

snowpacks for summer irrigation. The ski industry is already fearful of the economic losses from shortened seasons.

As you watch the world's finest athletes glide across your TV screen for the next two weeks, consider, too, how sad it will be to lose much of that part of the year when you can glide across ice or race down a slope.

This doesn't have to happen. We've already locked in some global warming from our profligate use of fossil fuels in the past, but it's not too late to take serious action to slow climate change. Indeed, though Washington is still in the grip of the fossil fuel lobbyists, state and local governments are beginning to lead the way to clean energy now.

Here in Salt Lake City people are committed to cutting emissions of carbon dioxide 7 percent or more, meeting the targets of the Kyoto Protocol, to which all industrialized nations except the United States (under the Bush administration) have voiced commitment.

How will it be done? By reducing energy consumption, preserving large tracts of open space and creating new guidelines for "high performance buildings." Salt Lake City is changing development patterns, expanding its mass transportation system—in short, it's growing smart.

Salt Lake City is not alone. The Seattle City Council last fall pledged that the city would meet or beat the targets of the Kyoto treaty on global warming, and promised that its municipal utility would soon be "carbon-neutral," generating power without contributing to the greenhouse effect. Voters in San Francisco last fall passed, by a wide margin, an initiative that commits the city to buying large amounts of solar power. And the governors of the New England states, prodded by new computer models showing that Boston's climate could resemble present-day Atlanta's by century's end, have also committed to reductions in CO₂ output.

Elsewhere, local governments are experimenting with electric cars and windmills, with gas-guzzler taxes and prime parking spaces for high-mileage cars, with new rapid transit incentives and old utility phase-outs.

All of this would be easier and more effective with committed leadership and backing from the federal government. In the meantime, others have to take the lead.

Municipalities are good competitors. Every four years, mayors around the world vie with each other to land the next Olympics. If we spent the same effort and creativity on redesigning our cities for energy efficiency, we might do more than determine who wins the next Winter Games.

We might actually save winter.

THE BIODIESEL PROMOTION ACT OF 2002

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced S. 1942, the "Biodiesel Promotion Act of 2002," to provide tax incentives for the production of biodiesel from agricultural oils. I was pleased to be joined by Senators DAYTON and JOHNSON as original cosponsors of my bill.

I was also pleased yesterday to be joined by Senator GRASSLEY in offering S. 1942 in amendment form to the Senate Finance Committee Energy Tax Incentives legislation. My amendment was included in the legislation with an overwhelmingly favorable vote of 16 to 5. The amendment differs from S. 1942 only in the length of authorization of the program. Due to budget con-

straints, the amendment authorizes the program for three years as opposed to the bill language of a ten-year authorization.

S. 1942 is a start, but we must make sure that these incentives are not just a flash in the pan. We must ensure that biodiesel becomes a central component of this nation's automobile fuel market.

S. 1942 will provide a partial exemption from the diesel excise tax for diesel blended with biodiesel. Specifically, the bill provides a 1-cent reduction for every percent of biodiesel blended with diesel up to 20 percent.

The bill also provides for reimbursing of the Highway Trust Fund from the USDA Commodity Credit Corporation, (CCC). I believe this procedure will protect the Trust Fund from lost revenues due to the biodiesel incentive while providing a much-needed boost to our nation's biodiesel industry. The cost to the CCC would be offset at least initially by the savings under the marketing loan program.

Biodiesel, which can be made from just about any agricultural oil including oils from soybeans, cottonseed, or rice, is completely renewable, contains no petroleum, and can be easily blended with petroleum diesel. A biodiesel blend typically contains up to 20 percent renewable content. It can be added directly into the gas tank of a compression-ignition, diesel engine vehicle with no major modifications. Biodiesel in its neat or pure form is completely biodegradable and non-toxic, contains no sulfur, and it is the first and only alternative fuel to meet EPA's Tier I and II health effects testing standards.

Biodiesel also has many environmental and operational benefits. One I would like to highlight is the fuel's lubricating characteristics. Even at very low blends, biodiesel contributes operational and maintenance benefits to diesel engines by continuously cleansing the engine as it runs. This is even more significant when using ultra-low sulfur diesel. With the EPA's new rule to reduce the sulfur content of highway diesel fuel by over 95 percent, biodiesel stands ready to help us reach this requirement.

Farmers in my State of Arkansas and across the country began investing in the development of biodiesel because of the economics of the farm industry. Producing biodiesel from farm commodity oils will provide a ready new market for our farm products. Currently, agricultural oils are widely produced for use in our food markets. However, large supplies of vegetable oils in the world market have resulted in depressed commodity prices in the domestic market.

More than a decade ago, soybean growers recognized that the traditional approach of riding out a depressed market by storing surplus soybean oil until better times would no longer work. The industry had to do more. It needed a proactive and aggressive plan to de-

velop new markets and expand existing ones. Biodiesel is one of these new markets identified with true potential for displacing large quantities of soybean oil.

For cotton, the cottonseed is presently about 20 percent of the value of the crop. Biodiesel will open new value-added uses for the cottonseed oil at a time when new uses and markets are extremely important because of these hard economic times. And for our rice farmers, biodiesel will provide additional incremental increases in value to our rice crop and open up a new outlet for the co-product of rice bran oil.

A Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture study has shown that biodiesel yields 3.2 units of fuel product energy for every unit of fossil energy consumed in its life cycle. By contrast, petroleum diesel's life cycle yields only 0.83 units of fuel product energy per unit of fossil energy consumed. Such measures confirm the "renewable" nature of biodiesel.

Even after years of research and market development, biodiesel is not yet cost-competitive with petroleum diesel. In order to be so, market support and tax incentives are needed. I believe the provisions provided in this bill will help in leveling the field for biodiesel blends and help jumpstart this exciting new industry.

The time is right for this investment. It is right for our rural economy, for our environment, and for our national energy security.

SHE FLIES WITH HER OWN WINGS

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, today I commemorate the anniversary of Oregon's statehood, which was secured this day in 1859. Oregon became the 33rd State to join the Union, and did so as a free State. At the time, there was no room for Oregon's new Senators in the Capitol, and construction immediately began on the Chamber we find ourselves in today. One hundred and forty-three years later, there seems to be plenty of room in the Congress for Oregon and the 17 States that followed her.

From "fifty-four forty or fight!" to my State's current motto, "She flies with her own wings," Oregon has always been emblazoned with the spirit of independence. Inaugurated by the arrival of Lewis and Clark at Fort Clatsop in 1805, this spirit of self-determination brought forth the pioneers from across the plains and over the snowy peaks of the Rockies and into Oregon Country. It is the marrow of the pioneers with their axes who forged high into Oregon's forested mountains to fell the timber needed to build an empire, and the farmers in the emerald valleys who pulled their plows through the soil to grow the crops that feed a nation.

The economy that grew from those natural resources stood strong for a century, during which time we learned to build fish hatcheries and to replant

our trees to ensure a sustainable bounty from the land and the water. When the hydropower system was built on the Columbia River, rural Oregon was electrified and the agricultural products of the "inland empire" were launched into the world. It was at the dedication of Bonneville Dam in 1937 that President Roosevelt aptly described the growing challenge of balanced economic growth between urban and rural areas. He said that the healthiest growth of urban areas "actually depends on the simultaneous healthy growth of every smaller community within a radius of hundreds of miles."

The current economic downturn in my state echoes Roosevelt's challenge. Whether it is in the Silicon Forest or the Doug Fir Forest, Oregon is learning that entire industries must no longer be pitted against one another, or rural economies exchanged for urban ones. We need them all, and we have to create an environment for them to flourish. Not long ago, Oregon was the Nation's leader in high-tech and timber. Now, Oregon leads the Nation in unemployment and hunger.

The wings by which Oregon flies are heavily burdened, and much of the weight falls from the Federal Government. Congress has failed to produce a stimulus package to relieve small businesses, families and the unemployed. But federal failures like this are not new to Oregon. The government is still in default on its promise to timber communities affected by the Northwest Forest Plan. So, too, are answers due to farmers in the Klamath Basin whose livelihoods were held captive by shoddy science.

Ironically, Oregon needs both "more" and "less" of the federal government. Oregon needs the federal government to be less burdensome to commerce, less capable of wiping out resource-based communities, and less eager to carry out grand political experiments on Oregon soil. But it also needs the government to be more honest in its dealings, more accountable for its actions, more targeted in its assistance, and more respectful of local approaches to local problems. It is only in such a world that Oregon's farmers and ranchers can truly thrive, her businesses flourish, and her economy survive. On the 143rd anniversary of Oregon's statehood, I know this because I know that no bird flies too high if she flies with her own wings.

AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION, AND RURAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the farm bill the Senate passed yesterday.

I want to commend Senator HARKIN for this bill. Through his leadership, the Senate has passed a Farm Bill that will establish a better economic safety net for many farmers, bolster conserva-

tion efforts, improve nutrition and food security for our poorest citizens, and encourage new opportunities in rural communities. The bill also makes critical investments in agricultural trade and research.

I will talk about the long-term policy changes in a moment, but I want to mention a critical amendment sponsored by Senator BAUCUS. The Baucus amendment provides assistance to farmers and ranchers who have been hard hit by drought and other weather events in the last year. I worked with Senator CANTWELL to include \$100 million in market loss assistance for apple growers in the amendment. I am very pleased the Senate voted 69-31 in favor of the amendment, and I will work to keep it in the final bill.

This Farm Bill passed by the Senate today will restore an effective safety net for many of our Nation's farmers.

For the last several years, I have heard concerns from farmers in Washington State who grow wheat, barley, dry peas, lentils and chickpeas. They believe, as I do, that the 1996 Farm Bill failed to meet the needs of producers and rural communities. The strongest proponents of the 1996 Farm Bill argued that if we gave producers more flexibility, created the best agricultural research system in the world, and opened foreign markets, our farmers would thrive in the global marketplace.

I strongly supported more flexibility in our commodity programs. And I have strongly supported efforts to improve our research infrastructure and expand and open foreign markets.

But our actions were not enough. Congress could not wave a magic wand and create a rational world market for agricultural products. The commodity title of the 1996 Farm Bill was written for a world that simply did not, and does not, exist.

This year, in this Farm Bill, Congress has the opportunity to write a commodity title that works. And Senator HARKIN and the Senate Agriculture Committee did just that. Wheat and barley producers in Washington State will benefit from a strong safety net that includes a good balance between higher loan rates, fixed payments, and countercyclical payments when market prices fall below target prices.

In addition, the bill includes a new marketing assistance loan program for dry peas, lentils, and chickpeas. I applaud this provision in the bill. It will help restore market-based decisions and make it economical for producers across the northern-tier States to grow these important rotational crops. I have been pleased to work with my dry pea, lentil, and chickpea growers in Washington State on this important issue. I believe it is critical, and I urge, the conferees to retain this provision in the final bill.

The Senate Farm Bill makes critical investments in conservation. The conservation title creates new opportuni-

ties to conserve resources on private lands while helping farmers and ranchers with their bottom lines.

The conservation title of this bill gradually increases funding for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program from its existing authorization of \$200 million a year to \$1.5 billion each year. EQIP is an effective and flexible tool. It provides technical, financial, and educational assistance to producers to build animal waste management facilities, improve irrigation efficiency, or enhance wildlife habitat. The EQIP funding included in this bill will help us improve water quality and salmon habitat in the Pacific Northwest.

The bill also includes commonsense increases for the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program. While I recognize there are some concerns in farm country with expanding these programs, I believe the CRP and WRP provisions in this bill are reasonable.

The bill includes a new water conservation program within CRP. I believe this program will lead to new opportunities to protect fish and wildlife, while respecting the rights of our farmers and ranchers. As the bill goes to conference, I look forward to working with interested organizations on this issue.

Finally, the conservation title expands our investments in the Farmland Protection Program, the Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program, the Resource Conservation and Development Program, establishes a new Conservation Security Program, and improves forestry initiatives.

The conservation changes made in this bill are particularly important to States like Washington. The farmers in my State produce approximately 230 commodities. However, only a fraction of these commodities have a direct income or price support relationship with the Federal Government.

Without new investments in the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, the Conservation Reserve Program, and the Conservation Security Program, many farmers and ranchers would not receive the financial help they need to make the conservation investments the public is demanding. This bill creates a win-win situation for the environment and for farmers and ranchers.

I believe Congress also has a responsibility to create a win-win situation for our farmers and ranchers with respect to trade. One way we can do this is to invest in trade promotion programs that will help our farmers build marketshare in foreign countries.

In 1999, and again in 2001, I introduced the Agricultural Market Access and Development Act. My legislation would increase funding in the Market Access Program to \$200 million and enhance funding for the Foreign Market Development Program. I was joined on that legislation by a bipartisan coalition of members.