

native Columbus County. Home to nine mills just three years ago, the county now has 3 mills, and two of those are scheduled to close this fall.

They will have one mill left.

It's a corner of North Carolina that was spared from the worst of Hurricane Floyd's floods last month, but it is bearing the brunt of an industry's decline. After Jasper Textiles and Whiteville Apparel close their gates, the number of textile jobs in this county [Columbus County in eastern North Carolina] will have fallen to 50 from 2,100.

In other words, they have gone from 2,100 jobs to 50. There is nowhere for these people to go to work. They have no comparable jobs. There is nowhere else for them to go.

Those figures also bear witness to the decline of a distinctly Southern way of life.

Lorie Coleman said it best. She spent her life working in this mill and all of a sudden it was gone. Everything she spent her life learning to do has disappeared.

There is another fundamental problem with this bill. These bills are unilateral. They are not multilateral. Every Member of the Senate should require, in order to vote for a trade bill, that it be multilateral.

What does that mean? First, in the Caribbean, the Dominican Republic charges a 30 to 35 percent tariff on apparel imports. Honduras charges 25 percent. Nicaragua charges 20 percent. We are lowering our tariffs in this bill. Do we have a corresponding lowering of tariffs in those countries? The answer is no. We are unilaterally lowering our tariffs and expecting nothing from the countries that are part of this trade agreement. Their tariffs remain exactly the same. Where is the fairness in this agreement?

In Africa, the average tariff on apparel is 27 percent. Exactly the same tariff is charged on home textiles. This simply makes no sense. Why should we as a nation unilaterally lower our tariffs and have our companies in this country subjected to tariffs in the countries we are entering into contracts or agreements with, where they can charge any tariff they want? That is exactly what is happening in this agreement. There is no lowering of trade barriers in Africa, no lowering of trade barriers in the Caribbean. Instead, we have decided unilaterally we will lower trade barriers.

I have heard a lot of my colleagues talk about the poverty that reigns in Africa and in the Caribbean. My heart goes out to those people. They are suffering; they are struggling. The fact that they are working for anywhere from 35 to 85 cents an hour bears witness to the terrible lives with which they and their families are confronted. But we, in my State of North Carolina, have an awful lot of people who are struggling to make ends meet, too. We have an awful lot of people and families who have spent their lives going into those mills every day, 5, sometimes 6 days a week, 8 to 10 hours a day, to learn to do a job, to build up seniority, to provide for their families.

When we enter into these kind of trade agreements, particularly when we can't enforce provisions against transshipment, where there is a real likelihood that yarn and fabric forward will go out when this bill goes to conference and, as a result, there is a devastating economic impact on North Carolina's textile business and on North Carolina's textile workers, those people lose everything. This is not just an abstract economic proposition we are debating. We are talking about human lives. We are talking about an enormous impact on the families I represent in North Carolina.

I want my colleagues, when they come to vote, either on cloture or on the passage of this bill ultimately, if we reach that stage, to understand every single one of them has a dramatic effect on real human beings' lives across this country and in my home State of North Carolina.

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I want to say a word about my friend and colleague, Senator Chafee. Having had the honor and privilege of being his friend for the 10 months I have been here, the thing that struck me most about Senator Chafee was his kind and gentle nature. It was the sort of thing I am afraid we need more of in government in general and particularly in this body. He was a thoughtful leader who showed exactly the kind of leadership we desperately need in our country today. He was also a thoughtful, non-partisan voice on issues that were not partisan, issues we ought to be able to work together on, issues that are good for America.

It is an extraordinary loss for me personally to lose Senator Chafee. He was someone I looked up to and admired in my brief time here. I don't know anyone here who did not love and adore him. I can certainly add my voice to those who will miss him dearly.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon for just a few moments to add my voice to the chorus of leaders in the Senate, in Congress, and throughout the Nation who have expressed in the last 2 days their admiration and respect for our colleague, Senator John Chafee of Rhode Island.

Upon coming to this Chamber almost 3 years ago, one of the first things I did was to try to search out role models who put principle ahead of politics, who held people more important than political parties. John Chafee was such a role model.

As has been mentioned many times on this floor, as a young marine who battled at Guadalcanal, to the Rhode Island Statehouse as Governor, to the floor of this Chamber, John Chafee answered the call of his country. While he was never afraid to fight for his country or for his principles, as we all know, he knew that common ground provided a better place to find solu-

tions than the battleground. That is one of his most outstanding legacies to this body, to his State, and to our Nation.

Throughout his public career, John Chafee was a tireless fighter for America's children and their families. He correctly perceived that the future of our country would be dictated by how we treated and nurtured our children and set about to create laws, policies, initiatives, and programs which prepared them for the future.

We were all privileged to work with him on many issues. I was, indeed, privileged to work with him on a particular issue of which he was so proud: The Adoption and Safe Families Act. I spoke on the floor about this act, of which he was a tireless advocate and leader, just a few weeks ago and said in its first year 37,000 children had been moved from foster care to a place of limbo, to a place where they were not certain anyone wanted them, to families of their own. That was a 32-percent increase over the previous year. John Chafee had a great deal to do with making that happen.

As leaders retire or pass on, as in this case, through our meager ways we try to construct buildings, highways, and bridges and name them in their honor. I am sure Senator Chafee will have the prerequisite number of bridges or buildings or statues in his honor. I think knowing him the way I did, the way we all did, the legacy of which he will be most proud is that he spent an entire career building up families, building up children, building up people. There will be millions of families built stronger and nurtured and provided for because of the great work he did, not only on the floor of this Senate but in the many ways he has served his State and Nation.

I also want to mention his legacy in regard to the environment. I find, unfortunately, few voices of reason on a subject that is so important to the future of our country. I was so proud, as we all were, to work with Senator Chafee on many issues regarding the environment. He was one of our outstanding leaders working to find a permanent source of funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, funding of Teaming with Wildlife programs, for wetlands, for estuaries, for endangered species. I am confident that as we continue the work in these areas, many of his dreams and aspirations on these initiatives will come to pass.

In addition, his passion for history and historic preservation was evident until the end. Fittingly, his last public appearance was at the 50th anniversary of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, just this last Thursday at the National Cathedral. In his final speech, he wisely warned of the danger to America's future if it forgets its past. It was a fitting tribute to 50 years of tremendous work, 25 years or more by a leader in this particular area.

The poet Abraham Joseph Ryan wrote:

A land without ruins is a man without memories. . . . A land without memories is a land without history.

John Chafee understood that. Today we honor his memory. Let us never forget his example as an excellent role model, a tireless crusader for families and for children, and a tremendous and reasoned voice in our debate on how to balance the needs of our Nation and our world with the great need to preserve and protect our environment.

Today there is an emptiness in this Chamber that we all sense, a terrible emptiness because a grand man, a great man, has left us. We hope our work in these areas will be pleasing to him so we can carry on many of the initiatives he started.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to speak regarding the late Senator John Chafee. I have a few comments I want to make.

I was privileged to be presiding whenever our colleagues spoke about Senator Chafee and what a great man he was. People have gone through his resume. It struck me as I was listening that it is rare for us to recognize giants when they are among us. It is generally only after they leave us that we recognize the giant of the individual.

Senator Chafee was such a giant. For all the things he has done and for which he has been recognized—his work for his country, his fighting for his country, his service in this body, his service in Rhode Island—he was truly a giant among us. Only now do we measure his true greatness because we have this void in that he is no longer with us. He was a great giant, he was a humble giant, he was a kind giant, a giant of a man, and a giant of a soul.

We can look at his desk and see the flowers—and they are beautiful flowers. As I look at Senator Chafee's desk, I see this giant oak tree. It is a soaring oak tree, and it has limbs that branch out everywhere. It has leaves that are providing shade and support and nurturing and housing for so many people. It glistens and reaches all the way across America. That is the kind of person he really is. He is a giant of that stature and that nature. The other thing about him is, he doesn't even want to be noticed that he is there. He just wants to do that. He just wants to provide this great shade and this great tree and this great support for this country. He really doesn't even want to be noticed.

When you said, my, isn't that great; he just kind of said, no, I just wanted to do this. I just wanted to help the people in this country whom I love so much, these people who are here for whom I feel so strongly. I believe that I have been given much. To whom much is given, much is expected. I am just providing what I think I ought to.

That was the kind of humble man he was.

I have my own personal experience and memory, as all of us do, about

working with him. I am a newer Member, so I didn't have the length of service others did. But I was working with him on a rails-to-trails bill that had a particular problem for Kansas. This was a program he deeply loved. Yet I was having a particular narrow problem. Normally, one would think—I am a new Member and this is a program he loves; I am having a problem with it—that he would kind of quickly shuffle me to the side, that that would have been the normal experience. Yet he was the kindest man about it. He said: I know you have a problem with this. Let's see if we can work it out. He could have easily said: I really don't have time for this. I have more important things to do. But my problem was his problem. He worked with me, and he worked with me in kindness and in gentleness to try to deal with the problem I had with which, in many respects, he disagreed. Yet that was the kind of man he was. There was a great kindness about him.

In my estimation, few have carried greatness so gently as John Chafee carried it. If pride is the first sin, humility is the first grace. And John was a truly humble man. John was a man of grace. We will all miss him dearly, as we see this giant that is no longer amongst us. We loved him. God loves him. Our prayers will be with him and his family.

I only hope his memory can stay with us as long and that we can recognize that giant who was amongst us and in many respects that giant tree which is still there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair for an opportunity to join my voice with others who have talked about our dear friend, John Chafee.

This place is sadder these last couple days because of the unexpected passing of Senator John Chafee. His death has left the Senate and the entire country mourning the loss of one of our most admired and respected elected leaders.

Senator Chafee belonged to a breed of public servants who have become a vanishing species in American politics. He was always a gentleman, even under attack while defending causes about which he felt deeply. He always stood for moderation and common sense over political extremism.

Senator Chafee was a consensus builder. He believed in bipartisan solutions as an alternative to the typically partisan bickering which is now often a feature of congressional debate.

I served for 15 years with John Chafee on the Environment and Public Works Committee—some of those years, obviously, before he became chairman, and these recent years when he was chairman of the committee. He and I were allies on many battles for a cleaner environment. Even when our approaches diverged, his commitment and leadership were always to be admired. He worked tirelessly to make our air cleaner, to keep pollutants

from being dumped into our oceans, and to preserve those species that were endangered.

He had a wonderful patience factor in his being. Senator Chafee and I spent years trying, in good faith but, unfortunately, unable to reach a consensus on a Superfund reform bill. The reason we failed to reach a consensus was not for lack of effort Senator Chafee put in to try to get a Superfund bill out that was satisfactory to both sides and a majority view.

Senator Chafee played an important role in most of the major environmental bills that have come before the Senate since 1977. In standing up for the environment, he often had to stand firmly against overwhelming pressure from powerful special interest groups—not to mention, by the way, pressures from members of his own party, and certainly from some pressures on our side as well—to try and form the consensus we so much wanted to have. He was a role model for all of us in public service and for anyone considering a career in government. He voted his conscience on issues as diverse as child care, welfare reform, tobacco, and transportation, even when voting his conscience meant crossing party lines.

I was particularly proud to have Senator Chafee agree with me, when he supported my bill to require background checks at gun shows. These were not easy votes to make because most of the Members of his party felt differently about that. But he stood up for what he believed in and voted that way and spoke that way and was honored for his views. His own gun safety initiatives made him a hero to me and to all Americans. This was noteworthy, considering his wartime experiences in the face of deadly combat. In World War II, he fought with the Marine Corps in the invasion of Guadalcanal. In 1951, he reentered the service and commanded a rifle company in Korea. His political career was exemplary, including 6 years in the Rhode Island legislature, 3 terms as the State's Governor, and 3 years as Secretary of the Navy. And his four highly distinguished terms here in the Senate made him one of the most treasured figures in American politics.

In his home State, Senator Chafee was known directly as "the man you can trust." No one was more deserving of that trust or worked harder to earn it. His constituents in Rhode Island and all of us here always knew where Senator Chafee stood on an issue. That was true largely because he believed in the Government's ability to help people, to make their lives better. He didn't buy into the notion that Government was the people's enemy.

Mr. President, Senator Chafee's death is an incalculable loss to the Senate and the American people. He set an example that all of us here would be proud to emulate. I know I speak for everyone in the Senate when we extend our deepest sympathies to his wife Ginny, whom we have gotten

to know over the years, and his entire family. Senator Chafee's unique style and his physical and moral courage are irreplaceable. The country has lost a great public servant. We are all poorer with his demise, and we will all miss him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

PREScription DRUG COVERAGE FOR SENIORS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this is the sixth time I have come to the floor in recent days to talk about Medicare coverage for prescription medicine and particularly to talk about bipartisanship. I want to talk about this issue of prescriptions for senior citizens.

I am very pleased to see my good friend and colleague from Oregon in the chair. He has been extremely supportive of the effort Senator SNOWE and I have been making over these last few months to try to show that we can deal in a bipartisan manner with this issue of prescription drugs for the Nation's elderly. I think a lot of people have pretty much consigned this issue to part of the campaign trail in the fall of 2000 and that Republicans and Democrats are just going to fight about it and nothing is going to get done. But what Senator SNOWE and I have been talking about for the last few weeks is that we ought to act on this now; we ought to deal with it in this session of Congress. I thank the Chair, my friend and colleague from Oregon, because he has been very supportive.

I am going to read this afternoon, as I have done on five previous occasions, from some of the letters we are getting from seniors across the State of Oregon who are concerned about this issue. In fact, this is part of a campaign Senator SNOWE and I are making to urge seniors across the Nation, as we say in the poster, to send in their prescription drug bills. We hope they do send them to their Senators, in the hopes that we can galvanize bipartisan action in this session. It is more than a year until the next election. It would be a shame, with all of the suffering and hardship we are seeing in these letters, to have the Senate just take a pass on this issue and say, well, we will deal with it some other time and on some other day.

So I am going to, as I have on five previous occasions, read from some of these letters in an effort to try to make the case for bipartisanship and action in this session.

One senior from Lebanon wrote recently that she has about \$990 per month in income. This senior spends about \$175 of that for just one prescription each month. That leaves this older

person a little over \$700 a month on which to live. Think about what it is actually like for a senior citizen on a \$990-a-month income to spend \$175 of that for just one prescription each month. It is pretty clear that you just can't pay for necessities if you have to pay out of your monthly income that very large prescription drug bill.

It would be one thing if that letter were a rarity, but here is another letter I got recently from a couple in The Dalles, OR—the Chair and I have been in that community often—who has to spend something like \$1,500 a year for tamoxifen, a drug used to fight cancer. It is very clear that with their other health expenses, their dental work, eyeglasses, a variety of things that Medicare doesn't cover, this couple in The Dalles, OR, is walking on an economic tightrope, having to balance food costs against fuel costs, their fuel costs against their medical bills.

So I am very hopeful that, as a result of this campaign Senator SNOWE and I are making to urge seniors to send in their prescription drug bills, we are going to have a chance to respond in this session.

I see our good friend, Senator MOYNIHAN. He has really led in the area of health research and prevention. We talked a little bit about it on Friday last. What is so important about this issue and dealing with it in this session of Congress and not in 2001—by the way, we won't have the good fortune of having Senator MOYNIHAN as a Member of this body then. The reason we ought to deal with it now is that the drugs seniors need most are preventive in nature.

Back when I was director of the Gray Panthers, which was for about 7 years before I was elected to the Congress—and I think the Chair was still practicing law at that time. It is clear that these new drugs can make a tangible, significant difference in the lives of our elderly people. I talked about a drug last week, an anticoagulant that a senior could get for just over \$1,000 a year; and if they take that medicine, it can prevent strokes and debilitating illnesses that can cost more than \$100,000 a year. Think of it—a modest, preventive investment in an anticoagulant drug, helping us to save \$100,000 that seniors might need to treat a debilitating stroke.

I am going to be brief this afternoon. I am going to wrap up with a few additional cases.

In Portland, I was told by a constituent about her mother and father. They are 83 and 79 years old. Right now at their home in Portland, OR, they are being treated for diabetes, hypertension, and a variety of illnesses relating to arthritis. They have a monthly income of \$1,600 a month. They are spending more than \$400 of it on prescription medicine—25 percent of their monthly income for an older couple 83 and 79 in our home State of Oregon just for prescription medicine.

From Silverton, OR, a senior sent me a copy of all of her prescription drugs

for 1 year. She spent more than \$1,000. Her annual income that year was \$868 a month. She is spending more than 10 percent of her income on prescription drugs.

From Astoria, OR, a couple on a modest income wrote that for the first 10 months of 1999 they spent over \$5,000 on their prescription drug costs.

What Senator SNOWE and I have said is that we have an opportunity to deal with this on a bipartisan basis. We can steer clear of price controls and one-size-fits-all Federal policy. We can use a model that we know works. It is based on the Federal Employee Health Plan, one that serves all of us and our families here in the Senate.

Our bill is called the SPICE Program, the Senior Prescription Insurance Coverage Equity Act.

Our legislation now is the only bipartisan prescription drug bill now before the Senate.

Frankly, I am very confident in the bipartisan team I see assembled from the Finance Committee with Chairman ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN.

I would like to see as a result of seniors sending in to all the Senators—as this poster says, “Send in your prescription drug bills”—I would like to see the Senate Finance Committee have the opportunity under Chairman ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN to devise a good bipartisan proposal in this area.

Senator SNOWE and I have an approach that we think works. More than 54 Members in the Senate have voted for the funding mechanism we have proposed. We have a majority in the Senate already on record supporting the funding approach that we would take.

Frankly, when Chairman ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN sit down, they may well have better ideas for dealing with it. It is not as if Senator SNOWE and I are saying we have the last word in terms of dealing with this issue. What we are saying is given the severity of the problem, given the stakes and the chance to do some real good with anticoagulant drugs where \$1,000 a year worth of help can save \$100,000 in terms of the cost of a stroke, let's go forward, and let's not let this issue become fodder for the 2000 election.

I am going to wrap up because the chairman and Senator MOYNIHAN are here. They want to talk about this important trade bill, which I also happen to support.

But I hope seniors will keep sending me copies of these bills. Just as the poster says, “Send your prescription drug bills” to your Senator. Senator SNOWE and I are collecting these.

We are going to talk again and again on the floor of the Senate about the importance of this issue.

I think we can do this with market forces. We can use an approach that gives senior citizens the kind of bargaining power that a health maintenance organization has.

What is so sad about this is these vulnerable older people, such as the