

And if there is another tie vote, the amendment would fall.

But in order to try to resolve the issue, for the moment, my suggestion is that the Senate should adopt this amendment, putting in the extra provision of consultation with the National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods, and suggest that, if this standard is given the force and effect of law, there must be some connection between the contaminated product and unsanitary conditions or the way in which the processing plant was being operated in order to justify the Department withdrawing its inspectors and therefore closing the plant.

We want to continue to ensure—and this ought to be clear—that our Nation's food supply is safe; that it is processed in the most sanitary conditions possible; that it is inspected to ensure that the food is safe for human consumption, all of that will continue to be reflected in the adoption of this amendment.

What we add is that scientific advice and counsel be sought by the Department of Agriculture on this subject with respect to this standard that has been thrown out by a court. If it can be modified to ensure that we continue to see the force and effect of the standards enforced by the courts, then that is what we would like to see happen. We would like it to be done in a process that gives respect for the power of a court and the judicial process that is in place but also the prerogatives of the Congress. The Congress has not empowered the Department of Agriculture to issue a standard of the kind the court said it could not enforce. That is a point to remember, too. The adoption of the Harkin amendment would give that power legislatively, give that power to the Secretary of Agriculture without a careful review of the implications of that new power by the Congress.

I am hopeful that this will resolve the issue for the time being, for today. The legislative committee has a right to look at it, to have hearings, to propose changes in the authorities the Department has in situations such as this. That would be the appropriate way to resolve the issue for the long term. But for today, I am hopeful the Senate will agree to this amendment, maybe on a voice vote, and then we can adopt the amendment of the Senator on a voice vote and proceed to other issues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Paul Coverdell, our friend and colleague. Paul was an extraordinary human being who really cared. He looked at his opportunity to serve in the Senate as a way to make a difference in the lives of his fellow man.

I will never forget Paul Coverdell. He was one of the first people who reached out to me when I first came to this body, greeting me with a warm welcome and caring advice. Although he was in leadership and had many demands on his time, he always had time for me and truly listened to what I had to say. He had common sense and a common touch. I have truly enjoyed working with him on several legislative initiatives, particularly education and the Ed-Flex bill we passed last year.

Paul had a wonderful knack for being able to work with people and to get things done. He led by example. He understood that to be a leader one had to serve. There was no job so small that he would not take it. His commitment and ability always made you want to be on his team. His enthusiasm was contagious. He made you feel good just being around him.

My regret is that because of my short tenure in the Senate, I did not get to know Paul or spend as much time with him as many of my colleagues.

He gave witness to his Christian faith every day. He will continue to be my role model in the Senate. Paul Coverdell will be missed by all of us, but my faith tells me that he is eternally happy with our Father in Heaven. I pray that thought will give comfort to his wife Nancy and the members of his family.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as have so many of my colleagues, I speak with a sense of loss and sadness about the passing of our friend, Paul Coverdell. Over the years serving in the Senate, I have seen too often the flowers on a Senator's desk and known, by that unique tradition of our body, the reflection that we have lost somebody in an untimely fashion—no one more untimely than the Senator from Georgia.

I have had the honor to serve with many Senators during the time the people of Vermont have been kind enough to let me be here. Each of these Senators has brought special qualities. It might be a knack for fiery oration or professorial intelligence. But Paul Coverdell brought a special formula of kindness and quiet persistence.

I first knew Paul when he was director of the Peace Corps. I was chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee which handled his budget. I recall times when there would be an issue that would come up of some contention. I remember President Bush calling and saying: Pat, sit down with Paul. I assure you you can work it out.

We would sit quietly in my office. We would go over the issues, and we would

work it out. We would work it out because I knew that Paul Coverdell would keep his word; he knew I would mine. I also knew that neither of us would read about the intricacies of our agreements in the paper the next day. We would keep each other's confidence.

When he came to the Senate, he was first and foremost a tireless champion for the interests of the people of Georgia. We all remember his relentless advocacy for some of the military bases in his home State and how proud he was to represent the State that hosted the Olympic games in 1996. In that regard he entered the sometimes messy realm of appropriations to bring full Federal support to that gigantic effort.

In many ways, these efforts were an embodiment of the people of Georgia, possessing a boundless energy, ambition, and generosity.

What I remember most, though, about Paul Coverdell—and so many of our colleagues have said the same thing—is how he worked on everything with a paradoxically quiet energy. He was not one to seek the cameras and head to the floor to yell about every disagreement. If he had a disagreement, he would call you. He would go and work with you face to face. He was often convincing. I know he changed my mind on issues.

I think one of the reasons he was so convincing is that he was always open-minded and attentive. I don't think there is any case more obvious about that than the Senate's recent consideration of the supplemental appropriation for antidrug assistance in Colombia.

There were many disagreements on this aid package. But everybody, whether they were on his side or on the opposite side, admired the strength of his conviction and the depth of the knowledge of the region.

I was privileged to work closely with him on a resolution on a recent presidential election in Peru. Senator Coverdell and I believed strongly that it was important for the United States to send a strong message throughout the hemisphere in support of democracy and to condemn the blatant subversion of democracy by the Fujimori government. Again, it was the strength of Paul's convictions and willingness to stand for the most important principles this country stands for. That is why the resolution was there.

Our mutual concern for international human rights extended to the effort to establish a global ban of antipersonnel landmines. I was so pleased to work with Paul on this issue. He would always consider my proposals thoughtfully and thoroughly. He brought a very special perspective. For him, banning landmines was about protecting Peace Corps volunteers and the communities they served. He had this unique way of looking at an issue that went way beyond warring parties. He was concerned about innocent civilians.

Paul took part in these debates and he worked behind the scenes with a

big-hearted kindness. He was one of the kindest people to grace this floor, and there was a certain peacefulness about him that was always pleasantly contagious. In a sometimes very divisive Senate, that peacefulness was so respected.

That is why when I look at the flowers, like many of us who have served here a long time, I think we have seen those flowers too often. But it is hard to think of a time when both Republicans and Democrats have felt the pain more than on this occasion. Paul, we will all miss you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, all of use are saddened by the death in our Senate family. I join Senators on both sides of the aisle in mourning the loss of our colleague and friend, Paul Coverdell, and I extend my deepest condolences to the members of his family.

Senator Coverdell and I differed on many of the major issues of the day. But it was obvious to all of us who served with him that he was a leader of genuine conviction, deep principle, great ability, and high purpose.

His commitment to public service was extraordinary. It was always a privilege to work with him.

I especially admired his dedication to seeking common ground—to exploring every aspect of every issue, and to learn as much as possible about it—to going the extra mile to achieve worthwhile compromise instead of confrontation—and above all to finding practical answers to the many serious challenges we face together in the Senate.

He was deeply committed to enhancing the quality of life for all Americans. We both shared a strong commitment to improving education in all of the Nation's schools. I'm saddened that he will no longer be with us as the Senate turns again in coming days to the important debate on support for elementary and secondary education in schools and communities across the country.

I also particularly admired Paul Coverdell's leadership role as Director of the Peace Corps in the Bush administration from 1989 to 1991, before he came to the Senate.

Over the years, the Peace Corps has had special meaning for all of us in the Kennedy family, because it is one of the finest legacies of President Kennedy. I know that my brother would have been proud of Paul Coverdell's commitment to the Peace Corps and its ideals and its service to peoples in need in many different lands.

In a very real sense, the campaign slogan that Paul Coverdell used so effectively in his successful Senate reelection campaign in Georgia 2 years ago sums up his extraordinary career, and tells why he had so much respect and friendship from all of us. That slogan consisted of two simple words—"Coverdell Works." And it was true, in every sense of the word. Paul Coverdell served the Senate well, the Nation

well, and the people of Georgia well, and we will miss him very much.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, Howell Raines, Editorial Page Editor of The New York Times has written a warm and wonderful tribute to Paul Coverdell, recalling his career in the Georgia State Senate in the 1970s. It is part of his life story that is not widely known here in Washington—certainly not by me—and helps to account for the great affection and respect in which he was held here in the United States Senate.

Withal this adds a touch to our mourning, we are much indeed indebted to Mr. Raines memoir.

I ask unanimous consent that the "Editorial Notebook" from this morning's New York Times be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 20, 2000]

A QUIET MAN IN A NOISY TRADE

(By Howell Raines)

PAUL COVERDELL'S LEAP TO THE SENATE
MARKED A SHIFT IN SOUTHERN POLITICS

Senator Paul Coverdell of Georgia was a mild-mannered Republican seasoned in political obscurity. As minority leader of the Georgia State Senate in the 1970's, he was part of a legislative bloc so small and impotent that it was ignored, steamrolled and sometimes openly ridiculed by the Democrats who controlled the legislature as if by birthright. None of us covering the Georgia Capitol in those days would have picked Mr. Coverdell, who died Tuesday at age 61, as a future United States senator. Now, in retrospect, we can see him as part of the second of two transforming waves that swept Georgia politics in the last third of the 20th century.

The first wave of change was driven by law. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 brought hundreds of black Democrats into office. The second wave of change was demographic, as exemplified by fast-growing Atlanta. Georgia's progressive Democrats had long dreamed of the day when Atlanta would be big enough to outvote the state's rural conservatives. What they had not foreseen was that thousands of the newcomers flooding into the Atlanta suburbs would be out-of-state Republicans who rejected both the Democratic power structure and the Goldwater Republicans then in control of the Southern G.O.P.

They created a ready-made constituency for Mr. Coverdell, a classic mainstream Republican who was fiscally conservative yet moderate on social issues. "That was what made the Republican Party attractive to these people who came in," said Bill Shipp, a veteran political commentator from Atlanta. "Until Coverdell and Johnny Isakson [another Atlanta moderate] came along, Georgia Republicans were disgruntled segregationist Democrats."

Unlike the sprinkling of ultraconservative Republicans elected during the Goldwater boom, Mr. Coverdell was not hostile to black aspirations. Indeed, by the time he left the Georgia Senate in 1989, he had gained enough influence to make his mark as a reliable legislative advocate for Atlanta's black mayors. He was known as a policy wonk and a nice guy, traits that would mark his service as director of the Peace Corps under President George Bush. He worked hard in that position to promote a program that is unpopular

with many Republicans because of its identification with President John F. Kennedy.

A similar earnestness would mark Mr. Coverdell's career in the United States Senate, but he did not get there by wearing a halo or emphasizing his credentials as a moderate. He won his seat from Wyche Fowler, a Democrat popular with liberals, by running to the right, especially on the abortion issue.

It is, of course, always tricky to define political moderation among Southern Republicans. By any measure, Mr. Coverdell, a big booster of tax cuts and school vouchers, was plenty conservative. Lately he had grown close to Trent Lott, the Senate's tough-guy majority leader. But his primary alliances were with less hard-edged types like President Bush and his son George W. Bush, the Texas governor. He helped plan the coming Republican Convention. In the event of a Republican victory, according to Senator Max Cleland of Georgia, a Democrat, Mr. Coverdell, "would have played a big role in a Bush administration, in the cabinet or as a special adviser." But in a region that still tends to celebrate pols who are loud and flashy, Mr. Coverdell will be remembered for his general decency, his serious interest in good government and his unlikely leap from the back benches of the Georgia Capitol.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to remember our friend Paul Coverdell. The state of Georgia and the United States have lost a talented and dedicated statesman.

Senator Coverdell's workmanlike approach to government was a breath of fresh air in today's atmosphere of glamour politics. He didn't aspire to be in the spotlight, but he fought tirelessly to spotlight the issues in which he believed. Whether you agreed with his position on those issues or not, you admired his style—his lack of pretense, willingness to complete tedious, but important tasks, and pleasant demeanor during a tough debate.

His office was one floor above mine in the Russell Building and we often rode the subway together over to the Capitol. His easygoing nature always struck me as particularly Southern. We shared a love for that slow, gracious lifestyle of our home states and enjoyed working together when it served the similar needs of our constituents.

Paul had a deep appreciation for the office of U.S. Senator having persevered in his quest for a Senate seat in 1992 despite a highly-competitive race that featured two runoffs. For the next eight years, he never took the privilege of serving the people of Georgia or the nation lightly. We can all learn something from his example.

Service was an evolving theme in Paul Coverdell's life, beginning with an overseas stint in the U.S. Army, later followed by almost two decades in the Georgia state Senate and a post in President Bush's administration as Director of the U.S. Peace Corps. He was well-prepared when he arrived in the Senate chamber and used his experience to advance an aggressive legislative agenda. It was a pleasure to serve in the U.S. Senate with Paul Coverdell. He fought fairly, was gracious in victory and honorable in defeat.

My sympathy goes out to his wife, Nancy, and other family members and to the people of Georgia.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Georgia, Paul Coverdell, who passed away Tuesday in Atlanta.

While Senator Coverdell and I came from different political parties and ideologies, we shared several things in common. We both served our country in the U.S. Army, and after our service we both returned home to run successful businesses.

With our military and business background we decided to turn our attention to serving the public, and Senator Coverdell had an impressive record of public service.

Senator Coverdell served in the Georgia State Senate—rising to the position of minority leader. He then served as Director of the Peace Corps under President Bush, focusing on the critical task of serving the emerging democracies of post-Soviet Eastern Europe. In 1992, he was elected to serve in the United States Senate.

Although we failed to agree on many issues before this body, Senator Coverdell always demonstrated honor and dignity in this Chamber. He argued seriously for the positions he believed in. When he pushed legislation to fight illegal drugs or promote volunteerism, it was obvious that his heart was always in it. And his motivation was sincere and simple—to help the people of Georgia and the Nation.

I send my deepest sympathies to his wife Nancy, his parents, and the entire Coverdell family. I also extend my sympathy to the people of Georgia.

We will all miss Senator Paul Coverdell of Georgia.

Mr. L. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my sympathy to the Coverdell family and my own sorrow at the death of Senator Paul Coverdell. May his family find solace in their memory of Paul's many contributions to a better Georgia, a better United States, and a better world. I followed Paul onto the Foreign Relations Committee and also into his chair of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee. I will do my best to carry on your good work there, Paul.

As many people have said, Paul Coverdell was a gifted communicator. To every organization those skills are valuable and especially here in Congress. Perhaps Paul learned those skills at the prestigious Missouri School of Journalism from which he graduated. But I suspect, despite having known him only a short time, that Paul's easy manner and obvious kindness were inherent traits. He was a natural communicator and we mourn his loss.

Once again, my heartfelt sympathy to Nancy and all of Paul Coverdell's family and friends.

Rest in peace.

Ms. COLLINS. Senator Paul Coverdell was a rare and wonderful man—and a spectacular Senator. Anyone who

had the good fortune to work with him left more hopeful, more committed, more convinced we could all make a difference.

Much is being said about his extraordinary ability to get things done; I would like to talk about how he was able to accomplish so much. Senator Coverdell had many talents, but perhaps the secret to his success was high ability to bring people together. In times of friction, fractiousness, and pressure, he was always the one who remained focused and calm in the eye of the legislative storm.

It was a common for him to hold meetings in his office where conservatives and moderates, strategists and ideologues, listened to each other, shared ideas and figured out not just ways of accomplishing diverse goals, but also what those goals really should be. And his energy and willingness to take on the most difficult task with little public recognition or thanks was legendary.

Senator Coverdell was a man who listened. He listened to Senators and staff and policy experts. He listened to those he agreed with and those he didn't—and merged it all into a comprehensive, concise and workable plan. He respected all individuals with an honesty and sincerity that set the tone for working together.

Most of all, and through it all, Senator Coverdell was kind and gracious in his dealings with everyone. The country, his state, and all of us who have been privileged to know him will miss him terribly. We join in praying for his family as they suffer his loss. We have all lost a very good friend.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Cochran amendment be laid aside.

Mr. REID. Objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, at the appropriate time I intend to propose an amendment. I will be glad to discuss it at this time. Perhaps the Senator from Nevada could clarify for me when it might be appropriate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when Senators VOINOVICH and LEAHY took the floor, the purpose was to allow them to speak about our dearly departed friend. At the time the quorum was called for, we were trying to resolve this issue that was on the floor—the Harkin amendment and the second degree by the manager of the bill. We are almost ready to do that. I was asked by the Senator from Iowa to hold things up until that was resolved. That is why I offered the objection. We should be in a position soon to move forward, but I think the Senator should go ahead and speak.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, is it the desire of the distinguished manager, the Senator from Mississippi, that I go ahead and discuss the amendment or wait until a resolution of the pending Harkin and Cochran amendments?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator proceeding. I think it would expedite the proceedings of the Senate if he would discuss his amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am prepared to enter into a time agreement on this amendment. Whatever is agreeable to the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Wisconsin would be fine.

I will be proposing an amendment, joined by Senators GREGG and SCHUMER, that will stop the Federal Government from wasting taxpayers' dollars on an unnecessary and outdated sugar program that costs consumers as much as \$2 billion in inflated sugar prices.

I ask unanimous consent to have Senator LUGAR added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. The amendment is simple. It withholds funding for the costly Federal sugar program for fiscal year 2001.

Mr. President, my colleagues and I are here today to say enough is enough. The American taxpayers have subsidized the sugar industry, with price support loans and strict import quotas in various forms, since 1934. Each year American taxpayers pay close to \$2 billion in artificially high sugar prices and this year paid an additional \$60 million to bail out sugar producers facing massive loan defaults.

We're not here today to dispute the choice of sugar as a consumer product. Most Americans buy some type of sugar product on a daily basis—a can of soda or a candy bar—and most Americans buy various types of sugar products every time they shop in a supermarket. What we object to, as consumers purchase these products, is that the federal government is unfairly overcharging them.

The sugar program has outlived other agricultural commodity subsidies that have since been phased out through past farm bills. However, the retention of this flawed program has not been dictated by common sense or sound economics, but political influence.

Originally, the sugar program was intended to prop up sugar prices to ensure a profit for sugar farmers. Unfortunately, the higher prices result in the usual "trickle-down" effect. Food companies have to pay the higher price for sugar, which is then passed on in the form of higher prices for sugar products. The average consumer ends up paying the cost of sugar subsidies in the grocery store.

Let me take a few moments to explain why federal assistance for the sugar program should end.

First of all, it is unfair to American consumers. A recent GAO report confirms what we have known all along,