

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.

The Senate Farm Bill includes substantial new investments in the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Program, and I was pleased to be the leading advocate in the Senate to enhance these programs.

Congress also has a responsibility to allow all commodity groups to participate in our foreign food aid programs. I worked to include a small provision in the Farm Bill that requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture to issue a report on the use of perishable commodities, like potatoes and apples, in foreign food aid programs. Specifically, my amendment requires USDA to report to the Congress on transportation and storage infrastructure problems and funding problems that have prevented greater participation in the programs by specialty crops.

Just recently, 110,000 boxes of apples arrived in Vladivostok, Russia. This is the first time USDA has funded a shipment of perishable commodities through our foreign food aid programs. I believe our fruit and vegetable producers deserve an opportunity to participate in these initiatives, and I believe this report will be an important first step in improving access to these programs.

The Farm Bill includes additional provisions that I believe will help our farmers and ranchers.

The first would require country-of-origin labeling for fruits and vegetables, meat, and farm-raised fish and shellfish. We require our farmers and ranchers to meet environmental and food safety standards that are far above many of our competitors. Country-of-origin labeling will give consumers additional information with which to make a decision on the food they buy.

The second provision would allow the Federal Government to guarantee private loans to Cuba for the purchase of U.S. agricultural products. For too long, the United States has used food as a weapon against the Cuban people. The only person that has benefitted from this policy is Fidel Castro. I strongly support the Committee's bill with respect to Cuba, and I was pleased to join with my colleagues in defeating an amendment to eliminate these new financing tools.

Trade is critical to the long-term future of our agricultural producers. One other long-term investment we need to make is in the area of agricultural research.

In my home State, we are fortunate to have an excellent working relationship between our State universities and the USDA Agricultural Research Service. Through these partnerships, our universities and USDA have been able to leverage limited resources to create new varieties of crops, enhance food safety and improve conservation. This research benefits farmers, consumers, and the environment.

I am pleased that this Farm Bill strengthens our research infrastruc-

ture and increases funding for priority research initiatives. One program that is of particular significance to researchers in Washington State is the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems, and I am pleased the Senate bill includes additional funding for it.

The Farm Bill goes far beyond agriculture and conservation. It is a critical vehicle for helping communities and the poor.

Senator HARKIN has always been a leader in rural development, and this Farm Bill shows how seriously he takes this issue.

Included in the managers' amendment is a provision I authored on rural telecommunications planning. It would simply modify the broadband telecommunications grant program in the bill to add a small planning component. I will work to include this and other rural telecommunications provisions in the final bill.

I would like to complete my remarks by commending Senators HARKIN and LUGAR for their efforts in writing a strong nutrition title in this Farm Bill. Both the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee have an outstanding record on these issues. During debate on the Farm Bill, I was pleased to support amendments that further strengthened the food stamp program changes included in the bill.

The underlying bill made significant improvements to the food stamp program. It provides three more months of transition food stamps for families moving off welfare. It simplifies the program for State administrators and participating families. It helps benefits keep up with inflation and addresses the needs of the poorest families. And it restores eligibility for low-income working legal immigrants and their families.

The Senate also passed amendments by Senators DURBIN, DORGAN, and MCCONNELL that expanded the nutrition title. The Durbin amendment helped restore food stamp benefits to legal immigrants who have lived in the United States for five years. The Dorgan amendment expanded access to food stamps for families with children and modified the excess shelter expense deduction. The McConnell amendment expanded access to food stamps for low-income disabled families.

I was pleased to support final passage of this legislation. I believe it is the right bill at the right time for rural America, and I look forward to working with my colleagues as the bill goes to conference.

TRIBAL FORESTRY IN THE FARM BILL

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on two tribal forestry amendments that were included in the Farm Bill that passed the Senate yesterday. I was pleased to work on these amendments with Senators INOUE, DASCHLE, CANTWELL, BAUCUS, and WELLSTONE.

The purpose of these amendments is to improve coordination between the

United States Forest Service and Native Americans in managing and protecting our natural resources.

The Forest Service owns millions of acres of forests and grasslands that share borders with land owned by tribes and by individual Native Americans. It is in the national interest for the Forest Service and tribes to coordinate their efforts to protect and manage these resources. It is also the Federal Government's fiduciary responsibility to assist tribes in managing trust lands and to ensure that tribal treaty rights on Forest Service lands are upheld. While over the years the Forest Service has adopted many policies regarding relationships with tribal governments, these policies have not been implemented consistently.

In 1999, the Chief of the Forest Service created a National Tribal Relations Task Force to make recommendations to strengthen policies and improve coordination. The Task Force, which included representatives from the Forest Service, the Intertribal Timber Council and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, BIA, found that, "Specific legal authorities, authorizing legislation, regulations, manuals, and handbooks, must be modified to expand the foundation necessary to build long-term working relationships with Indian Tribes."

These amendments build upon the recommendations made by the Task Force. The first amendment expands the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act to include a section creating four programs for tribal governments. Currently, tribes are eligible to participate in the Forestry Incentives and Forest Stewardship programs created by the Act, but there are significant barriers to tribal involvement in these programs, which were designed primarily for state governments.

This amendment would allow the Secretary to facilitate tribal consultation and coordination on issues related to tribal rights and interests on Forest Service land, management of shared resources, and tribal traditional and cultural expertise. It would also authorize the Secretary to provide assistance with: conservation awareness programs on tribal forest land; technical assistance for resources planning, management and conservation; and tribal acquisition of conservation interests from willing sellers.

The second amendment to the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act would create an Office of Tribal Relations within the Forest Service. The purpose of this Office is to provide advice to the Secretary on Forest Service policies and programs affecting Native Americans, to ensure coordination between the Forest Service and tribes and to administer tribal programs set up by the Forest Service. The amendment also requires the Office to coordinate with other agencies within the Agriculture Department, as well as with the BIA and the Environmental Protection Agency. Finally, the amendment requires the Office to create an annual

report on the status of these efforts to increase partnerships between the Forest Service and Native Americans.

There is widespread support for these amendments authorizing greater collaboration between the Forest Service and Native American tribes. The Department of the Interior is in favor of these amendments, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture has signed off on them as well. I have heard from several Washington state tribes asking me to be an advocate for these additions to the Forestry Title of the Farm bill. I am especially grateful for the Makah Tribe and the Intertribal Timber Council, which brought these ideas to me last year. Also, I greatly appreciate the assistance I have received from Senators DASCHLE, INOUE, CANTWELL, and BAUCUS in working on these amendments. I also appreciate help I received from Senators HARKIN and LUGAR so these amendments could be included in a manager's package of amendments to the Farm Bill. On behalf of the numerous tribes with forest and grasslands bordering Forest Service lands.

ENDORSEMENT OF AMENDMENT TO BAN PACKER OWNERSHIP OF LIVESTOCK

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the *Huron, SD Daily Plainsman* entitled "We Need Action, Not Another Study." This editorial provides a strong endorsement of the bipartisan amendment that Senator GRASSLEY and I had included in the Senate version of the farm bill to ban the ownership of livestock by packers.

This newspaper recognizes the importance of my amendment and understands the real motivation behind the lobbying efforts to replace my language with a study on vertical integration—to kill it.

This editorial speaks clearly to the importance of having a farm bill that goes after concentration and replaces government checks with dollars from a true, competitive marketplace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the *Huron Daily Plainsman* on February 10, 2002, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Huron Daily Plainsman*, Feb. 10, 2002]

WE NEED ACTION, NOT ANOTHER STUDY

An amendment to the Senate farm bill being offered by Sen. Tim Johnson, D-S.D., that would ban packer ownership of livestock 14 days prior to slaughter is running into rough resistance from the packing industry.

The latest is an amendment that would replace Johnson's proposal with a study.

Passing a farm bill that generously hands out taxpayers' dollars to producers who are caught in the mire of low services caused by corporate concentration in the agricultural industry isn't the idea. More important is a farm bill that attacks concentration and replaces government checks with dollars from the marketplace that are generated from true market competition.

The Johnson-Grassley amendment is a step in that direction. If Congress decides to study it some more, all that will do is to allow the big boys to get even bigger and continue the economic depression that has staggered rural South Dakota the last five years.

Smithfield Foods, which owns the John Morrell plant in Sioux Falls, recently placed ads in South Dakota newspapers criticizing Johnson's amendment. The ad said that if the amendment becomes law, Smithfield Foods would not rebuild the Sioux Falls plant, or build a new plant in South Dakota or make any further investment in South Dakota or any other state where public officials are hostile to their company.

The ad has been called economic blackmail and politically motivated. It appeared only in South Dakota newspapers, even though Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, is a co-sponsor of the amendment and Smithfield owns a plant in Iowa. Johnson, who has championed a number of bills, such as the ban of packer ownership of livestock and a meat-labeling law, that brought the ire of the meat-packing industry down on him, is facing a tough re-election bid against Rep. John Thune.

But the motivation of the Smithfield ad is clear and simple—further control and dominance of the livestock industry.

It must be remembered that Smithfield is the company that bought out the Dakota Pork plant and then promptly closed it down, abruptly putting about 800 people out of work. At the time, Dakota Pork was John Morrell's main competition for South Dakota hogs.

In the Smithfield ad, not only did the company criticize Johnson's amendment, but it also said Amendment E was a restrictive law that was responsible for diminishing the supply of South Dakota hogs to its Sioux Falls plant.

But what has caused the decline of the hog industry in South Dakota was not the law that banned corporate hog farms in the state, but the vertical integration business practices of companies such as Smithfield Foods that seek to dominate the industry from the gate to the plate.

The "it's either our way or no way" business philosophy of giant agricultural corporations seeks to industrialize the agricultural industry at the expense of independent farmers and ranchers and rural communities.

Smithfield, which is already the world's largest producer and processor of hogs, also reflects a corporate philosophy that is troubling to independent producers and rural communities.

Grassley recently spoke of a conversation he had with the head of Smithfield, Joe Lutters, when Lutters said that the average farmer isn't sophisticated.

"I wish we could remember the exact words because it was very denigrating to the family farmer, not being smart enough to run his operation," Grassley said.

The objectives of this amendment are to increase competitive bidding, choice, market access, and bargaining power to farmers and ranchers in livestock markets.

Now, does that sound like that would destroy the pork and beef industry? Or does it sound like it would threaten large corporations in their bid to decrease independent producers' ability to have competitive bidding, choice, market access, and bargaining in livestock markets?

PLANNING GRANTS FOR RURAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased that Chairman HARKIN and Senator LUGAR accepted my amendment on rural telecommunications to the Farm Bill that passed the Senate yesterday.

My amendment simply adds a small planning component to the scope of acceptable activities for grants in the bill to help rural communities get connected to broadband telecommunications services.

Specifically, my amendment would provide access to broadband planning and feasibility grants to rural communities, with a maximum of \$250,000 for statewide grants and \$100,000 for regional grants. The total resources would be no more than \$3 million per year for this purpose. State governments, regional consortia of local governments, tribal governments, cooperatives, and State and regional non-profit entities would be eligible to receive the grants.

As small and rural communities across the country try to get connected to advanced telecommunications services, they need help in the planning stage. And this amendment will give them the help they need.

Three years ago, I formed several working groups in my state to identify the primary needs of our rural communities and to find ways that our government can help meet those needs. We learned that many rural communities don't have access to advanced telecom services, like high speed Internet access. That lack of access is hampering their economic development and quality of life.

So I developed another working group to look for ways to help communities get connected to advanced telecommunications services. The members of my Rural Telecommunications Working Group held forums around the state that attracted hundreds of people. We tapped the ideas of experts, service providers and people from across the State who are working to get their communities connected.

They found that while urban and suburban areas have strong competition between telecommunications providers, many small and rural communities are far removed from the services they need.

We must ensure that all communities have access to advanced telecommunications like high speed Internet access. Just as yesterday's infrastructure was built of roads and bridges, today our infrastructure includes advanced telecom services.

Advanced telecommunications can enrich our lives through activities like distance-learning, and they can even save lives through efforts like telemedicine. The key is access. Access to these services is already turning some small companies in rural communities into international marketers of goods and services.

Unfortunately, many small and rural communities are having trouble getting the access they need. Before areas can take advantage of some of the help and incentives that are out there, they need to work together and go through a community planning process.

Community plans identify the needs and level of demand, create a vision for

the future, and show what all the players must do to meet the telecom needs of their community for today and tomorrow.

These plans take resources to develop. This amendment would provide those funds.

Providers say they're more likely to invest in an area if it has a plan that makes a business case for the costly infrastructure investment. Communities want to provide them with that plan, but they need help developing it.

Unfortunately, many communities get stuck on that first step. They don't have the resources to do the studies and planning required to attract service.

So the members of my Working Group came up with a solution: have the Federal Government provide competitive grants that local communities can use to develop their plans.

I took that idea and put it into a bill that I introduced in June 2001, S. 1056, the Community Telecommunications Planning Act of 2001. The basic structure of that amendment was incorporated into the Farm Bill.

When you think about it, it just makes sense. Right now the Federal Government already provides money to help communities plan other infrastructure improvements, everything from roads and bridges to wastewater facilities.

The amendment would provide rural and underserved communities with grant money for creating community plans, technical assessments and other analytical work that needs to be done.

With these grants, communities will be able to turn their desire for access into real access that can improve their communities and strengthen their economies. This amendment can open the door for thousands of small and rural areas across our state to tap the potential of the information economy.

I will work to ensure this provision is included in the final bill along with the other critical telecommunications initiatives that passed the Senate yesterday.

BUTTER/POWDER TILT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, sets a price for the purchase of non-fat dry milk and the economic impact of USDA's decision is very important to California dairy farmers. On May 31, 2001, USDA made a decision to drop the price at which it will purchase non-fat dry milk as part of the dairy price support program.

USDA did not provide the dairy industry with an opportunity to provide information or comment on the Department's recommended decision. There was no advance notice or public hearings.

USDA conducted an economic analysis and all of the options may have been analyzed. But this information has not been released to the public, even though it was requested under the Freedom of Information Act.

In the first 6 months after USDA's decision to lower the price for non-fat

dry milk took effect, California's dairy farm families lost tens of millions of dollars. In meetings with USDA, California farmers learned that another drop in the price is under consideration, which would result in millions more lost to dairy farmers. California produces 40 percent of the nation's supply of non-fat dry milk and so California could be hit hard yet again.

Transparency is a critical part of a fair and equitable decision-making process and it does not currently exist in the USDA process for setting the non-fat dry milk price. The Secretary is currently required to make a decision that includes factors such as cost reduction to USDA. The Secretary also must consider other factors that the Secretary considers appropriate. I believe additional steps should be taken during the conference to assure transparency in the Secretary's decision-making process.

Factors that may be important to a decision to change the prices for butter and non-fat dry milk include: whether the decision will result in an intended change in milk production, whether the change will actually reduce government purchases and related costs, whether it will change producer milk prices, and whether other market factors, such as imports, have an effect.

Milk Protein Concentrate, MPC, is of particular concern. A recent GAO study documented significant increases in MPC imports that may be displacing domestic milk protein products. Since USDA is not releasing its economic analysis, we cannot know whether this important issue is being properly considered.

I would like to ask the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Senator HARKIN, if he would be willing to work with me on additional language to address this issue during the conference?

Mr. HARKIN. I would be pleased to work to address the concerns of the Senator from California regarding USDA procedures for the dairy support program.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S CHINA VISIT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, later this month President Bush will be visiting the People's Republic of China. Clearly this is going to be an important visit. The issues the President will discuss with China's leaders are among the most important of our national agenda, including the following:

The war on terrorism, where we need China's continued support and cooperation.

The global economy and our bilateral economic relations with the PRC, a new member of the WTO.

Security relations in Asia where both of our countries have important interests and long-standing and close ties to other regional powers.

Among all these issues, though, one that will undoubtedly be raised by the PRC is Taiwan. It is a pretty safe bet that the PRC's leaders will try to use

the President's visits to win some concessions on issues relating to Taiwan. They will probe for any signs that the United States is willing to compromise some of our interests in a strong U.S.-ROC relationship in exchange for real or promised strengthening of our ties with Beijing.

I know the President will be ready for this gambit, and will be fully prepared and determined to turn back any such efforts by Beijing. The President has already made it clear how important our ties with Taiwan are to the United States, and he has made it equally clear that he will not compromise our interest in regard to Taiwan in any way.

I am confident he also knows that as he pursues this strong, principled and sensible stand, he will have the full backing of the U.S. Senate. He will not stand for any Beijing attempts to undermine U.S.-ROC relations, and he knows the Senate of the United States won't, either.

The fact is, the Republic of China is one of our best friends in the region. It is also one of the region's strongest economies and most vibrant democracies. We have extensive ties to Taiwan, which are both articulated and protected in the Taiwan Relations Act. We are not going to do anything to compromise those ties.

I know I speak for all Senators when I express the wish that the President's visit to the PRC will be productive and advance our interests in Asia and the world, and when I express the confidence that U.S.-ROC relations will continue to be strong and to prosper, even as our relations with Beijing evolve.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in keeping with my policy on public disclosure of holds, today I placed a hold on further action on the Clean Diamond Trade Act, legislation reported out by House of Representatives.

Although this bill is very important to the continent of Africa's efforts to rid itself of rebels that use the sale of rough diamonds to overthrow legitimate governments, the measures in this legislation fall within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.

The proposed legislation calls for prohibiting diamond imports and should be discussed thoroughly before any rash decisions are made. With this in mind it is necessary for this bill to be referred to the Finance Committee to be heard and debated by our members before we send this legislation back to the floor.

NATIONAL DUCHENNE MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY AWARENESS WEEK

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as we commemorate National Duchenne Awareness Week, I express my gratitude to my colleagues and to the Bush administration for their support late last year in passing H.R. 717, the Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance Research and Education Act.