

know how low unemployment can go before inflation is once again triggered. But Greenspan is testing the limits. We don't know how high the minimum wage can rise before it hurts demand for labor. But with the real minimum wage no higher than it was under President Reagan, we can afford to take prudent risks.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in reading that particular article, you will see that they make the point that the money that is actually used or actually received by minimum wage workers is spent and adds to the economy.

Take a State such as Oregon, that has the highest minimum wage in the country. Since Oregon went to a higher minimum wage more people are working, because it brought people who work back into the labor market because they were able to provide meaningful income to themselves and to their families. It provided an additional boost to the economy.

That concept has been supported by the Card and Krueger studies that have been referred to in other debates on the minimum wage.

Raising the minimum wage is an issue of fundamental and basic fairness, fairness and justice for men and women who are working at the lower economic rungs of the economic ladder. These are people working as assistants to school teachers in many of the schools across the country. These are people who are working as assistants in nursing homes that are looking after our parents and grandparents. These are men and women working in the great buildings in our major cities cleaning up after long days. These buildings effectively would not be functioning unless people were willing to provide that kind of work.

This issue, as I have said many times, is a women's issue because the majority of individuals will benefit from increasing the minimum wage are women. This is an issue of civil rights because one-third of minimum wage workers are men and women of color. This is a children's issue because more than 80 percent of families eaning the minimum wage are headed by women. Providing for the children in these families is directly related to the incomes that people have, and many have not just one job but the two jobs held down by many minimum wage workers who are heads of households.

We hear a great deal about family values. How are parents going to be able to spend their time with their children when they are out there working on two different jobs trying to put food on the table, a roof over their heads, and trying to clothe their children?

It is amazing to me when we have this greatest economic boom in the history of this country, this body is going to be begrudging to men and women who work hard, 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, and who value work. How many speeches did we hear on the other side of the aisle that we honor work, and we want them to go out and

work? People are out there working, and you refuse to give them the kind of income they need so that they can work in dignity and not live in poverty.

I know we have a lot of important pieces of legislation. This isn't a very complicated issue. Every Member in this body knows these issues. Everybody knows this issue. We are not talking about a complicated policy question. It is just a question of whether we are prepared to stand up and speak for those individuals who have fallen further behind economically than any other group—any other group in our society. They are the minimum wage workers. They haven't even been able to maintain the purchasing power of their wages, they have fallen further and further behind and continue to do so.

With all respect to all the other items we have in the Senate in terms of public policy questions, certainly the issue of fairness to our fellow citizens is something the American people understand.

The obstinacy of the Republican leadership in refusing to permit a limited period of time for us to vote on this issue, I think, is a real tragedy for these families. It certainly is. But they have refused and refused and refused with these tired, old arguments. We cannot get this issue on the agenda. They say we are the majority and we will set the agenda.

Let us have an opportunity to vote on those issues.

We saw our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: Well, all right; if we are going to find an increase in the minimum wage for 2 years, we are going to require \$35 billion in unpaid tax breaks that are going to swell to \$100 billion over ten years.

If you want to look after the working poor, Senators, they say, you are going to have to provide \$100 billion in tax breaks—not related to small businesses, not related to minimum wage individuals, but to the highest paid 10 percent of taxpayers in this country who will get over 90% of the benefit from those tax breaks.

Still we can't even have a chance to debate, they refuse us the time even to debate that. They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

The last time we provided an increase in the minimum wage was the first time we added all the tax goodies. Now the Republican leadership understands they have a train coming along the tracks, and they are piling up and piling up.

They may consider doing \$1 over 3 years.

We have already delayed a year—2 years now. They refused to let us bring up the issue up last year, and they are refusing to let us bring it up this year. They want to spread it out three more years. That won't even keep up in terms of inflation for those working families. And to be able to do even that, you have to tag on \$100 billion

over a 10-year period of tax goodies, unpaid for.

If these individuals end up contributing and paying taxes, they will be paying some of their taxes to try to offset the increase that the Republican leadership wants in these tax breaks.

We may see another hour that goes by without facing the minimum wage issue. We may see another day that goes by without facing the minimum wage issue. But I will tell you, it is inevitable that we will one way or the other bring these measures to the attention of the Senate and try to get accountability.

How many times do we have to hear about accountability on the other side of the aisle? We want accountability. We want accountability for this. We want accountability for that. We want accountability for everything except being willing to vote up or down on the increase in the minimum wage. Yet they were quite prepared to vote themselves—all of the Senate, and the House of Representatives—a \$4,600 raise. But they won't even permit a vote on the Senate floor on an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. President, maybe that goes over well someplace. But it doesn't seem to me that it will go over well with the American people. We intend to continue to press this issue.

Mr. President, I withhold the remainder of my time.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I had a chance to speak this morning and I don't really want to repeat what I said, except to mention one point which is both an argument I want to make to my colleagues here and an argument I want to also make to the administration.

We have a WTO meeting coming up next month in Seattle. There will be many rank-and-file labor people and labor leaders attending, farm organizations, nongovernment organizations, environmentalists. We have been told by the administration that maybe within WTO we can have some enforceable labor standards, some enforceable environmental standards, so we are raising everything up rather than racing to the bottom.

This is important because with NAFTA, in spite of what was said, the truth is, the environmental standards and labor standards were an afterthought and not enforceable. What kind of message are we sending to people when, on the one hand, we have the administration and others saying with WTO we will try to have enforceable standards, and then we have a bilateral agreement, several trade agreements, without enforceable labor standards, without enforceable environmental standards?

As a Senator my bottom line is that I am in favor of the right of people to

organize and bargain collectively in our country and in other countries. I am in favor of the rights of ordinary citizens to be able to bargain collectively and have the right to organize so they can make a decent wage and support their families. That is what is sorely lacking in this legislation.

I will mention one amendment. I mentioned several this morning. If we go forward with this legislation tomorrow, I certainly want to have the right to introduce amendments. I talked about a number of amendments. One dealt with campaign finance reform and for the right to apply for clean money, clean elections for Federal offices. I don't think we should abandon this debate or issue.

The amendment I want to introduce tomorrow, if that is the direction in which we are heading, deals with this economic convulsion that is taking place in agriculture. On October 25, Bird Island Elevator, Renville, MN, crop prices: Wheat, \$2.89 a bushel; corn, \$1.43 a bushel; soybeans, \$4.04 a bushel. This has nothing to do with what our livestock producers are getting.

Let me say to those who don't know agriculture, this is way below what it costs farmers to produce a bushel of wheat or corn.

Let me say to my colleagues, in my State of Minnesota, farm income has decreased 43 percent since 1996, and more than 25 percent—a quarter of our farmers—may not be able to cover expenses for 1999.

At the same time, you have these conglomerates that have muscled their way to the dinner table, exercising their power over family farmers. They will do it over consumers, and they are driving our family farmers out.

According to a recent study at the University of Missouri, five firms now control over 80 percent of beef packing; six firms, 75 percent of the pork packing, and the list, frankly, goes on and on.

I want to give a few more figures, then mention the amendment and finish up. The top four pork packers have increased their market share from 36 percent to 57 percent. That is what has been occurring. Smithfield is buying up Murphy, and now they are about to buy part of Tyson Foods that deals with pork production. Our pork producers are facing extinction and these packers are in hog heaven.

The top four beef packers have expanded their market share from 32 percent to 80 percent just in recent years. The top four flour millers have increased their market share from 40 percent to 62 percent. The top four turkey processors now control 42 percent. The list goes on and on.

What we have is a food industry where we are looking for the competition. So here is the amendment I will introduce with Senator DORGAN. I think we may get a majority of votes. I hope so. This will be an amendment to address the market concentration in agriculture. What we would call for is a

moratorium that would apply to these mergers and acquisitions over the next 18 months, during which time there are a couple of things that will happen. This would deal with companies that had assets of over \$100 million and the second party had more than \$10 million. This is the threshold test right now under which these firms would have to apply to the Justice Department and FTC.

The moratorium would last for 18 months or until Congress passes comprehensive antitrust legislation to deal with this problem of the concentration in agriculture, whichever comes first. Moreover, our amendment will establish an antitrust review division to look at this concentration in agriculture and to make recommendations as to what kind of regulations are necessary and what kind of action we should take.

I finish this way. We will be talking about this legislation today. I spoke about it earlier. If we move forward tomorrow, as a Senator from Minnesota I want to have the opportunity to introduce this amendment with Senator DORGAN that calls for a moratorium on these acquisitions and mergers. I want to do it because these big conglomerates are pushing our family farmers off the land. I want to do it because there is a direct correlation between their concentrated market power and the record low prices that our producers are receiving. I want to do it because if we do not have a moratorium over the way in which these huge conglomerates are taking over agriculture, then our rural communities will be devastated and more and more family farmers will be driven off the land. Someone will own the land, someone will own the livestock, but it will be the few.

I think that kind of concentration of power is frightening. It is frightening for our family farmers. It is driving them off the land. It is frightening for our rural communities that depend upon the number of family farmers who live in the communities and buy there. Do you know what else? It is frightening for America. Food is a very precious commodity. We ought not have just a few conglomerates that control all phases of this food industry from seed all the way to grocery shelf. This is wrong. It is not acceptable.

As a Senator from Minnesota, I hope my colleagues will excuse me for saying that for 4 weeks I have asked the majority leader for an opportunity to introduce the amendment. Tomorrow morning, if we go forward with this legislation, I will be here first thing and this is the first amendment I am going to introduce to this legislation. Then we can have an up-or-down vote, and I am hoping we will get a majority vote.

I see my colleague from North Carolina. I gather he wants to spend some time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, on the Africa-Caribbean trade bill, let me say first I believe in free trade. This country and my State of North Carolina are part of a global economy. To put our heads in the sand and pretend that is not true is completely unproductive and accomplishes nothing.

My concern is that the bills we are addressing this week, the African-Caribbean trade bills, put us in a position of playing with fire. The Senate version of those bills is marginally acceptable but they are significantly different, from my perspective, than the House version of those bills. The Senate version specifically contains provisions for what is called yarn forward and fabric forward, which I will talk about in a few minutes. But both bills are dramatically deficient in one respect; that is, they make it almost impossible, in my judgment, to enforce provisions against transshipment.

Transshipment, as my colleagues know, means a country such as China can ship goods to Africa that they otherwise could not ship directly to the United States because of quotas, have a button sewn onto a garment or a piece of apparel, and then have it shipped to the United States and otherwise circumvent existing tariffs and quota requirements. The problem is the enforcement mechanisms against transshipment. In the House bill, in my judgment, they are virtually nonexistent. In the Senate bill, while somewhat better, still we rely heavily on African countries to develop and enforce rules against transshipment. That is simply not a bet worth taking. Unfortunately, transshipment has the potential of putting an enormous number of folks out of work in North Carolina and having a dramatic impact on the textile and apparel industry in my State of North Carolina.

The second problem with these bills is the issue of yarn and fabric forward. The Senate bill provides for yarn and fabric forward, which essentially means African countries operating under the Senate bill, if it were passed, would be required to use American yarn, American fabric, which theoretically would help protect American manufacturers in those two areas. The problem is those provisions are not in the African trade bill on the House side. Unfortunately, if this bill passes the Senate, once it gets to conference, there would be enormous pressure to drop out the fabric forward and yarn forward provisions. Without those provisions, the textile and apparel industry in the United States and in my State of North Carolina would be dramatically affected.

I said when I began that I believe in free trade, and I do believe in free trade. But I think there are certain fundamental principles with which every free trade agreement should comply.

First, the agreements must be negotiated and must be multilateral. The countries with which we are entering

into these agreements have to give something up. As I will discuss in a few minutes, that is not true with respect to this bill.

All the trade laws have to be fair and enforceable. As I indicated a few minutes ago, there is at least one major area, transshipment, that in my judgment is not enforceable in this bill.

Third, the trade bill must have adequate labor and environmental protections overseas.

That is common sense. If our businesses and workers in this country are going to compete, as they should, with businesses and workers overseas, these bills must have adequate labor and environmental protections.

Finally, the trade bills must have tangible and provable benefits for U.S. companies and U.S. workers.

Those four criteria must be present for a free trade bill to make sense for our country and for my State of North Carolina.

I am going to talk about some of these principles and how they apply to this specific bill.

First, I just mentioned tangible benefits for U.S. workers. Let me tell you a little bit about what is happening with textile and apparel industry jobs in this country and specifically in my State of North Carolina.

We have 177,000 textile jobs in North Carolina. We have 45,000 apparel jobs, 222,000 jobs in total. Almost a quarter of a million workers in my State of North Carolina are dependent on the textile and apparel industry to put food on the table for their families; a quarter of a million families who are going to be impacted if this bill passes and is signed by the President and becomes law.

Let's look at what has happened to folks who have worked in that area in North Carolina over the last several years. In the last 5 years, from 1993 to 1998, North Carolina has lost 62,000 jobs in the area of textile and apparel manufacturing. That is 62,000 families who had a breadwinner working in that industry who lost their jobs. I believe the studies have shown that those folks have had a terrible time finding other employment. The reality is that the people who work in these jobs need these jobs. They are critically important to provide them and their families with a livelihood. Oftentimes, there is nowhere else for them to go.

I want my colleagues to recognize that when we do pass the kind of legislation we are talking about in these trade bills, it is not just an economic issue. This has real and human consequences on families in my State of North Carolina.

We have lost during that same 5-year period in the textile apparel industry almost 300,000 jobs nationally, which means 300,000 families in this country have lost their source of income during that same 5-year period.

What has happened during the 10-year period from 1989 to 1999? In North Carolina, we have gone from 220,000 to

177,000 textile jobs, almost 43,000 jobs lost, a 20-percent drop in 10 years. We have gone from 83,000 to 45,000 in the apparel industry, which means they have almost been cut in half; half the people in North Carolina who were dependent on the apparel industry to provide income and livelihood for their families have been put out of work; a 45-percent drop, almost half. The reality is, these families have been devastated by the loss of these jobs.

The bill we are talking about today, the African-Caribbean trade bill, could very easily have exactly the same impact because it ensures these jobs we are trying to hold on to in the United States are very likely to be exported to the Caribbean and to African countries.

The average apparel wage in the United States is \$8 an hour. Let's see how that compares with these other countries. In Mexico, the average wage is 85 cents an hour. In the Dominican Republic, it is 69 cents an hour; El Salvador, 59 cents an hour; Guatemala, 65 cents an hour; and Honduras, 43 cents an hour—\$8 an hour to, in all these countries, well under \$1 an hour that companies will have to pay in wages. It does not take a mathematical wizard to figure out what is going to happen to these jobs and to all these folks in my State who are completely dependent on the textile and apparel industry to provide for their families, many of whom have been working in this industry for many years.

On a personal note, I grew up in the textile business. My dad worked in the textile business for 37 years before his retirement from that business. I have seen firsthand, having worked in mills in North Carolina when I was in high school and in college, how heavily folks depend on these jobs. They have nowhere else to go.

The bottom line is, it is all they know, and it is all well and good to talk abstractly about retraining, but when you are talking about retraining somebody who does not have a high school education and who has spent the last 30 or 40 years of their life working in a cotton mill, they have no idea what to do and they have no realistic prospect of going to some other field of employment. These people need these jobs. This is a human tragedy that is created oftentimes by these trade bills. I want folks to realize this is real, and it has a real and devastating effect on people's lives in my State of North Carolina and all over this country.

Let me talk briefly about the jobs we know have been lost and the plants that have been closed over the last few years in North Carolina. In September of this year, Pluma Inc. closed a plant in Eden, NC, a small community in North Carolina, 500 jobs lost; 500 families lost their breadwinner. The company of Jasper closed a plant in Whiteville, NC, in September of this year; 191 jobs lost. Whiteville Apparel in Whiteville, NC, in eastern North Carolina, closed a plant in August of this year; 396 jobs lost. Stonecutter

Mills in Rutherford and Polk in western North Carolina closed a plant in June of this year; 800 jobs lost. Dyersburg, in Hamilton, NC, closed a plant in May of this year; 422 jobs lost. Unifi in Raeford and Sanford closed a plant in March of this year; 257 jobs lost. Levi Strauss closed a plant in Murphy; 382 jobs lost. Burlington Industries in January of this year closed plants in Cramerton, Forest City, Mooresville, Raeford, Oxford, and Statesville; 2,600 jobs lost. Cone Mills at the end of last year, in December, closed a plant in Salisbury; 625 jobs lost.

In a period of less than a year, 6,173 jobs have been lost in my home State of North Carolina. Just imagine what impact the passage of this piece of legislation will have. It will accelerate those numbers. It will not retard them. It will accelerate them, so more and more workers who have spent their lives working in textiles will have nowhere to go, no way to feed their families, and their families are just out of luck.

I want to read from a news story that appeared in the Arizona Republic. It appeared on October 23 of this year—just recently. It is entitled "Textile Industry Unravels Workers Idled By Cheap Labor." It does a terrific job of telling the story of what is happening to workers and families all over North Carolina who are being impacted by these trade bills:

It was the only work she'd ever done, the only work she'd ever wanted to do. And a contented Lorie Coleman spent a decade and a half inspecting stitch lines, examining cloth and making sure everything that came out of the Ithaca Industries textile mill here met her "high standards"—never mind the company's. A \$6-an-hour job it may have been, but it was hers.

Then it was gone.
"To think you could work somewhere," Coleman . . . said recently, her voice still tinged with disbelief . . . and the next thing you know, you're gone, just like that."

Just like that, a livelihood for the Lorie Colemans of North Carolina and thousands of others in the Piedmont area is disappearing.

Since 1995, according to state labor statistics, more than 160 textile and apparel mills have closed in North Carolina, leaving nearly—

Listen to this, Mr. President—
leaving nearly 30,000 people out of work [since 1995].

Those losses are reflected throughout the Southeast, which, according to federal figures, lost more than 85,000 such jobs, even as the country was experiencing its fabled economic expansion.

During a period of booming prosperity for this Nation's economy, when everyone else is taking advantage of investment in Wall Street, great earnings on Wall Street, companies are doing terrifically well, 85,000 people in the Southeast lost their jobs, 30,000 in my State of North Carolina.

To be sure, North Carolina is still the leading state in the leading region for U.S. production of textiles and apparel. Nevertheless, the State is hemorrhaging.

Few places in the State have felt the sting of such losses as much as Lorie Coleman's

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: