

Pain Management, the American Society of Anesthesiologists and the American College of Osteopathic Family Physicians. (True, support isn't unanimous. Dissent within the medical community has been led by the Rhode Island Medical Association.)

It has broad bipartisan support. Seventy-one House Democrats voted for the bill, and 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 likely to pass the Senate. If President Clinton truly feels our pain, he will sign it the moment it hits his desk.

[From the Oregonian, July 1, 1999]

#### KILL THE PAIN, NOT THE PATIENTS

#### CONGRESS SHOULD ALLOW DOCTORS TO 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 physician-assisted suicide.

But last year, when the American Medical Association and the National Hospice Organization 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 concerns seriously.

The groups argued that the proposed law could reverse recent advances in end-of-life care. Doctors might become afraid to prescribe drugs to manage pain and depression—things that, when uncontrolled, can lead the terminally ill to consider killing themselves in the first place. 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 also preventing them from relieving their terminally-ill patients' agonies.

This Congress's Pain Relief Promotion Act proves it, and the proposed legislation comes not a moment too soon. A new report by the Center for Ethics in Health Care at Oregon Health Sciences University shows that end-of-life care in Oregon—which fancies itself a leader in this area—is far from all it should be. Too many Oregonians spend the last days of their life in pain.

There's no real need for that—and the Pain Relief Promotion Act of 1999 would go a long way toward addressing these systemic and professional failures here and elsewhere. The proposal would authorize federal health-care agencies to promote an increased understanding of palliative care and to support training programs for health professionals in the best pain management practices. It would also require the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research to develop and share scientific information on proper palliative care.

Further, the Pain Relief Promotion Act would clarify the Controlled Substances Act in two essential ways.

One, it makes clear that alleviating pain and discomfort is an authorized and legitimate medical purpose for the use of controlled substances.

Two, the bill states that nothing in the Controlled Substances Act authorizes the

use of these drugs for assisted suicide or euthanasia and that state laws allowing assisted suicide or euthanasia are irrelevant in determining whether a practitioner has violated the Controlled Substances Act.

Technically, of course, the bill does not overturn Oregon's so-called Death with Dignity Act. But it would thwart it, for all practical purposes, because it makes it illegal for Oregon doctors to engage in assisted suicide using their federal drug-prescribing license. Suicide's advocates may think of some other method, but none seems obvious.

Is this a federal intrusion on a state's right to allow physician-assisted suicide or euthanasia?

To hear some recent converts to states' right talk, you might think so. But you could just as easily argue that Oregon's assisted suicide law intrudes on the federal domain. The feds have long had jurisdiction over controlled substances, even as states kept the power to regulate the way physicians prescribe them. At best, it's a gray area.

You'll recall that the Department of Justice declined to assert a federal interest in all of this when it plausibly could have, shortly after Oregon voters approved assisted suicide. It's probably better—and high time—that Congress asserts that interest explicitly.

This act would establish a uniform national standard preventing the use of federally controlled drugs for assisted suicide. That, in itself, should advance the national debate on this subject in a more seemly way than, say, the recent efforts of Dr. Jack Kervorkian.

Beyond that, it's high time that Congress made clear that improved pain relief is a key objective of our nation's health-care institutions and our Controlled Substances Act. The Pain Relief Promotion Act will do all this. No wonder the American Medical Association and the National Hospice Organization are now on board.

#### PRISON CARD PROGRAM

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President I rise today to talk about an important and highly successful 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 program, greeting cards are donated to the Salvation Army that are then given to inmates at correctional facilities across the country. 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. However, there are also benefits to the community as well. Inmates who maintain strong ties with their families and friends are less likely to return to prison once their sentence is completed.

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 program 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 WITH ISRAEL

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President. I would like to alert my colleagues to an issue raised by H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Initiative, regarding trade with Israel under the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement. Notwithstanding our free-trade agreement with Israel, the CBI provisions of this legislation would unfairly discriminate against U.S. imports from Israel.

Under that legislation, most U.S. textile products made with Israeli inputs, such as yarn, fabric or thread, would not be eligible for duty free treatment when assembled into apparel in the Caribbean. To illustrate the contrast with current law, today, if a U.S. company uses Israeli yarn in manufacturing fabric, the products made from such fabric would be eligible for CBI benefits. The trade bill creates a unilateral change from the status quo in our trade with Israel and a major barrier to U.S. companies using Israeli-origin inputs.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter from the Economic Minister of the Israeli Embassy that was sent to each of the Members of the Senate Finance Committee urging Congress to treat Israeli inputs on par with U.S. inputs in this trade legislation. I ask unanimous consent that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

EMBASSY OF ISRAEL,  
Washington, DC, June 15, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you, as well other members of the Committee on Finance, to ask for your support during the 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 yarn, fabric or thread, under the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement ("FTAA").

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 disqualify 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 companies and U.S. companies that supply raw materials used in the manufacture of Israeli inputs, such as nylon yarn.

I am bringing this matter 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.-Israeli trade.

The legislative measure that we are asking you to support is consistent with previous trade measures approved by your Committee and enacted into U.S. law to preserve U.S.-Israeli trade under the FTAA. Such a provision would preserve the status quo in U.S.-Israeli 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,

OHAD MARANI,  
Economic Minister.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not think that it is the intent of the CBI legislation to undermine our trade with Israel. Preserving 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 with Israel as we develop 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. Mr. 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 10, 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

##### S. 623—Dakota Water Resources Act of 1999

###### 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 not become significant until 2007. S. 623 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). The state of North Dakota and local governments in that state would probably incur some costs as a result of the bill's enactment, but these costs would be voluntary.

S. 623 would amend the existing authority for construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit (GDU) of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, administered by the Bureau of Reclamation (the Bureau). S. 623 would authorize the appropriation of about \$688 million (in 1999 dollars) for the Bureau to complete the GDU. Adjusting for anticipated cost growth, CBO estimates that implementing this legislation would require the appropriation of \$793 million over the 2000-2017 period. Most of the outlays from such funding would occur after 2004. We estimate that enacting the bill would reduce offsetting receipts (a credit against direct spending) by less than \$200,000 a year between 2002 and 2006, but would result in increased offsetting receipts of about \$7 million a year starting in 2007.

###### ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact on S. 623 over the next five years is shown in the following table. 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
<b>CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION<sup>1</sup></b>					
Estimated Authorization Level ...	0	24	33	47	31
Estimated Outlays	0	16	27	41	47

<sup>1</sup> Most of the costs of implementing S. 623 would occur after 2004. In addition, to the bill's discretionary costs, it would increase direct spending by less than \$200,000 a year over the 2000-2004 period. (That estimated annual effect would continue through 2006, but S. 623 would reduce direct spending by about \$7 million a year after 2006).

Assuming appropriation of the necessary funds, CBO estimates that implementing S. 623 would cost \$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.

###### BASIS 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 that S. 623 will be enacted during 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 amounts, CBO estimates that design and initial construction would 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 an additional \$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 both of 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 GDU would be covered by using 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 a 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 additional amounts necessary for the operation and maintenance of wildlife mitigation and enhancement facilities, including wildlife refuges. Based on information from the Bureau, CBO estimates this work would cost about \$1 million annually starting in 2001.

Natural Resources Trust.—S. 623 would authorize the appropriation of \$25 million for the Secretary of the Interior to make annual contributions to the Natural Resources Trust, a nonfederal corporation (currently known as the Wetlands Trust). The amount to be contributed in any fiscal year would equal 5 percent of the amount appropriated in that year for the Red River Valley Water Supply Project and for non-Indian municipal, rural, and industrial water supply systems. CBO estimates this provision would cost \$6 million between 2000 and 2004.

Recreational Projects.—The bill would authorize the appropriation of \$6.5 million for the Bureau to construct, operate, and maintain new recreational facilities, provided that the Secretary of the Interior has entered into agreements with nonfederal entities to provide half of the cost of operating and maintaining any such facilities. CBO estimates that implementing this provision would cost about \$1 million between 2000 and 2004.

Oakes Test Area Title Transfer.—S. 623 would authorize the Secretary to convey the Oakes Test Area, an experimental irrigation facility in North Dakota, to the local irrigators. The Bureau currently spends less than \$200,000 annually to operate and maintain the facility. These amounts are subject to appropriation and are reimbursed by users of the facility. Reimbursements are deposited in the Treasury as offsetting receipts and are unavailable for spending without appropriation action. Based on information from the Bureau, CBO expects that the title transfer would occur during fiscal year 2002. Starting in that year, this provision would yield annual discretionary savings of less than \$200,000.

###### DIRECT SPENDING

Offsetting Receipts from Repayment Contracts.—Under current law, the GDU water