

of basic institutions against future shocks to come. Each of these responses comprises an infinite number of sub-components.

The Senate's passage of this bill is remarkable. But our work has just begun. According to the Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS, Asia has reached a critical point in the development of the AIDS epidemic. Though India has a relatively low infection rate, it has more than four million cases and is now the nation with the largest number of HIV cases in the world. In Africa, the U.N. has predicted that half of all 15-year-olds in the African countries worst affected by AIDS will eventually die of the disease, even if the rates of infection drop substantially in the next few years. Sandra Thurman, the director of the Clinton administration's anti-AIDS effort, put it best: "We are at the beginning of a pandemic, not the middle, not the end."

On February 3, Mr. FEINGOLD and I introduced S. 2032, the Mother-to-Child HIV Prevention Act of 2000. This bill has been included in this assistance package and will authorize \$25 million to bolster intervention programs, which include voluntary counseling and testing, antiretroviral drugs, replacement feeding, and other strategies.

At the beginning of this year, a score of bills were introduced by my colleagues in this body. Some proposals were more ambitious than others. No single proposal would have been a complete solution. Neither is the relief package before us. But each was an approach that did not require waiting for a cure. And each could make a difference. I hope this momentum will not face—but instead, grow internationally and exponentially—and that we will not become fatigued by this most formidable challenge.

#### IN MEMORY OF SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to my esteemed colleague, Paul Coverdell. I join with my colleagues in expressing sadness at his passing. He was a tremendous leader in the Senate and an asset for Georgians and the rest of the country. His years of exemplary public service have included the military, the Peace Corps, the Georgia statehouse, and finally the U.S. Senate. Senator Coverdell was an effective leader and demonstrated many times his unifying influence in the Senate.

On a personal level, he was an unpretentious man who had a quiet sense of humor and good mind for details. He was instrumental in helping me make the transition from the U.S. House to the Senate a couple of years ago, and provided insight and advice in every-

thing from how to set up a Senate office to how to make time for my family. There is not a day that goes by that his influence in my Senate career has not been felt.

Paul was a friend and a model statesman. He spent a lifetime of service to his country. I will miss him dearly. I extend my prayers to his wife, Nancy, and the rest of his family.

### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORT

SENATE REPORT NO. 106-373

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at the time Senate Report No. 106-373 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 for the information of the Senate.

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

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE—SEPTEMBER 1, 2000

##### S. 1612—Missouri River Basin, Middle Loup Diversion Facilities Conveyance Act

As reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on August 25, 2000

#### SUMMARY

S. 1612 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain facilities, lands, and rights to the Farwell Irrigation District, the Sargent Irrigation District, and the Loup Basin Reclamation District, in the state of Nebraska. Under the bill, these districts would pay the federal government about \$2.8 million for the Sherman Reservoir, Milburn Diversion Dam, Arcadia Diversion Dam, related canals and lands, and other associated rights and interests currently owned by the United States.

Based on information from the Bureau of Reclamation, CBO estimates that enacting S. 1612 would result in net receipts of about \$1.3 million over 2001–2005 period; \$2.8 million in asset sale receipts, offset by \$1.5 million of forgone offsetting receipts over that period.

Because enacting S. 1612 would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. CBO estimates a net pay-as-you-go cost of \$1.5 million over the 2001–2005 period, reflecting the forgone offsetting receipts. The asset sale receipts would not count for pay-as-you-go purposes because the sales of assets under S. 1612 would result in a net financial cost (on a present value basis) to the federal government.

CBO estimates that implementing this bill would have no net effect on discretionary spending in 2001, but would result in a very small decrease in discretionary spending each year thereafter.

S. 1612 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). The conveyance provided for in this bill would be voluntary on the part of the districts, and all costs incurred by them as a result of the conveyance also would be voluntary.

#### ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact of S. 1612 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				
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
<b>CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING</b>					
<b>Asset Sale Receipts:</b>					
Estimated Budget Authority .....	–2.8	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays .....	–2.8	0	0	0	0
<b>Forgone Offsetting Receipts:</b>					
Estimated Budget Authority .....	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Estimated Outlays .....	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
<b>Net Changes:</b>					
Estimated Budget Authority .....	–2.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Estimated Outlays .....	–2.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3

#### BASIS OF ESTIMATE

For the estimate, CBO assumes that S. 1612 will be enacted near the start of fiscal year 2001. We expect that the project would be conveyed to the districts in fiscal year 2001. The bill would require the water districts to pay about \$2.8 million for the facilities that would be conveyed.

Currently, those districts have fixed repayment and water service contracts with the Bureau. Those contracts result in payments of about \$300,000 a year through 2016 and about \$130,000 a year over the remaining life of the contract (through 2042). Once the assets are conveyed to the districts, those repayments would no longer occur, and would result in a loss of offsetting receipts to the federal government. In addition, customers of the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) are scheduled to pay a total of \$29 million to the government over the 2036–2042 period to assist with the repayment of the cost of these facilities. Enactment of S. 1612 would lead to a loss of these receipts as well.

S. 1612 would direct the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) to transfer \$2.6 million of receipts from the sale of electricity at the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin project to the reclamation fund at the time of the transfer or as soon as certain conditions are met. That intergovernmental payment would represent the net present value of \$29 million in payments that WAPA customers owe to the government under current law over the 2036–2042 period. The bill specifies that WAPA shall not increase the electricity rates to offset this payment; consequently, this provision would have no budgetary effect.

Based on information from the Bureau of Reclamation, CBO estimates that the agency currently spends less than \$60,000 each year for expenses related to the projects to be conveyed under S. 1612. After the projects are conveyed, these expenses would no longer be incurred, resulting in a small savings to the government. However, in the year of the conveyance, CBO expects that the bureau would spend about the same amount to administer the conveyance, resulting in not change in discretionary spending in 2001.

#### PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS

The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. Enactment of S. 1612 would result in the loss of offsetting receipts of \$0.3 million annually over the 2001–2010 period, and additional amounts later. For the purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, only the effects in the current year, the budget year, and the succeeding four years are counted.