



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1999

No. 147

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Ever-loving God, we thank You for the quiet rest of the night, for the promise that has come with this new day, and for the hope that we feel. While we slept, we rested under the shadow of Your love. Now, as sleep has been washed from the eyes of our minds, implant them with trifocal lenses so that we may be able to behold Your signature in the natural world around us, see the needs of people so we can care for them with sensitivity, and visualize the work that we must do. With minds alert and hearts at full attention, we salute You as our Sovereign. Thank You for meeting all the needs of our bodies, souls, and spirits so that we can serve You with renewed dedication. As You hover around us as we pray, grant us wisdom throughout the day. In the name of Him who is Your amazing grace. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable GEORGE VOINOVICH, a Senator from the State of Ohio, led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will resume debate on

the motion to proceed to the African trade bill with a cloture vote on the motion to proceed scheduled to occur at 10 a.m. Following the vote, it is hoped that the Senate can start debate on the bill so that Senators can begin to offer their amendments. Completion of the bill is expected to occur mid-week so that the Senate can move to other items on the calendar prior to adjournment. The conference committees are working to complete action on the two remaining appropriations conference reports, and the Senate will consider these conference reports as soon as they become available.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 434, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes for debate equally divided.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion to proceed to H.R. 434. As I indicated on Friday, when we proceeded to the bill, I will offer a substitute to the House language that consists of the Finance Committee-reported bills on Africa, CBI, GSP renewal, and the reauthorization of our Trade Adjustment Assistance programs.

Each one of these measures deserves our support. What each represents in its own way is an attempt to reach out

and provide not just a helping hand, but an opportunity—an opportunity for millions around the world to seize their own economic destiny.

Africa has for too long suffered from our neglect. The continent faces daunting political, economic, and social challenges. Yet, African leaders are seizing the opportunity to press for political and economic change.

The goal of the Finance Committee's Africa bill is to meet Africa's leaders half way. It is not a panacea for Africa's problems; rather, it is a small downpayment—an investment—in a partnership that I hope we can foster through our actions here.

The Finance Committee's CBI bill does much the same. It builds on an economic foundation begun with the passage of the original CBI in 1983, but responds as well to the efforts of Caribbean and Central American leaders to rebuild their economies in the face of incalculable devastation their countries faced this past year. The bill would afford the same basic package of enhanced trade preferences offered to Africa under the Finance Committee's bill.

The economic opportunities offered by the Finance Committee Africa and CBI bills extend to U.S. industry as well. According to the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, the Finance Committee bills would lead to an increase in their sales of \$8.8 billion over 5 years and an increase in employment of 121,000 jobs. The bills are expressly designed to ensure that they are a benefit to Africa and the Caribbean, and to the United States as well.

The renewal of the Generalized System of Preferences would continue the longstanding policy of the United States of opening our market to create economic opportunity throughout the developing world and merits our continued support.

The renewal of the Trade Adjustment Assistance programs is entirely consistent with the theme of creating economic opportunity, but it is focused on

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

home. I have always maintained that those who benefit from trade should help those who are adversely affected. The TAA programs have lapsed and must be renewed if we are to fulfill that commitment.

Now, much has been made in this debate of the fact that Finance Committee bills entail a unilateral grant of preferences. The implication is that there is nothing in this for the United States. In fact, the economic growth fostered by this legislation create new markets for our goods and services, as well as help create more prosperous and stable neighbors.

That is an investment I will make any time. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the cloture motion and the motion to proceed to H.R. 434. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself so much time as is allotted.

Mr. President, right to the point made by our distinguished chairman, the expression was used, "meeting halfway." I am of the school that NAFTA did not work. But assuming it did work, it at least included the side agreements with respect to the environment, side agreements with respect to labor, and reciprocity with respect to the actual tariffs. This particular bill has no reciprocity, whether it be in the Caribbean—we are prepared now to list the various tariffs there, minding you that the United States average textile tariff is about 10 percent.

I am looking at lists of the sub-Saharan Africa tariff rates: Ethiopia, the average there would be about—I see some 65, but most of them on apparel are 80 percent; other made-up products, textile, home furnishings, 80 percent; Gabon, 30 percent for an average there; Ghana, 25 percent. We are going to do away with the Ivory Coast, which has a markup also, a tariff; Kenya: 50, 50, 50, 62 percent on laminated fabric, 50 percent on apparel; the textile, home furnishings, another 50 percent; Madagascar: 25 percent, 30 percent; Mauritius, 80 percent for man-made filament yarn, textile floor coverings, apparel, textile; home furnishings, 80 percent—I ask unanimous consent a summary of these tariffs be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### APPENDIX

#### SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA TARIFF RATES—SUMMARY

HS Chapter and product	Tariff rate <sup>1</sup> (percent ad valorem)	
	Range	Average (estimate)
50—Silk fiber, yarn and fabric .....	0-100	15
51—Wool yarn and fabric .....	0-100	18
52—Cotton yarn and fabric .....	0-65	18
53—Other vegetable fiber yarn and fabric .....	0-100	15
54—Manmade filament yarn and fabric .....	0-65	17
55—Manmade staple fiber yarn and fabric .....	0-80	17
56—Wadding felt & nonwovens, yarn, twine, cordage .....	0-100	19
57—Carpets and other textile floor coverings .....	0-100	34
58—Special woven fabric, tufted fabric, lace, tapestries .....	0-100	24

#### SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA TARIFF RATES—SUMMARY—Continued

HS Chapter and product	Tariff rate <sup>1</sup> (percent ad valorem)	
	Range	Average (estimate)
59—Impregnated, coated, laminated fabric .....	0-100	22
60—Knit fabrics .....	0-80	28
61—Knit apparel .....	0-100	31
62—Apparel, not knit .....	0-100	27
63—Other made-up products, textile home furnishings .....	0-100	27

<sup>1</sup> Summary of 28 countries' tariff rates (South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland, Central African Republic, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe).

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is for the sub-Saharan. Later, when we have more time I will be delighted to list in there, too, what we have down in Nicaragua and Panama, and the other so-called Caribbean Basin Initiatives.

The truth of it is, in the initial observation of our distinguished chairman that this is going to give millions around the world a chance to seek their economic destiny, my problem is it is going to sink the economic destiny of the United States, particularly in the textile field, as it were, and many other fields as we set the case for so-called free trade.

I wish I had the time to emphasize the fact there is no such thing. Starting with Alexander Hamilton, in the earliest days of David Ricardo and comparative advantage, and just after the fledgling colonies had won their independence, that the Brits corresponded with Alexander Hamilton saying now what you should do is trade best with what you produce and we will trade back from the mother country with what we produce best. In a little booklet, "Reports On Manufacturers"—there is one copy left there at the Library of Congress—Alexander Hamilton, in a line said: Bug off. We are not going to remain your colony. We are not going to continue to ship our wheat and our corn and our coal and our timber, our natural resources, like some kind of infant republic, and let you have the manufacturing strength.

As a result, on the 4th day of July, 1789, the second bill to pass the National Congress after we had adopted the Resolution for the Seal of the United States, the second bill was a tariff bill of 50 percent covering some 60 articles. We built this economic giant with protectionism.

We maintain certain protections, oh, yes, we make sure we protect intellectual property, you know, that brainy crowd, that Microsoft crowd that has 22,000 employees who are all millionaires; 22,000 millionaires working for you. I wish I were one of them. That is a wonderful situation, when you have all that manpower. But the real strength of our democracy is our middle class. Henry Ford said: Pay them enough so they can buy what they are producing. That is how we develop, with our manufacturing strength, this industrial power, the United States of America.

Now there is a zeal for continuing foreign aid as foreign trade. This is not a trade bill, it is an aid bill. It is unilateral. It is a one-way street. It is not even like NAFTA. There are not any side agreements whatever, yet you do not find some of our leaders in the environment and in labor. I know not why the chairman mentioned ATMI. No one has worked more intimately with ATMI than myself, until we got to NAFTA. Then the fabric boys said: The dickens with you apparel boys, we are going for broke. Certain it is they can sew down in Mexico as well as they do in the United States. That is your problem. Our problem is, with all this fine manufacturing, where we can produce the fabrics and continue to make a fortune.

So they just dropped their political strength. As the principal author of five textile bills that passed in this Senate in the last 30 years or more, I know better than any that we have the votes from up in the Northeast. The apparel boys—Saul Chaikin would turn over in his grave at this particular bill. Herman Staorbin, Jack Sheinkman—real leaders. I don't know where they are today. I cannot find them around. They seem to go along with foreign aid, export some more jobs. Yes, under NAFTA, we lost 420,000 textile jobs. The chairman is quoting ATMI that it is going to produce 121,000 jobs. That is pure poppycock. I make a bet on it. Let him bet on his words, any odds he wants and I will cover the bet. I can tell you here and now there is no chance of creating the jobs. This is a one-way export of jobs.

That Finance Committee comes around and says: Exports, exports, we have to emphasize exports. We do not have anything left to export. We are not exporting any software. We are not exporting the computers or anything else such as that. We had to put in Semitech to save the semiconductor industry. They talk about aid and subsidies and everything else—oh, they are all for themselves but they are not for working Americans.

It is unique. Here I am—I voted for the right-to-work law and I am a strong supporter at the State level, not at the Federal level; I want my advantage down there in South Carolina because that is how we are getting a lot of good industry there; I want that individual decision—but this so-called conservative southern Governor is now having to protect organized labor when there is no one around this morning at all. There is no voice to be heard to save the jobs up there in the Northeast or anywhere else.

This is a sad occasion. Let me try to list some of those things we have imported now, from the Center of Domestic Consumption, the various products there, to show you exactly where we are. With respect to the machinery sector—48.9 percent of the machinery sector is represented in imports. I know with respect to textiles it is over 66 and two-thirds.

I told the Members on Friday we were alarmed when it reached 10-percent import penetration in textiles. Now two-thirds of the clothing I am looking at is imported; 86 percent of the shoes. I know with respect to electronic products it is 57.9 percent.

It is sad. We invented the radio and electronics, and the Japanese have taken over in those areas. These things are too detailed to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will have a better listing. Sometimes when you try to get information, you get so much information it is totally useless.

My point is, the strength and security of the United States of America is like a three-legged stool: One leg is our values as a nation. That is unquestioned. Everyone knows America will commit in Somalia and help bring about freedom and democracy in Bosnia. As we travel the world as Senators, we see we are the envy of the world with respect to individual rights, freedom of mankind, and equal justice under law. They all acknowledge that. We do not have to worry about that leg.

The other leg, of course, is the military leg or military power. As the one remaining superpower, that is unquestioned.

But the third leg, the economic leg, has been fractured. We have had foreign aid. It worked. This Senator is not complaining about it. I am making a factual observation as to where we are. Yes, we started after World War II and taxed ourselves some \$85 billion for the Marshall Plan. We sent over our machinery, the best of our machinery, the best of minds, the technology, the managers, and capitalism has conquered communism in the Pacific rim and in Europe. We continued.

I will never forget, as a Governor, they said: Governor, come on, what do you expect these recovering and emerging nations to make, airplanes and computers? We will make the airplanes and computers, and they will make the shoes and the clothing. My problem today is, they are making the shoes, they are making the clothing, they are making the computers, and they are making the airplanes. They are dumping them.

We are finally getting the attention of the Senators from Washington and Boeing. They are beginning to understand. I have had their opposition over many years with respect to trade because they like the Federal Government, in defense, doing all their research, they like the Federal Government putting in the Eximbank to subsidize their sales overseas. We never had subsidized sales for textiles. They love all of that. Then they said: Oh, we have to get to work; we have a global economy, competition, competition.

The textile industry—look at the record—for 15 years has reinvested an average of \$2 billion a year modernizing. I told the story of the Clinton plant the other day. It is 100 years old. It looks like from the outside it will

fall down, but it has the most modern machinery. There was no one in the card room. Where they once had 125 in the weave room, there are no more than 15. They have mechanized, computerized, and electronically controlled operations.

Those companies that have survived are the most productive, competitive textile industry in the entire world. Our problem is, it is not going to pay to invest and continue to compete and survive for the plain and simple reason that this one-way street of foreign aid—I wish it were going to aid those countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I will continue at the appropriate time. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I want to transfer my hour under closure. I ask unanimous consent that the hour transfer to the Democratic manager so it can be yielded to another Senator today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLINGS. It is just a transfer of an hour. I do not think anybody will object to it. I have to make an appearance before the city council of Isle of Palms relative to the loss of my home. I have to leave to make that appearance and come back.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair, and 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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Paul Hamrick, a congressional fellow in Senator GRAHAM's office, be granted the privilege of the floor during debate on this legislation.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this side yields back what unexpended time we have.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 215, H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa:

Trent Lott, Bill Roth, Mike DeWine, Rod Grams, Mitch McConnell, Judd Gregg, Larry E. Craig, Chuck Hagel, Charles Grassley, Pete Domenici, Don Nickles, Connie Mack, Paul Coverdell, Phil Gramm, R.F. Bennett, and Richard G. Lugar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 341 Leg.]

#### YEAS—90

Abraham	Feinstein	Lott
Akaka	Fitzgerald	Lugar
Allard	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Baucus	Graham	Mikulski
Bayh	Gramm	Moynihan
Bennett	Grams	Murkowski
Biden	Grassley	Murray
Bingaman	Gregg	Nickles
Bond	Hagel	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Breaux	Hatch	Robb
Brownback	Hollings	Roberts
Bryan	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Burns	Hutchison	Roth
Campbell	Inhofe	Santorum
Cochran	Inouye	Sarbanes
Conrad	Jeffords	Schumer
Coverdell	Johnson	Sessions
Craig	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Daschle	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Kyl	Thomas
Domenici	Landrieu	Thompson
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Durbin	Leahy	Voinovich
Edwards	Levin	Warner
Enzi	Lieberman	Wellstone
Feingold	Lincoln	Wyden

#### NAYS—8

Bunning	Collins	Snowe
Byrd	Helms	Thurmond
Cleland	Smith (NH)	

#### NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 8. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I believe strongly in free trade. I believe in the productivity of the American worker. I believe in American ingenuity and technology and I believe that, if we

eliminate the barriers, our industry and our workers can compete effectively with anyone in the world.

I have always supported fast-track legislation to give the executive branch the freedom to negotiate trade agreements with other nations.

But back in 1993, despite my inclination to support free trade, I wrestled long and hard with the facts and the figures and I determined that NAFTA—the North American Free Trade Agreement—was not a good agreement for us.

It was a hard vote for me—in 1993—but I ended up voting against NAFTA. I was convinced that it would indeed cost this Nation jobs.

Unfortunately, time and the trade statistics have proven me right. NAFTA was a bad agreement. Since the implementation of NAFTA, we have managed to turn a trade surplus with Mexico of \$1.7 billion a year into a trade deficit that, this year, will exceed \$20 billion.

The giant sucking sound has been heard in Kentucky—5,000 jobs from the apparel industry—sucked out of the State and the Nation. Thousands of apparel manufacturing jobs have drifted south to Mexico. At least 7,000 Kentucky jobs are gone.

In particular, the apparel and textile industries have been devastated. In the last 56 months—since the implementation of NAFTA, the apparel industry has lost 305,000 jobs, and the textile industry has lost 125,000 jobs.

They are just gone, disappeared.

Now, we are being asked to expand portions of this agreement to include the other Caribbean and Central American countries—and to provide new trade preferences for the 48 countries of Sub-Saharan Africa.

Basically, we are being asked to take a failed policy—NAFTA—and expand it dramatically. That makes absolutely no sense at all.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this expansion of NAFTA and the guaranteed loss of additional U.S. jobs.

The CBI parity portion of this legislation is based on the premise that we need to spur economic growth in the Caribbean and Central America. The same arguments are used in favor of this bill that were used in support of NAFTA.

Supporters say that economic growth and investment in our neighbors to the south will benefit us in terms of increased exports and increased domestic employment because of those exports. And that logic is very difficult to dispute—over the long haul.

Certainly, healthy economies in the Caribbean and Central American countries would open new export opportunities for U.S. goods and services. Certainly, expanding economies in the area would reduce the pressure of immigration—legal and illegal alike.

Certainly we want healthy economies in this area to help strengthen the growth and stability of democracy in our neighborhood.

We do need to do everything we can, within reason, to encourage economic growth in the Caribbean. It makes sense.

But it doesn't make sense to sacrifice an entire U.S. industry and hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs to do it. And that is what this bill will do.

The Caribbean Basin apparel and textile business is already booming. Last year, apparel and textile exports from the Caribbean and Central America to the United States grew 9 percent, a growth rate double that of the U.S. economy.

At \$8.4 billion in 1998, textile and apparel exports from the Caribbean Basin countries to the United States already exceed the \$7.5 billion in textiles and apparel exported to our Nation by Mexico.

When it comes to helping expand the economies of the Caribbean countries and Central American countries, the American textile and apparel workers have already given at the office—430,000 jobs have been lost to help fuel this exodus.

Expanding NAFTA in this way, at this time, will simply reward the companies that have already left the United States and sent their manufacturing facilities to the Caribbean Basin because of lower wages.

In the process, we stand to lose another 1.2 million jobs in the apparel and textile industry.

Ask the people in Campbellsville, Kentucky if that makes sense to them.

It doesn't.

The African trade portion of this bill doesn't make much more sense.

I think that everyone certainly agrees that we need to encourage economic development in Africa. It is in our long-term best interests to establish strong trade linkages with Africa because it is a huge potential market for U.S. goods.

And if this bill simply provided incentives for increased manufacturing and production of African products, I would probably not have any problem with it.

But this bill doesn't just open the door for increased trade with Africa—it opens, even wider, the door to a flood of Asian products that could further devastate our domestic textile and apparel industry. So, our good intentions would, in all likelihood benefit Asia much more than Africa.

The bill creates a huge new incentive for transshipments of Asian goods through Africa.

Transshipment is nothing new. Asian manufacturers have been illegally transshipping goods into the United States through Africa for more than 15 years.

Customs has estimated that transshipments from Asia have grown from \$500 million in 1985 to \$2 billion, and possibly as much as \$4 billion a year. Africa has been one of the major transshipment routes into this country.

This bill, because it lowers tariff duties dramatically, would create an al-

most irresistible incentive to cheat even more.

And ironically that cheating will actually undermine NAFTA and the Caribbean Basin Initiative which include strict anti-fraud provisions that safeguard our domestic producers to some extent.

Because it offers lucrative incentives for Asia to transship and no realistic methods to prevent transshipment, billions of dollars of illegal Asian imports will enter the United States duty free and quota free from Africa in direct competition with NAFTA and Caribbean Basin products.

And no matter how good U.S. workers are, they can't compete against Asian imports that are subsidized from fiber production on down.

The U.S. Customs Service doesn't have the resources to stop illegal transshipment. Local African customs officials don't have an incentive to stop it.

Asian manufacturers, who dominate world trade in textiles and apparel are unlikely to invest money in Africa if it is more cost effective to transship through Africa.

And that means the Asian manufacturers will either transship the entire garment or they will only do minor assembly work in Africa. Either way, the yarn, the fabric and most, if not all, of the labor will come from Asia.

A couple buttons or a zipper here and there might be added in Africa, but this trade bill will benefit Asia much more than Africa and African workers.

So, here we have two trade bills wrapped into one. Both are flawed. Both jeopardize domestic industries and domestic workers who have been devastated already.

The Caribbean Basin Initiative portion of this bill expands NAFTA—which has already been costing us thousands—hundreds of thousands of jobs—many of them from my home State of Kentucky.

It rewards companies which have already moved their jobs from the United States to the Caribbean and for what purpose?—to expand growth in an industry which is already growing very nicely in those Caribbean nations.

More U.S. jobs will be lost as a result.

The African trade provisions in this bill are designed to increase investment and expand the manufacturing base in Africa. But in the absence of strong, realistic restrictions on transshipment of Asian manufactured products, this bill would, in all likelihood, benefit Asia more than Africa.

And it would further devastate the apparel and textile industries in our own country.

I still believe in fair trade. But there is nothing fair about this bill for the U.S. apparel and textile industries.

We keep talking about creating a level playing field when it comes to fair trade. But this bill pulls the field right out from under U.S. industries which have already had an uphill fight just to stay alive.

It doesn't make any sense. And I urge my colleagues to vote against it. NAFTA should have taught us a lesson.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I have a question. If the Senator from Florida is going to speak now, I am not actually trying to get the floor ahead of him. I wanted to ask the Senator from Florida, is it his intention to speak on this legislation now?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am prepared to yield time to the Senator if he is prepared to speak at this time.

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield? I had indicated to our colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, who wishes to make a memorial statement for our colleague, Senator Chafee, that he would have an opportunity to do so at this time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Absolutely. Of course.

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

---

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to rise to express my thoughts about the loss of a great friend and a dear colleague, Senator John Chafee. The Senate has lost a great Senator and this country has, indeed, lost a great American. All of us in the Senate family have lost a great friend.

John Chafee was a Senator who thought of what was best for his country first and thought about the politics, if he did at all, last. All of his colleagues, I know, will have great personal memories of Senator Chafee, how their paths crossed over the years, and the work he did as a leader of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. On our own Senate Finance Committee, when we had such historic debates, Senator Chafee was always in the midst of them. I know his work on the Environment and Public Works Committee will ensure all Americans in the future will breathe cleaner air and drink cleaner water and have to worry less about their health because of the environment in which we all live. He always was a leader in the environmental area and will always be noted for that. It is true; all of us are better off for the services he provided in that capacity.

I remember John Chafee and the efforts he and I undertook together. It was, indeed, my privilege to work with him on what became known as the Centrist Committee, a centrist coalition. Senator Chafee was enthusiastic about finding a consensus on the difficult issues that faced our country, but he was concerned about more than just trying to find a consensus; he was really concerned about creating a consensus. His efforts in our little coalition produced some dramatic results

because he, in hosting these meetings with our colleagues from both sides of the aisle, truly recognized solutions to difficult problems cannot come from the far left or the far right. These difficult solutions must be found in the center, and that is where I think he found himself most comfortable.

We used his hideaway office here in the Senate almost on a weekly basis, as I said, to host meetings between Republicans and Democrats who worked together. We talked to each other rather than merely listened to echoes of ourselves. We actually spoke about the issues and tried to find and recommend solutions that were not necessarily good political solutions but were the right thing to do for this country.

I think his greatest accomplishment in this area that I remember was the recommendations that he helped guide in the area of health care. We ultimately brought them to the floor of the Senate and they were adopted by a very strong majority of this Senate, to a large extent because of the credibility John Chafee brought when he was listed as being one of the principal cosponsors. Unfortunately, those recommendations did not become the law of the land, but I am certain, and very confident, that one day they will.

So John Chafee will be missed by all of us. He served his State and he served his Nation very well. I look to the day in the Senate when there will be more John Chafee's. Certainly this Nation and this country needs them and we deserve them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing my profound sadness on the passing of our good colleague and our great friend, Senator John Chafee, and to offer my most sincere condolences to his wife Ginny, their 5 children, and 12 grandchildren, the entire Chafee family, and also people in Rhode Island, who have lost a strong advocate, a compassionate leader, and a true friend.

This body and this Nation are diminished today by the loss of one of the finest people I have ever had the privilege to know in politics.

Senator Chafee's life was an ode to the finest ideals of public service. He fought in World War II and Korea because he believed in freedom. He served in the State legislature and as Governor of Rhode Island because he loved his State. He answered the call to become Secretary of the Navy because he wanted us to have the best defensive force in the world. He ran for the Senate because he thought he could make a difference, and what a difference he has made.

I had the honor of working with Senator Chafee in this body for only a little under 5 years, but as did everyone else on Capitol Hill, I had long known of his reputation for thoughtfulness and reason. Indeed, for anyone who really cared about the art of legis-

lating, John Chafee was a household name.

I consider myself fortunate for the opportunity to have worked with this great American and to have seen firsthand why he engendered such respect and affection from both sides of the aisle and from all political persuasions. He was an extraordinary man of sincere humility, boundless energy, and steadfast integrity. It was difficult enough coming to terms with his impending retirement from the Senate. Now it will be immeasurably more difficult to come to terms with his passing.

Throughout my tenure in the Senate, I have felt a special kinship with Senator Chafee on a number of levels. For one thing, he and his wife Ginny have long had a home in my State of Maine, a home that has been in his family more than 100 years, in the beautiful town of Sorrento just across the bay from where my husband's family has a place. And we had a chance to see them during the course of the summer. Clearly, I knew from the start that Senator Chafee was a man of discerning taste.

In fact, he would often say—only half-jokingly—he considered himself the third Senator from Maine. If such a thing were really possible, we could not have been more honored, and we certainly could not have had a better advocate for our great State.

On the political front, I always saw Senator Chafee as something of a kindred spirit. He epitomized what it meant to be a modern, moderate Republican. For him, compromise was a way things got done. It was the way we distilled all the opinions, all the issues, all the viewpoints, and arrived at legislation that could change America and change lives for the better. For John Chafee, there was strength in compromise, courage in compromise, honor in compromise, and he was right. He viewed it not as an abdication of principle but a catalyst for constructive policy.

Senator Chafee was willing to take risks in order to do what he believed was in the best interests of Rhode Island and our country. For him, leadership and the public good were two concepts forever and eternally intertwined. Sometimes that meant being a lone voice in the wilderness, and he was willing to be that voice.

Time and again, John Chafee was there, both out in front and behind the scenes, as Senator Breaux just mentioned, forging consensus, breaking deadlocks, and bringing people together on countless issues that were key for Americans, issues that resonate today in people's daily lives and will continue to resonate for generations to come.

John Chafee always put ideas ahead of ideology. That is why he was at the forefront of the legislative and political debates in Congress. He proposed sensible, viable, and realistic alternatives. I well remember in the budget