

one of the rationales of our Founding Fathers, establishing a bicameral legislature with one house being very close to the people and one house being, hopefully, a more deliberative body. John Chafee epitomized that concept of the place where the hot passions are reconciled.

John Chafee was also the kind of person who was more interested in results than with recognition. There probably are some pieces of legislation that are known as the Chafee act, or have his personal name associated with them. But, frankly, today, I cannot recall what that might be. I think John Chafee is perfectly satisfied with that. His goal was not to have his name etched in legislative marble or stone but, rather, to achieve a result. He was interested in building the edifice, not whose name was on the cornerstone of the edifice. That was the kind of human being John Chafee was.

As a result of his commitment to results rather than recognition, in fact, some of the Senate's most memorable achievements in recent years bear his imprint. Expanded environmental protections, a balanced budget, and an improved transportation system were the results of his leadership and influence.

As with all of us, John Chafee was a good friend, a trusted colleague. John will be sorely missed. He leaves a legacy that adds distinction to this body and to the title of public servant. We all send our deepest sympathy and best wishes that solace will be found in the great accomplishments of this truly great man, and that his family and the thousands of persons fortunate enough to call John Chafee a friend will find a solace and a capacity to deal with the grief that we all suffer today.

Mr. President, I yield such time as he may wish to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, for those who might be watching our deliberations, I had a chance to speak yesterday about Senator Chafee. I will get back to the debate on this legislation.

As I listened to my colleagues, I was reminded of a press conference that we had several months ago on some work I have been doing with Senator DOMENICI. The legislation is called the Mental Health Equitable Treatment Act, which we very much want to pass this year. Certainly, we won't get it done in the next 2 weeks, but I hope we will when we come back. I remembered that one of the original cosponsors was Senator Chafee. I agree with what everybody has said about him. It will be a tremendous loss for the Senate and our country. Again, today, I extend my love to Senator Chafee's family.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED Continued

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, both colleagues have been gracious to those of us who are in opposition to this legislation. We will be taking some time to lay out our case against the legislation. Senator HOLLINGS, of course, is one of the leading opponents. Because of the necessity to go back to his family experience of the real agony of having a home burned down, he needs to be away for this afternoon. A number of us will be here because a number of Senators want to speak. I will divide up my time and take about a half hour now, and I will be back this afternoon as other Senators speak.

I have a letter that went out to Senators, signed by many African American religious leaders who oppose the African Growth and Opportunity Act and support the HOPE for Africa Act. That is the title.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

AFRICAN-AMERICAN RELIGIOUS LEADERS OPPOSE THE "AFRICA GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT" (AGOA) AND SUPPORT THE "HOPE FOR AFRICA ACT", OCTOBER 20, 1999

DEAR SENATOR: We are a group of religious leaders who share with other community leaders, scholars and activists, grave concerns about the various proposed versions of the "Africa Growth and Opportunity Act" (AGOA: H.R. 434, S. 1387, S. 666). We urge you to oppose the AGOA approach to U.S.-Africa relations.

We support an alternative legislative proposal, the "HOPE for Africa Act" (HOPE meaning Human Rights, Opportunity, Partnership and Empowerment) S. 1636 introduced by Senator Russ Feingold (WI). The HOPE for Africa bill has been developed with colleagues and other public interest advocates, human rights and community groups in Africa and the United States.

We have been very clear about our opposition to H.R. 434, the "Africa Growth and Opportunity Act" that has now come over to the Senate. We view this controversial bill, which was accurately dubbed the "African Re-colonization Act" last year, as actually *damaging* to the interests of the majority of African people.

The AGOA's sponsors have refused to seriously address the concerns of its prominent critics, such as TransAfrica President Randall Robinson, Professor Ron Walters, President Nelson Mandela of South Africa, Rev. William Campbell, Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice and Rep. Jesse Jackson Jr., and many of his colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus including Rep. Maxine Waters, and Rep. John Lewis.

Over the course of the last and current Congress, African American leaders and organizations concerned about Africa have carefully studied the actual provisions of the different versions of the AGOA. Close analysis of the bills reveals that although they are wrapped in rhetoric about helping Africa, these bills are designed to secure U.S. business interests, often at the expense of the interests and needs of the majority of African people and at the expense of African nations' sovereignty and self-determination. They have thus been rightly designated as "corporate bills" rather than as measures promoting justice or fair trade.

Incredibly, the House version of AGOA, which its proponents insist will be preserved in any House-Senate conference process, imposes substantial burdens on the sub-Saharan countries, burdens which are not imposed on other U.S. trading partners. That the U.S. should condition trade with African nations alone on demands that these countries reorganize their domestic policies and priorities is offensive. To add injury to insult, these burdens are in exchange for meager trade benefits—two of the 48 sub-Saharan countries would have quotas for textiles and apparel removed, yet all such quotas expire when the Multifiber Agreement sunsets in 2005.

The Senate versions of the "Africa Growth and Opportunity Act" effectively eliminate even the meager trade benefits the House version of AGOA could provide African countries. After all, it is highly unlikely that manufacturers will assume the expense of shipping product to Africa (as opposed to the Caribbean) just for the limited purpose of assembly, as provided in the bill.

The people of Africa must have our support as they strive to build democracy and improve the standard of living in their nations. Certainly it would be a travesty if U.S. policy actually undermined the future prospects of most Africans, which is why many on the continent oppose AGOA.

Given our opposition to the AGOA approach and our strong desire for a mutually beneficial U.S.-Africa policy, African colleagues participated in crafting a proposal aimed at promoting equitable, sustainable, sovereign African development. The key elements of "The HOPE for Africa Act" are the African priorities of debt relief and self-determination of those economic and social policies best suited to meeting the needs of African people. These include strengthening and diversifying Africa's economic production capacity (for instance in the processing of African natural resources and manufacturing), and fair trade in sectors (unlike textiles and apparel) promising a long term opportunity for African economic development.

We urge you to support S. 1636, the forward-looking "HOPE for Africa Act," that would meet the needs and interests of the people of both Africa and the United States, and to oppose the various outstanding versions of the AGOA approach.

Sincerely,

Rev. William D. Smart, Phillips Temple CME Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. Dr. Bennie D. Warner, Camden, AR.

Rev. William Monroe Campbell, Second Baptist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. M. Andrew Robinson-Gaither, Faith United Methodist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. Richard (Meri Ka Ra) Byrd, Senior Minister Unity Center of African Spirituality, President of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches (LAM), CA.

Pastor Leroy Brown, Wesley United Methodist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Pastor William Brent, Evening Star Baptist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. E. Winford Bell, Mount Olive Second Missionary Baptist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. Al Cooke, Fort Mission Fruit of the Holy Spirit Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Pastor Wellton Pleasant, South LA Baptist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Pastor Maris L. Davis Sr., New Bethel Baptist Church, Venice, CA.

Pastor Robert Arline, Bethesda Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. Joseph Curtis, United Gospel Outreach, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. Eugene Williams, Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches, Los Angeles, CA.

Pastor Larry D. Morris, Mount Gilead Baptist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. W.K. Woods, President Progressive Baptist Convention of CA.

Pastor Kenneth B. Pitchford, Greater Hopewell Full Gospel Baptist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. J.C. Briggs, Christian Life Missionary Baptist Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Rev. Michael Pfleger, St. Sabina Church, Chicago, IL.

Dr. Rev. Bennet Poage, Associate Regional Minister, Christian Church Kentucky for Kentucky Appalachian Ministry.

Rev. Dr. Curtis A. Jones, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, MD.

Rev. Clarence Philips, Nazareth Baptist Church, Menden Hall, MS.

Rev. David E. Womack, Mt. Olive Ministries, MS.

Rev. Artis Fletcher, Mendall Bible Church, MS.

Rev. Thomas Jenkins Sr., New Lake Church, MS.

Rev. R.J. Walker, St. Matthew Baptist, MS.

Pastor Tony Duckworth, Mount Olive Community Church, MS.

Rev. John L. Willis, Disciples of Christ Inter-denomination, Menden Hall, MS.

Pastor Neddie Winters, The Church of the City, MS.

Rev. Phil Reed, Voice of Calvary Ministries, MS.

D.L. Govan, Voice of Calvary Fellowship, MS.

Rev. Edward Allen, Philemon Baptist Church, Newark, NJ.

Bishop Alfred L. Norris, The United Methodist Church, Northwest Texas—New Mexico Area.

Reverend David Dyson, Pastor, Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, NY.

Rev. Daniel Mayfield, Knoxville, TN.

Rev. Derek Simmons, First AME Zion Church, Knoxville, TN.

Rev. Walter Shumpert, Houston St. Baptist Church, Knoxville, TN.

Rev. Brian Relford, Logan Temple AME Zion Church, Knoxville, TN.

Rev. Dr. Terrie E. Griffin, Founder & President of HEAL AIDS Inc., Richmond, VA.

Dr. Jesse Gatling, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Rufus Adkins, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Joan Armstead, Richmond, VA.

Dr. Charles Sr. Baughan, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Selwyn Q. Bachus, Richmond, VA.

Dr. Louis R. Blahey, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Meredith J. Blow, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Delores O. Booker, Richmond, VA.

Rev. J. Elisha Burke, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Gloria W. Flowers, Mechanicsville, VA.

Rev. Dr. G.G. Campbell, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Marie G. Arrington, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Joseph A. Fleming, Richmond, VA.

Dr. Samuel F., Jr. Williams, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Dr. B.S. Giles, Mechanicsville, VA.

Rev. Dr. Terrie E. Griffin, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Queen Harris, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Barbara Ingram, Glen Allen, VA.

Rev. William Jenkins, Sandston, VA.

Rev. John E. Jr. Johnson, Richmond, VA.

Rev. D. Wade Richmond, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Dr. Robert L. Taylor, Glen Allen, VA.

Rev. Fernando, Sr. Temple, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Robert E. Sr. Williams, Richmond, VA.

Rev. Lucille L. Carrington, Richmond, VA.

Rev. William Moroney, Missionaries of Africa, Washington, DC.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to say to my colleague from Florida, given the remarks I am about to make, that I know when it comes to the United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act, although we have a number of trade bills that are lumped together right now—he is interested in one of the questions that I am going to be raising today and one of the reasons I oppose this. I certainly hope we can have some enforceable labor standards. I will talk about that in a moment.

I want to say one of two things. Either the debate on S. 1387 and S. 1389 is not the debate that we should be having now, or if we do move on to this legislation—I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If we go forward, I want to make the case that either we should not be considering this legislation, or if we go forward, a number of Senators are very anxious to have the opportunity to bring amendments to the floor that are all about our work and representation of the people in our States. In particular, I want to make the case that I have an amendment that I have said to the majority leader for the last 4 weeks—I have had to even put holds on other bills of some Senators, making the point that I am not opposed to your legislation. I don't want it going through by unanimous consent, and I only want an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on this amendment that deals with the mergers and acquisitions that are taking place in agriculture.

My view is we ought to have a moratorium on these mergers and acquisitions at least for the next 18 months. We ought to do that because, right now, this frightening concentration of power on the part of these packers and grain companies and on the part of these middle men, on the part of these exporters is driving our family farmers and producers off the land—that along with record low prices. The two are interrelated. I certainly, as I speak today—and probably this afternoon—will talk about that amendment and talk about why I believe so strongly that I should have the opportunity to—and I intend to—bring that amendment out on this legislation if we go forward.

I also want to say I don't think the debate on campaign finance reform should be over. It is too central an issue to politics and public life in America. I think it is the core problem. I think it is one of the major reasons why people are so disillusioned. I had an amendment that I brought to the floor, which basically went down when those who were opposed to campaign finance reform were able to block the legislation.

The amendment I am focused on says, look, if we are not prepared to enact bold reform, then at least let's not get in the way of citizens around the country who, at the grassroots level, are making a difference. And if the people in Maine, Vermont, Missouri, Massachusetts, and other States are going to go forward with the clean money/clean election initiative, which is a way of getting the big, private in-

terest money out and basically making sure the public financing means these elections belong to the people, they ought to be able to apply that to Federal races as well, the Senate races and House races. For any Senator or Representative, it would be voluntary on our part as to whether we want to be part of that system. But States ought to be able to pass legislation to present that option. I will have that amendment, and I will be ready to introduce that amendment to this legislation. I don't think the debate on campaign finance reform should be over. I hope other Senators will come out here with other amendments to deal with campaign finance reform.

If we think this is such a central issue, if we think this is an issue perhaps of the same importance as the civil rights question and legislation that we passed in 1964 and 1965, we ought not to be abandoning this fight. And there are a number of us with amendments.

For me, again, my answer on that is, first and foremost, the producers and the family farmers of my State are being driven off the land. I think the farm policy is a miserable failure. I think we have to make some changes. I am hoping people on both sides of the aisle will agree. I am not interested in pointing fingers and saying you cast the wrong vote X number of years ago; you are wrong, and you are wrong. I am interested in making some modifications and changes to get farm prices up and farm income up to give our producers a fair shake. That is what I am interested in. I certainly am interested in this whole question of campaign finance reform.

I also want to say to colleagues that I certainly hope we consider an amendment on raising the minimum wage. We have been trying to get this amendment up for some time now.

Senators should have an up-or-down vote. If Senators are opposed to raising the minimum wage \$1 over 2 years, then Senators can come out here and say they are opposed and make their case. I think that is the way it should be. I am sure I will hear some good arguments on the other side of the aisle, or maybe even among some Democrats. I don't know why they oppose raising the minimum wage. I think some of them will be forceful arguments. But the point is, we ought to be accountable. The point is, we ought to be willing to have an up-or-down vote. I am assuming there will be Senators who will want to have an amendment on raising the minimum wage, Senator KENNEDY being the leader of this effort with any number of us joining in.

Finally, before I get to the substance of this bill, I want to bring up another topic which I am sure some of my colleagues are tired of. This will be the fourth round where I have been making the appeal that we ought to have the courage to do the policy evaluation to know what is happening with the welfare bill. Every time I do this, I am either defeated by a close vote or it is

passed and then dropped in conference. I think that has happened again. To me, it is outrageous. I will have an opportunity to talk about this when I introduce this amendment.

But to make a very long story short, to cut the welfare rolls in half does not necessarily mean we have success. We have success when we have cut poverty in half; we have success when welfare recipients, who by definition are basically single-parent families—women and children primarily—are better off economically. So we ought to know, as women and children are essentially no longer receiving welfare assistance, do women have jobs now? What kind of wages do they pay? We need to understand. The Families U.S.A. study says 670,000 of America's children have no medical assistance because of this bill. Do they still have health care coverage or not? In addition, we ought to know with the 30- to 35-percent drop in food stamp participation—the Food Stamp Program being the major safety net program for children's nutrition—does this mean more children are now going hungry today in our country?

Finally, we need to know whether or not there is affordable child care. We ought to at least do the honest policy evaluation. Given, again, the conference committee dropped this, I will be back with this amendment.

After having said that, in particular, again, let me emphasize my primary focus—there are a number of amendments—which is, more than anything else, I want to make the fight on agriculture. I want to have the opportunity to bring to the floor of the Senate an amendment and legislation that I think will help alleviate some of the suffering among family farmers. I want to do that. I think we should have, before we leave, the opportunity to have a debate about ways in which we can change agricultural policy for the better. If other Senators have other ideas, I think that is great as well. I do not want to see us leave without trying to take some positive action.

After having said that, I think this debate about the CBI and the African trade bill could be useful and enlightening. I said this on Friday as well. The question really is, when we talk about trade policy, we want to know whether we can make the global economy work for working families. That is the test: Can we make this new global economy work for working families in our country. I am an internationalist. I argue for the people of the other countries as well.

Senator FEINGOLD introduced an impressive and innovative bill based on legislation that was introduced in the House by JESSE JACKSON, Jr., that blazes a trail for U.S. trade policy. It is truly ground breaking.

Finally, people who want our trade policy to work for working families will have an alternative that I think they can wholeheartedly support. I don't think the issue is whether or not we expand trade. I don't think the

issue is whether or not the United States of America is part of an international economy. I certainly don't think the issue is that we should put walls up on our borders. I think the issue is, on whose terms are we going to expand trade? What are the rules and who benefits from those rules? I am interested in the rules of trade. I am not interested in trade without rules. Let me say that again. I am interested in the rules of trade, which means I am interested in trade. I am not interested in trade without rules.

In this case, the choice could hardly be clearer. The Feingold-Jackson legislation, called the HOPE for Africa Act, says the expansion of trade should benefit working families and poor families in America and in Africa. Trade agreements should be about making the global economy work for ordinary citizens. The HOPE for Africa bill says if you are really serious about raising labor and environmental standards across the globe, then we have to have enforceable—let me mention that two or three times—enforceable protections built into our trade agreements. The HOPE for Africa bill says that we can't be serious about wanting to help African countries develop economically if we don't do anything about their crushing debt burden. The HOPE for Africa bill says that the lives of Americans or the lives of Africans suffering from AIDS are more important than the monopoly profits of the pharmaceutical companies. The HOPE for Africa bill has its priorities set straight. It expands trade the right way by putting people first. We have heard that before. Why don't we make it a reality?

Our other option, I fear, is more of the same, more NAFTAs—NAFTA for the Caribbean, NAFTA for all of South America, NAFTA for Africa. I certainly don't want to see IMF-style economic policies that I think have been impoverishing one country after another all over the world with the austerity measures—raise interest rates, try to export your way out of a crisis, and more investment protections for multinationals to export jobs overseas so they can avoid complying with American-style labor and environmental standards. That is what we are talking about—more investment protection for multinationals to export jobs overseas so they can avoid complying with American-style labor and environmental standards—more trade incentives so multinationals can shift those goods right back into the United States, competing against American workers trying to organize a union.

The message is: Try to organize a union and we go to another country. More enforceable protections for the interests of multinationals and foreign investors and more unenforceable lip service for the interests of working families. This is a policy that says to working Americans: Don't even try to organize a union.

This is the main basis of my opposition. Do that and we will move jobs

overseas with special trade and investment incentives. It says to workers overseas, don't try to organize a union; the only way to compete for foreign investment is by accepting rock bottom wages.

That is the flaw in this trade legislation. It is a pretty good deal for an investor who wants to save labor costs, but it is a pretty rotten deal for an American worker or worker overseas. That is what is at issue. We are basically saying to working Americans: Don't even try to organize a union; do that and we will move your jobs overseas. That is what we are saying.

It says to the workers overseas: Don't try to organize a union; the only way to get the foreign investment is by accepting rock bottom wages.

It is great for the investors who want to save labor costs, but it is a rotten deal for an American worker and it is a rotten deal for a low-wage worker in another country.

I want to see a global trade policy that works for workers. I want to see a trade policy that lifts the living standards of workers. This is a developmental model that has failed time after time. This is the way of the past. It is time to say good riddance once and for all.

It is not as if we don't have any choice. The Feingold bill gives a clear alternative. It is called the HOPE for Africa Act. We need something similar for the Caribbean. I know my colleague from Florida is now working on trying to have some enforceable labor standards. That would make a huge difference.

We have a World Trade Organization meeting coming up in Seattle. I hear the discussion from the administration and others who want this trade legislation to pass. They think it is possible we could push for meaningful and enforceable labor and environmental standards.

What kind of message are we now conveying, with about a month to go before this critical WTO meeting, when we are talking about a bilateral trade agreement which does not have any enforceable labor and environmental standards? I ask the administration: Where are you going with this? What is your message to labor? What is your message to the environmental groups? What is your message to the human rights groups? What is your message to all the nongovernment organizations that are going to be out in Seattle?

As a Senator, I will be proud to join them. On the one hand, we have the rhetoric that says we think it is possible through WTO to have enforceable labor and environmental standards. That is implied in the rhetoric. At the same time, we have some trade bills that the administration is saying we have to pass; this is a No. 1 priority; we have to pass them before the WTO, which communicates the exact opposite message. They basically say we are not interested in enforceable labor standards; we are not interested in enforceable environmental standards.

And, by the way, the message for farmers and producers in my State: If we don't have an opportunity to offer amendments, we are also not interested in trade policy that gives them any kind of fair shake. Both Senator DORGAN and Senator CONRAD will be out here, as well.

I will say that 1,000 times over the next X number of hours: If we don't have the commitment to enforceable labor and environmental standards in our bilateral trade agreements, how can we credibly expect to include them in multilateral agreements?

I think this legislation in its present form sets a terrible precedent. I think it goes in exactly the opposite direction from the words I hear the administration speak. I think it goes in the exact opposite direction from the rhetoric of at least some of my colleagues.

I am interested in negotiations. Senator GRAHAM has talked about the United States-Caribbean trade agreement and is trying to work on enforceable labor standards. However, I don't now see it in any of these trade bills. From my point of view, I think we have to have some enforceable labor standards that give working people in these other countries the right to organize and bargain collectively.

If someone in the Senate says that my insistence as a Senator from Minnesota on some enforceable global labor standard is protectionist and that is the case, then we might as well say the Fair Labor Standards Act is also protectionist. That is the piece of legislation that relates to commerce in States in our country. We are saying we are going to apply this to all the States. Companies are not going to be able to have these atrocious child labor conditions. We will have protection dealing with child labor. Senator HARKIN will probably be here with an amendment dealing with that. We will make sure people have a right to organize and bargain collectively.

If we live in a global instead of a national economy—haven't I heard all Members say that—then we need the same kind of rules on the global level that we have on the national level for exactly the same kinds of reasons.

I will come back later this afternoon to critique the legislation. I am preparing amendments to introduce.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the very distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, for his graciousness in yielding the floor. I realize this is somewhat inconvenient for him, but I deeply appreciate his kindness in yielding at this time.

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate today is a sadder, lesser place. Like many others, I am shocked and sad-

dened by the sudden loss of Senator John Chafee. My thoughts, and my wife Erma's, go out to his family—to his wife, Virginia; his sons, Zechariah; Lincoln; John, Jr.; and Quentin; and his daughter, Georgia.

I understand the funeral will take place this coming Saturday in Providence. Senator John Chafee is the eighth Senator from Rhode Island to die in office, the second in this century, since Senator LeBaron B. Colt on August 18, 1924.

Since his first election to the Senate in 1976, Senator Chafee was the kind of Senator upon which the smooth running of the Congress has always depended. He was a man of great humor, gentleness, thoughtfulness, and compromise—none of which detracted from his clear views and opinions as to what the best course of action was for the nation. He could disagree with his colleagues and still find a way to move forward on issues that were important to him.

This was a man devoted to the well-being of his country, in war and in peace. As others have stated, Senator Chafee served in World War II and in Korea. He also served as Secretary of the Navy. He served in the state legislature and as Governor of Rhode Island before his election to the Senate. He is a man who heard the clear call of duty and of love for his country and its people like a church bell ringing over the gentle hills of his beloved Rhode Island. His acts of faith came daily in his service to that calling bell.

His golden locks time hath to silver turn'd;
O time too swift, O swiftness never ceasing!
His youth 'gainst time and age hath ever
spurn'd

But spurn'd in vain; youth waneth by in-
creasing:

Beauty, strength, youth, are flowers but fad-
ing seen;

Duty, faith, love, are roots, and ever green.

So wrote poet George Peele in the 16th century. But surely John Chafee's sense of duty and his faithful service to the nation will prove equally evergreen, living beyond his untimely demise in laws and legislation that bear his stamp of compromise and caring for even our smallest and most helpless citizens.

We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not
breaths;

In feelings, not in figures on a dial.

We should count time by heart-throbs. He
most lives

Who thinks most—feels the most—acts the
best.

Senator Chafee was consistent in his feelings, in his outlook, and in his actions. He always looked out for children in the health care debates that have consumed the Senate. His love of nature and his championing of environmental causes is well known, but tempered by his sense of fairness and practicality. He supported the Clean Air Act and the Rio treaties on global climate change and biodiversity, but he also supported requiring cost-benefit analyses of Environmental Protection Agency regulations and voted in sup-

port of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution requiring developing nation participation and a cost-benefit analysis of the Kyoto Protocol on global warming before the Senate would consider that treaty. Senator Chafee was a principled man. He was true to his bedrock beliefs, but he was not so idealistic that he would sacrifice success for unyielding principle. In doing so, he advanced his causes most effectively.

For a man as battle-tested as his history suggests, Senator Chafee was known for his civility and his ability to seek a gentler, more civil path in the often strife-torn and partisan Senate. I have not served on any committees with Senator Chafee, but I was well aware of his ability to work with colleagues from both sides of the aisle to ensure the success of his legislative agenda. This talent ensured that he would be sorely missed upon his retirement from the Senate next year. Upon announcing his retirement plans last March, he made it clear that he was not "going away mad or disillusioned or upset with the Senate. I think it's a great place," he said. I think it was a greater place for his presence. It is merely unlucky chance that he is gone before we could all savor our last months in his company.

Now, we must instead hold close our best last memories of this kind and gentle man, crusty New Englander that he was. We must measure the legacy that he leaves in legislation and in the fine example that he set with his life. Only thus can we, in the poet William Wordsworth's words, aspire to "Intimations of Immortality:"

Though nothing can bring back the hour
Of splendor in the grass, of glory in the flow-
er;

We will grieve not, rather find
Strength in what remains behind;

In the primal sympathy

Which having been must ever be;

In the soothing thoughts that spring
Out of human suffering;

In the faith that looks through death,

In years that bring the philosophic mind.

Senator John Chafee leaves behind a rich legacy that honors his name, his State, and the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this sad and somber day, we recall our wonderful friend John Chafee and begin to appreciate how much he will be missed. We extend our love and respect to his family. I suspect John would like us to move forward with the business of the Senate. As Senator BYRD has just said, he was a crusty New Englander, and I believe John would be very happy with that description. One of the many admirable traits of crusty New Englanders is that they like to get down to business.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPOR-
TUNITY ACT—MOTION TO PRO-
CEED—Continued

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, one of the last conversations I had with John