procedures are a part of daily patient care.

And this quarter billion dollars cut in funding would be felt in Connecticut, in New Jersey, in Delaware, in Vermont, in South Dakota, in Montana—in all the States in which New York-trained doctors practice.

New York's teaching hospitals are an engine for the Nation's health care system. They are too crucial a resource to let struggle under the pressure of continued funding cuts. And I am committed to ensuring that this devastating cut does not happen this year.

As the Senate begins to craft Medicare provider legislation, I urge all my colleagues to stand with me in ensuring that any Medicare provider package includes a repeal of the IME cut.

Our teaching hospitals—and especially those in New York—are an engine for the Nation's health care system. I would have a very hard time supporting any Medicare provider package that does not include IME relief.

In conclusion, we need to train our doctors to be the best. Fifty percent of the residents trained in the United States are educated in just seven States. My State is home to 10 percent of the Nation's hospitals and trains 15 percent of our new doctors, the greatest percentage of any State. In fact, all over the country, 22 percent of the physicians practicing in Vermont and New Hampshire and 20 percent in Delaware were trained in New York. Well, that is an east coast State. Five to 6 percent of the physicians practicing in South Dakota and Montana were trained in New York hospitals.

In 1997, there were dramatic cuts in money to teaching hospitals.

There is not a State that hasn't benefited from the great training doctors have received in our New York teaching hospitals, or in other teaching hospitals throughout. Besides, the teaching hospitals are at the core of our medical research industry. They brought 10 percent to the NIH grants. Yet in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, we dramatically slashed funding for teaching hospitals. This year, they face another 15-percent cut. That could mean $750 million to the teaching hospitals in New York. Well, that funding is a lifeline for our medical centers, the great research, and the great physicians which we are able and blessed to have in this country.

So I am here to join my colleague from New Jersey and my colleague from New York, Senator CLINTON, as well as others who are coming to the Chamber to join this effort, to stand firm in saying that we need to provide the help for the teaching hospitals. We cannot allow this next cut from the Balanced Budget Act to go into effect. We should not allow any kinds of benefits and other kinds of changes in the Medicare Program to occur without taking into account our teaching hospitals.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle will be working long and hard to see that that happens.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Democrats have used all their time. In fact, the time until 12:15 that we set aside should be used by the minority. I have talked to my friend from Wyoming. Senator BAUCUS is planning to be here at 12:15 to give his opening statement on this important trade bill. We have had good discussion today, and I look forward to the Republicans coming out.

EULOGY OF THE DOG

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I talked to my brother a couple of weeks ago. My brother is 22 months younger than I. We are very close. I talk to him as often as I can. He lives alone in rural Nevada.

The last time I talked to my brother Larry he was very despondent. His dog had died—Smokey. The dog was almost a cartoon caricature, little short legs, a great big stomach. We used to make fun of my brother's dog, but he loved this dog. My brother was very emotional on the phone. He felt bad about his dog having died.

We all know that yesterday Senator BYRD's dog Billy died. My brother's dog was Smokey. This caused me to reflect, of course, as we all do in our lives, on the past. My brother's dog was Smokey, and the dog I grew up with was Smokey, a wonderful dog, part Chow, a great dog. He was a great fighter and protector of us. He could appear very mean, but he wasn't mean at all. But he was somebody I grew up with in rural Nevada. He was a companion and a friend. I still remember him warmly, our dog Smokey.

When I reflected on Senator BYRD yesterday, I remembered the speeches he gave on the floor where he talked about Billy Byrd, his dog. It was obvious he cared a great deal about his dog.

Senator BYRD, on this floor, with the memory that he has—and I cannot match that—one day I heard him recite this on the Senate floor. It was April 23, 1990, and this comes from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He, by memory, gave the ''Eulogy of the Dog'' by Senator George G. Vest.

Senator Vest served in this body for 24 years. He is really not remembered for what he did in the Senate, but he is remembered for what he did as a lawyer, because George Vest represented a farmer whose dog named Drum was shot by another farmer. A lawsuit was filed against this man for having killed his dog Drum. George Vest is remembered for the closing statement that he gave to the jury regarding his dog.

This is very short and I will read this into the RECORD. I cannot do it, as Senator BYRD did, from memory. In doing this, those of us who had animals, like my Smokey and my brother's Smokey and Senator BYRD's Billy Byrd, the little poodle he had, will reflect on really what good friends these dogs have been to us. So, again, I do this in memory of Billy Byrd, Senator BYRD's and Erma's friend. This was given to the jury on September 23, 1870. Mr. President, this speech is so memorable that, in 1958, the town of Warrensburg, MO, where the speech took place, erected a bronze statue to honor old Drum and the orator, George G. Vest:

> Gentlemen of the jury. The best friend a man has in the world may turn against him and become his enemy. His son or daughter whom he has reared with loving care may prove ungrateful. Those who are nearest and dearest to us, those whom we trust with our happiness and our good name, may become traitors to their faith. The money that a man has he may lose. It flies away from him perhaps when he needs it most. A man's reputation may be sacrificed in a moment of ill-considered action. The people who are prone to fall on their knees to do us honor when success is with us may be the first to throw the stone of malice when failure settles its cloud upon our heads. The one absolutely unselfish friend that a man can have in this selfish world, the one that never deserts him, the one that never proves ungrateful or treacherous, is the dog.
>
> Gentlemen of the jury, a man's dog stands by him in prosperity and in poverty, in health and in sickness. He will sleep on the cold ground when the wintry winds blow and the snow drives fiercely, if only he can be near his master's side. He will kiss the hand that has no food to offer, he will lick the wounds and sores that come in encounter with the roughness of the world. He guards the sleep of his pauper master as if he were a prince.
>
> When all other friends desert, he remains. When riches take wings and reputation falls to pieces, he is as constant in his love as the sun in its journey through the heavens. If fortune drives the master forth an outcast into the world, friendless and homeless, the faithful dog asks no higher privilege than that of accompanying him, to guard him against danger, to fight against his enemies. And when the last scene of all comes, and death takes his master in its embrace and his body is laid in the cold ground, no matter if all other friends pursue their way, there by his graveside will the noble dog be found, his head between his paws and his eyes sad but open, in alert watchfulness, faithful and true, even unto death.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have heard a number of topics discussed this morning which, of course, is the purpose of morning business and that is fine. We will, however, at the expiration of this time, move back into the topic that is before us—the one that seems to me is of major importance right now, the issue of which we are required to take some action within the next week is trade promotion authority.

It is accompanied with several other bills, and so it has become a little more difficult to understand and more difficult to pass, in fact, because of the leverages. I think we ought to focus on trade, creating jobs, and to the extent that trade stimulates our economy, and to talk a bit about that. The President has had this on his priority list

for a good long time. The basic idea here is to provide the outline for the President to follow—the President and the Trade Representative and his other helpers—in terms of how we negotiate trade agreements around the world. Quite obviously, constitutionally, the Congress has authority there, the Senate has authority over trade, trade negotiations.

But it is also clear that 535 people are not going to be able to negotiate trade agreements. Therefore, there needs to be a system, which has been in place until 1994, when it was not renewed, of doing this. It provides an outline for the President to follow with regard to developing trade negotiations and trade agreements with people around the world.

Because of the expiration of that outline, we have fallen far behind those countries making agreements, and the impact of that has been rather marked. Certainly the time has come for us to do something about this situation.

In this time of economic uncertainty, when we are seeking to build the economy, it is one of the bills the President has called on us to pass. The effects of it are fairly obvious. It can expand markets for American goods and services. It creates higher paying jobs. It taps the most effective workforce in the world to compete and boost productivity. It has all kinds of advantages.

It is clear that when we have trade, some elements in the economy do not do as well, and I understand that. What we are trying to do is find trade agreements that will emphasize the positive aspects, which I think is very likely to happen, and to hold down to a minimum negative impacts.

Economists say reducing tariffs by even one-third will reduce the world economy by $613 billion and boost our economy by $177 billion a year. All economists who are knowledgeable about this issue indicate there is a great deal to be gained from moving forward with a process that allows us to do what we need to do in areas where trade is prominent. We can stand back and let other countries have trade agreements, and we will find ourselves on the losing side.

We were involved in the committee, of which I am a member, on this issue. We reported out a package, the bill on which we voted this morning to consider, the Andean trade bill, reauthorizing trade with poor countries in South America. This bill is an opportunity to renew that trade. One country is Colombia, in which there are a great many problems, a great many drug problems that affect us. Some other countries are Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. This is not new trade. We have had this agreement before, and we will, I am sure, continue it.

There is a question about the textile industry, of course, and Senators from those States are concerned about what it will mean to the textile industry.

As I said, invariably there will be certain industries that will be impacted more than others. We need to deal with that situation.

Attached to that bill, as I understand the plan, is trade promotion authority and the Trade Adjustment Act. It makes sense to separate these bills and deal with them independently. We dealt with them before. There is no reason we ought to be using one as leverage on the other. They ought to stand on their own merits. I hope we come to some agreement to separate these issues and deal with them independently. That makes sense to me.

The renewal of Presidential trade promotion authority should be one of our top legislative priorities, and indeed it is one of the President's priorities. We have in the last few months dealt with the President's priorities. I am pleased with that, and I hope we can continue to consider his priorities. We have dealt with energy. We have dealt with the farm bill. We have dealt with tax reductions. We have dealt with education. These are issues the President has been pushing, and I do not see why we cannot work together to include trade promotion authority, which certainly has an impact on our economy and on families in this country.

It passed the House by a very close vote; nevertheless, it passed. We are going to be dealing with a bill that will ultimately go to a conference committee to deal with the House or, as some prefer it, to take the House's version so there will not have to be a conference committee. I suspect that is unlikely. Nevertheless, that is the situation with which we are faced.

In general terms, the procedures are a little difficult to understand, but they fall into two categories: The President's authority to proclaim changes in tariffs resulting from negotiations of reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations and procedures for implementing provisions of such agreements entailing changes in U.S. laws. These procedures, commonly known as fast track, require an up-or-down vote in the Senate. Again, the process is one of having the experts on trade making agreements and bringing them back to the Senate. That process has been used for a very long time.

The key provisions of the bill are:

Establish negotiation objectives of the United States. These objectives are designed to provide congressional guidance to the President in the negotiations he undertakes. He is not totally uninhibited when negotiating.

It requires Presidential consultation with Congress before, during, and after trade negotiations, again to make sure there is congressional involvement, as there should be.

It creates a congressional oversight group, a broad-based, bipartisan, and permanent organization to be accredited as official advisers to U.S. trade negotiating delegations—again, the voice of Congress in negotiations.

It requires special consultation procedures for including agriculture, fishing, and textiles, recognizing these are segments of our economy that are impacted and need special consultation.

As I said, it requires an up-or-down vote by the Congress.

The administration, of course, is urging we pass a clean bill so we are able to make some adjustments with the House. Senator Baucus and Senator Grassley, the chairman and ranking member of the committee, have urged we hold it to limited issues. I hope we can, indeed, do this.

The trade adjustment bill is more controversial. Most people agree there is merit to taking a look at the impact trade agreements will have on workers in the United States and that there ought to be some recognition of that impact and some assistance. Generally in the past, these programs have included financial and training assistance for workers displaced by import competition, assistance for firms facing a significant adjustment due to increased import competition, and assistance programs established in conjunction with NAFTA. This has been done in the past.

This Trade Adjustment Act has been in place, and I believe most people believe there should be some help. However, it has generally been training, an effort to help people become reemployed, and not to set up a longstanding welfare relief program. That is what many of us try to guard against.

I mentioned the programs that will expire, but there are some new provisions that have been put into the bill that I think will be controversial: Health insurance subsidies. No agreement has been reached as to how that will be done. Some people prefer temporary assistance be given in tax relief or tax assistance, where payments can be made for a period of time and let the workers select their health care.

One of the proposals, however, is to have the Government pay up to 75 percent of continuing what is called COBRA; that is, continuing the insurance program that was provided by the company. Unfortunately, there are no time limits on this proposal.

We are developing another health care relief entitlement, which is troublesome to some, when we ought to be thinking about how do we get people back to work rather than providing a longstanding program.

In addition to that, it increases the coverage to farmers, ranchers, independent fishermen, iron workers, and truck operators. Along with that is what is called assistance for secondary workers, those who supply the goods to the industry, whether it is upstream or downstream, and without a very clear definition as to what that means.

It would be very difficult to identify the various people who could be impacted, and one can imagine how many would be suggesting they were impacted.

These are the kinds of conflicts I think we have to deal with, and we should. We have to do something about it. Amendments will be offered. There is an amendment I was involved in, where a sugar anticircumvention provision was put in. What that deals with is, in the past, we have had a situation from Canada in which sugar was mixed up in molasses, brought over the border where sugar is not allowed but molasses is, the sugar is then taken out, and the molasses is sent back. We have been able to put a stop to that, but this is a permanent anticircumvention provision, which all it does is go around the law. So I hope that is not struck.

There are a number of other things, of course, that could well be included.

This is basically an issue that is very important to the United States. It is very important to the administration to be able to do their job. I do not think there is any question about that. I come from a State that is involved in agriculture. Agriculture is very much a part of trade. About 1 out of every 3 acres, almost 40 percent of the production, goes into foreign markets. We produce much more than we consume. So one of our real issues is to be able to develop some fair overseas foreign markets for agricultural products. That really has not happened as it should. As well as we get along, for instance, with Japan, we still have very high tariffs on U.S. beef. Japan could be a great market for us.

In balance, it is like most everything else we have to face up to, which is that not everyone agrees. We will hear someone say we ought to do it the right way. I do not know of anyone who wants to do it the wrong way, but there are differences of views as to what is the right way. That is the reason we come together and vote. It is perfectly legitimate to have different points of view, but it is not legitimate to not deal with the issues that are before us.

We spent a very long time on energy. I am very pleased we have a bill, but we now have to do something in the conference committee. Certainly, in terms of our situation, in terms of defense, in terms of terrorism, in terms of our economy, these are issues that have real impact. We can deal with lots of little things. We could list a number of major issues that have a great deal to do with the way we want to see our country in the future, and what we see down the line and that is really what we ought to be doing, is sort of setting some goals as to where we want to be in terms of freedom, in terms of economy, in terms of safety. Having set those goals, it is then reasonable to deal with the issues that are in the interim and determine whether those issues will lead us to the goals we have established.

Unfortunately, too often I think we sort of deal with the issue that is at hand without much thought to where it is going to be over time. It is also true that we represent 50 States, and each of us is a little different. Some this morning were talking about health care. I am chairman of the caucus on rural health care. Wyoming is a rural State, so when one talks about health care, it is different in Meeteesi, WY, than it is in Pittsburgh, PA. There has to be a system to recognize those differences.

The same is true with trade. It is different in different parts of the country. Overall, it is to our advantage, and I hope we move forward.

In conclusion, we need to get on with some other things, like the budget, like appropriations, some of the things that have to be done in order to keep our Government rolling. I am sure we can do that. I urge we move forward and complete our work as soon as we can.

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.

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

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

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business.

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

The Senator from New York is recognized.

THE FUTURE OF TEACHING HOSPITALS

Mrs. CLINTON. I will speak on a very important issue that affects every single American. It affects people all over the world. That is, the future and viability of our teaching hospitals. We know we have the crown jewels of the global health care system in the teaching hospitals who train our doctors and nurses and provide research that gives breakthrough therapies and drugs that saves and lengthens lives. We know our teaching hospitals are often the treatment of last resort for the sickest of the sick and the poorest of the poor.

Yet if we do not act by October of this year, our teaching hospitals nationwide will lose $700 million next year alone. I believe that would be a disastrous outcome. It certainly would undermine the ability of our teaching hospitals to continue to provide the funds in our health care system that all of our other hospitals, all of our entire health care infrastructure, rely upon.

New York, because we have a plethora of first-class, world-renowned teaching hospitals, would lose about $230 million of that $700 million, with over half of that falling directly on our leading-edge teaching hospitals. In 1 year alone, New York teaching hospitals will lose $120 million in Medicare payments because of the effects of the balanced budget amendment, which have slashed hospital reimbursements by $100 billion more than the CBO originally estimated. That is a huge amount of money. It is often the difference between a hospital being able to continue to provide first-class service, training, and charity care, and having to shut departments, lay off people, and turn their backs, literally, on those who need the help. Congress has already softened and delayed some of those reimbursement cuts, including postponing the reductions in the so-called indirect medical education payments, sometimes referred to as IME.

This October, the delay expires and Medicare will revert to the very harsh reimbursement levels that we all recognize cut much more deeply than anyone predicted. The cut would amount to an automatic 15-percent decrease in IME funding across the board, across all States. I oppose an automatic 15-percent decrease in home health payments, and I oppose such a decrease in medical education payments. That is why today a number of my colleagues and I are joining together to introduce a bill to call on the elimination of those cuts before they eliminate our academic medical centers.

New York has a number of fine teaching hospitals. Everyone will recognize the names. It also has 60 rural hospitals, which is more than some rural States have altogether. I am always a little bit surprised when my colleagues and others do not understand that New York, with 19 million-plus people, is not only the island of Manhattan or the five boroughs of New York City or the beaches of Long Island or the suburbs that I live in to the north. It is rolling countryside. It is dairy farms with 80, 100, 120 cows. It is apple growers with the orchards along the Great Lakes that form our northern and western borders. That is why I support a balanced package that will try to help both our teaching hospitals and our rural hospitals.

I draw our attention to a provision in this legislation that deals directly with our great centers of biomedical innovation. If we go forward with the cuts as planned, I believe we set back the cause of clinical trials, of lab research that is going on right now that might hold out a cure for one of us or a loved one. Make no mistake, these cuts will not only close departments, lead to layoffs and furloughs of highly trained doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel, I believe it will also harm patients. If we do not act on the indirect medical education amounts we need to continue to function, the scheduled cuts will affect the quality of health care all over the country.

It is not only New York that benefits from New York's teaching hospitals; our hospitals are filled with people from all over our Nation who are sent there because they cannot get what they need at home. We are proud of that. We have people from all over the world who come to New York's teaching hospitals. We train 20 percent of all physicians practicing in the United