

I am disappointed the conference report requires that decennial census activities be appropriated by specific program components, known as frameworks.

Appropriating by framework for the decennial census has never been done before and would cause serious management problems for Census 2000. According to Census Director Kenneth Prewitt, such a change in funding practices would come at the same time that Census 2000 activities are at their highest. Past congressional direction on the allocation of funds by framework has been in report language, which afforded Congress the ability to guide spending without hamstringing operational management of the census.

Director Prewitt noted in a letter to the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on the Census, "Congressional approval in the form of a reprogramming would be required for any movement of funds between decennial program components." This would necessitate obtaining clearance by the Department of Commerce and the Office of Management and Budget, as well seeking congressional approval. The Senate version of H.R. 2670 did not include this onerous provision, which will seriously impede the Census Bureau from shifting needed funds in a timely manner. "A decennial census is, by its nature, an unpredictable exercise. Decisions must be made quickly and frequently adjusted to adapt to ever-changing conditions in the field," Director Prewitt said.

In its budget presentation, the Census Bureau designed eight frameworks for major decennial activities, such as management, field data collection, address listing, automation, Puerto Rico and Island areas. The frameworks have been used as strong guidelines rather than strict appropriation limits because funds may need to be shifted quickly between frameworks to cover unexpected contingencies. Historically, the Census Bureau has been able to move funds among its frameworks—it is inappropriate and damaging for Congress to mandate reprogramming at this time.

Any delay in census operations in order to accommodate having to wait for affirmation of a reprogramming request will seriously degrade the quality and completeness of the resulting population count that must be delivered by December 31, 2000. The President vetoed the conference report yesterday, and it is my hope this provision, retained from the House version of the bill, will be deleted. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print Director Prewitt's letter in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, DC, October 15, 1999.
Hon. DAN MILLER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Census, Committee on Government Reform, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLER: On Tuesday, October 12, 1999, you requested a summary of the Census Bureau's views on the comparative versions of the Commerce, State, Justice and the Judiciary Appropriations bills for FY 2000. There is language in the version of the bill passed by the House that is of significant concern to the Census Bureau.

In the House version of the FY 2000 appropriations bill, funding is provided by specific program components (known as frameworks). Consequently, Congressional approval in the form of a reprogramming would be required for any movement of funds between decennial program components. This is a dramatic departure from past practices and takes place at precisely the time when Census 2000 activities peak, when the need for program flexibility is most crucial. If the need to obtain Congressional approval significantly delays the transfer of funds, Census 2000 operations could be compromised. The companion legislation passed by the Senate does not contain this restrictive provision and would permit the timely transfer of funds, if necessary, to attain the results we are all working so hard to achieve.

In the past, formal reprogramming has only been required to shift funds between different programs, accounts, and bureaus within the Department of Commerce. This has allowed Congress to exercise its oversight responsibility without constricting the operational management of Bureau activities. The proposed House provision would trigger a time-consuming reprogramming process, in addition to the bill's provision that mandates a delay of at least 15 days for Congressional review.

As you know, the Census Bureau has spent literally thousands of hours developing a carefully analyzed Operational Plan, which we believe can achieve the most accurate and complete census possible within the parameters required by the recent Supreme Court decision requiring a complete enumeration of all census non-respondents.

A decennial census is, by its nature, an unpredictable exercise. Decisions must be made quickly and frequently adjusted to adapt to ever-changing conditions in the field. One obvious example of the need for this type of flexibility is in dealing with our new construction program. The Census 2000 New Construction procedures perform a vital role in address list development after all other addressing processes have concluded. If the volume of new construction listing work is significantly higher than anticipated, funds must be rapidly shifted from other frameworks to cover the costs of investigating areas, listing households, and preparing maps and other materials for enumeration. Reprogramming could inhibit the timely completion of listing operations and jeopardize the quality and completeness of the population count in states with high rates of new construction.

The census has the potential to be a civic ceremony that celebrates participation and responsibility. It is up to all of us to ensure that it is. Congress has consistently expressed and demonstrated a commitment to ensure the most complete and accurate census possible.

I appreciate your support and commitment in making Census 2000 a success.

Sincerely,

KENNETH PREWITT,
Director.

THE AFRICA TRADE BILL

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my objections to the Africa trade bill. I have listened to how this bill will help those countries on the African Subcontinent, and I support that goal. However, Mr. President, what I don't support is watching mills close in my State, and around the country, and having to tell these people that they no longer have jobs because cheap labor overseas has either caused their company to go out of business or move overseas.

At the same time, I don't believe that this legislation will serve the intended purpose of helping to raise the living standards of Africans through increased trade and economic cooperation between the United States and African countries. In order for this to occur, workers need to be paid well, treated well and have a suitable workplace. Workers in many countries in both Africa and the Caribbean Basin are subjected to abusive conditions at work while their governments remain uninvolved, or, with government complicity. This legislation does not have the provisions necessary to guarantee that the workers in these countries receive the benefits of U.S.-Africa trade.

In addition, being from Maine, I understand the importance of balancing the needs of loggers with the desires of environmentalists. This legislation would result in increased rates of logging, which has been cited as the greatest threat to Africa's remaining native forests. As only eight percent of Africa's forests still exist in large undisturbed tracts, forcing African nations to give even more access to foreign logging companies could be fatal to these vital tropical forests.

In the last 57 months, from December 1994 to September 1999, the U.S. apparel industry has lost 309,000 jobs. The textile industry has lost 128,000 jobs, for a total of 437,000 American jobs lost.

My home state of Maine has seen its fair share of lost jobs as well. Since 1994, 26,500 Mainers have been told that they no longer have a job to provide for them and their families. I have heard some of my colleagues state that this legislation is about jobs. Well, I am unwilling to trade well-paying jobs with benefits for lower paying ones—but that's precisely what's happened under our ill-conceived trade agreements. As the trade deficit and globalization of U.S. industries have grown, more quality jobs have been lost to imports than have been gained in the lower-paying sectors that are experiencing rapid export growth. Increased import shares have displaced almost twice as many high-paying, high-skill jobs than increased exports have created.

It was my concern about the impact of foreign labor on the American job market, Mr. President, that led me to oppose passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1993. Unfortunately, NAFTA has become a trade agreement whose provisions are not adequately enforced—to

the detriment of the United States, our industries, and our workers.

I am in agreement with my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, in his assessment of NAFTA last week. We were told that NAFTA would create jobs in America. I have seen in my state that they were wrong.

The U.S. textile and apparel industry has been decimated by imports from the Far East as a result of the Asian "flu" and also illegal transshipments that our government does not catch and which find their way into this country in what is estimated to be an annual volume of somewhere between \$4 and \$10 billion.

For 23 years, U.S. imports have exceeded U.S. exports. Consequently, in the last quarter of the 20th century, the United States has amassed a total trade deficit of more than \$2 trillion. As a result, the United States, which entered the decade of the 1980s as the world's largest creditor nation, leaves the 1990s as the world's largest debtor country.

This is no time to further liberalize trade policy that is hurting not only the textile and apparel industry but also steel, computers, and auto parts where net imports have climbed enormously. Last year, all of manufacturing lost over 340,000 jobs.

Mr. President, when I became a United States Senator, one of my pledges to the people of Maine was that, and continues to be, that I will work to the best of my ability to ensure that their jobs are not lost because of actions taken by their government.

The administration and proponents of NAFTA told us over and over again how good the Agreement would be for creating American jobs. I now hear the same argument with this legislation and I want to say that if what has happened is considered good, then I could not imagine what poor trade legislation would do to the textile and apparel industry.

THE CLIMATE CHANGE ENERGY POLICY RESPONSE ACT AND THE CLIMATE CHANGE TAX AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the Climate Change Energy Policy Response Act would bring the debate on global warming and climate change out of the arena of mass speculation and back to the refuge of sound, practical science. This legislation I am cosponsoring with my colleague from Idaho, Senator LARRY CRAIG, would not only move our Nation toward a healthier environment by requiring Federal agencies to establish clear goals for addressing climate change concerns, but it also seeks to protect rural economies that are currently threatened by policies based on scare tactics developed by professional global warming special interest activists and the politicians that cater to their agenda.

One thing that should be pointed out is that for many of the people who attend global warming conferences and who circulate global warming propaganda, global warming is an occupation. This is how they make their living. I make my living by ensuring the people of Wyoming and the United States get a fair deal. Committing our Nation's valuable resources and our children's futures to policies that unduly burden our communities is, to me, not only unfair, it's unconscionable.

This bill would direct the Secretary of Energy to coordinate and establish Federal policy for activities involving climate change. It would require increased peer review of the science used to create that policy and it establishes important objectives for the science such as understanding the Earth's capacity to assimilate natural and man-made greenhouse gas emissions and to evaluate natural phenomena such as El Niño.

I also am cosponsoring companion legislation that would put the power of addressing global warming issues into the hands of those most affected by climate change initiatives. It does this by amending the Internal Revenue Service Code to provide incentives for voluntary reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and for the development of global climate science and technology. This would permanently extend a tax credit for research and development involving climate change. It also would apply tax credits for greenhouse gas emission reduction facilities. This rewards industry for investing in cleaner technology without punishing it for thinking beyond short-term profits.

Our entrepreneurs, small businesses and the employers and employees of large companies have the ability to protect and preserve the environment without sacrificing the global economy. The goals of environmental health and economic stability are not mutually exclusive. For example, voluntary, incentive-based programs, in combination with private efforts, have been largely responsible for the success of wetlands restoration. We made developing and preserving wetlands an asset instead of a burden and as a result we have more wetlands now than before we enacted the incentive-based programs. Resorting to Federal regulations, on the other hand, has produced hostility and confusion on the part of private citizens. Why? Federal regulations are typically cost prohibitive and are promulgated with a single-minded purpose that sacrifices America's ability to respond to future challenges via proactive incentives.

It is my hope that proponents of government-knows-best policy and special interest mandates will set aside their rhetoric and walk with us on the practical path of real, reasonable environmental progress.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday,

October 25, 1999, the federal debt stood at \$5,676,428,132,415.49 (Five trillion, six hundred seventy-six billion, four hundred twenty-eight million, one hundred thirty-two thousand, four hundred fifty-two dollars and forty-nine cents).

Five years ago, October 25, 1994, the federal debt stood at \$4,711,435,000,000 (Four trillion, seven hundred eleven billion, four hundred thirty-five million).

Ten years ago, October 25, 1989, the federal debt stood at \$2,876,559,000,000 (Two trillion, eight hundred seventy-six billion, five hundred fifty-nine million).

Fifteen years ago, October 25, 1984, the federal debt stood at \$1,599,358,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred ninety-nine billion, three hundred fifty-eight million).

Twenty-five years ago, October 25, 1974, the federal debt stood at \$480,139,000,000 (Four hundred eighty billion, one hundred thirty-nine million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,196,289,132,415.49 (Five trillion, one hundred ninety-six billion, two hundred eighty-nine million, one hundred thirty-two thousand, four hundred fifty-two dollars and forty-nine cents) during the past 25 years.

FULL DISCLOSURE ON CHILE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the National Security Archives recently released an additional selection of declassified documents from the State Department, Defense Department, and the CIA on U.S. relations with Chile between 1970 and 1973, when the democratically-elected government of President Allende was overthrown by General Pinochet. The release of these documents is part of the Administration's ongoing "Chile Declassification Project," an effort begun following the arrest of General Pinochet last year. According to the President's directive, U.S. national security agencies are directed to "review for release * * * all documents that shed light on human rights abuses, terrorism, and other acts of political violence during and prior to the Pinochet era in Chile."

On October 24, the Washington Post carried two articles which emphasized the need for full disclosure by the CIA of its documents related to its covert operations in Chile during this period. The release of these documents will facilitate a full understanding of this period in U.S.-Chile relations. I believe that these articles will be of interest to all of us in Congress concerned about this issue, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 24, 1999]

STILL HIDDEN: A FULL RECORD OF WHAT THE U.S. DID IN CHILE

(By Peter Kornbluh)

As Augusto Pinochet continues to fight extradition from England to face charges of