

putting a compact in place. Now, unless I am wrong, in every dairy state there are many times more consumers than dairy farmers. It would seem that it would be very difficult to get compact legislation passed if consumers were strongly opposed to it. That must not be the case if some 25 state legislatures have passed compact legislation. What's more, 25 governors who have had the power to veto state compact legislation haven't.

Arguably, this is proof that consumers are not opposed to dairy compacts even though it can result in higher milk prices. One reason could be that the extra revenue the compact price generates over and above the federal order price (when, and only when, it is higher than the set compact price) goes directly to the dairy farmers.

Another reason could be that a compact minimum Class I price removes much of the volatility from consumer prices. Just as there was a lot less volatility in milk prices when the support price was \$13.10, there is a lot less volatility when Class I has a minimum price, too.

Still another reason could be that consumers like the idea of milk for their kids being produced "locally." Milk isn't orange juice. It has a different mystique. Even though the milkman delivering "fresh" milk to the consumer's doorstep is a thing of the past, that doesn't mean that consumers don't want fresh milk. The lack of success that UHT milk and powdered milks have had here as compared to Europe, one could argue, is because of consumers' desire for (and the availability of) fresh milk.

One can sort of understand fluid processors opposing dairy compacts. It certainly can result in higher average milk costs for processors. Fortunately for the processor, the consumer is apparently willing to accept the slight increase. And, if one study reported on is correct, processors and retailers are taking advantage of the consumer's willingness as well.

What is difficult to understand is the opposition to compacts by some producers. This opposition seems to be based on the fear that it will negatively affect them. This fear appears to have been generated more by economic theory than fact.

The theory was based on a single premise—money makes milk, more money makes more milk. A dairy compact will give producers in compact states more money. This will result in them producing more milk. This additional milk will go into manufactured products which will hurt producers in states where the majority of milk goes into cheese. At least that's the theory.

The fact is that more money hasn't brought on more milk in the one compact area currently in existence. Only one of the Northeast compact states, Vermont, is in the top 20 milk-producing states. And, the total area has not seen milk production rise faster there than the national average.

Has the Northeast Compact hurt producers in other areas of the country? The answer is no. Will a Southeast Compact bring on a surge of milk production? Again, the answer is no. Just take a look at what happened after Class I differentials were raised \$1.00 per hundred weight in the Southeast in 1986. Did milk production boom? Did it outstrip demand? Did cheese plants spring up from Arkansas to Florida? No, no, no.

Finally, the argument that really makes me knuckle is that the Northeast Compact passage and implementation was political. It wasn't mandated by Congress. It didn't stand on its own two feet. Congress never got to vote on the compact on its own. It was only supposed to be a transition program while federal order reform was taking place. Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman didn't have to implement it.

Don't ask me to respond to those kind of comments. What hearing was ever held or separate vote taken on forward contracting? I don't recall any serious discussion of the portion of a recent budget bill that exempted one county in Nevada from federal order Class I differentials. Of course Glickman had to implement it . . . the pet project of a Vermont Democratic senior senator in an election year. Think about it.

The dairy industry has many more important issues to spend political capital on. Issues that really are having, or will have, an impact on it. Instead of fighting over compacts, it should be working together to improve our potential for growth in world markets by really pushing for fair trade, dealing with environmental and food safety issues and developing programs that will allow all segments of the industry to continue to flourish in the 21st century.

The views expressed by CMN's guest columnists are their own opinions and do not necessarily reflect those of Cheese Market News.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 118—TO DESIGNATE THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER 2001 AS "NATIONAL AMERICAN INDIAN HERITAGE MONTH"

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DOMENICI, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. REID, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. BREAX) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 118

Whereas American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians were the original inhabitants of the land that now constitutes the United States;

Whereas American Indian tribal governments developed the fundamental principles of freedom of speech and separation of powers that form the foundation of the United States Government;

Whereas American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians have traditionally exhibited a respect for the finiteness of natural resources through a reverence for the earth;

Whereas American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians have served with valor in all of America's wars beginning with the Revolutionary War through the conflict in the Persian Gulf, and often the percentage of American Indians who served exceeded significantly the percentage of American Indians in the population of the United States as a whole;

Whereas American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians have made distinct and important contributions to the United States and the rest of the world in many fields, including agriculture, medicine, music, language, and art;

Whereas American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians deserve to be recognized for their individual contributions to the United States as local and national leaders, artists, athletes, and scholars;

Whereas this recognition will encourage self-esteem, pride, and self-awareness in American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians of all ages; and

Whereas November is a time when many Americans commemorate a special time in the history of the United States when American Indians and English settlers celebrated the bounty of their harvest and the promise of new kinships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates November 2001 as "National American Indian Heritage Month" and requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the Federal Government and State and local governments, interested groups and organizations, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, along with thirty of my colleagues today I am pleased to introduce a resolution to recount the many contributions American Indians and Alaska Natives have made to this great Nation and to designate November, 2001, as "National American Indian Heritage Month" as Congress has done for nearly a decade.

American Indians and Alaska Natives have left an indelible imprint on many aspects of our everyday life that most Americans often take for granted. The arts, education, science, the armed forces, medicine, industry, and government are a few of the areas that have been influenced by American Indian and Alaska Native people over the last 500 years. In the medical field, many of the healing remedies that we use today were obtained from practices already in use by Indian people and are still utilized today in conjunction with western medicine.

Many of the basic principles of democracy in our Constitution can be traced to practices and customs already in use by American Indian tribal governments including the doctrines of freedom of speech and separation of powers.

The respect of Native people for the preservation of natural resources, reverence for elders, and adherence to tradition, mirrors our own values which we developed in part, through the contact with American Indians and Alaska Natives. These values and customs are deeply rooted, strongly embraced and thrive with generation after generation of Native people.

From the difficult days of Valley Forge through our peace keeping efforts around the world today, American Indian and Alaska Native people have proudly served and dedicated their lives in the military readiness and defense of our country in wartime and in peace.

It is a fact that on a per capita basis, Native participation rate in the Armed Forces outstrips the rates of all other groups in this Nation. Many American Indian men made the ultimate sacrifice in the defense of this Nation, some even before they were granted citizenship in 1924.

Many of the words in our language have been borrowed from Native languages, including many of the names of

the rivers, cities, and States across our Nation. Indian arts and crafts have also made a distinct impression on our heritage.

It is my hope that by designating the month of November 2001, as “National American Indian Heritage Month,” we will continue to encourage self-esteem, pride, and self-awareness amongst American Indians and Alaska Natives of all ages.

November is a special time in the history of the United States: we celebrate the Thanksgiving holiday by remembering the Indians of the Northeast and English settlers as they enjoyed the bounty of their harvest and the promise of new kinships.

By recognizing the many Native contributions to the arts, governance, and culture of our Nation, we will honor their past and ensure a place in America for Native people for generations to come. I ask for the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this resolution, and urge the Senate to pass this important matter.

SENATE RESOLUTION 119—COMBATING THE GLOBAL AIDS PANDEMIC

Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GRAHAM, and Ms. SNOWE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 119

Whereas the international AIDS pandemic is of grave proportions and is growing;

Whereas the epicenter of the AIDS pandemic is sub-Saharan Africa, and incidences of contraction of HIV, AIDS, and related diseases are growing in the Caribbean basin, Russia, China, Southeast Asia, and India at alarming rates;

Whereas AIDS pandemic-related statistics are especially staggering in sub-Saharan Africa—

(1) the infection rate is 8 times higher than the rest of the world;

(2) in the region, over 17,000,000 people have already lost their lives to AIDS or AIDS-related illnesses, with another 24,000,000 living with AIDS, according to the World Health Organization and Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS;

(3) in many countries in the region, life expectancy will drop by 50 percent over the next decade;

(4) more than 12,000,000 African children have lost 1 or both parents to AIDS or AIDS-related illnesses, and that number will grow to more than 35,000,000 by 2010;

(5) if current trends continue, 50 percent or more of all 15-year olds in the worst affected countries, such as Zambia, South Africa, and Botswana, will die of AIDS or AIDS-related illnesses; and

(6) one-quarter of the sub-Saharan African population could die of AIDS or AIDS-related illnesses by 2020, according to the Central Intelligence Agency;

Whereas confronting the AIDS pandemic is a moral imperative of the United States and other leading nations of the world;

Whereas confronting the AIDS pandemic is in the national interest of the United States, given that 42 percent of United States exports go to the developing world, where the incidence of AIDS is growing most rapidly;

Whereas in today's globalized environment, goods, services, people—and disease—are moving at the fastest pace in world history;

Whereas we cannot insulate our citizenry from the global AIDS pandemic and related opportunistic disease, and we must provide leadership if we are to reverse global infection rates;

Whereas the AIDS pandemic is perhaps the most serious and challenging transnational issue facing the world in the post-Cold War era;

Whereas the AIDS pandemic is decimating local skilled workforces, straining fragile governments, diverting national resources, and undermining states' ability to provide for their national defense or international peacekeeping forces;

Whereas United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, asserts that between \$7,000,000,000 and \$10,000,000,000 is needed annually to address the AIDS pandemic, yet current international assistance efforts total roughly a little more than \$1,000,000,000 per annum;

Whereas the United States has joined the call from the United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, and others in support of a global fund to assist national governments, international organizations, and nongovernmental organizations in the prevention, care, and treatment of AIDS and AIDS-related illnesses; and

Whereas the United Nations Special Session on AIDS, taking place in June 2001, and the Group of Eight Industrialized Nations meeting in July 2001, are key opportunities for more states, governments, international organizations, the private sector, and civil society to donate assistance to the global fund; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the tragedy of the AIDS pandemic in human terms, as well as its devastating impact on national economies, infrastructures, political systems, and all sectors of society;

(2) strongly supports the formation of a Global AIDS and Health Fund;

(3) calls for the United States to remain open to providing greater sums of money to the global fund as other donors join in supporting this endeavor;

(4) calls on other nations, international organizations, foundations, the private sector, and civil society to join in providing assistance to the global fund;

(5) urges all national leaders in every part of the world to speak candidly to their people about how to avoid contracting or transmitting the HIV virus;

(6) calls for the United States to continue to invest heavily in AIDS treatment, prevention, and research;

(7) urges international assistance programs to continue to emphasize science-based best practices and prevention in the context of a comprehensive program of care and treatment;

(8) encourages international health care infrastructures to better prepare themselves for the successful provision of AIDS care and treatment, including the administration of AIDS drugs;

(9) urges the Administration of President George W. Bush to encourage participants at the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on AIDS in June, and the Group of Eight Industrialized Nations meeting in July, to contribute to the global fund; and

(10) calls for United States representatives at the United Nations General Assembly

Special Session on AIDS and Group of Eight Industrialized Nations meeting to emphasize the need to maintain focus on science-based best practices and prevention in the context of a comprehensive program of care and treatment, combating mother-to-child transmission of the HIV virus, defeating opportunistic infections, and improving infrastructure and basic care services where treatment medicines are available, and seek additional resources to support the millions of AIDS orphans worldwide.

SENATE RESOLUTION 120—ORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE

Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. LOTT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 120

Resolved, That the Majority Party of the Senate for the 107th Congress shall have a one seat majority on every committee of the Senate, except that the Select Committee on Ethics shall continue to be composed equally of members from both parties. No Senator shall lose his or her current committee assignments by virtue of this resolution.

SEC. 2 Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXV the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate are hereby authorized to appoint their members of the committees consistent with this resolution.

SEC. 3 Subject to the authority of the Standing Rules of the Senate, any agreements entered into regarding committee funding and space prior to June 5, 2001, between the Chairman and Ranking member of each committee shall remain in effect, unless modified by subsequent agreement between the Chairman and Ranking member.

SEC. 4 The provisions of this resolution shall cease to be effective, except for Sec. 3, if the ratio in the full Senate on the date of adoption of this resolution changes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 121—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 53RD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

Mr. KERRY (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. SARBAKES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 121

Whereas whales have very low reproductive rates, making whale populations extremely vulnerable to pressure from commercial whaling;

Whereas whales migrate throughout the world's oceans and international cooperation is required to successfully conserve and protect whale stocks;

Whereas in 1946 the nations of the world adopted the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, which established the International Whaling Commission to provide for the proper conservation of the whale stocks;

Whereas the Commission adopted a moratorium on commercial whaling in 1982 in order to conserve and promote the recovery of the whale stocks;

Whereas the Commission has designated the Indian Ocean and the ocean waters