Pueblo Indians in New Mexico and Arizona. It is my hope that improved diagnostic and prevention programs will readily flow from this Gallup center to all IHS facilities around the country.

It may surprise my colleagues as it did me, that in the 1950's the IHS officially reported negligible rates of diabetes among Navajo Indians. In less than 50 years, diabetes has gone from negligible to rampant and epidemic.

I commend the Washington Times for this timely and informative update on the surge in diabetes in our nation. I ask to have the entire article printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

I believe this article is a poignant reminder of the seriousness of this disease and its rapid growth in our country. My colleagues can count on me to continue to help with the critical funding to control this disease with every sensible means possible, especially among the First Americans who seem to suffer at disproportionately high rates. With our funding successes of this year, I would urge my colleagues to continue to seek ways to combat the slow physical erosion that Dr. Bernstein described as being almost like leprosy.

Dr. Bernstein is advocating for a billion dollars to expand urgent research and treatment of diabetes. I do not see this amount possible in our current budget situation, but I do concur that the medical costs of treating diabetes will continue to escalate unless our medical and prevention research efforts are more successful. I thank the Senate for this year's strong support of our efforts in this year's budget to improve the situation for all Americans who are susceptible to the ravages of diabetes.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 3, 1997]

SURGE IN DIABETES TIED TO UNHEALTHY LIFESTYLES—DOCTORS CALL FOR FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDS

(By Joyce Howard Price)

The president-elect of the American diabetes Association, Dr. Gerald Bernstein, says no one should be surprised by the explosion of diabetes in the United States today, confirmed in a new federal report.

Given that the population is older, fatter and less active, Dr. Bernstein says, the continued increase in diabetes was predictable. He also criticizes the federal government for "totally inadequate" levels of support for research.

With all its complications, he says, diabetes costs the nation about $140 billion a year—about 15 percent of all U.S. health expenditures:

"While cancer, HIV [and other major diseases] get $5 to $10 for research for every $100 spent on health care, diabetes gets just 25 cents," says Dr. Bernstein, director of the Harold Rifkin Diabetes Center in New York.

A report by the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention says about 16 million Americans currently have diabetes, but only about 10 million have been diagnosed. The number of diagnosed cases is up from 1.6 million in 1958.

Diabetes is the nation's seventh leading killer and was the primary cause of more than 59,200 deaths in 1995, according to the National Center for Health Statistics. But data also indicate it may have contributed to as many as 180,000 deaths that year.

"We are becoming a more overweight population, we are less active and we are also getting somewhat older," says Dr. Frank Vinicor, director of the CDC's diabetes division. "If you put all of those factors together, we are seeing a chronic disease epidemic occurring."

Diabetes is a disease caused by a deficiency of insulin, a hormone secreted by the pancreas that is necessary for the metabolism of sugar.

Of the estimated 16 million diabetics in the United States today, less than 1 million have Type I diabetes, meaning their pancreases do not work at all, and they are insulin-dependent. Type I diabetes usually occurs in childhood or adolescence.

The overwhelming majority of diabetics have Type 2 diabetes, a form of the disease that usually occurs after age 40 and is usually treated by diet, pills or both.

"The prevalence of Type 2 diabetes is increasing tremendously in the United States as people adapt more sedentary lifestyles and obesity increases," says Dr. Stephen Clement, director of the Diabetes Center at Georgetown University Medical Center.

Dr. Bernstein says "more women die of diabetes than breast cancer."

Nevertheless, he says, it has been hard to "politicize" diabetes except when young children are involved, because the average Type 2 diabetic is a "fat [adult] individual who's not compliant" with recommendations that he or she exercise and adopt a healthy diet.

"Cancer is much more dramatic and devastating. With diabetes, you erode and rot away. It's almost like leprosy," he says, explaining why this disease has been given short shrift by political leaders, the media and those handing out research dollars. He says the disease has failed to get priority status because it strikes minorities disproportionately.

He points out that the gene that predisposes someone to diabetes is five times more prevalent in American Indians than in whites and twice as prevalent in blacks, Hispanics and Asians than in non-Hispanic whites.

Dr. Richard C. Eastman, director of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, declines to comment on the adequacy of research funding for diabetes, which he says is currently $200 million a year.

"We had a record (funding) increase this year," he says. "While we usually get an increase of 3 to 4 percent, there was an 8 percent increase this year. We fund 1 in 4 or 1 in 5 investigators."

Dr. Bernstein says the recent push for stepped-up diabetes research money came from medical insurers, overwhelmed by having to pay the staggering costs of treating patients stricken with strokes, cardiovascular disorders, nerve damage, kidney problems, limb amputations, and vision loss triggered by diabetes.

Cardiovascular disease and stroke risk are two to four times more common among diabetics than the general population, and better than 60 percent of diabetics have high blood pressure and mild to severe neuropathy, or nerve damage.

"This disease is going to break the economic back of this country, so the amount provided [by the federal government] for diabetes research should be a billion dollars a year," Dr. Bernstein says.

As evidence of the need for more research, he cites a recent study by researchers at the University of Arkansas "who found a teenage population that was obese, hypertensive [had high blood pressure], and also had Type 2 diabetes," a condition usually confined to middle-aged adults. "So we're now seeing it's all over the place."

Dr. Clement agrees a lot more federal money is needed for research. But he and Dr. Eastman point out that the National Institutes of Health is currently funding large studies designed to determine if both types of diabetes can be prevented.●

CBO COST ESTIMATE—S. 1228

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs reported S. 1228, the 50 States Commemorative Coin Program Act on Friday, October 31, 1997. The committee report, Senate Report No. 105–130, was filed the same day.

The Congressional Budget Office cost estimate required by Senate Rule XXVI, section 11(b) of the Standing Rules of the Senate and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Impoundment and Control Act, was not available at the time of filing and, therefore, was not included in the committee report. Instead, the committee indicated the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate would be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when it became available.

Mr. President, I ask that the full statement and cover letter from the Congressional Budget Office regarding S. 1228 be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 31, 1997.

Hon. ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 1228, the 50 States Commemorative Coin Program Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is John R. Righter (for federal costs), and Matthew Eyles (for the private-sector impact).

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM
(For June E. O'Neill, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 1228—50 States Commemorative Coin Program Act

Summary: S. 1228 would require the U.S. Mint to make changes to the quarter-dollar and one-dollar coins and to issue three coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the first flight at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina. CBO estimates that enacting this bill would decrease direct spending by $15 million over the 1998–2002 period and by $40 million over the 1998–2007 period. Because the bill would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. S. 1228 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Description of the bill's major provisions: S. 1228 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to design and issue a series of quarters commemorating the 50 states over a 10-year period beginning in 1999. During this period, designs for each state would replace the current eagle design on the reverse side of the George Washington quarter. The Mint would issue five quarters a year in the order that the states ratified the Constitution or were admitted into the Union. Before selecting an emblem for each state, the Secretary of the Treasury would consult with the state's governor and with the federal Commission of Fine Arts (CFA) and would submit the selected design for review by the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee (CCCAC). The bill would authorize the Mint to sell silver replicas of the quarters—both in proof and uncirculated versions.

S. 1228 also would permanently replace the current Susan B. Anthony one-dollar coin with a new dollar coin. Under the bill, the Mint could produce additional quantities of the Susan B. Anthony, if needed, until the new coin was ready for circulation. (The Mint predicts that public demand will exhaust its current inventory of approximately 130 million coins in about 30 months.) The new one-dollar coin would be golden in color and have distinctive tactile and visual features but would have the same diameter and weight as the current coin. In consultation with the Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury would select the designs for both sides of the coin. The bill also would direct the Treasury to market the coin to the American public before placing it into circulation and to study and report to the Congress on the results of its efforts. In addition, the Mint would have the authority to include quantities of the new coin in collector sets sold to the public prior to its introduction into circulation. Unlike previous proposals to introduce a new dollar coin, S. 1228 would not eliminate the one-dollar bill.

Finally, S. 1228 would direct the U.S. Mint to produce a ten-dollar gold coin, a one-dollar silver coin, and a half-dollar clad coin in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 commemorating the 100th anniversary of the first flight of Orville and Wilbur Wright at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina. In selecting a design for each coin, the Secretary of the Treasury would consult with the Board of Directors of the First Flight Foundation and the CFA and submit the designs for review by the CCCAC. The coins would be available for sale from August 1, 2003, through July 31, 2004. The price of each coin would equal the sum of its face value, the amount of the surcharge set for it by the bill, and the costs of the Mint to produce it. The bill would set a surcharge of $35 per coin for the ten-dollar coin, $10 per coin for the one-dollar coin, and $1 per coin for the half-dollar coin. S. 1228 would require the Mint to transfer all proceeds from surcharges to the First Flight Foundation.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S. 1228 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 800 (general government).

In addition to the budgetary effects summarized in the table, by increasing the public's holding of coins, S. 1228 also would result in the government acquiring additional resources for financing the federal deficit. The seigniorage (or profit, the difference between the face value of coins and their cost of production) from placing the additional coins in circulation would reduce the amount of government borrowing from the public. Under the principles established by the President's Commission on Budget Concepts in 1967, seigniorage does not affect the deficit but is treated as a means of financing the deficit.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—				
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING					
50 States Quarter Program:					
Estimated Budget Authority	0	−8	−5	−5	−5
Estimated Outlays	0	−8	−5	−5	−5
New One-Dollar Coin:					
Estimated Budget Authority	1	3	3	1	0
Estimated Outlays	1	3	3	1	0
Net Change in Direct Spending Under S. 1228:					
Estimated Budget Authority	1	−5	−2	−4	−5
Estimated Outlays	1	−5	−2	−4	−5

Note.—The table only includes provisions that would change direct spending in fiscal years 1998 through 2002. S. 1228 also includes a provision that would authorize the Mint to issue three commemorative coins during fiscal years 2003 and 2004.

Basis of estimate

Direct spending

50 States Circulating Commemorative Quarter Program. Beginning in 1999, S. 1228 would authorize the Mint to sell silver replicas of the redesigned 50 states quarters—both in proof and uncirculated varieties. CBO estimates that enacting this provision would decrease direct spending by $23 million over the 1998–2002 period and by $48 million over the 1998–2007 period.

CBO assumes the Mint would sell a five-coin proof set a price of around $30, which would cover the full cost of the set and provide it with a margin of profit consistent with past silver proof sets. We also assume the Mint would sell each uncirculated silver quarter at a price equal to the spot price of silver plus a markup of 3 percent. Because the silver replicas would be sold as a commercial product, the receipts would constitute offsetting collections to the Mint. Based on information provided by the Mint, including historical sales and profit data for past silver proof and uncirculated designs, CBO estimates that the sale of the silver replicas would increase offsetting collections to the Mint by about $10 million each year for a total of $40 million over the 1999–2002 period. This estimate assumes that, on average, the Mint would sell about 1 million five-coin proof sets each year, which would generate the $10 million in profits. CBO expects that the profits earned in any one year from selling uncirculated versions of the quarters would not be significant.

Public Law 104–52, which established the U.S. Mint Public Enterprise Fund, requires the Mint to transfer any excess funds to the general fund of the Treasury at least annually. For the purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that the Mint would retain about one-half of the $10 million in increased offsetting collections generated from annual sales of the silver replicas. We estimate that half of the amount retained would be spent in the same fiscal year, with the other half spent in the following fiscal year. In total, net direct spending would decrease by between $20 million and $25 million over the 1998–2002 period, or by about one-half of the increase in offsetting collections to the Mint.

New One-Dollar Coin. S. 1228 would replace the current Susan B. Anthony one-dollar coin with a new one-dollar coin. The bill would authorize the Mint to produce quantities of the Susan B. Anthony, as needed, until the new coin was ready for circulation. (The Mint has not produced any new Susan B. Anthony coins since 1981). According to the Mint, it would need at least 30 months to design, test, and produce a new one-dollar coin for circulation. Thus, assuming this bill is enacted within the next several months. CBO expects that the new coin would not begin circulating before sometime in fiscal year 2000. CBO estimates that producing a new one-dollar coin would increase direct spending by between $5 million and $10 million over the 1998–2002 period.

Previously, the Mint has estimated cost of about $93 million to purchase the necessary infrastructure and materials and to design and promote a new one-dollar coin. That estimate, however, assumed that the one-dollar bill would be eliminated, and that the Mint would produce an initial supply of approximately 9 billion coins to meet the public's demand for one-dollar currency. Under S. 1228, CBO expects the public's annual demand for one-dollar coins would approximate the roughly 50 million Susan B. Anthony coins currently added to the nation's circulation of coins each year. Thus, based on information provided by the Mint, CBO estimates start-up costs under this bill of between $5 million and $10 million. That estimate includes the costs to research, design, and test the new coin and to market it to the public. CBO estimates the Mint would also incur costs of less than $500,000 in fiscal year 2001 to study the effects of the marketing program and report its results to the Congress by March 31, 2001.

S. 1228 also would authorize the Mint to include the redesigned dollar coin in coin sets sold as commercial products to the public. The Mint currently offers a five-coin proof set, a five-coin silver proof set, and a 10-coin uncirculated set. Adding a redesigned dollar coin to one or all of these sets could increase offsetting collections to the U.S. Mint Public Enterprise Fund if its addition increases collectors' interest in the sets. It is uncertain whether the Mint would add a redesigned dollar coin to each of these sets. Given the addition of the commercial items that would be included under the 50 states quarter program, as well as the Mint's recent introduction of platinum coins and its expected first-time issue of .9999 fine gold coin sets, CBO estimates that even if the Mint does include the new dollar coin, any increase in net offsetting collections from the sale of all commercial products would be small—as much as several million dollars in the first two years—and largely one-time. In addition, CBO estimates that the Mint would retain and spend any additional collections, resulting in no net budgetary effect over time.

Commemorative Coins. S. 1228 would direct the Mint to produce and issue three coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the first flight at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina. Because the coins would not become available until 2003, the provision would have no budgetary impact over the next five years. CBO estimates that the provision would have no net budgetary effect over the 1998–2007 period. The bill could raise as much as $9.25 million in surcharges if the Mint sold the maximum mintage level authorized for each coin, although the experience of recent anniversary-based commemoratives suggests that sales would be less than the authorized total of 1.35 million coins. Because the bill would require that the Mint transfer all surcharges to the First Flight Foundation, a nonfederal entity, proceeds from surcharges would have no net budgetary impact over time. We expect that the Mint would retain and spend any additional net proceeds generated from such sales to fund other commercial activities.

Seigniorage

In addition to the bills' effects on direct spending, by increasing the public's holding of quarters, S. 1228 also would result in the government acquiring additional resources for financing the federal deficit. Based on the previous experience of both the United States, with the bicentennial quarter in 1975 and 1976, and Canada, with its series of quarters commemorating its 12 provinces and territories in 1992, CBO expects that enacting the bill would lead to a greater production of quarters. The seigniorage, or profit, from placing the additional coins in circulation would reduce the amount of government borrowing from the public. Such profits are likely to be very significant—the Mint estimates that the seigniorage from making a quarter is 20.2 cents, so for each additional $100 million worth of quarters put into circulation each year for 10 years, the amount of seigniorage earned by the federal government would increase by about $808 million over the ten-year period.

By substituting a new dollar coin for the current Susan B. Anthony, the legislation could also affect the seigniorage earned—estimated at 92 cents per coin—from circulating one-dollar coins. That increase would occur only to the extent that the public demanded more one-dollar coins than under current law. (According to the Mint, the federal government currently is increasing the amount of Susan B. Anthony dollars placed in circulation by about 50 million coins each year.) Because S. 1228 would not eliminate the one-dollar bill, CBO expects that any increase in circulation of the one-dollar coin would not be significant.

Previously, CBO has done estimates for proposals that would replace the one-dollar bill with a new one-dollar coin. S. 1228 would not remove the one-dollar bill from circulation. Consequently, the savings in the production and handling of the nation's currency and the changes in seigniorage previously estimated by CBO would not apply to S. 1228.

Pay-as-you-go-considerations: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 specifies procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. The projected changes in direct spending are shown in the following table for fiscal years 1998 through 2007. For purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, however, only the effects in the budget year and the succeeding four years are counted.

SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON DIRECT SPENDING AND RECEIPTS

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—									
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Changes in outlays	1	−5	−2	−4	−5	−5	−5	−5	−5	−5
Changes in receipts	Not applicable									

Estimated impact on State, local, and tribal governments: S. 1228 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated impact on the private sector: S. 1228 contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. However, some private-sector entities would incur costs as a result of provisions in the bill to issue a new dollar coin. Vending machine operators who choose to accept the new coin, for example, would be required to modify their machines because the electromagnetic properties of the new gold-colored dollar coin would be different from those of the Susan B. Anthony dollar (which many machines are currently equipped to accept). Costs of modification would be reduced if the new coins were used with some regularity and operators were able to eliminate bill acceptors from most vending machines. In addition, to the extent that the dollar coin circulates even modestly, depository institutions would incur some additional expenses because they bear a substantial share of processing costs for all circulating coinage. Other entities, such as mass transit authorities, would experience lower costs because coins can be collected and processed at a cost that is significantly lower than notes. Mass transit authorities, however, are generally publicly operated and therefore not included in the private sector. Nevertheless, because no provision in federal law requires any person or organization to accept a specific form of payment, including the proposed new dollar coin, S. 1228 contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: John R. Righter. Impact on the Private Sector: Matthew Eyles.

Estimated approved by: Paul N. Van de Water, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.●

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a) appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] from the Committee on Appropriations, vice the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL].

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—NOMINATION OF JAMES S. GWIN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, November 5, the Senate proceed to executive session and that there then be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided, between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. I further ask unanimous consent that following that debate, the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of Calendar No. 328, the nomination of James Gwin to be U.S. district judge in Ohio. I finally ask unanimous consent that immediately following that vote, the President be notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

HOOPA VALLEY RESERVATION SOUTH BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 230, H.R. 79.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 79) to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the Six Rivers National Forest in the State of California for the benefit of the Hoopa Valley Tribe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 79) was read the third time and passed.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2464, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2464) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt internationally adopted children 10 years of age or younger from the immunization requirement in section 212(a)(1)(A)(ii) of such Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill exempts adopted immigrant children ages 10 and under from the battery of immunizations they would normally have to receive before being allowed to enter the United States.

I share Senator ABRAHAM's disappointment that this bill does not go further. The immunization requirement which has caused so many problems for all immigrants, including the parents of adopted immigrant children, was passed as a part of last year's immigration bill. This provision requires all immigrants to receive the entire series of vaccinations recommended by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices before they are allowed to enter the United States. During the debate of the immigration bill, significant concerns were raised that this requirement would lead to many unintended results, such as forged immunization records, unavailability of vaccines, and inadequate health care if the immigrant had an adverse reaction to a vaccine.

As a result of these concerns, the Senate passed a modified immunization provision, requiring immigrants to obtain most of their immunizations after they entered the United States, where vaccines and health care are available and adequate. Unfortunately, the Senate provisions were dropped in the conference on the final bill. Our