

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 saddened 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 increasing:

Beauty, strength, youth, are flowers but fading 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 support 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 flower;

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 OPPORTUNITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—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