the act. Thus, as an editorial in the (Port-
land) Oregonian said, it is the Oregon law
that “goes into an area of longstanding fed-
eral jurisdiction.” Thus passage of the act
would return national uniformity to the en-
dorsement of physician-assisted suicide.
It merely reaffirms existing federal law.
Because the act declares that assisted sui-
cide is not a “legitimate medical purpose”
under the Controlled Substances Act, critics
have wrongly accused supporters of granting
new authority to the Drug Enforcement
Agency to punish doctors. In fact, DEA has
had the power to do this for nearly 30 years.
Since 1980 it has brought more than 250 enforce-
ment actions for violating the federal legal
standard of “legitimate medical purpose.”
The medical community overwhelmingly
favors it. Proponents of the bill include the
American Medical Association, the National
Hospice Organization, the Hospice Associa-
tion of America, the American Academy of
Pain Management, the American Society of
Anesthesiologists and the American College
of Osteopathic Family Physicians. (True,
support is divided. The American Psychiatric
Association has been led by the Rhode
Island Medical Association.)
It has broad bipartisan support. Seventy-
one House members voted for the bill; its
Senate sponsors include Joe Lieberman
(D., Conn.), Chris Dodd (D., Conn.) and Evan
Bayh (D., Ind.).
It would enhance pain control. If the act
becomes law, pain control will for the first
time be specifically identified in federal law
as a proper use of controlled substances—
even if the use of pain-controlling drugs has
the unintended side effect of causing death.
That is a much-needed legal reform, because
many doctors fail to treat pain aggressively
because they fear the government’s second-
guessing. Several states have recently passed
similar laws, leading to dramatic increases
in the use of morphine and other palliative
medications.
The Pain Relief Promotion Act looks like-
ly to pass the Senate. If President Clinton
truly feels our pain, he will sign it the mo-
ment it hits his desk.

[From the Oregonian, July 1, 1999]

KILL THE PAIN. NOT THE PATIENTS
CONGRESSIONAL BILL WOULD USE
CONTROLLED DRUGS FOR AGGRESSIVE PAIN
TREATMENT INSTEAD OF SUICIDE

It’s no secret to any reader of this space
that we oppose Oregon’s venture into physi-
cian-assisted suicide.
But last year, when the American Medical
Association and the National Hospice Orga-
nization came out against a bill in Congress
giving medical review boards the power to
deny or yank the federal drug-prescribing
license to physicians who prescribed these
drugs to assist in suicides, we took their con-
cerns seriously.

The groups argued that the proposed law
could reverse recent advances in end-of-life
care. Doctors might become afraid to pre-
scribe drugs to manage pain and depression—
things that, when uncontrolled, can lead the
terminally ill to consider killing themselves in
the process. We thought then that the
problem could be worked out and that it was
possible to keep doctors from using federally
controlled substances to kill their patients
without the threat of criminal charges for
deieving their terminally-ill patients’ agonies.

This Congress’s Pain Relief Promotion Act
proves it, and the proposed legislation comes
not a step forward.
A new report by the Center for Ethics in Health Care at Oregon Health Sciences University shows that end-

PRISON CARD PROGRAM

Mr. ASHCROFT. Madam President, I rise
today to talk about an important
program and high priority program operated
for more than 25 years by the Salvation
Army in conjunction with the Bureau of
Prisons. This program is called the
Prison Card Program. Under the pro-
gram, greeting cards are donated to the Sal-
vation Army that are then given to inmates
at correctional facilities across the coun-
try. This program allows inmates to keep in touch
with family and friends—not only during the
holiday season—but throughout the
year. The benefits of this program to the
inmates and their loved ones are clear. How-
ever, there are also benefits to the
community as well. Inmates who
maintain strong ties with their fam-
ilies and friends are less likely to return
to prison once their sentence is com-
pleted.

I want to commend the Salvation
Army, the Department of Justice, and
the Bureau of Prisons for supporting
this program. In particular, I want the
Department to know that this program
has the support of Congress. I have
spoken to Chairman GREGG, who has
indicated that he is prepared to work with
me and other supporters of the pro-
gram in the coming months to ensure
that this important charitable program
is sustained well into the future.

THE CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE
AND THE IMPACT ON TRADE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President. I
would like to alert my colleagues to an
issue raised by Ambassador Kurt L. Warmbier
to the President of the Congress. I
would like to submit for the
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Committee’s mark-up of the U.S.-Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act (also known as the “CBI” trade parity bill) to ensure that it does not impose an economic barrier against U.S. imports of Israeli-origin inputs, such as cotton, yarn, or thread, under the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement (“PTAA”).

My Government urges the inclusion of a provision in the CBI legislation that will enable U.S. companies to continue utilizing Israeli-origin inputs in producing American-made products without making such products ineligible for CBI duty-free trade preferences.

The current CBI trade program provides preferential tariff treatment to apparel made from U.S.-formed components that are finished in a CBI-eligible country. Currently, such components may be cut from fabric, or formed from yarn, originating either in the United States or Israel. The legislation before the Committee incorporates a U.S.-only fabric and thread forward rule of origin. The CBI bill recently approved by the House Ways and Means Committee also incorporates a U.S.-only “yarn forward” requirement for knit-to-shape products. Either bill in its current form would adversely affect Israeli exports to the United States. Market conditions would all but require U.S. companies to halt imports of Israeli inputs so as not to qualify their products from the duty-free trade preference to be extended unilaterally to CBI-eligible countries. The loss of sales to the U.S. market would harm both Israeli and U.S. companies that supply raw materials used in the manufacture of Israeli inputs, such as nylon yarn.

I am writing 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.-Israel trade. The legislative measure that we are asking you to support is consistent with existing trade measures approved by your Committee and enacted into U.S. law to preserve U.S.-Israeli trade under the PTAA. Such a provision would not adversely affect U.S.-Israel 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,

OHAH MARANI,
Economic Minister.

Mr. JOHNSON, I do not think that it is the intent of the CBI legislation to undermine the benefits we deserve 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 as we deliberate 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. Madam 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 19, 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

SUMMARY

CBO 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 result in savings of $7 million over the 2000-2004 period.

Initially, the bill would have no significant offsetting receipts. S. 623 would authorize the appropriation of $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.

BASE 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 S. 623 will be fully funded in 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 funds, CBO estimates that design and initial construction would cost 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 $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 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 CBI would be covered by 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 the 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 about $3 million annually for the operation and maintenance of wildlife mitigation and enhancement facilities, including wildlife refuges. Based on information from the Bureau, CBO estimates this provision would cost about $1 million annually starting in 2001.