

about asking. I have spoken to Secretary Rumsfeld, as recently as 35 minutes ago, about this case.

Because it is Iraq, it puts someone such as Secretary Rumsfeld in a difficult situation because he naturally is concerned, as we all are, about wanting to take out Saddam Hussein who, if he has not built, he certainly will be trying to build, weapons of mass destruction. We are going to have to protect the position of the United States and the free world by not letting him do that. So it makes it difficult for us at this particular time, trying to get information. It is so important in this gripping human drama.

In the late 1990s, the Department of Defense actually changed the status of Commander Speicher from "killed in action" to "missing in action." At some point, with further evidence, it may well be that they will consider changing the status, if the evidence is there, from "missing in action" to "prisoner of war." That, of course, would be welcome news because that would mean that he is alive. Then we would have to address the question of how to get him home to his loved ones.

It is going to take the attention of a lot of people. I have written to the Embassies in that region of the world, asking our Ambassadors to ask their friends and their contacts, to see if we can get a little snippet of information. We owe this to the family. But we owe it to every military pilot, past, present, and future, who needs to have the confidence to know, if they are shot down, the rescue forces are coming to get them and we are not going to abandon them.

There is now talk that Iraq will invite a delegation to come to investigate. If it is another charade, as were some of the investigations as to whether or not there are weapons of mass destruction, then that is not going to be profitable. It should be a high-level delegation so it will be accorded the respect of the receiving Iraqi Government in order that access will be given. For example, this eyewitness account that he was driven to the hospital from the crash site—what hospital? Let's see the records of the hospital. If he was released from the hospital, where was he sent? Was he sent to a prison? What prison? Let's see the records of that prison. Let's see tangible evidence so we can know the fate of CDR Scott Speicher.

The Nation owes this to our military. The Nation owes it to Commander Speicher's family.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to share this matter with the Senate.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes in morning business. I understand the leader and others will momentarily be on the floor.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, my plea is to the brothers and sisters in the lodge this afternoon. It came to mind last evening, when I met with the maritime folks that if our Amtrak is about to be phased out in October, and rail transportation is about to end for the passengers, and if the airlines are all in financial difficulty, we need more American construction, American ships, crewed with American crews, and those kinds of things. Yet we are just about to pass a wonderful farm bill.

They have gotten together in a compromise on the farm legislation. This Senator has supported agriculture for nearly 50 years in public office. In fact, I took my farmers to the west coast. I found out, back 40 years ago, that our total farm income in South Carolina was around \$380 million, and out in Orange County, CA, one county had \$384 million in total farm income. So they knew something more about agriculture than we did. And we had a 100-year start in agriculture in the little State of South Carolina before they had even founded California.

So I have been in the vanguard, in the forefront of developing our corn and our soybeans. The grain elevator was constructed when I was Governor. I could go on down the list of the different caucuses we have developed and the trips we made with the farmers to the markets overseas.

Just please, I ask my farm friends, don't give me this protectionism talk about we are ruining trade and trade relations and trade agreements, having gotten all the subsidies, all the protection you could possibly imagine.

They have gotten this 73-some-odd-billion-dollar farm bill. They get all the subsidies, which I support. And I hope the Senate supports it. They get the Ex-Im Bank to finance.

I see one of my agricultural Senator friends coming to the Chamber. I am sure he is not going to talk about protectionism. I am trying to get some of the farm votes to help us on fast track.

Then they get the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. They get all the help.

I experienced this when I campaigned out in Iowa in the '80s. They had me on an early morning news show there in Des Moines, and they said: Senator, how do you come from a textile State with all that protection and subsidies, and you expect to get the farm vote? They had no idea I did not get any subsidies. I was just trying to hold on to the jobs that we had.

So we need the farmers' help. Don't talk about Public Law 480. I know one of the Senators from Iowa has a favorite. After he gets his subsidies, then he comes on the floor and he says: No. We want to ship our PL-480s, our agriculture, under this Federal act to the other countries of the world because we can do it cheaper.

Well, we can produce agriculture cheaper, too. We almost did with the Freedom to Farm Act, but it did not work. But it can be done. So don't give us: Let's do away with it, having gotten all of mine, then I want yours, too. In essence, the farmers ought to wake up.

I want to show what has happened in agriculture with these charts I have in the Chamber. This chart shows that in 1996, under the Department of Commerce figures, we exported more than \$8 billion of corn annually. And you can see where it has gone. It went down in the year 2000 to about \$4.5 billion. Now, why?

The Chinese are not only producing textiles, they are producing corn.

I followed the statistical flow downwards of wheat. I asked about the Chinese, how do they do it? And the answer is, they are very clever. Now they are shipping their wheat to Korea, Japan, and other places, and still importing ours so as to keep an appearance of the need for wheat. But, actually, they are exporting more than they are importing.

Let's look at the agriculture surpluses from the chart I have in the Chamber. I want everyone to know that we are not only losing our manufacturing capability, our industrial backbone, but the United States has lost agriculture surplus since NAFTA.

Beginning in 1994 we had about a \$1 billion surplus with Mexico and Canada in agriculture. Now that we have free trade, free trade, free trade, we have a deficit of close to \$1.5 billion. Well, we are bound to lose with the higher standard of living in the United States of America. We are bound to lose some industrial jobs. But we are going to pick up agriculture.

Ah, no, sirree, we did not pick it up. They are losing their shirt and don't even know it. That is what we want our farmer Senators to know about. They are losing their shirt and don't even know it. They have been going out of business. And you are going back home and saying: Look, look what we have done. We have helped you. You need even more protection.

Here is what has happened with respect to citrus. We went from a \$700 million surplus to about \$650 million surplus in our exports. We have our Senator here who said it was sort of immoral. We had a moral obligation to go along with the Andean trade pact. They needed help. We are trying to get them out of drugs and tell them to grow bananas and pineapples. That is what it is all about.

What do you think we have gotten from Colombia? Not a thing in that

agreement. From Ecuador, from Bolivia? We did not get anything in that one-way agreement. But here is what happened with citrus.

Now, I do not like to be vindictive or seem to be petty, but I would like to come down to the 17-percent tariff on textiles from the Andean countries and bring citrus down from 50 percent—50 percent, I say to the Senator—down to the 17 percent.

Tell these citrus boys, tell these agriculture boys, don't talk about China and Japan and India, be fair, be fair; Mexico, be fair. Let's be fair to each other. We are all U.S. Senators. We represent one country. And we represent agriculture.

I have agriculture and I have textiles. I have steel. I told a story about Nucor. I am glad President Bush acted.

Here is wheat. Where are those wheat farmers? In 1996, we exported more than \$6 billion in Durum wheat. In 2001, we exported less than \$3.5 billion.

You are going out of business, Senator. You are gone. I am losing my textiles. You are losing your wheat. They can give us a little tin cup and we can stand out on the sidewalk and beg because you and I are being put out of business. You are a leader here on trying to awake the town and tell the people.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina would yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I would be delighted to yield, if we have time.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, because of the previous unanimous consent, time is almost gone for the Senator. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be recognized for another 10 minutes. And I announce, on behalf of the majority leader, there will be no votes this evening.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask the Senator from South Carolina, isn't it the case that the chart that the Senator shows on durum wheat starts showing a collapse—actually, if the chart started back a bit, it would start showing a collapse almost immediately following the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. That was a Free Trade Agreement where Clayton Yeutter, who was then our trade ambassador—he had a great disposition. He smiled all the time. And you always felt like the Sun was shining and everything was right, nothing was wrong.

So Clayton Yeutter went up to negotiate with Canada on our behalf, and he came back with the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement.

We didn't learn it until later, but he had just traded away the interests of American farmers because what happened to us was an avalanche of unfairly subsidized grain that came into our country from the Canadian Wheat Board, which is a state monopoly. It

would be illegal in this country. But in Canada they shoved all this grain into our country. And then when we went up to try to find out what the prices were so that we could take action against Canada, the Canadian Wheat Board said: Go fly a kite. We don't intend to show you any information.

We have done that for years. The result is that our farmers have been devastated by this unfair trade. This all comes from Clayton Yeutter's negotiations with the Canadians; is that not the case?

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is the case. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota has followed this in a judicious fashion. He and I have worked together, but he has really been the leader to get some sensibility and attention to the dilemma. All we ask on the floor of the Senate is a chance to do our job. In article I, section 8 of the Constitution, it is not the President, not the Supreme Court, but the Congress that shall regulate foreign commerce. This is so we can look at these little side deals and the things that were negotiated that we didn't know about, as the distinguished Senator points out.

The lawyers on K Street and the White House make the need for fast track up. They fix the vote. They don't call it until they have a 60-vote margin to cut off debate. Here we have been waiting dutifully to put up our amendments. And there has been a little difficulty on finalizing the leadership amendment, but once it is filed, we are ready to go. We have been ready to go.

Don't blame us for holding this up for however many days. We are not trying to hold it up. We are just asking the Senate, please kill this so-called fast track. We haven't had it for the past several years. There have been some 200 agreements without fast track. That is what the Senator from North Dakota is speaking to.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield for an additional question.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. There are so many issues we could talk about—beef to Japan, automobiles from Korea. Let me talk about this issue of wheat from Canada for a moment. It is a fascinating issue. There was a woman from North Dakota who married a Canadian and moved up to Canada. She came back for Thanksgiving or Christmas to North Dakota. And when she was back on the farm, her father said: Take up a couple bags of wheat. She was going to mill that back up in Canada and make bread because we have great spring wheat for making great hard bread. She took back a grocery sack full of wheat. All the way back to the Canadian border she met 18-wheel trucks full of Canadian wheat coming south—hundreds and hundreds of trucks, millions of bushels, every day, every hour.

But when she got to the border with two grocery bags full of grain she was going to grind in order to make bread,

they told her: You can't take two grocery sacks full of American wheat into Canada. She had to pour it on the ground at the border, despite the fact that all the way up she met Canadian 18-wheel trucks hauling Canadian wheat south. She couldn't get two grocery bags full through the border near Canada.

How did we end up with that? A circumstance where they are hauling all that grain, coming south from Canada in an unfair way, but you can't get two grocery bags full into Canada because of a trade agreement negotiated by people who were basically incompetent and traded away the interests of American farmers.

Yet here we are being told: Let's not fix the trade agreements we have problems with. Let's give the President the authority to do new trade agreements.

My message is very simple: Fix a few of the problems, just a few, start fixing a few. Demonstrate that there is some backbone in this country to stand up, to have the nerve and the will to fix some trade problems. Then come to us and talk about the next negotiation. But only then and not until then. Fix a few problems first.

Mr. HOLLINGS. As the Senator has pointed out, the blasphemy is that the most productive farmer in the world is the American farmer. The most productive industrial worker in the world is the American industrial worker. What is not producing is us the Congress. Forty years ago, we produced poultry in South Carolina. We produced peaches—in fact, more peaches than the State of Georgia. I landed in Europe. I had the same experience. Leave that on the plane and destroy it. You are not bringing fresh peaches in here, they told me. You are not bringing your poultry in here.

Rules are rules. This isn't aid. This is trade. Everybody looks out for the agricultural strength of their nations. That is what we are elected to office to do. But Heaven above, you would think I was a Communist or something in here trying to stop fast track. Fast track is a dirty, no good political gimmick. Everybody knows that. Yet they continue to go on with this thing to get a fix and not take the responsibility. And then when they have to explain it: Well, it was take it or leave it. I wanted to support the President and everything.

Of course, we all want to support the President. But that is the story. Here it is. We are losing out agriculturally, and the Chinese are the ones winning. When you have 1.3 billion people, they can produce more than our 280 million. They have 600 or 700 million farmers, at least, or more. How many million farmers do we have?

We have about 3.5 million farmers in the United States of America. They are outstanding. I am not belittling them in any sense. But 3.5 million can't produce what 700 million Chinese farmers produce, and at the cost and everything else like that. They don't have