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I yield the floor.

I thank the President for his patience and perseverance.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, for whom I was seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent that Senator Kohn be allowed to speak for 5 minutes after Senator Kerry.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about some mixed feelings because I have heard several of my colleagues and, specifically, want to talk about the remarks of Senator Byrd and Senator Rockefeller for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect. I know when they speak about miners they speak from their hearts, and they speak from their souls.

I haven't looked at the specific wording of the amendment. But I want to raise some questions. If this amendment comes to a vote, I will look at the amendment and then decide.

But I think I heard some of my colleagues trivialize this question. Just looking at it from another very important point of view, I can say that I have spent a considerable amount of time in eastern Kentucky. That is where my wife's family is from. I spent some time years ago with an organization called "Save Our Cumberland Mountains" in east Tennessee.

When I come to the floor and talk about this as saving some exotic species, they are not talking about what I have seen with strip mining. What I have seen with strip mining in east Tennessee and east Kentucky is a situation where, first of all, all the coal mining companies came to the region and took an awful lot of the wealth, and then they left an awful lot of the people poor.

But one of the things people had was their streams, rivers, and their creeks. They had a lot of outdoors, and the land that they loved.

I want to say to my colleagues that when you take the tops off these mountains with the strip mining as opposed to deep mining, and you let the leftover rock and earth get dumped into the adjacent valleys and bury or pollute streams, it raises a big question.

Again, I say, in deference to my colleagues, that I know what they are saying. We will have a chance to analyze this and then decide how to vote.

But I do not believe this is a trivial question at all. I have seen communities ravaged by this strip mining. I have seen courageous people who have lived in the mountains their whole lives speak up. So I want to speak up by raising this question on the floor of the Senate.

I also want to say to my colleagues, Senator Byrd—and others—who, as I said, from his heart cares about the miners, that when I hear some of my colleagues talk about miners, I hope there will be equal concern for the miners in east Kentucky when they don't have the unions. Right now, they can't see 6 inches in front of them because of the coal dust level. I hope we will have the concern for the health and safety of the miners. When I hear speakers on the floor, I hope we will have this concern on raising wages; I hope we will have concern for civilized working conditions; and I hope we will have a concern for the right of miners and other people to be able to organize and bargain collectively.

When I hear about the President's trip to Hazard, KY, where is the concern for poverty? I hope we will also see the same amount of concern for health care, to education, to affordable child care, to economic development, and all of the rest.

It is a little bit too much to hear some colleagues frame this debate in these terms given this broader context.

It is a difficult question. I said to Senator Byrd earlier I have not looked at the specific amendment yet. I will do that. But I don't want any Senator to come to the floor and act as if there isn't some question—again, the Senator can clear this up for me—as to whether or not, given section 404 of the Clean Water Act, we are or are not creating a loophole. That is a terribly important question. The courts must resolve before a final vote on the issue.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. The distinguished Senator has mentioned my name. The word "waste" has been used. The newspapers have repeatedly used the word "waste," saying this amendment that I am sponsoring is to let coal companies continue to dump their waste into the streams.

As to the use of the term "waste," the Clean Water Act, section 404, governs the disposal of "dredged and fill" materials into waters of the United States. Excess material from coal mines has always been regulated in this fashion as "dredged and fill" material under section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Judge Hayden in West Virginia, however, determined that excess material from coal mines is "waste" and, as such, could not be disposed of in valley fills.

For 20 years, the stream buffer zone regulation has not been interpreted as preventing the disposal of excess material from coal mines into streams. Rather, Congress relied on the Clean Water Act to govern this activity.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent Mr. Shelby be added as a cosponsor to the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

GRATITUDE TO JEANETTE BOONE SMITH

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I want to share with all of my colleagues, particularly with the citizens of Massachusetts, the deepest sense of appreciation I have for the longest serving member of my staff, someone I have been privileged to have work with me since I entered elective office in 1982.

Jeanette Boone Smith is leaving my staff after serving all of that time, since 1982, both in the Lieutenant Governor's Office in Massachusetts and in the Senate.

Through the years, Jeanette has symbolized the values and the priorities I have tried to represent in the Senate. I am, indeed, extraordinarily fortunate to have had her friendship and her counsel throughout my public life.

Jeanette embodies the fight for equality and for social justice that defines the entire second half of this century. Her life is filled with stories of personal struggle, public struggle, and of triumph, of sacrifice, and of victory.

She was born in Englewood, NJ, and she remained in that state throughout her young adulthood. For Jeanette, public service and political action came very early. She became president of her Fourth Ward Democratic Club, where she worked for local and national Democratic candidates. Her commitment to ensuring equality of opportunity and access to resources led her to fight tirelessly for the integration of the Englewood schools and for public housing. The success of the campaign in which she was involved opened up education and affordable housing to the whole community, and it serves as just one example of the countless times Jeanette sacrificed her time and her energy to help provide a better life to people who had traditionally been denied the full measure of the American dream.

Jeanette interviewed with me in January 1983 when I was putting my staff together for the Lieutenant Governor's Office. From that time on, through those early years, she served as my executive assistant, performing the endless and thankless tasks that all here understand are so vital to our ability to be able to manage our schedules and our state operations. As the years passed, she took on greater responsibilities as the director of constituent services where her warm, generous,
open personality, and remarkable compassion for people in need allowed my office to advocate successfully to open and to successfully complete the work on more than 100,000 individual cases throughout Massachusetts.

As my colleagues well know, constituent services are critical in serving the people of our States, and they are sometimes the most thankless and the most difficult tasks we confront. Jeanette assembled and managed a team that continues to help people in search of housing, education opportunities, and nutritional assistance. She has also overseen many complex housing partnerships with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and State agencies, helping to bring quality, affordable housing to thousands of people throughout the State.

Jeanette is leaving to enjoy more time with her husband Perry, her son Tracey, and his sons, and the South End where she loves so dearly. Within the South End, she formed the Four Corners Neighborhood Association, which led to the construction of the Langham Court Apartments. This complex is a wonderful example of Jeanette’s abilities and her commitment to improving her community. It has been recognized with awards for its architecture and innovative program of mixed-income housing. She is also deeply involved in the Roxbury Presbyterian Church where she serves as an elder, a trustee, a member of the choir, and a member of the renovation committee.

These words today—and I know my colleagues will share this sense for any long-term staff person who departs—cannot fully recognize Jeanette’s contributions to the people of Massachusetts or the full extent of my personal appreciation for her time with me. Although the next staff person tomorrow, the principles she has represented in her work will never leave; rather, they will do as Jeanette has done, which is to serve as a moral compass pointed toward a better world where a bright future is open and available to everyone in this country.

I am deeply grateful for her time with me, and I extend to her and Perry my very best wishes as they begin a wonderful new chapter in their lives.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Wisconsin.

THE NORTHEAST DAIRY COMPACT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, in the omnibus package that will be brought to the floor sometime this evening, there are two pieces of legislation on dairy that I want to spend a couple of minutes on. I think they are unfair and very much not in the spirit of the American economic system.

One is the Northeast Dairy Compact. The Northeast Dairy Compact is an arrangement in which the New England States literally fix the price of milk in those seven States and no one can tamper with that price. It is the only price at which milk can be distributed from the farmer to the processor. In effect, it takes all the competition out of that product in that State, in all the New England States. We have never done that before in this country. It is contrary to everything that is represented by the economic system in the United States.

The reason why we have such a great country in part is because our economic system provides that anybody with a good idea to develop a product or a service has an unfettered opportunity to test that product. That is what has made America great: competition. That is why we have full employment, the best economy in the world, and an economy that can compete anywhere in the world and succeed. That is because in this country we say: In order to get your share of market, you have to be able to provide the best product at the best price and market it in the best way. There are no restrictions in the 50 States to do that. That has been true since the United States of America was originated.

The northeast dairy cartel is in contrast to that. There is nothing about the cartel that is American in terms of how we do business. There is something about that that I have heard from some of the leaders in the northeast: Can’t we just have our cartel? After all, it represents only a fraction of the milk market in the country. Why can’t we just have our cartel? But, obviously, if they can have their cartel, then everybody can have a cartel. What stops us from having a Southeast cartel or a Southwest cartel? What stops us from having a Midwest corn cartel or a Plains States wheat cartel? If a cartel makes sense in any form, then it makes sense not only in the New England States and not only for milk; it makes sense anywhere, conceivably, and for any product.

Now I ask the question: Does the Senate want to go on record as favoring this type of economic policy? I think we all know the answer is not yes. Nobody has defended this to me, even though it is coming tonight. Nobody has defended it to me. I talked with the leaders in the Senate. I asked them to explain why we should have this kind of legislation in the omnibus bill. I tell you, not a leader, not a single Senator, has explained to me and defended in any way that makes sense why it is a price-fixing cartel. Yet here it comes.

I am told it is coming because promises have been made and arrangements have already occurred, and so on and so forth. On something as important as this, which is price-fixing cartels, it seems to me that saying “promises have been made,” and “it has been passed in the House,” or “it is too late,” or whatever, does not make any sense. May I also say I have been in dialogue with the leaders in the Senate for months on this, so this is not a surprise. So here we are with this piece of legislation.

Then we also have this milk pricing policy which, as you all know, arbitrates milk prices from the farmers. In Wisconsin in this country, the more you get for your milk if you are a dairy farmer. We all know, again, this was set up 50 or 60 years ago when there was no refrigeration to transport milk all over the country. We wanted to encourage the development of the dairy industry. So we provided incentives for dairy farmers at points distant from Wisconsin to develop the dairy industry and to circumvent the need for refrigerated transportation. That is no longer true.

So what we are trying to do is not to eliminate that price differential because that would be too big a step to take at once. We are trying to reduce the price differential—not eliminate it, reduce it. USDA has come up with a program and 97 percent of the farmers in this country have voted for the change in the present milk pricing program. I am not suggesting we need to eliminate the price differential at this time. But let’s accept the reduction of the price differential in the context of the fact that the present system is archaic and makes no sense.

Again, coming over from the House is legislation that continues to mandate that the old Depression-era pricing system be continued. May I also say the present system, both with respect to the Northeast Dairy Compact and the pricing system, was mandated to conclude on October 1, and we would put in a new system. But before October 1, there was a Federal judge in Vermont Wisconsin in this country, the more you get for your milk if you are a dairy farmer. We all know, again, this was set up 50 or 60 years ago when there was no refrigeration to transport milk all over the country. We wanted to encourage the development of the dairy industry. So we provided incentives for dairy farmers at points distant from Wisconsin to develop the dairy industry and to circumvent the need for refrigerated transportation. That is no longer true.

So what we are trying to do is not to eliminate that price differential because that would be too big a step to take at once. We are trying to reduce the price differential—not eliminate it, reduce it. USDA has come up with a program and 97 percent of the farmers in this country have voted for the change in the present milk pricing program. I am not suggesting we need to eliminate the price differential at this time. But let’s accept the reduction of the price differential in the context of the fact that the present system is archaic and makes no sense.

Again, coming over from the House is legislation that continues to mandate that the old Depression-era pricing system be continued. May I also say the present system, both with respect to the Northeast Dairy Compact and the pricing system, was mandated to conclude on October 1, and we would put in a new system. But before October 1, there was a Federal judge in Vermont who challenged that kind of outcome. So right now it is tied up in the courts and nothing is going to happen. The present system will stay until at least the courts rule on the validity of a new system.

So I suggested, and many have suggested, there be no dairy language in the omnibus; just don’t say anything and let’s let this thing roll because it is tied up in the courts now anyhow, and we could put it in for next year.

No, promises have been made. People have been won over in one way or another. Other agendas are on the table. So today it comes in an omnibus bill,