

Later, at Yale, he was captain of the undefeated Yale freshman wrestling team. We will never know if he would have repeated that achievement the following year, because he left Yale in his sophomore year to enlist in the Marines—he didn't have to do that, but because he was an American Patriot, he did.

In the Marines, he served at the Battle of Guadalcanal. John was in the first wave of Americans to join in the bloody and important battle there. This country will always owe a great debt to him and the other Marines who served so bravely there.

After the Marines, John sought to move on with his life. He went to Harvard Law School, got married, and began the practice of law in the state he loved so dear. But duty called once again, and he returned to the Marines, to lead a rifle company in our struggle in Korea, and the nation's debt to him became even greater.

After his service in Korea, John returned to Rhode Island and embarked upon a political career. While John had ups and downs in his time, he certainly had more ups than downs. And more importantly, he knew how to handle those downs.

One of the downs came in 1968, when he lost the governorship in a surprising upset. Richard Nixon, recognizing the talent in John, tapped him to be Secretary of the Navy. There he was faced with a difficult decision concerning the chief officers of the *Pueblo*, a Navy ship that had been taken by the North Koreans. John decided not to court martial the captain and chief intelligence officer of the ship, deeming that they had suffered enough during their internment in a Korean prisoner of war camp. It was a difficult decision, but John Chafee has a great wisdom in difficult matters and the nation once again benefited from John's leadership.

In 1976, he was elected to the United States Senate, the institution to which he would devote the rest of his days. Both John Chafee and I won elections to the Senate in 1994, he for his fourth term and I for my first. Despite the disparity in seniority, we became friends, exchanging greetings on his birthday, which was just last Friday. He always appreciated my greetings, and sent the kindest thank you notes in response.

In my time here, I had the pleasure to work with him on a great number of issues, but two in particular stand out.

The first is ISTEA, the all-important transportation legislation we passed here few years ago. I worked closely with John to secure desperately-needed transportation projects in my home State of Missouri. John was always willing to work with me and my staff, and the citizens of Missouri must be added to the list of those who owe him a debt of gratitude.

The other issue that stands out in my mind when I think of John is his effort to reform the Superfund program. John was always concerned about the environment; back in 1969, the New York

Post reported that John would stop his campaign motorcade and get out of his car to pick up a piece of litter. John always understood that we were all responsible for improving the environment, and his efforts to improve Superfund were based on that belief in individual action. As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, he was in a position to act on his love for the environment, and his work in reforming Superfund is one of his most important achievements.

John leaves behind a loving wife, Ginny, 5 children, and 12 grandchildren. My prayers are for them at this time. They will miss him, as will we all.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to remember my friend and colleague, Senator John Chafee.

We were both elected to this great body in 1976. But, John was not your average freshman Senator. Whereas I had never held office before, John came to the Senate with a service record to his State and his country that was already exemplary.

He was a war hero, having fought with the Marines on Guadalcanal. He was a Rhode Island state legislator, Governor, and Secretary of the Navy.

But here, he was not content to rely upon past achievements, no matter how great those achievements were. He fought diligently for a cleaner environment, better health care, and a fair and fiscally sound Medicare and Medicaid system. Most recently, we worked together on the "Caring for Children Act," a bill which would have responsibly taken our nation's child care policy into the next century, providing parents with more options and expanding the ability of states to meet the needs of low-income working parents.

It was my pleasure to serve with John Chafee on the Finance Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence. His leadership and understanding on these issues will be greatly missed.

I secretly admired John in another way as well. I understand that he could play a mean game of squash, which is a game I never learned.

Of all of John's titles—Governor, Secretary, Senator—I know that his favorites were "Dad" and "Grandpa." I offer my deep condolences to John's wife, Virginia, and to their children and grandchildren. I know that spending more time with them and in his beloved Rhode Island following his retirement next fall was something that he looked forward to. The tragedy of his sudden death is all the worse because he was cheated out of this well-earned retirement.

John Chafee was a gentleman, a statesman, and a true public servant. There is no higher accolade that I can pay him.

Elaine and I send our deepest sympathies to his wonderful family and to all Rhode Islanders on this great loss.

CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are nearing the end of the budget process, and there were inferences made on the floor yesterday that the class size initiative should not be part of the final budget agreement because—it has been claimed—the President doesn't have the authority to insist that we hire more teachers to reduce class size.

Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to clarify the President's important—and authorized role—in fighting for smaller classes. I have also come to the floor to remind my colleagues that this year we have smaller class sizes—where discipline has been restored and kids can learn the basics—because last year Congress made a bipartisan agreement—and a bipartisan commitment—to hire 100,000 new teachers in order to reduce size in first, second, and third grades.

Today, as the budget process winds down, I want to make sure that our agreement is not pushed aside.

Let me remind my colleagues that the President does have the authority in the Constitution to register his opinion on whether or not the budget is acceptable. In fact, the President doesn't just have the authority, but he has the responsibility under Article I, Section 7 to return bills with his objections that he does not approve of. And I'm glad the President has that authority and that he will use it if this Congress doesn't guarantee class size reductions. And 38 Senators signed a letter saying we would stand behind his threatened veto because we agree class size reduction is critical.

Mr. President, in trying to reduce the number of students in each classroom, I have followed the process. In March, I was told it wasn't the right time. In the subcommittee, I was told we weren't allowed to offer amendments. In full committee, I was told it was too controversial. Then, when I got the floor, I was told I'd have to wait until the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was written. If we have to wait until then, we won't be able to tell kids they will have small classes next year, and we can't tell teachers they will have their jobs next year.

Mr. President, I have followed the process, and I have waited. But I am tired of waiting as I sense that this Congress is trying to undo our bipartisan commitment. What am I supposed to tell students, "Congress has to write the ESEA and until then, you have to learn your ABCs in a class with 35 students." To me, that is not acceptable. I'm not going to tell them that. If this Congress feels so strong that guaranteeing smaller classes is not important, you can give them your excuses.

This is about money in the budget that Congress approved last year, and it is about us keeping our commitment to improving education by reducing class size.

The class size reduction effort has been a success in its first year. Today, we have kids learning in classrooms

that are less crowded—learning to read, learning to write, and learning the basics with fewer discipline problems. They are working with a trained professional. Research shows they are going to have higher graduation rates, higher grade point averages and a higher likelihood of pursuing higher education.

They are going to be successful because of the work this Congress did one year ago. And the President has a right to insist on it. We as Democrats have a right to insist on it, and—as a Senator in this body—I am here to insist on it.

Now is the time to keep our commitment. Now is when the decisions are being made. Now is when we have to stand up for smaller classes. If we have to wait until after all budget deals have been cut, until after all the money has been spent, we will have failed those teachers, we will have failed those parents, but most importantly, we will have failed those children.

Mr. President, it is a national priority to reduce class size so kids can learn the basics and so discipline can be restored in the classroom. It is a promise we made last year and we need to put the money behind it, wherever it is appropriate.

A few weeks ago, I met with a teacher in Tacoma, WA, named Kris Paynter. Last year, there were 30 kids in her first grade class. This year there are 13 because of this program. That makes a huge difference for those kids. I saw a disciplined classroom where kids could learn the basics. Next year, we don't know how many kids will be in Ms. Paynter's class. And we can't even guarantee those 29,000 teachers hired last year will keep their jobs.

Mr. President, putting all of these process questions aside, what really matters at the end of the day is that kids have smaller classes. The teachers and parents in this country care that we do it. Period.

The millions of children who are now in smaller classes aren't wondering "has this been authorized?" or "is this in the budget?" or "does the President have the constitutional authority to reduce class sizes?" What really matters is that we fulfill our promise to parents, teachers, and students that we made last year in a bipartisan process.

Mr. President, I hate to say it, but at every turn, this Congress has put special interests ahead of the interests of real families. This is the last opportunity we will have to do something significant for kids. We didn't address the loopholes that still allow kids and criminals to get their hands on guns. We didn't make schools safer after the Columbine tragedy. We didn't provide health insurance to more kids. This is the last chance we have in this Congress to do something for our kids, fix a problem we know exists. And I am here to say that we cannot let this chance pass.

We need to keep our commitment to reducing class size. We need to be able

to tell those teachers they will have jobs next year, and we need to be able to tell those kids they will have small classes next year. Let's stand behind our commitment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

THE HAGEL PROPOSAL ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I come to the floor to briefly comment on a significant development in the fight for campaign finance reform. This morning, a bipartisan group of Senators, led by the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL, announced a new campaign finance reform proposal. Let me say that I and the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, warmly welcome the heightened participation of this new group of Senators, which includes the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, who has been, from the day she came to the Senate, a strong supporter of campaign finance reform. I also note that it includes five Republican Senators who have previously never voted for a campaign finance reform measure that includes limits on soft money.

As I predicted last week on the floor, the wall of protection for the current system of unlimited soft money contributions to the political parties is rapidly crumbling. While I am pleased by this development, I am not surprised. The soft money system is indefensible. I think we saw that during our abbreviated debate last week. Opponents of reform didn't defend soft money; they tried to divert our attention from it. They actually questioned whether there is anything corrupting about unlimited contributions from corporate and union treasuries to the political parties.

As the chairman of the Global Board of Directors of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu wrote in the New York Times when he heard about these comments on the floor:

You could almost hear the laughter coming from boardrooms and executive suites all over the country when Senate opponents of campaign finance reform expressed dismay that anyone could think big political contributions are corrupting elections and government.

I think the new initiative, led by the Senator from Nebraska, recognizes the opponents of reform have now retreated to an untenable position. They are defending the indefensible. To say there is nothing wrong with unlimited contributions to the political parties, that this is somehow the "American way," is to live in a fantasy world the American people simply will not accept.

The public knows soft money is wrong. The public knows soft money is corrupting. And the business community knows it, too, as the Global Chairman of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu so well expressed.

While the Hagel proposal does not ban soft money completely, which I be-

lieve is an essential element of an acceptable campaign finance reform bill, it does limit it significantly. So what you have here is a whole new group of Republican Senators, as well as some Democrats who are obviously saying it is not unconstitutional to limit soft money. In fact, they are obviously seeing the abuse of \$300,000 or \$500,000 contributions and they want to do something about it. So I am looking forward to working with Senator HAGEL and the others to reach common ground.

When campaign finance reform left the floor last week, we had a total of 55 Senators who had voted in favor of reform. Now, with this new initiative, there are five more Senators who apparently are prepared to vote to change this system. I think that is very significant, as I am sure my colleagues know, because what is 55 plus 5? It is 60. If we can bring all of these Senators together on a package they can all accept, we can break the filibuster. What we need now is real hard work, bipartisan work. We need to bridge our differences. If we can do that, we can defeat the defenders of this corrupt system and give the people a cleaner and fairer campaign finance system for the new century.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

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

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

Pending:

Lott (for ROTH/MOYNIHAN) amendment No. 2325, in the nature of a substitute.

Lott amendment No. 2332 (to amendment No. 2325), of a perfecting nature.

Lott amendment No. 2333 (to amendment No. 2332), of a perfecting nature.

Lott motion to commit with instructions (to amendment No. 2333), of a perfecting nature.

Lott amendment No. 2334 (to the instructions of the motion to commit), of a perfecting nature.

Lott (for ASHCROFT) amendment No. 2340 (to amendment No. 2334), to establish a Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the trade bill which is before us, and to register some disappointment with the path the leader has chosen to pursue because at this point the leader has indicated that he is not going to permit amendments to this trade bill. He has brought the bill to the floor, but he has what we call around here "filled the tree."