

Elizabeth's work here in the Senate will be remembered. I hope she will come back and see us. She has served the Senate well and in serving the Senate well, she served her country well. I wish the best for Elizabeth Letchworth and her husband Ron as they embark upon a new phase in their lives. I doubt that our paths will ever cross in that new phase because I do not play golf. I do not have much time for it, but I hope this new phase in her life will be enjoyable. I trust she will remember us as fondly as we will certainly remember her.

LIFE'S MIRROR

There are loyal hearts, there are spirits brave,
There are souls that are pure and true,
Then give to the world the best you have,
And the best will come back to you.
Give love, and love to your life will flow,
A strength in your utmost need,
Have faith, and a score of hearts will show
Their faith in your word and deed.
Give truth, and your gift will be paid in kind:
And honor will honor meet:
And a smile that is sweet will surely find
A smile that is just as sweet.
Give pity and sorrow to those who mourn,
You will gather in flowers again
The scattered seeds from your thought out-borne,
Though the sowing seemed but vain.
For life is the mirror of king and slave,
Tis just what we are and do;
Then give to the world the best you have,
And the best will come back to you.—Madeline Bridges.

May God always bless you, Elizabeth.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent all the remarks made on the Senate floor regarding Elizabeth Letchworth appear in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of Senator LOTT.

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

ELECTING DAVID SCHIAPPA SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY

Mr. LOTT. Now, we make a first attempt to name a successor, and that will be a difficult task. So I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The clerk will report the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 155) electing Dave Schiappa of Maryland as secretary for the minority of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 155) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. LOTT. Good luck, Dave; you are going to need it. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask to proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. JEFFORDS. I rise today to voice my frustration about the events that unfolded today regarding the Agricultural Economic Assistance Act. I am disappointed for one reason. This legislation leaves my farmers behind. Of the \$5.5 billion in this bill, only a very small amount goes to Vermont or any of the farms in our area of the country. Only \$1.5 million out of the \$5.5 billion in this package will reach Vermonters. That amounts to only about \$1,000 per farm.

Mr. President, 50 percent of the money goes to 10 States. Our dairy farmers are the hardest working, most efficient. The compact has no Federal cost.

It is without question that the states in the Northeast are left out.

During the proceedings on this bill, there was much talk about the amount of the overall spending package. As we continue to wrestle with budget and spending concerns, I encourage my colleagues to take a look at a program that provides assistance and stability for farmers at no cost to the federal government, the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact.

The Northeast Dairy Compact was established to restore the regulatory authority of the six New England states over the New England dairy marketplace. This authority, however, must be granted by Congress.

By gaining the consent of Congress in 1996, the Northeast Dairy Compact has allowed the compact commission to regulate milk pricing in the region.

Since July of 1997, when the compact commission first set the Class I over-order price at \$16.94, the Northeast Dairy Compact has proven to be a great success—providing farmers with a fair price for their milk, protecting consumers from price spikes, reducing market dependency upon milk from a single source, controlling excess supply, and helping to preserve rural landscapes by strengthening farm communities.

Farmers across our Nation face radically different conditions and factors of production.

Differences in climate, transportation, feed, energy, and land value validate the need for regional pricing. Compacts allow states to address these differences and create a price level that is appropriate for producers, processors, retailers and consumers.

The stability created by the compact pricing mechanism is important for several reasons. It guarantees farmers a fair price for their product and allows

them to plan for the future. Farmers, knowing that they can count on a fair price, can allocate money to purchase and repair machinery, improve farming practices, and above all, stay in business.

Opponents of compacts argue that compacts leads to overproduction. These allegations, however, are unfounded. The Northeast Dairy Compact has not led to overproduction during its first 4 years. In fact, during 2000, the Northeast Dairy Compact states produced 4.7 billion pounds of milk, a 0.6 percent reduction from 1999. Since the Northeast Dairy Compact has been in effect, milk production in the region has risen by just 2.2 percent. Nationally, milk production rose 7.4 percent from 1997 to 2000. Over this same period, California, the largest milk producing state in the country, increased its milk production by 16.9 percent.

Originally created as a three-year pilot program, the Northeast Dairy Compact has been extremely successful in demonstrating the merits of compacts. We no longer need to speculate about the potential effects of compacts. We now have the hard evidence—they are good for farmers, good for consumers, and good for the environment.

As has been stated by several of my colleagues today, we, who represent the Northeast will do everything in our power to secure the survival of our family farms. We look forward to working throughout this year to make sure the dairy compact is, again, allowed to show the benefits to this Nation of effective farming which results in no cost to the Government.

It is certainly hard for me to understand why we get so much criticism. It is the only farm program that doesn't cost the Federal Government money, and it is one of the first on some people's lists of programs to get rid of. It is entirely unbelievable and incomprehensible.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES OVER THE LABOR DAY HOLIDAY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 208, just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate H. Con. Res. 208, which will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday,

August 2, 2001, or Friday, August 3, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 208) was agreed to.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ELECTION REFORM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to talk about election reform. I have talked about it on a number of occasions.

Yesterday, as chairman of the Rules Committee, we had a markup of one of the election reform bills. I say with a high degree of sadness—and I truly mean this—that our good friends on the Republican side of the aisle decided for whatever reasons not to show up; to sort of boycott the markup. I haven't had that experience in my 20 years in the Senate and 6 years in the House. I gather that it may have happened on other committees but never on ones on which I served.

Again, I understand there is disappointment sometimes when our amendments or our bills are not going to be marked up, or are not going to have the necessary votes to be marked up. I had scheduled the markup well in advance with full notice. There are some 16 election reform bills that I know of which have been introduced in the Senate. We didn't mark up all of them. We marked up one bill. It was open for amendment, or substitution, as is the normal process. As I have been both in the majority and minority, over the years that is how it has been done.

In the Rules Committee you cannot vote by proxy. You have to be there for the final vote. You can only vote by proxy on amendments.

We had the convening of the markup at 9:00 in the morning with the full idea that at least an hour-and-a-half would be available for people to come and offer amendments, debate, or discuss the issue of election reform.

I think there were some 200 to 300 people in the hearing room. Many came in wheelchairs and some with seeing-eye dogs and other such equipment in order to assist them. There were people from various ethnic and racial groups in the country who care about election reform, and average Americans who just wanted to see what Congress might do and what the Senate might do in response to the tremendously disappointing events of last fall when we

saw what tremendous shambles our election process is in. The events of last fall peeled back the scandalous conditions of our electoral processes all across the country—not only in one state during one election. Almost without exception, every State is in desperate need of repairing the election process.

As a result of what happened last fall, there has been a heightened degree of interest in doing something about our election process. As a result, as the chairman of the Rules Committee since June, I have had three hearings on the issue. We had one hearing prior to that when I was ranking member of the committee.

The bill I propose is one that has been cosponsored by 50 other Members of this body. It received some rhetorical support from others who are not exactly cosponsors but have told me that they will support the bill when it comes to the floor. The same bill has been introduced by Congressman JOHN CONYERS of Michigan in the House of Representatives. It enjoys, I think, over 100 bipartisan cosponsors in that body. There are also other bills that enjoy some support. The bill offered by the now ranking member of the Rules Committee, Senator McCONNELL, has some 70 cosponsors. Thirty-one of those cosponsors are cosponsors of the bill I introduced.

There is a lot of interest in this subject matter. What was disappointing to me and what saddened me was that on a day in which we were going to hold a markup to figure out how we might improve the electoral system so more people would have the opportunity to vote and have their votes counted, our friends on the other side decided not to come and be heard, let alone vote on this matter.

That troubles me, and I hope it is something not to be repeated. It is not a very good civics lesson, particularly for the dozens of people who showed up yesterday. Some made the extra strenuous effort to be there, considering their physical condition.

Mr. President, between 4 to 6 million people last November 7 showed up to vote and were told their votes would not count despite the fact they had the right to vote. Many of them stood in lines in the colder northern tier States for hours on end.

I heard in our hearings in Atlanta the other day, with Senator CLELAND at my side, witnesses from Georgia who literally sat in rooms for hours without chairs—elderly people simply waiting for a chance to vote and to have their votes counted.

When you have a markup of a bill that is open for all sorts of bills to be considered as amendments or substitutes before the committee, it is disheartening to me that such a message might be sent that we don't care enough to vote on a bill such as this to encourage Americans to vote.

I hope that when we come back in September the offer I made in Novem-

ber of last year as the ranking Democrat on the committee to the then-chairman of the committee to work together on a bipartisan bill will be taken up, and that we can sit down and try to craft something a majority of our colleagues would like to get behind and support; and that the other body would do the same, and put some meaningful resources on the table so that States and localities will have the help to make the changes that are necessary in order for the election system in our country to work.

The election system is in a shambles. This is not some question of fixing a minor problem, I regret to report. All you need to do is read the reports that have come out in the last few days—studies from the Civil Rights Commission report, to the reports by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the California Institute of Technology.

Their studies indicate, as I noted a few moments ago, a stunning 4 to 6 million people showed up last fall who attempted to vote or intended to vote and were not able to have their votes counted. It is a scandalous situation by any estimation.

For example, in my State alone—one of the most affluent States in the Union, the State of Connecticut, on a per capita income basis—we have not bought a new voting piece of equipment in almost a quarter of a century. In fact, the company that made the machines we use in my State no longer exists.

Mr. President, there are some exceptions. I think some States, such as Rhode Island, because of the tremendous efforts of the former secretary of State there—now Congressman JIM LANGEVIN, who is a quadriplegic and has been elected to Congress by the good people of Rhode Island—have become very progressive in regards to the electoral reform.

The people in Rhode Island who are blind, for instance, can vote without having someone go into the voting booth with them. It is the only State I know of in the country where you can do that today. But Congressman LANGEVIN was sensitive to it because of his own physical condition. He told me, with very minor investments—about \$400 per precinct—they were able to make not only the voting place accessible but the ballot accessible.

Last fall, 10 million blind people did not vote in America. I have a sister who is blind, blind from birth. She is legally blind. She totally lacks vision in one eye, and has very slight vision in her other eye. From time to time, she has needed assistance—and I don't want to suggest to you she has not voted on her own from time to time—but she works with many people as part of the National Federation of the Blind. She is a board member and attends their conventions. You need only talk to people in your respective States, and ask people who are totally blind what it was like to go and vote last fall. They will tell you they had to