

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

the environmental rules and regs and everything else of that kind.

I appreciate the body yielding the floor. My plea is, let's be fair to each other. Just don't come here and try to do away with the Jones Act now when we are trying to build America. Please don't do away with the industrial strength of the United States, pointing a finger: You are a protectionist; we are not going to start protectionism.

That is what built the country—good, strong protectionism.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be given 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Let me ask if the Senator will yield for a question. The Senator comes to the floor often and talks about Ricardo and the doctorate of comparative advantage. I used to teach a little economics in college. There is no doctrine of comparative advantage in most of these unfair trade circumstances. Most of what has happened with respect to advantage is political; that is, the political system of the country decides we are going to have a state monopoly which trades in your country.

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is right.

Mr. DORGAN. So decisions are made to allow 12-year-old kids to work in a manufacturing plant for 12 cents an hour. That is unfair. Manufacturing plants to operate without safe working places. Manufacturers will dump chemicals into the streams and the air and send the product to the store shelves in Pittsburgh and Los Angeles and Fargo and Charlotte. That is unfair. These are political decisions in countries around the world about the conditions of production.

People listen to the Senator from South Carolina, and some are going to say: It is the same old stuff. He just wants to be a protectionist.

In my judgment, there is nothing wrong with protecting American interests and requiring fair trade. If that is what protecting is about, sign me up. I want to protect our country's economic interests. But I believe the Senator from South Carolina feels as I do. I support expanded trade. I believe expanded trade is healthy. I believe we can compete anywhere in the world. But I demand fair trade. When trade is not fair, this country has a responsibility to stand up for its producers. It has failed to do that time and time again. Is that not the case?

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is the case. The unfairness of it is here in the "Foreign Trade Barriers" book from 10 years ago. I think we spotted it with about 260 pages and 10 years hence that we got free trade. We are getting rid of the barriers, remember. We are helping out agriculture by decimating our industrial strength. I am trying to open the eyes of my farmer Senator friends. Instead of 260 pages, this book is 453 pages. When I held up this book yesterday, it was very interesting. Oh, it just

put these fleet a flitter. They gathered around and you can tell the fixes they got—we are trading more. Well, wait a minute, you are getting more trade agreements? Your debate has been all year long that you are losing out on the agreements, that we are passing them by. All these countries are getting agreements and we are not getting any. Of course, that is not the case.

Let's look now and see. For example, Korea had 10 pages of restrictions here in 1992. In 2002, they have gone to 27 pages. Japan has gone from 18 pages of restrictions to 42—they are not lowering barriers.

The European economic community, 32 pages in 1992. They have come down to 20 pages. We are doing pretty good there. I hope we can do better than with bananas. We don't even produce a banana. These special Trade Representatives ought to be embarrassed. India's was 8 pages, and it went up to 14. You can see what is happening in these countries—where we are supposed to be lowering the barriers, we are increasing them with trade agreements.

So, come on, let's stop, look, and listen. Give each Senator a chance to stop, look, and listen. Don't give me those fast tracks and whip it on through with the special interest lawyers. I tell my textile people, the lawyers are working this thing on K street; I have nothing to do with it. By the time I get a bite at the apple and a chance to even discuss it, they give me limited time, and the vote is already fixed. Nobody listens because the vote is already fixed. So why pay attention to the thing? Let's move on. We have to get our work done around here. So nothing happens. We are supposed to learn and exchange views from all parts of the country.

When I came here 35 years ago, I tell you it was an educational experience. We didn't have TV, so if you wanted to find out what was going on, you were in the cloakroom. There were always 25 to 30 Senators in either cloakroom and you could engage in debate, listen to the other Senators, their experience, and their constituent needs and things of that kind. And then we had a concurrent majority to move forward for the good of the country.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield for one additional question?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. Senator HOLLINGS raised the issue of bananas. I wanted to explore that for a moment. Is it not the case that our country had a big fight with Europe about bananas?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes. One fellow from Ohio gave a lot of political contributions. We didn't have any bananas. Do you know where they grow bananas?

Mr. DORGAN. No. We were fighting with Europe because they would not allow bananas into the European economies. I mentioned today that we had a dispute with Europe about beef. We went to the WTO and won a case against Europe. You know how we penalized Europe? We said: We are taking

action against your truffles and your goose liver and Roquefort cheese.

Mr. HOLLINGS. They have got no embarrassment, I can tell you that.

Mr. DORGAN. We were fighting with Europe about bananas and we don't produce them. Those bananas were coming from the Caribbean, and Europe would not let them in.

Mr. HOLLINGS. JOHN MCCAIN is right—money controls, campaign finance is needed. I can tell you that right now. We haven't gotten it yet. We are moving in that direction about soft money, but we have doubled the contributions and everything else. That was a compromise Senator MCCAIN had to make. Now I have to travel to California, maybe Nevada, and New York, and maybe Missouri even to get that kind of money. I cannot find that in South Carolina. Even a Republican friend—and I have some Republican friends, but they don't want to contribute. If their name appeared in the little news squib, and they might say Saturday night when they go to the club: Why did you give to that Democrat? Why embarrass the family and the wife and everybody else? They just don't give. So I travel around the country, and beg from my friends and try to stay in office. They have been good to me. Here I am. But I cannot get the attention of anybody.

I used to say I would love to serve in the Senate rather than practice law because I not only could make the final arguments, like I used to in the courtroom, but I can go in the jury room and vote. But the vote means nothing. Now the way this thing is geared up, over the past 35 years we don't have a discussion, don't have the deliberateness or the consideration.

I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Nevada yielding. 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. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE EXPANSION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under the Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic:

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Andean Trade Preference Expansion Act".*

##### TITLE I—ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE

##### SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

*Congress makes the following findings:*

(1) *Since the Andean Trade Preference Act was enacted in 1991, it has had a positive impact*