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 additional $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

small western town, and on every Native American reservation, smack into the middle of the information-based global marketplace. It allows small businesses all over the world to tap into the global marketplace. It's forcing virtually every company to become more competitive.

But there's another side to the story. Call it the dark side of globalization. And it has a long history.

America's age of industrialization created great wealth and progress. But it left behind a terrible environmental legacy. Rivers so infected with toxic chemicals that they caught fire. Abandoned mine tailings that dot the landscape of the mountainous west. The loss of wetlands and other habitat necessary to sustain the animal and plant species upon which our survival depends.

In America, we have turned the tide. Our air and water are cleaner now. But we have seen what unchecked economic development did to us.

Extend that kind of growth worldwide. And pick up the pace, to reflect the hyper-speed of global competition. As globalization accelerates, along with the expanded trade that accompanies and fuels it, we are likely to see a rapid increase in environmental problems.

Tom Friedman puts it this way, in The Lexus and the Olive Tree:

> [globalization has] unleashed forest-crushing forces of development . . . which, if left unchecked, [has] the potential to destroy the environment and uproot cultures, at a pace never before seen in human history.

Let me give you two examples.

For years, Montanan and other U.S. softwood lumber producers have been fighting against subsidized Canadian imports. One continuing issue is Canada's relatively weak environmental standards for timber harvesting. Canada has no law, at the federal or provincial level, like our Endangered Species Act.

This gives Canadian producers an economic advantage over U.S. producers. It also can have a serious environmental effect. In Montana, we're struggling to protect the Bull Trout, which is listed as an endangered species. One of the biggest populations resides in Lake Kookanusa, just south of the Canadian border. In the spring, the fish swim up Wigwam Creek, across the border in British Columbia, to spawn.

Recently, British Columbia announced a program of aggressive timber harvesting in the Wigwam Basin. Maybe things will work out, and the harvesting will occur in a way that does not threaten the Bull Trout. But, if not, our efforts to protect an endangered species in this country will be undermined because of another developed country's environmental laws that are deliberately weak to support an industry interest.

Or consider the objectives of the Endangered Species Act which includes preserving biodiversity, the web of life that sustains us. We're losing species at an alarming speed—perhaps a thousand times the natural rate.

No matter how strictly we protect species here in the United States, if the South American rain forest continues to disappear at the current rate, all of our efforts will have been futile.

The message is simple. Globalization and expanded trade benefit us. But we must ensure that globalization and expanded trade are conducted in a way that enhances, and does not undermine, environmental protection.

One thing that worries my greatly is the polarization that has occurred among participants in the trade and environment debate. The middle ground seems to have fallen into a sink hole. Yet the middle is where we need people to find solutions to these very difficult problems.

Let's turn to the next round of multilateral trade negotiations that will be the subject of the WTO Ministerial in Seattle in late November. We must accommodate globalization and expanded trade while, at the same time, preserve and enhance environmental protection.

America must lead. We are the world's largest economy. We are the world's largest trader. And we are the world's leader in developing strong environmental laws. As in many different areas, if we don't exert leadership, no one else will. This is not arrogance. This is not unilateralism. This is leadership, and I offer no excuses and no apologies for it.

I believe that we must follow three broad precepts in developing the proper linkage between trade and the environment. Call these my ''Three No's''.

Trade liberalization must not harm the environment: Trade rules must not be used to stop legitimate and reasonable environmental protection; Environmental regulations must not be used as an instrument for trade protection that closes markets and distorts trade flows.

We need to balance trade and environmental goals and prevent trade and environmental abuses. So, let me turn to my agenda for trade and the environment in the next round of trade negotiations.

First, the WTO dispute resolution process must be made more open, transparent and publicly accessible. This is important in the context of environmental law and regulation, which relies heavily on citizen suits and the public's right to know. And it is important in the context of the WTO's credibility. Secrecy does not enhance respect and confidence in institutions.

The GATT was created in an era when nation-states were the only significant actors on the world scene. The WTO followed the same structure. But it does not reflect today's reality where non-governmental entities have become important international and national players. The rules and procedures must accommodate these new actors.

The dispute settlement process takes too much time and must be shortened significantly. Loopholes that allow delay in complying with decisions must be closed.

Second, the Administration must conduct an environmental assessment for the trade agreement that will emerge from the new round. I will introduce legislation soon requiring such a review.

Third, we should eliminate all tariffs on environmental goods and services. One important way to improve environmental conditions in other countries, especially in developing countries, is to reduce the cost of environmental technology—everything from the elements of a sewage treatment plant to catalytic converters to groundwater bioremediation technology. U.S. companies are leaders in this field, so reduced tariffs will have the added advantage of increasing U.S. exports.

My fourth item involves environmentally harmful subsidies. In some cases, like fishing and agriculture, excessive subsidies lead to practices that are both economically and environmentally harmful. By limiting such subsidies, we can achieve a ''win-win,'' that makes good economic and good environmental sense. I would like to see the total elimination of fishing subsidies. Export subsidies for agriculture should be eliminated worldwide. We should also start looking seriously into the reduction of domestic agricultural subsidies throughout the world.

The fifth item relates to other subsidies—the so-called ''pollution subsidy'' where intentionally keeping environmental standards weak can be an unfair and unacceptable practice that distorts trade, cuts costs of production for the polluter, and makes taxpayers pay the difference through higher health and environmental cleanup costs.

A sub-set of this problem is that of PPMs—production processes and methods. How a product is produced affects the environment. Examples include the way shrimp harvesting affects sea turtles, and the way timber harvesting affects species, water pollution, and the demand for recycled materials.

These are complex issues. Some argue that the WTO has already accepted the principle that a production process can determine how a product should be treated. They point out that countries already determine if an imported product was made with improperly obtained intellectual property or with improper government subsidies. If so, those countries can prevent the import of that good because of the process of production. They argue that if this is the rule under the WTO for intellectual property and for subsidies abuses, it should be the rule for environmental processes as well.

The WTO needs to take on this set of tough issues that sits clearly at the intersection of trade and the environment. We need serious and responsible discussion now.

Sixth, the environmental community believes that we need to find a way to integrate multilateral trade agreements and multilateral environmental agreements, MEAs, and they are right. Actions taken under an MEA should not be subject to a GATT challenge. There are two ways to go about this. One is to ''grandfather'' specific environmental agreements, as we did in NAFTA. We could start out by providing a so-called ''safe haven'' for the Montreal Protocol and CITES, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. The other is to describe the characteristics of an MEA that will automatically be protected.

Let me add a few other agenda items that are unrelated to my Seattle list but need to be on our ''to do'' list in the United States.

First, we should take a hard look at the NAFTA environmental side agreement, and see how it is working. I will ask the key Congressional Committees, including the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, to conduct appropriate oversight.

Second, we need to improve our domestic trade policy institutions. And that includes enhancing the role of Congress in trade negotiations. Last week, in a speech at the Washington International Trade Association, I proposed the establishment of a Congressional Trade Office. This office would provide the Congress with additional independent, non-partisan, neutral trade expertise.

Its functions would include: monitoring compliance with major bilateral, regional, and multilateral trade agreements; analysis of Administration trade policy, trade actions, and proposed trade legislation; participation in dispute settlement deliberations at the WTO and NAFTA, and evaluation of the results of dispute settlement cases involving the United States.

The National Wildlife Federation and the Sierra Club have proposed such an office, although the functions in my concept are quite different.

I will be offering legislation on this later this year.

One of the most difficult issues that has arisen in recent years has been the relationship between trade policy and environmental protection. The lack of consensus on this relationship has been one of the major reasons that we have not been able to proceed with fast track legislation in the Congress.

Paralysis helps no one. I hope that the thoughts I have set out today for Seattle and for our own domestic agenda will help to begin a constructive and responsible dialogue between the trade and the environmental communities. We need trade. We need environmental protection. We need a sustainable earth, and that means a clean world and a growing world—more and better jobs everywhere, increased income, cleaner air and water, the protection of our natural heritage for future generations. These goals are only incompatible when people are unwilling to talk about them together.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 2480

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to H.R. 2480, the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

The Presiding Officer (Mr. KYL) appointed Mr. ROTH, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. MOYNIHAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of the Senate of July 1, after having received H.R. 2587, the Senate will proceed to the bill. All after the enacting clause is stricken, and the text of S. 1283 is inserted. H.R. 2587 is read a third time and passed. The Senate insists on its amendment and requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints Mrs. HUTCHISON of Texas, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. INOUYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

(The text of S. 1283 was printed in the RECORD of July 12, 1999.)

DECEPTIVE MAIL PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to consideration of S. 335, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 335) to amend chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, to provide for the nonmailability of certain deceptive matter relating to games of chance, administrative procedures, orders, and civil penalties relating to such matter, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act''.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON MAILINGS USING MISLEADING REFERENCES TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

Section 3001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)—

(A) in the first sentence by striking ''contains a seal, insignia, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol that reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval or endorsement'' and inserting the following: ''which reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval, or endorsement through the use of a seal, insignia, reference to the Postmaster General, citation to a Federal statute, name of a Federal agency, department, commission, or program, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol; or contains any reference to the Postmaster General or a citation to a Federal statute that misrepresents either the identity of the mailer or the protection or status afforded such matter by the Federal Government''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''or'' at the end and inserting ''and''; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) does not contain a false representation implying that Federal Government benefits or services will be affected by any purchase or nonpurchase; or'';

(2) in subsection (i) in the first sentence—

(A) in the first sentence by striking ''contains a seal, insignia, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol that reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval or endorsement'' and inserting the following: ''which reasonably could be interpreted or construed as implying any Federal Government connection, approval, or endorsement through the use of a seal, insignia, reference to the Postmaster General, citation to a Federal statute, name of a Federal agency, department, commission, or program, trade or brand name, or any other term or symbol; or contains any reference to the Postmaster General or a citation to a Federal statute that misrepresents either the identity of the mailer or the protection or status afforded such matter by the Federal Government''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''or'' at the end and inserting ''and''; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) does not contain a false representation implying that Federal Government benefits or services will be affected by any purchase or nonpurchase; or'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (m) and (o), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

''(j)(1) Matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails described under paragraph (2)—

''(A) is nonmailable matter;

''(B) shall not be carried or delivered by mail; and

''(C) shall be disposed of as the Postal Service directs.

''(2) Matter that is nonmailable matter referred to under paragraph (1) is any matter that—

''(A) constitutes a solicitation for the purchase of any product or service that—

''(i) is provided by the Federal Government; and

''(ii) may be obtained without cost from the Federal Government; and

''(B) does not contain a clear and conspicuous statement giving notice of the information under subparagraph (A) (i) and (ii).''.

SEC. 3. RESTRICTIONS ON SWEEPSTAKES AND DECEPTIVE MAILINGS.

Section 3001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (j) (as added by section 2(4) of this Act) the following:

''(k)(1) In this subsection, the term—

''(A) 'facsimile check' means any matter designed to resemble a check or other negotiable instrument that is not negotiable;