	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Changes in outlays	−112	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Changes in receipts	Not applicable									

Under the Balanced Budget Act, proceeds from nonroutine asset sales (sales that are not authorized under current law) may be counted for pay-as-you-go purposes only if the sale would entail no financial cost to the government. Based on information provided by the bureau, CBO estimates that the sale of the Griffith Project as specified in S. 986 would result in a net savings to the government, and therefore, the proceeds would count for pay-as-you-go purposes.

ESTIMATED IMPACT ON STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

S. 986 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA. In order to receive title to the Griffith project, the bill would require the SNWA to assume all costs associated with the project and to prepay their outstanding liability to the federal government. The conveyance would be voluntary on the part of the authority, however, and these costs would be accepted by it on that basis. Further, the authority is already responsible for all costs of operating and maintaining the facility. The bill would impose no costs on any other state, local, or tribal governments.

ESTIMATED IMPACT ON THE PRIVATE-SECTOR

This bill contains no new private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimated prepared by: Federal Costs: Megan Carroll (226–2860). Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Marjorie Miller (225–3220).

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

CBO COST ESTIMATE FOR S. 1211

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at the time Senate Report No. 106–175 was filed to accompany S. 1211, 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 5, 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. 1211, a bill to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Mark Grabowicz (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 5, 1999

S. 1211: A BILL TO AMEND THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ACT TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL MEASURES TO CARRY OUT THE CONTROL OF SALINITY UPSTREAM OF IMPERIAL DAM IN A COST-EFFECTIVE MANNER

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

SUMMARY

S. 1211 would authorize the appropriation of $175 million for a program to control the salinity of the Colorado River upstream of the Imperial Dam. Under current law the Congress has authorized the appropriation of $75 million for this activity. The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a report by June 30, 2000, on the status of the comprehensive program for minimizing salt contributions to the Colorado River.

Assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts, CBO estimates that implementing S. 1211 would result in additional discretionary spending of about $6 million over the 2000–2004 period. Enacting this legislation would not affect direct spending or receipts, so pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. S. 1211 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). State and local governments might incur some costs to match the federal funds authorized by this bill, but these costs would be voluntary.

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact of S. 1211 is shown in the following table. Of the $75 million authorized under current law about $36 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 2000. Assuming that annual appropriations for this program continue near the 2000 level of $12 million as anticipated by the Department of the Interior, the balance of the $75 million authorization would not be exceeded until fiscal year 2004. Thus, CBO estimates that the additional $100 million authorized by S. 1211 would be appropriated in 2004 and in the following years. We estimate that the report required by the bill would cost less than $500,000 in fiscal year 2000. 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
Spending subject to appropriation					
Spending Under Current Law:					
Budget Authority/Estimated Authorization Level [1]	12	12	12	12	2
Estimated Outlays	12	12	12	12	6
Proposed Changes:					
Estimated Authorization Level	[2]	0	0	0	10
Estimated Outlays	[2]	0	0	0	6
Spending Under S. 1211:					
Estimated Authorization Level [1]	12	12	12	12	12
Estimated Outlays	12	12	12	12	12

[1] The 2000 level is the amount appropriated for the Colorado River salinity control program for that year. The estimated levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2004 represent the use of the remaining authorization under current law.

[2] Less than $500,000.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: None.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE-SECTOR IMPACT

S. 1211 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. State and local governments might incur some costs to match the federal funds authorized by this bill, but these costs would be voluntary.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Mark Grabowicz (226–2860). Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Marjorie Miller (225–3220).

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

OPPOSITION TO FRAMEWORKS LANGUAGE IN CONFERENCE REPORT TO H.R. 2670

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to a provision in the Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary conference report, which Congress passed a few days ago, and which the President vetoed yesterday. As the ranking member of the Senate Subcommittee on Proliferation, International Security, and Federal Services, with jurisdiction over the census, 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.