

I remember one occasion he said: You have to come to Atlanta.

I said: I don't want to come to Atlanta.

He said: Just come for lunch; Newt and I want to sit and talk with you.

So I flew down. We had lunch. He had charts and he had a video this time. He talked about how we should be planning our strategy. Then we flew back. I thought about that many times, in a way, the temerity of that. But that was Paul. Nobody objected. Nobody took it as a threat. Nobody worried he was stepping on their turf. And thank goodness, somebody was thinking and planning. That was Paul.

Then after that, of course, he got involved as a member of the leadership team. I really liked that because I can remember very early on I realized that if there was a task that needed to be performed that nobody else would do, I could call on Paul; he would be glad to do it. I can remember going down the leadership line: Would you have the time to do this? Do you have the staff to do this? It would come down to the third person. He always sat at the other end of the leadership table. I would get to Paul, having had three turn downs, and Paul would say: Sure, I'll do it.

Very quickly I developed the moniker for Paul of "Mikey." I like to nickname Senators. Most of them wouldn't like for me to talk about it publicly. But Paul actually kind of liked being called Mikey. Mikey came from the television cereal commercial where the two kids are pushing a bowl of cereal back and forth saying: You eat it; no, you eat it. Finally, they push it to the third little boy and say: Give it to Mikey; he will try anything.

That was the way Paul was. When all the other great leaders of the Senate were not willing to take the time, not willing to do the dirty, difficult, time-consuming job, Mikey would do it. I remember every time I called him Mikey, he would break out in a big smile. Tricia, my wife, picked it up, too. We liked too talk to Nancy about how sorry we were to have kept him tied up a little extra, too, sometimes in the Senate. But Mikey had his work to do. So it was a very affectionate term I had for him, and it described him so perfectly.

He was not a funny, ha-ha sort of guy, but he was willing to laugh. He had a sense of humor. He was willing to laugh at himself, which really made him attractive. He was self-effacing. There was no grandeur there. He was, as PHIL GRAMM said in his remarks at the services Saturday—I believe it was PHIL—or as somebody said: An ordinary man with extraordinary talents. He was willing to work hard to make up for whatever he lacked in some other way. He surely was loyal. I never had to worry about anything I said or asked Paul to do being used in an inappropriate way against me or against anybody else. He would handle it properly. And he was sensitive. He was al-

ways sensitive: Did I do the right thing? Did this Senator react some uncertain way?

I remember asking him to come and help us on the floor on issues he cared about. He really cared about education. He wanted education savings accounts. He believed it would help parents with children in school. He believed it would help low-income parents have the ability to save just a little bit of their money, just a little bit to help their children with clothes or computers or tutoring. If we ever find a way to pass that legislation, instead of education savings accounts, it should be the Coverdell savings accounts. That would be an appropriate memorial and monument to Paul Coverdell. He believed in it. It wasn't a partisan political thing. It was something he thought would make a difference.

As for drugs, I remember him following me around in the well heckling me about the need to pay more attention to the drug running in the Gulf of Mexico area across the borders in the Southwest. The Senator from Arizona worked with him on that issue. I remember his commitment to trying to be helpful to the Government in Colombia to fight drug terrorism there. He was passionate about it because he felt it threatened our country, threatened our very sovereignty, and it threatened our children. Once again, as with education, he saw it in terms of what it was doing or could do to our children. Again, he was involved.

One of the last discussions I had with him was on the intelligence authorization bill. There is a provision in it which he didn't particularly like. He was determined to have a way to make his case on that. In his memory, we will make sure his case is made by Senator KYL, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator DEWINE, perhaps others. He really would dig into issues and make a difference.

I also called on him at times when there really was nobody else who could take the time to do the job.

He worked with us for a solid week on the floor on the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill. I came in one day and found that we had over 200 amendments pending. Somebody had to take the time to work with both sides to begin to get those amendments reduced, accepted, eliminated, withdrawn, or whatever. To his credit, Senator SPECTER said: I would like to have Paul spend time helping me with this.

Other leadership members were involved in other issues. I could not be here. Senator NICKLES could not be here. We had other things we had to do. Within a short period of time, the 200 became 50. Before the week was out, it was done.

Senator REID will tell you that Paul really made the difference. He didn't just hang out on this side of the aisle; he was rummaging around on the other side trying to see if we could work through it. I remember at the end of the week he was a little pale and, obvi-

ously, a little stressed. He came to my office and said: Boy, do I understand a little bit better what your job entails.

Well, he was able to do it because nobody felt threatened by Paul. He wasn't getting in my hair, stepping on Senator NICKLES' turf, or inappropriately shoving amendments away. He was working with everybody involved. Nobody got mad. Nobody got even. It is sort of a unique thing for a Senator to be able to do that.

So I guess I will be trying to find another "Mikey." But I don't think there is one. And so as I thought about doing this speech, I tried to find some statement, some poem, something that would pay a final appropriate treatment to Senator Coverdell. I came across a passage from a poem, "The Comfort of Friends," by William Penn.

He said:

They that love beyond the world
Cannot be separated by it.
Death cannot kill what never dies,
Nor can spirits ever be divided
That love and live in the same divine principle:

[Because that is] the root and record of their friendship.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thank the leader for his comments and his very strong feelings about friends, people with whom he has worked.

I had a little different experience, I guess, with Paul Coverdell in that he was here when I came. So I was not in this business of leadership with him. Indeed, he took time to spend time with those of us who were new and to say: How can I help you? How can we work together? This was the kind of man that Paul Coverdell was. Certainly, he was an image that each of us should seek to perpetuate—that of caring, that of really feeling strongly about issues, and then, of course, being willing to do something about it. So I want to share with the leader my sorrow and sadness in not having Paul Coverdell here with us. I extend our condolences to his family.

f

GOALS FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to take some time today to talk about some of the things we are doing, some of the goals I hope we have, and the position we find ourselves in now as we come down to the last week prior to the August recess.

When we come back from the August recess, we will have, I suppose, about 20 working days to finish this 2-year session of Congress, the 106th session. We will have a great deal to do. As we go forward, as we take a look at the day-to-day tasks and activities that we have before us, I hope always that we look at where we want to go and what the goals are.

Sometimes I feel as if we get wrapped up in the day-to-day operations and the day-to-day problems and we lose sight

of where it is we want to be. But overall, as a Member of the Senate, or as an American citizen who is interested in Government, and as a voter, it seems to me that we ought to look at where we want to be over a period of time. Many things are involved, of course, in that. I think we have to take a look at where we are with respect to the Constitution. Most of us believe this Constitution has given us the greatest country in the world. This Constitution has given us more freedom, more opportunity, and more privileges than anywhere else in the world. Are we continuing to support that Constitution? Where will we be in 50 years? Where will we be in 10 years?

With regard to the role of the Federal Government, where do we want to be? What is our goal in terms of the future? What is the role of the Federal Government with regard to individual freedoms? What is the role of the Federal Government with respect to local government—the States and counties? Do we want a Federal Government that dominates all the things that we do? I don't believe so. So as we do each of these steps, it seems to me that it is appropriate to try to evaluate a little what we are doing and how that contributes to where we want to go. I know it is difficult. I think it is a challenge for each of us as we go about what we are doing.

I am, frankly, proud of what we have been able to do in this session. I am pleased about the direction the majority in the Senate has taken with regard to many of the issues; with regard to the balanced budget; with regard to Social Security; with regard to spending as it reflects Social Security and the changes that we have made to stabilize Social Security, making it strong; what we have done in terms of education; where we are in terms of the military and the security of this country, which is probably the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government.

So I think we ought to look at where we are. We are close now to finishing up. We have a number of things to do. But our determination, I believe, should be to stay within the budget we established. We have a budget program in which early this year we established spending limitations that we wanted to live within. It is difficult to do that. Everyone has a good idea as to where we can spend money. There are thousands of opportunities to spend money.

Frankly, when you have a surplus, spending becomes easier; it becomes something that everybody sort of gets into doing. We have a balanced budget. We maintain Social Security without spending Social Security dollars. We have been working on strengthening Medicare and pharmaceuticals, and we must continue to do that. We need to set up the technique for paying down the debt that we ought to pay. We have an obligation to pay that so our children don't have to. We are dedicated to returning the surplus back to the taxpayers, the people who have paid in the

dollars. The surplus, indeed, should go back to them.

So it seems to me that we have a principle in our party, in this majority of the Senate, and in the Senate generally, for fiscal responsibility, for preserving Social Security, tax relief, and education. I am very proud of what we have done.

With regard to balancing the budget, actually in the last several years—it is the first time since the Eisenhower administration in 1957 that we balanced the budget with funds outside of Social Security. As the money comes in, of course, it comes in a unified budget. Social Security money has been borrowed and spent on programs other than Social Security. In 1995, when the Republicans took control of Congress, for the first time in 42 years, we began to balance the budget. I am pretty proud of that. I hope that we continue to be.

In terms of Social Security, of course, the first obligation is to set aside those dollars so that they are not spent on something else. Under our system, all that we can do with Social Security dollars is to put them into the trust fund, a Federal investment, which yields a relatively low return. We are seeking to take a portion of the Social Security funds now and let that account belong to the individual, so that when young people take their first job and have 12.5 percent of their earnings set aside, a portion of that can be in an account that belongs to them, which can be invested in the private sector at their direction, which can return a much higher yield so that over time there will be benefits for young people, probably leaving the ones 55 and older not doing anything at all and making sure they stay as they are.

Young people years from now will not have a return unless they do something different. We could increase taxes. Nobody is much interested in that. We could reduce benefits. That is not an answer. But we can increase the return on the trust funds. We are doing that.

We are funding education at a higher level than before, at a higher level than the administration requested. But probably more important is the effort made to return the decisions made with regard to elementary and secondary education back to the schools—closer to the school districts and closer to the school boards, rather than having those decisions being made in Washington. I can tell you that the needs in Pine Bluffs, WY, are much different from those in Pittsburgh.

You have to have some flexibility. We have the Ed-Flex bill so that those kinds of decisions can be made. I am pretty proud of that. I am very pleased with that. As the leader said, Senator Coverdell was the leader in doing those kinds of things.

As for strengthening the military, we are finding ourselves, of course, at a time when we don't have the cold war, where the inclination is for the empha-

sis to be off the military. This is not a simple world. We find ourselves at times needing a strong defense. We have a voluntary military, which we should have. But you have to make it relatively attractive for people to go into the military and stay there. You bring people into the military and train them to be pilots and mechanics; then they leave. We have done something there. We have increased the appropriations. We have increased, hopefully, the pay. Of course, if you are going to have an up-to-date military, there has to be science moving forward in new weaponry. We have to have new weapons. It is most difficult to do that.

This weekend I visited the Warren Air Force Base in Cheyenne, WY, one of the major bases. It is really one of the stable portions of our defense. We have to support that, of course.

Health care, naturally, is one of the things that is most important. We have moved to improve some of the payments that were made. We made some reductions in the balanced budget amendment in 1996. However, the administration has made those even larger than was intended. We have to go back and reclaim some of those payments—particularly for outpatient care and hospitals.

These are the things the majority party has worked toward and continues to work on.

We find ourselves now in the appropriations process. There are 13 appropriations bills to be passed. Hopefully, we will get 11 of them passed by the time this week is over. But it is very difficult. We have to challenge the administration. If they don't get their way—if they don't get the money they want in a particular appropriations—they are going to veto it. The President has threatened to shut down the Government, as he did before, and blame the Congress, of course. We have to keep that from happening. Nobody wants to shut down the Federal Government. We have different points of view. We have a different philosophy.

That is what this is all about. We debate those philosophies. Some people think government ought to be involved in all of life's activities. Others think there is no end to the amount of abuses that can take place. Others believe there ought to be some limit on the rules of the Federal Government. After we strengthen Medicare and pay down the debt, we ought to return additional money to those people who have made the payments.

With regard to paying down the debt, I am hopeful we can consider the proposition of a plan to do that. Again, our goal is to pay off the national debt of \$6 trillion. It seems to me we ought to do it in an organized way—do it a little as a mortgage where you decide every year you are going to pay off some on the debt—and move toward doing that. If you keep saying, we will pay it down one of these days, it never happens. The interest on that debt becomes one of the largest items in the budget. We can fix that if we are willing to do it.

I am very proud of what we have accomplished in this Congress. I think we have established a philosophy and a direction of providing adequate programs for controlling the size and growth of expenditures of the Federal Government; doing those things that are necessary, yet moving many decisions back closer to the people and the local governments; taking care of the obligations we have, such as paying down the debt and returning those dollars.

One of the real controversies, of course, is going to be the tax relief that passed the Senate. The tax relief is in two areas that seem to be particularly appropriate—the marriage penalty tax, where two people who are working for x amount of dollars get married, continue to make the same amount of dollars, and then pay more taxes. It is a fairness issue. There is something wrong with that. We have changed that. The President has threatened to veto it.

The other one that needs to be changed, in my opinion—and the Presiding Officer has been a leader in this—is the death tax, the estate tax, the idea that when someone dies, up to 50 percent of their earnings throughout their life can be taken by the Federal Government.

The alternative, of course, is to not let death be a trigger for taxes but, rather, let those moneys be passed on to whomever they wish to pass them on to, and whenever things are disposed of and sold, there is a capital gains tax, of course, on the growth that has taken place. It seems to me that is a fairness issue.

That is where we are. Those are some of the exciting things that I think are happening, and things that fit in, I believe, with the goals most of us have in terms of moving forward with this Federal Government.

We now have a fairly short time to continue doing what has to be done. Appropriations have to be done. We need to continue with our tax reductions and continue with strengthening education. We need to continue in health care. We are on the road to doing that. I am very pleased with how we are doing it.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

£

REMEMBERING SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to take a few moments to reflect on some things you said and also on what the majority leader said a little while ago.

After our colleague Paul Coverdell died, I made a very brief statement on the floor. I knew I should speak briefly because it would be difficult to talk very long about Paul without becoming too emotional.

I think at a time when politics generally and politicians specifically are the subject of a lot of humor—they are denigrated because of cynicism about the political process, and in fact in some cases the denigration of some politicians is probably warranted—it is important for the American people to be reassured that there are some extraordinarily fine public servants who toil very hard on their behalf and who are responsible for whatever good comes out of these institutions—the House and the Senate.

Paul Coverdell was such a man. All of us who have spoken about him have shared with our colleagues and with the American people the same general notion that it is amazing what you can do if you are willing to let others take the credit for it. That was Paul Coverdell—self-effacing, very hard working, totally trustworthy and honest. Everyone could rely upon him to do the things that had to be done without fear he would in any way attempt to take advantage of any situation. He was as solid as a rock and a very important part of this institution—someone who really helped to make it run, and run in a good way.

I am sure my constituents in Arizona for the most part are unaware of Senator Coverdell, but they and others all around this country need to know how sorely he will be missed—not only personally but professionally—and how important a contribution he made to this country. There are truly some wonderful public servants, and Paul Coverdell was one of the best.

£

CONCERNS OF ARIZONA CONSTITUENTS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, when I was in Arizona this weekend, there were three things that seemed to come up frequently. One, of course, was the Vice Presidential selection of Governor Bush for the Republican nomination this fall. The other two subjects were the issues of tax relief, and I will briefly discuss that, and missile defense, which I will add to the mix, to share some of my constituents' concerns.

On the matter of Vice President, obviously, that is a subject of which Governor Bush will speak today or tomorrow, perhaps. Those on the Republican side will be, I am sure, very supportive. If it is former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, I think we will be especially pleased. I can't think of anyone who could make a better contribution, not only to the ticket but also to a future Republican administration, than Dick Cheney. He is from the Presiding Officer's State of Wyoming. He represents the kind of values that both the Presiding Officer and others from that great State represent: Straightforward-

ness, plain-spokenness, honesty, directness, a good strong sense of values, a willingness to do the hard work without having to take a lot of the credit, traits we treasure in someone such as Senator Paul Coverdell, and which Dick Cheney would certainly bring to the job. His experience and the great respect which people not only in this country but around the world have for Dick Cheney would serve the ticket well. I am not attempting to influence Governor Bush in any way, but if his choice is Dick Cheney, there couldn't be a better choice.

Now the other two subjects my constituents raised this past weekend. I was astounded that these were the two things they wanted to talk about: The tax relief that the Republican Congress continues to pass, and pass on to the President; and, secondly, the matter of missile defense, which I will get to in a moment.

I was amused to hear the Democratic candidate for President talk about a do-nothing Congress. This is rather strange, considering the fact that we have passed over and over and over legislation to help the American people, particularly to relieve them of some of the tax burden which imposes upon them an extra burden that they need not bear and that is inhibitive of future economic growth.

I am surprised that a Congress which has been so active—and, indeed, President Clinton has criticized us for being so active in this regard—would be accused then of being “do-nothing.” In truth, it is not the Congress that isn't willing to do these things; it is the Clinton-Gore administration that is unwilling to do these things.

Let me give some cases in point. We passed the estate tax relief about which the Presiding Officer talked. It passed overwhelmingly in both bodies, with bipartisan support. But the Clinton-Gore administration says it will veto this tax relief. We passed the marriage penalty, something that President Clinton said, in his State of the Union speech, was a top priority for him. He says he will veto that legislation. We can pass all of these things, but we can't get them into law unless the President signs them. We are doing our best in the Congress. It is now up to the President.

He did sign one thing that we passed this year. The Social Security earnings limitation was finally repealed. That was an important part of tax relief for an important part of my constituency, our senior citizens. There is more work to do there.

We want to also repeal the 1993 tax increase on Social Security which was imposed by the Clinton administration and the Democratic Congress when it controlled the House and the Senate, and Vice President GORE is always proud to remind everyone that he had to cast the deciding vote. This was the 1993 tax increase which, among other things, imposes a tax rate of up to 85 percent on the Social Security earnings of our senior citizens. This is