

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 ever-green, 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

Chafee just a few days ago was about the legislation we are now considering. John Chafee, as in all things, was a commonsense pragmatist. I do not know how he would have voted on these measures, but I think he would have been appealed to by the practical rationale for the United States moving forward in the way this legislation directs us.

This legislation, which was a product of the Committee on Finance, on which Senator Chafee served with such distinction, a committee in which he had voted for this legislation as a member of the committee during the time it was being considered there, I believe embodies many of the principles for which John Chafee stood. I want to particularly talk about one component of this legislation, and that is the United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act component.

Since the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement, our Caribbean and Central American neighbors have been at a competitive disadvantage. There is now a benefit of in the range of 5 percent to 10 percent, having the identical production factories located in Mexico as opposed to in Central America or Caribbean nations which are members of the Caribbean Basin Initiative. It has been stated we should have dealt with this issue when the North American Free Trade Agreement was first adopted. Unfortunately, we did not. Today, we have the opportunity to begin the consideration of the restoration of parity and balance within our region.

I thank Senator Lott for his support in bringing this important legislation to the floor. I also thank Senator ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN for the leadership which they have provided through the consideration of this legislation in the Senate Finance Committee.

Over the last 5 years, I have worked to enhance and build upon our existing trade relationship with our neighbors in the Caribbean Basin region. On February 3 of this year, in response to the overwhelming devastation and destruction caused first by Hurricane Georges and then by Hurricane Mitch, I introduced the Central American and Caribbean Relief Act. This bill represented a broad and comprehensive strategy to provide immediate disaster relief, economic and infrastructure recovery, and long-term trade enhancement that would benefit both the United States and the countries in the region.

On March 23, 1999, we passed legislation that provided immediate disaster relief to the countries in the region that were impacted by Hurricanes Georges and Mitch. This legislation included \$41 million of debt relief. We wiped out all of the bilateral debt of these countries to the United States and contributed to a Central American relief fund which will be beneficial in terms of reducing other forms of indebtedness of those countries that were so ravaged by the hurricanes.

I am pleased that now we are considering a bill that includes many of the

long-term trade enhancement provisions that were part of the Central American and Caribbean Relief Act. Enacting this legislation is critical to the continued economic growth and health of our Nation and the economic health of our closest neighbors in the Caribbean and Latin America. It is also in the national security interest of the United States of America.

Let me review what are some of the compelling reasons for the adoption of this legislation.

First, humanitarian. I have made three trips to Central America and the Caribbean since the devastation of Hurricane Georges and Hurricane Mitch. As a Floridian, I have had some exposure to the destruction that hurricanes can inflict upon a community. I can say I have seen nothing the likes of which I saw in Honduras after Hurricane Mitch. I know that many of my colleagues have also seen the destruction caused by these hurricanes. These two destructive storms caused a level of death and devastation not seen in the Western Hemisphere in over 200 years.

We have all heard of the tremendous loss of life, the economic disruption, the human suffering caused by these hurricanes. As a neighbor, a friend, and a great Nation, the United States has both a history and a current obligation of response with assistance to those in need, especially those nations and those peoples who are our closest neighbors. Providing enhanced trade benefits will be a significant part of that humanitarian response. It will allow nations that had major parts of their economies, particularly agricultural economies, devastated by these hurricanes to begin to rebuild on a more diversified and stable economic basis.

A second reason to pass this legislation is economic. Caribbean Basin enhancements are in the best economic interest of the United States. Experience shows us that providing trade benefits to the Caribbean Basin is good business for the United States. Following the enactment of the Caribbean Basin Initiative in 1983, our trade position with the region has improved from a trade deficit of \$3 billion with the Caribbean Basin, which we suffered in 1983, to today approaching a \$3.5 billion trade surplus. These are not only good neighbors, but they are good trading partners. They are trading partners who, on a per capita basis, have consistently outpaced all other regions of the world in terms of the U.S. trade surplus.

Between 1983 and 1998, U.S. exports to the region increased fourfold, while total imports into the U.S. region grew by less than 20 percent. In fact, since 1995, U.S. exports to the CBI countries have increased by approximately 32 percent. There are over 58 million consumers in the 24 countries represented by the CBI region. Seventy percent of their nonpetroleum imports come from the United States.

Let me repeat that: 58 million consumers in 24 countries close to the United States; 70 percent of their non-petroleum imports come from the United States. Yet there is another reason to strengthen the Caribbean economies, and that is the importance of the stability of our closest neighbors.

When the CBI bill was adopted in 1983, the Caribbean Basin, particularly Central America, was in flames with violent conflicts and rampant drug trafficking. The primary goal of the initial CBI legislation was to stabilize the region by building stronger, more diverse economies. These economies were seen as a critical element in supporting democratic governments.

Our national security and our continued interest in reducing the level of flow of illegal drugs and illegal immigrants into the United States was also at stake in the stability of the region.

According to the Department of State's Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, increased law enforcement efforts along the Southwest border of the United States have again encouraged drug traffickers to reactivate their old, well-established smuggling routes in the Caribbean and Central America. Recent cocaine seizures in the regions bear this out. In 1998, authorities in the Dominican Republic seized 2.4 metric tons of cocaine. During the same period, Guatemalan authorities seized 9.2 metric tons of cocaine, and Panamanian authorities seized 11.8 metric tons of cocaine. Cocaine seizures in the Bahamas during 1998 totaled 3.7 metric tons, the highest level in that country since 1992, while at the same time an estimated 54 metric tons of cocaine flowed through Haiti.

Experience tells us the vast majority of this cocaine was destined for the United States of America. Without assistance to restart the regional economy, without assistance to make it possible for people to provide for their families, the nations in this region will be even more susceptible to the scourge of drug trafficking. The people of this region must have opportunities in the legal economy so they may feed their families and resist the financial temptations associated with drug trafficking.

Failing to enact CBI enhancements will increase the pressure for illegal immigration into the United States. The people of the CBI region must have the real opportunity at home so they are not forced to turn to illegal immigration to find employment and feed their families.

The painful lessons of the 1980s need not be repeated as we move into the new century. We can act—we must act—to prevent it.

Today, I want to focus on yet another reason why passing the Caribbean Basin Initiative enhancement legislation is so critical. The reason can best be demonstrated by looking at these two shirts. This golf shirt is made in

China. It is made from fabric that was grown by Chinese farmers, woven in Chinese textile mills. This shirt costs approximately \$4.75 to produce. This shirt was made by a Caribbean Basin country, similar plant. It was made with fabric that was grown on U.S. farms, and it was spun in U.S. textile mills. This shirt costs approximately \$5 to produce. Both of these shirts were imported into the United States for sale at U.S. retail stores. There is no significant difference between these shirts, save the location, China and Nicaragua, where they were manufactured, and where the components were grown and spun into textile—China, the United States of America. Each of these shirts sells for approximately \$19. That is the price the law of supply and demand has set upon these items.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to present these shirts before the Senate.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. One might ask the question of basic economics. If the Chinese shirt is identical to the Nicaraguan shirt, if the Chinese cotton that is spun into this shirt is to the consumer essentially the same as the American cotton, which is spun into the Nicaraguan-assembled shirt, and yet the Chinese shirt costs 5 percent less to produce, sells for the same price, why is it there are any shirts being produced in Nicaragua or in the other Caribbean Basin countries?

Well, there are several reasons why there is a market for the more-expensive-to-produce CBI shirt. Transportation costs between the Caribbean Basin and the United States are less than the transportation costs between China and the United States. The proximity of the Caribbean Basin to the United States means that transit time for textile products manufactured in the CBI region and destined for sale in the United States is significantly less than transit time for Chinese products. This is a particularly important factor in the apparel industry with its rapid style changes. But neither of those are the most important reason.

The most significant reason why there is a market for the Caribbean-assembled shirt, the shirt which assembles U.S. cotton which is milled in U.S. textile mills, the most important is because there is a limitation on the number of these shirts which can be imported from China.

In 1999, the import quota for Chinese-manufactured shirts, such as the one I hold today, the exact number of these shirts which can be imported from China to the United States is 2,336,946 dozen per year. Imports of the shirt manufactured in Nicaragua, as well as other Caribbean Basin countries, where U.S.-grown and processed cotton is the basis of manufacture, are not subject to quota restrictions. The difference represented by these two shirts will become much more apparent in the year 2005, a watershed year for the textile

and apparel industry in the United States and the Caribbean Basin.

Why is 2005 such a significant date on the calendar? The import quotas which are currently applicable to textile products of most Asian nations, originally imposed under the Multi-Fiber Arrangement, now the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, will be phased out. There will no longer be, for most Asian nations, a quota limitation on the number of items such as this golf shirt which can be imported into the United States. At that time, textile production in the Caribbean Basin will be placed in a distinct and growing disadvantage due to its higher cost of production. Disinvestment in the region is a real potential, reducing the incentive to use any material from U.S. textile mills or cotton grown in the United States. We face the prospect in the year 2005, with the lifting of the quotas, that the already 5-percent production cost advantage of Asian countries will expand, as they are able to spread their production cost over an unlimited number of apparel items to be imported into the United States.

The transportation and proximity advantages of the CBI country will not be able to sustain the raw economic advantage of the lower cost of production under current standards in Asia.

That is why passing CBI enhancement legislation now, in 1999, is critical to U.S. textile and yarn industries as well as to U.S. cotton growers. There are 64,000 U.S. textile workers who are dependent on this partnership of textile produced in the United States and assembled in the Caribbean for their jobs. Overall, 400,000 U.S. jobs are dependent upon textile exports to the CBI region. Last year, \$4.5 billion worth of U.S. textile and apparel products were exported to the CBI region for assembly. Only by providing incentives for the development of stronger relationships with apparel manufacturers in our hemisphere will we have any chance of maintaining a market for U.S. cotton and textiles after the quotas are eliminated in 2005.

We must see this 5-year period as a period of challenge, a period in which we must increase the production competitiveness of U.S. textiles and Caribbean apparel. If we squander these 5 years, we face the very real prospect that we will be having a debate over nothing because, with the lifting of the quotas, there will be a strong incentive for this industry and the cotton farmers and the textile workers who support it to move from the Caribbean to Asia.

Developing strong relations with the countries in the Caribbean Basin, therefore, will not only promote political stability, will not only be in our humanitarian tradition, but will also be critical to the economic health of an important American industry.

An independent economic analysis funded by the Inter-American Development Bank and prepared by Professor Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda of the UCLA

School of Public Policy and Social Research and Professor Robert K. McCleery of the Monterey Institute for International Studies makes just this point. The numbers are clear.

According to the American Apparel Manufacturers Association, without CBI enhancement, U.S. textile and agriculture will be adversely affected, and the U.S. economy will suffer. Currently, 50 percent of the apparel items consumed in the United States are manufactured with U.S. cotton. Industry estimates indicate that if we can increase the attractiveness of the Caribbean Basin as the place of assembly, that number will grow from 50 percent of U.S.-consumed apparel made with U.S. cotton to 70 percent. But if we fail to act, if we allow this partnership of U.S. textile and Caribbean assembly to wither, this number will drop to 30 percent. Without these enhancements, the U.S. cotton content will continue to decline, as apparel producers look to reduce costs and will move towards products made from cheaper labor and cheaper materials, primarily in Asia.

The impact of the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing and year 2005 changes on man-made fiber industries will be comparable to the cotton situation. Without CBI enhancements, the U.S. man-made fiber content of imported apparel will continue to significantly decline. Without CBI legislation and in the face of year 2005 quota reductions, producers of man-made fibers will be inclined to relocate their production facilities in order to take advantage of lower wages and production costs. If we begin to work to establish stronger relationships with the nations of the Caribbean Basin, we will be able to provide incentives to sustain these industries in our own hemisphere.

Inherent in our CBI enhancement efforts are public and private investment incentives that will increase productivity and the quality of life within the region. We anticipate the textile industry will provide investment capital targeted for the construction and maintenance of schools, health and child care facilities, and technology enhancements to increase the productivity of both workers and existing manufacturing facilities. A well trained and healthy workforce will be more productive and efficient as Caribbean Basin producers compete for shares of the international textile market.

We have an unprecedented opportunity to strengthen our economic and national security through the enhancement of our trade relationship with our neighbors in the region. We must act prior to 2005 to build a dynamic, formidable Western Hemisphere trade alliance that encourages U.S. industry to invest in the region and to make commitment to rebuilding the industrial infrastructure in the region.

We are about to make a fundamental decision that will impact our closest neighbors, a decision that will impact a significant part of the economy of the United States. We can choose to create

a climate where the United States and our neighbors can be competitive into the 21st century or we can repeat the same turmoil of the 1980s. The choice is clear, it is stark, and I think it is beyond reasonable debate: Will we engage or will we retreat?

I urge you to extend this assistance to our neighbors to expand commerce and promote economic and political stability in the region. A primary beneficiary of that stability and expansion, a primary beneficiary of the new enhanced partnership between the United States and our neighbors in the Caribbean, will be the United States of America and its citizens.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a friend, an athlete, a scholar, a lawyer, a Governor, a Secretary of the Navy, a Senator, and a marine—not necessarily in that order.

The Senate and our country have lost a great man with the passing of John Chafee. He exemplified everything that is so good and decent and honorable about our country. A man born to privilege, he also recognized a duty and an obligation to serve his country. As a young freshman at Yale, he was moved to action by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. He became a marine because he wanted to fight, and they promised him he would do just that in the Pacific.

So many of our World War II generation, called by Tom Brokaw "our greatest generation," did exactly what John Chafee did. They left their ivy league campuses and their State universities, their jobs and their families, and they saw it as their duty to serve.

The Marines delivered on their promise; they gave John Chafee a chance to fight. Soon after his initial training, he found himself as a young private on the beach at one of America's bloodiest battles, at Guadalcanal. Several years ago, at a program at the Smithsonian, Senator Chafee joined a group of World War II veterans who discussed their memories of the war. John Chafee related that the lesson he carried with him was that there was no rhyme or reason to who lived and who died in combat. He said he learned that it didn't matter how good a marine you might be, the incoming artillery rounds and the enemy bullets did not discriminate among good and bad marines and that if one survived it was not though personal merit but by the

grace of God. He came away from that experience with a commitment to live honorably and well because he recognized that every day was a gift and because he owed that to those who he left behind on those fields.

He went on to receive a commission as a lieutenant and the Marines continued to provide those opportunities to fight in other bloody battles in the Pacific theater including Okinawa.

When the war ended, he took off his uniform, returned home, and picked up where he left off. He graduated from Yale where he distinguished himself as a collegiate wrestler and captain of the Yale wrestling team. Although a supremely modest man, the one honor for which he was always very proud and willing to talk about was his induction several years ago into the Collegiate Wrestling Hall of Fame in Oklahoma.

After Yale, he went on to Harvard and graduated in a class filled with many other veterans with similar war records including Senator TED STEVENS. But soon after graduating from law school, John Chafee learned the Marines weren't done with him and their promise to give him a chance to fight.

In fact, John Chafee related this experience to me when we were driving together in a car to see the mustering out of one of my favorite aides, my legislative aide Dave Davis, whose wife happened to be John Chafee's personal assistant. We were going out together because this was a big day for Dave Davis. He was going to leave the Army and to come with me full time. I must say it was a great day for me. John Chafee said: You know, I left after World War II, and I thought I was finished. I didn't sign any papers saying I had left the service; I didn't think it was necessary. And all of a sudden, one day during the Korean war, I get a notice from the U.S. Marines saying you never left the marines, and we are going to send you to Korea. He said: My gosh, I was so surprised.

He was no longer an 18-year-old who was looking for a place to fight. He had a wife and child. He had just graduated from Harvard Law School with a bright future ahead. John Chafee said: I still have a commitment and I am going to keep it.

He said he had a responsibility to young marines to teach and tell them what he knew from his own combat experience because he knew that would be helpful. He answered the call without complaint and once again distinguished himself as a marine company commander in battle against the Chinese in North Korea in the mountains of Korea.

One of his young lieutenants in that company in Korea was the novelist and writer James Brady. Brady wrote a book about his experience in the Korea war entitled "The Coldest War" and John Chafee is the hero of that story. Brady writes.

That's how it is in the Marine Corps. There are rules and a subtle understanding some of

them are to be broken. Colonels broke rules, I suppose generals did, enlisted men broke them, I broke them whenever I could with circumspection, but Chafee never. Captain Chafee kept the rules. Not that he was prissy. It simply did not occur to Chafee to cut corners.

Brady also writes about not having a chance to tell John Chafee how much he meant to him in a way in which many of us in the Senate can identify with today.

There was so much I wanted to say: what his confidence meant to me, how I admired him, how much he'd taught all of us. He was the only truly great man I'd met in my life, and all I had the time to do was say thanks. Maybe he understood.

We all know his incredible achievements after returning from battle. He continued to serve his native Rhode Island well as a three-term Governor and then Senator for 23 years. He also continued to serve his beloved Marine Corps as the Secretary of the Navy.

He kept faith with all those marines who paid the supreme sacrifice in the Pacific and in Korea by living a good life and representing them well. He was always Semper Fi to the Corps.

One story recalled by another member of the platoon years later at a gathering of Korean war veterans told of how John Chafee's Marine company was moving across snow-covered ground that was believed to be covered with landmines. No one in the company was eager to march through the area so Captain John Chafee, showing no fear, took point and led his men through the snow. When the marines reached the top of the hill, someone looked back and observed that the entire company had left only one set of tracks as each marine had carefully stepped exactly in Captain John Chafee's footprints.

This lieutenant observed nearly 50 years later that he and the others were still trying to follow in John Chafee's footsteps.

As did his marines so long ago, many of us are trying to follow in John Chafee's footsteps, setting a standard of decency, civility, and kindness, remembering how to disagree without rancor. This is something all of us in the Senate need to remember when we think of John Chafee. It is the lesson all of us could relearn as we are going into some very tough times in the Senate. He loved this institution. He loved what it meant. We have all been enriched and blessed by his presence.

I hope his legacy will be that all of us will be better for John Chafee having been here because he is known as one of the kindest, most civil, and absolutely great Members of this body by everyone who knew him. I have never heard anyone say John Chafee was not a superior person. Whether or not you agreed with him on the merits of an issue, you could never say he wasn't the best of us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

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