

schools and I hope my colleagues will spend some of their time during the recess to do the same.

I also hope my colleagues will take the opportunity to review the components of this bill. I feel strongly it should be a critical part of any federal response to school safety issues. I look forward to its passage.

This is our opportunity to begin the process that will show our children we do care about their emotional well being and the future success of our nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Wyoming.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, first of all, I ask unanimous consent that Brady Hayek from my staff be permitted the privilege of the floor during today.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to take 12 minutes of the time allotted, and then the Senator from Montana would like 20 minutes following that time.

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

ISSUES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 1999

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this is the last week before we go on recess. We will be gone approximately a month. We will have an opportunity to be home, to talk to our constituents about the issues that are here, to talk about what we have done during this calendar year, and talk about what we have not done for this year as well. We will be back, then, the first part of September. We will have, probably, 2 months to continue and to complete our work for this year.

There are 13 appropriations bills that must be passed to keep the Government running. They must be passed by September 30, the end of the fiscal year. This is a very difficult task. We are, hopefully, running on time. We passed eight bills out of the Senate. However, none has yet been sent to the President. So we will have a couple of months to wind up the year's work. I cannot tell you how important it is that we do complete that work. Of course, the Presiding Officer is the key Senator in that regard. He has done a great job.

We do not want the President to be able to put us in a position again of closing down the Government and blaming the Congress. I hope what we do is get these bills to him. I think we will do that. I cannot help but mention as we think about this a little bit, I hope in Congress we take a look at a biennial budget, as we have in many States—for instance, my home State of Wyoming. The Congress or the legislature would form a budget for a 2-year

period of time, which has advantages, particularly for the agencies, and we would have the other year for oversight, which is equally as important a task for the Congress—to oversee the expenditure of those dollars. So I hope we are able to do that.

This has been a tough year. We have had lots of difficulties, starting, of course, with the impeachment process, which was difficult. I don't know that it slowed us up particularly. On the contrary, we did a lot of committee work during the time the impeachment was going on. Nevertheless, it was tough. Then came the Colorado Columbine situation, of course, the tragedy out there at the school and, with that, the great controversy over gun control, which we are likely to see again now after the tragedy in Georgia. Then Kosovo was also an issue, of course, although Congress really was not as involved. It was pretty much the President on his own, committing troops there. Obviously, we were going to support them.

So it has been a difficult year. Despite that, it seems to me we have accomplished a great deal. I am a little disappointed that most of the accomplishments have been made without the support of the minority. Our friends on the other side have, in fact, opposed nearly everything that has been done—I think, unfortunately, often more to create an issue than to create a solution. That often is the choice we have; you can cook up something you can take home to talk about in political rhetoric, as opposed to trying to find some solutions.

But we have accomplished a great deal. Much of the controversy will continue, I suppose. There are legitimate differences of view when we are on the floor on almost every issue. Generally, the issue is the larger issue of whether or not you want more and more Federal Government, more and more Federal regulation, more and more taxes—which is basically Senators on that side of the aisle as opposed to this side of the aisle, where we are looking for limited government, where we are looking for less regulation, where we are looking for an opportunity for people to spend more of their own money.

So basically, when you get down to it in almost all these issues, if you really pare it away, that is the debate. Legitimate? Yes, indeed, it is legitimate. I happen to be on the side of being more conservative, of thinking we ought to be moving more and more of these decisions back to the States and to the counties rather than deciding everything, one-size-fits-all, at the Federal level. But these are the differences, and they are the basis for most of the things we find in conflict. We have had less cooperation from the administration than I had hoped we would have, from that side of the aisle. I think the President is seeking to change his image so the politics become more important than the movement of the congressional budget.

Let's review some of the highlights. The most recent one, of course, is the passage of tax relief, something I think is very legitimate, perfectly logical. We went through great debates about it, of course. One of the keys, naturally, is that you have to talk about reduction of taxes after having done something to save Social Security, having done something to strengthen Medicare. That is part of the program. That is not the choice.

We see these polls that are run from time to time. They say: Would you rather have Social Security protected or would you rather have tax relief? That is not the issue. That is one of the things we worked at. All of us are setting aside this surplus that comes from Social Security for the preservation of Social Security. These funds which will be used to reduce taxes and give some tax relief are beyond that.

I think one of the best illustrations is the Member who had three dollars—three dollar bills. This is basically the surplus we are looking at in the next 10 years, \$3 trillion, each of these. Two of them are being set aside for Social Security. Tax relief constitutes about 75 percent of the third one, with the additional amount of the third one being set aside for spending and for Medicare. The press has not been very helpful, of course, trying to get that understanding. But in any event, I think that is a real movement forward.

The thing one also has to keep in mind is, if there is money lying around here, it is going to be spent. It is going to be spent enlarging Federal Government. So if you go back to that original thesis, you go back to the original notion that you would like to move activities back closer to people, you do it that way rather than bringing more and more money here that inevitably will be spent increasing the size of Government.

I think we have some hope there. Both Houses have passed some tax relief. We will see if we can find a way to put that together, hopefully this week. Then it will be up to the President to say whether he wants to spend more and more money, wants to spend \$1 trillion on 81 new programs, or let the American people have an opportunity to spend some of their own.

Education? Our position again has been that the decisions that are basic to elementary and secondary education ought to be made closest to the people. They ought to be made by the States and by the school boards. Sure, we have an obligation to provide some financial help, but the Ed-Flex program that was passed by this Senate allows those decisions to be made more at home.

I can tell you, the delivery of education is quite different in Wyoming or different in Alaska, the State of the Presiding Officer, from what it is in New York—and properly so. But to make that work, then, the local people have to have that opportunity. We have done that with Ed-Flex, and we had some other educational programs.

I feel fairly strongly about some of the Federal involvement. My wife is a teacher. She teaches special ed and spends almost half of her time on paperwork because of the kinds of Federal programs that are involved. So we are making some movement to change that.

The military fulfills what is obviously one of the principal, if not the principal, obligations of the Federal Government, to provide for the safety and protection and defense of this country. Over the last number of years, the administration has increasingly reduced the amount of resources there. At the same time, we had more demands on the military than we had before. They are not able to conduct their mission on the amount of resources that have been available. I was very disappointed it took a congressional committee to press and push and demand from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to really get down to whether they are able to carry out their mission with the resources they have. The answer was no. So we have moved to make some additions to that, in the first step for a very long time.

The other thing is, if you are going to have a voluntary force, you have to make it fairly attractive to be in the military, and after having trained people to do technical things like flying airplanes or servicing airplanes, they have to stay in the service and do that. So we need more of that kind of support.

Social Security? For a very long time no one would talk about Social Security. It is the third rail of politics—touch it and you are dead. Now, finally, everyone does understand that you have to do something different if, indeed, your purpose is to maintain the benefits that are now going to beneficiaries and to provide an opportunity for young people, who are beginning to work and put their money into the fund, to have some anticipation of having benefits for themselves.

We have to make some changes. The sooner those changes are made the less severe they will have to be.

The President has been talking about saving Social Security for several years. He has no plan. He has done nothing except talk about it. We now have a plan. There is a bipartisan plan on this floor. There has been a lockbox amendment to preserve Social Security funds. It has been opposed on the other side of the aisle five times, but we are going to move forward on Social Security.

VA funding: The administration has for several years requested a flat budget for VA health care but at the same time has expanded the eligibility for people to utilize those facilities. We find, for instance, in my State we have two facilities, but they are underfinanced and are not providing the kinds of services to which veterans are entitled. More money needs to be provided, and we are going to do that. The Republican budget this year had an ad-

ditional \$1.7 billion for veterans' health. It is something that is very important.

Patients' Bill of Rights: We passed a Patients' Bill of Rights that did not involve the Federal Government, did not involve lawyers and the courts making the decisions but indeed guaranteed emergency services without having to go through some kind of clearance. It guaranteed, if you felt as if you were not getting the services, an appeal to a physician, not to a lawyer or to a court, and that was passed.

Medicare: We moved to doing something with Medicare. A bipartisan commission was set up and they have a reasonable plan for Medicare, but the President asked his folks whom he appointed to serve on that commission to vote against it, so it did not come out as a commission report and as a commission recommendation. We are going to take that, basically, and move forward and do something on Medicare.

We are moving toward the end. We have some very difficult issues to deal with, particularly in appropriations. We have to deal with them. We will deal with them. I am hopeful we will also have some kind of a relief valve so that if we get through and cannot come to an agreement with the President that it goes on as it has and will not let that political technique be used again. I hope we find a little less resistance from our friends on the other side in terms of finding solutions to these problems.

I also hope—and this is a philosophy, I admit—that as we go forward we continue to understand the greatness of this country. And it is a great country. If you have had a chance to travel about a bit, you find it is the greatest. Each time I have a chance to go somewhere, I come back thanking God this is the place in which I live. But it is a great country not because of the Federal Government. There is a legitimate role for the Federal Government, of course, described, by the way, in the Constitution, but the real strength of this country lies in its communities and in its individuals who have the freedom to make decisions for themselves. They have the freedom to get together and do things that are required to be done in their communities to make them healthy.

Admittedly, I come from a State that is unique. Maybe we are the lowest populated State now. We are one of the largest States. The delivery of services is quite different, whether it be airlines, whether it be electricity, whether it be education. We cannot have this one-size-fits-all situation.

Again, I am pleased with what we have done. I say to the Presiding Officer that he has had one of the most difficult tasks of leadership in the Appropriations Committee and has done a good job.

I hope we will continue to provide an opportunity for us to come together to resolve our problems so that we can continue to have the opportunity to

serve, to let communities make some of their decisions, and we will continue to be the greatest country in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

TRADE AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN AN ERA OF GLOBALIZATION

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to talk today about the relationship between trade and the environment.

When I joined the Finance Committee in 1979, debate about the Tokyo Round was just concluding. I don't remember a single mention of water pollution, air pollution, or the protection of sea turtles and other endangered species—important issues, but they were not part of the trade debate.

NAFTA changed this. We negotiated the environmental side agreement, and created the North America Commission on Environmental Cooperation. There were flaws and limitations, but it was a turning point.

Now, like it or not, environmental issues are an integral part of the trade debate. Environmental group opposition was one of the major reasons for the defeat of Fast Track legislation last year. Ambassador Barshefsky has said that the next round of trade negotiations should expressly address environmental protection. Two months ago, the WTO held a series of high level roundtable discussions on trade and the environment, in part to help define the issues for consideration in Seattle.

Why has this happened?

It is partly a function of technology. Environmental groups have plugged into the Internet—aggressively. Browse the web sites of almost any environmental group, and you will see what I mean. Any citizen can follow a high-level environmental trade dispute on the Internet. The heretofore insulated, inaccessible, and arcane international trade world meets the chaotic, grassroots, democratic, and Internet-savvy environmental world.

Let me tell my friends in the trade world something about my friends in the environmental world. I have worked with them for years. Sometimes on the same side, sometimes in disagreement. They are smart, dedicated, energetic, and aggressive. And they are very good at using the latest communications technology. So, if you are uncomfortable with the new role of the environmental community in the trade debate, my only advice is: Get used to it and figure out how to work together. The same advice goes to my environmental friends: The trade folks are here to stay. Figure out how to work with them.

There's a second important reason why environmental protection is now an important part of the trade debate.

We are in the midst of an economic boom in the United States and the revolution of globalization. Globalization is bringing every classroom in every