development Act of 1999

Summary: S. 507 would authorize the appropriation of about $2.3 billion (in 1999 dollars) over the 2000–2009 period for the Secretary of Army, acting through the Army Corps of Engineers, to conduct studies and undertake specified projects and programs for flood control, port development, inland navigation, storm damage reduction, and environmental restoration. Adjusting for anticipated inflation, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would require appropriations of $2.5 billion over that period. The bill also would authorize:

Prepayment or waiver of amounts owed to the federal government;

Spending a portion of the fees collected at Corps recreation sites;

Free use of sand, gravel, and shell resources from the outer continental shelf (OCS) at eligible projects by state and local governments; and

Sale of specified federal lands in Washington and Oklahoma.

CBO estimates that implementing S. 507 would result in additional outlays of about $1.9 billion over the 2000–2004 period, assuming the appropriation of the necessary amounts. The remaining amounts authorized by the bill would be spent after 2004. Enacting the bill would affect direct spending; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. CBO estimates that enacting S. 507 would reduce direct spending by $18 million in 2000 and would result in a net increase in direct spending of $6 million over the 2000–2004 period.

S. 507 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). State and local governments would likely incur some costs as a result of the bill's enactment, but these costs would be voluntary.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S. 507 is shown in the following table. For constructing, operating, and maintaining projects that are already authorized, CBO estimates that the Corps will need about $4 billion annually over the 2000–2004 period (roughly the level appropriated in 1999). The table shows the estimates of additional spending necessary to implement the bill. The costs of this legislation fall primarily within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By fiscal years, in millions of dollars—				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION					
Estimated Authorization Level	478	558	485	321	185
Estimated Outlays	239	446	510	414	278
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING					
Estimated Budget Authority	−18	6	6	6	6
Estimated Outlays	−18	6	6	6	6

Basis of estimate: For the purpose of this estimate, CBO assumes that S. 507 will be enacted by the end of fiscal year 1999 and that all amounts estimated to be authorized by the bill will be appropriated for each fiscal year.