The majority leader would like to remind Members that July will be a very busy month with late-night sessions and votes. The cooperation of all Members will be necessary for the Senate to complete its work prior to the August recess.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I would like to echo for all staffs and Senators returning from the Fourth of July work period that we really would like to see a definite list of amendments to the VA–HUD appropriations bill so that when we take it up, we can move as expeditiously as possible.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOND. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota.

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

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

IRS REFORM BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I have come to the floor to talk a bit about the crisis in agriculture, especially the crisis facing family farmers in my State of North Dakota. But before I do that, I would like to talk just for a moment about a piece of legislation that I understand may be brought to the floor of the Senate tomorrow—probably tomorrow evening. It is the so-called IRS reform bill.

In my judgement, there is much in the IRS reform bill that has merit. The hearings that were held in the Senate, which reviewed cases of harassment of taxpayers, some unacceptable behavior by Internal Revenue Service agents, and some other items clearly made the case for the need for some changes with respect to the Internal Revenue Service. Much of this piece of legislation, as I indicated, has merit. But I want to object to something that was done in legislative darkness in putting this conference report together. It is a provision that was not in either the House or Senate bills. It is a provision that had never been debated. It had not been put in either bill in the House or Senate. Yet at the last moment, in legislative darkness, it was stuck in this conference report in the conference committee. I don't understand by what rules they operate when they say we are going to stick something in the conference report that is not in either the House or Senate bill.

Here is what they did. They said in the conference report that they will reduce the holding period of assets for capital gains from 18 months to 12 months. What does that mean? Well, it means that those with incomes in this country of over $100,000 a year are going to get 90 percent of the benefit of a $2 billion tax break. That is $2 billion in tax breaks. Ninety percent of it will go to people who make over $100,000 in income. In fact, 76 percent goes to people making over $200,000 a year or more. This was done without debate. This was one of those little nuggets that was stuck in the bill. It was not debated by the House or the Senate.

The same day they said we have $2 billion to give away to the upper-income people, they said we don't have enough money to provide for low-income heating assistance during the winter for low-income folks in the northern climates. This majority in Congress doesn't have enough money for that. They don't have enough money for low-income people who are trying to heat their homes. They say we are out of money, so we will cut that program off. They don't have enough money for summer jobs for disadvantaged youth. Gee, there is not enough money for that. They say there is not enough money for school construction in Indian schools, where the schools are falling apart and kids are walking through school doors into classrooms of which we all ought to be ashamed. No, there is not enough money for that.

But in the dark of the legislative night, there is enough money to stick $2 billion into the purses of the richest Americans. This is done with no debate in this Congress. To the people who behave and operate like that and carry those knapsacks full of money to the upper-income folks, I just say that is a terrible way to legislate. On one hand you say you can't afford to help people who really need help, and that you have to abolish low-income energy assistance. Yet, on the other side there is plenty of money to reduce the capital gains holding period, without even a discussion in Congress about who it is going to benefit. It seems to me this is not a very happy day, when you talk about what should be our legislative priorities around this Capitol Building. I will talk more about that when the bill comes to the floor of the Senate tomorrow evening.

FAMILY FARM CRISIS

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, for the RECORD, I want to read a letter from Joni Flaten from Langdon, ND. I visited with her this afternoon. She sent me a letter some while ago. She is a farm wife. We have a huge farm crisis not only in my State of North Dakota, but also in the entire wheat belt. Grain prices have collapsed. We have been hit with the toughest, worst outbreak of crop disease in a century in North Dakota. So you take crop disease that devastates the crop and then you add collapsed prices, and you have a calamity for a lot of family farmers.

Joni Flaten writes:

> My husband has been farming now for 18 years. He is a third generation farmer, and with my oldest son graduating last Sunday, we were looking forward to some day having the fourth generation. However, that will no longer be possible for we have been unable to get an operating loan this season due to low grain prices . . .
>
> I have 3 children and have stayed home for 18 years to raise them and help my husband on the farm. We are now going to be forced into giving up the family farm, and I'm not sure if there is a lot of need for a 38-year-old combine operator/tractor driver/trucker/run for parts person and be a mother in the work force in North Dakota. We have been a true family operation since the boys were able to see over the steering wheels . . . We have not been able to hire an extra man to help us, but we have pulled together as a family at planting and harvest times to get the job done. Now Farm Credit tells us we are unable to get a loan to operate our farm. FAHS tells us we can't have a loan and the sad truth is such a blow to all of my family. Not that you or anyone can do much about this but maybe somehow you can stop it from happening to some other family in the future. It is a good life here in ND but I think you will be 5 people less come this winter!!!

This is from a woman named Joni Flaten, a farm wife, has been a farm wife for 18 years, and they are losing their livelihood, losing their family farm.

Let me show you a picture of Bev and Jim McAllister from Oriska, ND. Jim McAllister came to a meeting that I had in Mandan, ND, a few months ago. You can see Jim is a pretty big guy. He stood up at that meeting and began talking about his family farm. He said his granddad farmed it, his dad farmed it, and he has farmed it for 23 years. Then his chin began to quiver and he got tears in his eyes. Then he said he is going to have to quit farming. Jim and Bev McAllister love farming. They are family farmers. They have raised their family on the farm. It is a way of life they say they wouldn't have traded for anything, and yet they are having to leave the farm. There family farm will be history. No more family farming for the McAllister family.

Why is this happening?

This is a picture of an auction sale in North Dakota. You can see what an auction sale looks like. There are a lot of folks standing around with an auctioneer auctioning off farm machinery. Here are pages from a North Dakota newspaper. It shows about 150 auction sales. It is all advertised in the same week's paper. These auction sales go out for a good number of weeks. This listing includes some 150 auction sales.

They have had so many auction sales on North Dakota farms that they have had to call retired auctioneers back from retirement to handle the auction sales. Every one of these auction sales represents a family farmer who has tried to invest everything they have, and have worked hard, to run a family farm. And then they discover they can't make it.

Why can't they make it? Well, farmers are beset by a whole range of problems these days. First, they wrote a new farm program in Congress two years ago. I didn't vote for it. I thought it was a terrible farm program. But those who voted for it—and the President reluctantly signed it—essentially said we are going to pull the safety net

out from under family farmers. It doesn't matter what the circumstances are. If grain prices collapse, somehow we are going to still pull the safety net out from under family farmers and instead set up a decreasing scale of price supports, eventually hoping that family farmers will deal in whatever is the open market. They called this program Freedom to Farm.

It would be like saying to the people in the workforce we are going to reduce the minimum wage to $1 an hour and we are going to call it ''Freedom to Work.'' It is the same logic, exactly the same logic. If they cut the minimum wage to $1 an hour and call it ''Freedom to Work,'' it would make as much sense as what they have done to family farmers.

Here is what family farmers face in my State. Wheat costs somewhere around $4.50 to $5 a bushel to raise. When farmers plant it in the spring, in order to plant it they have to have equipment. They have to buy fuel for the tractor. They have to buy seed to plant in the ground. They have to buy fertilizer to fertilize it. They till and seed the ground, and hope and pray and cross their fingers and hope they get enough moisture. If they get enough moisture for that, and if they grow wheat, barley, or corn, they hope it doesn't hail and destroy the crop. Then they hope the insects don't come and eat the crop. And, they hope they don't experience crop disease that will in other ways ravage and decimate the crop. If all of that is avoided, then maybe in the fall they will have a crop that has come out of the ground and is high enough to harvest. Then they will buy fuel for the combine and they will go harvest the crop. When all of that is done, if they have been very lucky, they will have raised a crop that cost them $4.50 or $5 a bushel to raise, and they truck it to the county elevator, and they may get $3.10 a bushel for it. That means they go broke.

On top of the collapsed prices, in North Dakota and a couple of other States, we have been ravaged by the worst possible crop disease. It is called scab. The technical name is fusarium head blight. I am told that this is the worst crop disease in this century. So these family farmers are trying to fight a crop disease that decimates their crop and then a price that is in the tank. The question is: Does anybody care? Does anybody care at all?

We had a group of Senators a week and a half ago who held a press conference that said, ''Gee, this farm bill is working just fine. We think things are on the right track.'' What planet could they have possibly come from? Where on Earth did they get off the mother ship? How could they say, ''This farm bill is working just fine?''

I would encourage anyone who thinks that to go buy a quarter section of land and plant yourself a crop. After you plant it, raise the crop, and then sell it, then you will have the big loss that you are going to get under this farm program. After you have done that, then come and gloat about how the farm program is working. I dare you. See, if you have the courage of your convictions. Any one of those who think this farm program is working just fine, should go buy a farm and have the opportunity to lose some money for awhile. Then you will have your banker tell you it is not working out. Only then should you come back and give us your theory and tell us how great the farm program is working. Just do it. But don't come in here and preach these platitudes about a program working when it is a disaster. Freedom to Farm has been a disaster for family farmers.

Let me tell you what else is facing family farmers. There are hundreds of thousands of family farmers out there. There are almost two million of them out there. You see them with a yard light on at night dotting the countryside. They are raising a family and planting crops. Let s say they are raising livestock and they go to market. Let's assume they are taking some cows to market. What they find at the marketplace is the neck of that bottle up through which they are trying to market is squeezed by four beef packing plants. Four beef packing companies in this country control 87 percent of the market. That is right. Four firms with 87 percent of the market. Ten years ago, it was 67 percent. Now those four control 87 percent of the market. They set the market. They tell somebody out there who is herding cows and raising cattle exactly what they are going to pay them. If they don't like it, tough luck.

If you are not raising cows, maybe you are raising hogs. The top four pork packers in this country control 60 percent of that market. If you go into a packing house that slaughters hogs, 60 percent of the market is controlled by only four companies. With sheep, it is 73 percent of the market that is controlled by the top four companies.

How about raising grain? The top four firms in flour milling in this country have 62 percent of the market. The top four grain elevator firms control nearly 60 percent of the Nation's elevator facilities at our ports. The top four corn milling firms control 74 percent of the market. In soybean crushing, the top four firms have 76 percent of the market. When farmers try to market through the neck of this bottle, it is squeezed with an iron grip by increasing monopoly pricing power by corporations that press down on these farm prices.

If that is not enough for our farmers to face, then they have to haul their grain to the markets on railroads that are increasingly monopolistic. In 1980, there were 40 class-one railroads in this country. Now there are only four.

In our State, when they come through with the railroad cars, they charge $2,300 to ship a carload of wheat from Bismarck, ND, to Minneapolis. The railroad charges $1,000 to ship a carload of wheat from Minneapolis to Chicago, which is the same distance. What is the difference? The difference is that on one segment there is competition and, therefore, lower prices. In North Dakota, there is not. Therefore, they charge us more than double. We get overcharged because there isn't competition.

If farmers aren't discouraged enough by prices that are in the tank or by markets that are controlled by increasingly monopolistic tendencies, then they are beset by trade problems.

The Canadian trade agreement that we have is unforgivable in the way it was negotiated. The United States negotiator went to Canada and negotiated a United States-Canada trade agreement and fundamentally sold out agricultural interests. I say that understanding exactly what I am saying. I am sure the trade ambassador got other concessions. But family farmers had the rug pulled out from under them. Every day we have carloads and carloads of grain coming across from Canada into our marketplace. In my judgment this is in contravention of U.S. law. Yet, the Canadians refuse to open their books to GAO audits. In fact, they just recently refused once again to allow the GAO at my request to go up and audit their books. I think they are guilty of violating American trade laws. But they say, ''No. We are going to ship all of this product into your country and we don't intend to open our books to you.''

The United States-Canada free trade agreement is an outrage. It takes money right out of the pockets of family farmers, and it has gone on for a number of years, and nobody seems to care much. It is not just grain that comes in from Canada. It is also truckload after truckload of livestock. But nobody seems to care much.

It seems to me that farmers are told in every way that somehow it is a free market out there. They are told to go participate in that free market. Yet, when it comes to this country deciding that it wants to impose sanctions on Cuba, farmers are told: Oh, by the way, you can't sell grain to Cuba. Or they are told, by the way, you can't sell grain to Iran; and, you can't sell grain to Iraq; and, you can't sell grain to Libya.

Farmers are told, you have to pay the cost of those markets that are closed to you. Farmers are told they have to pay the cost of lost wheat sales to China, because we don't have the backbone to stand up to China. We should say to China, if you send us your shirts, your trousers, your shoes, and your trinkets, you then have to buy our wheat. Yet, because we don't have the backbone to say to China that as a condition of our market absorbing all her products that China must buy American grain. Farmers bear the consequences of those kinds of incompetent trade agreements and the lack of will and the lack of nerve and the lack of backbone. Farmers bear the consequence of that.

Most people probably don't know much about farming. Most people probably don't care much about farming. They probably in many cases think that food comes from a carton somewhere at the grocery store.

I had a fellow come to North Dakota once. He was a Member of Congress, who had never been on a farm. I decided that since he votes on farm policy issues that I should really take him out and show him a farm. And we did. We went to a dairy barn. And the dairy business is as tough a business as there is. It is hard. You get up early in the morning and milk cows. The last thing you do at the end of the day is milk cows. There is no tougher job in the country.

My friend was standing there in a blue-striped suit, which is the uniform for Congress, and he saw how hard this was. This fellow and his wife were in the dairy barn on a little farm north of New Salem, ND, and they were milking about 90 cows. That is tough. It was about 5:30 in the evening. The light was shafting through the barn, and it was beautiful. And my friend, this Congressman, watched this go on, and finally he said to the farmer, ''How often do you have to do this?'' The farmer was hooking up the milk machines. It is very tough work. He says, ''How often do you have to do this?'' The farmer, whose name was George, said, ''Well, you have to do it twice a day. You have to do it every morning and you have to do it every evening.''

And my friend, the Congressman from out east, thought about that a bit, and then he said, ''George, do you have to do this on weekends, too?'' And he didn't know. Of course, you have to do it on weekends. You milk 7 days a week twice a day. But he didn't know it. He had never been on a farm.

Family farmers work hard, risk everything they have. In every circumstance, all they want to do is make a decent living. And what we are finding in North Dakota and across the farm belt these days is that we have the goofiest, most detrimental farm program you can possibly conceive. What does our farm program say to our family farmers out there? What does it say to some lonely farm family living on the farm with a yard light on at night, 5 miles from the nearest neighbor?

What we say to them is that you are on your own. You fight the big grain trade firms. You fight the railroad companies. You fight the meat packing plants. And, when you are done with those fights, which by the way you are going to lose, then you go ahead and fight the European Union, because they are subsidizing their farmers. You fight China which keeps your wheat out. You fight Japan that doesn't buy enough beef. You go ahead and fight Canada that floods your market and takes money out of your pocket.

We tell our farmers that they have to wage those fights alone, and we know they are going to lose. Yet, we have people on the floor of the Senate who chant, ''Free market.'' All they can do is chant, ''Free market.'' There has never been a free market in agriculture. There never has been, and there probably never will be.

Nobody would like it more than I would if farmers could go to the grain elevator with their 2-ton truck, haul their wheat in and get a decent price. Nobody would like that better than I would, because farmers ought to be able to get a decent price from the marketplace. What if farmers can't? Does this country care whether there are any family farmers left? It is questionable whether at least some in the Congress care at all. But, if this country cares about whether there are family farmers left, then if farmers can't get the price at the grain elevator because the market is a manipulated market that is not a free market at all, then there has to be some mechanism, as other countries have done, that says to family farmers, here is a support price in the event you can't get a decent price at the marketplace. It is the only way we will keep family farmers on the farm.

Now, we don't have much choice, it seems to me, in the coming weeks. We are going to have to decide that we are either going to do something to respond to this farm crisis or we are going to see wholesale farm bankruptcies all across the country. The very survival of family farms is what is at stake.

Let me just briefly go through a couple of charts.

Here is what has happened to wheat prices. Wheat prices have fallen 53 percent in the 2 years since the farm bill was passed. That is what has happened to wheat prices under Freedom to Farm. If you love Freedom to Farm, then vote Freedom to Farm. But here is what has happened to wheat prices. You can chant ''Freedom'' all you like, and it is not going to help families on the farm stay on the farm. As I said when I started, chanting ''Freedom to Farm'' and pulling the rug out from family farmers, would be the same thing as coming to the floor and saying what we propose is to cut the minimum wage to a dollar an hour and we will call it freedom to work. It is exactly the same principle.

That is what has happened to grain prices. They have dropped from $5.75 per bushel to $2.72 per bushel. That is why farmers are in such significant trouble.

Secondly, in addition to that, there is no longer a disaster program. Now when you suffer disasters, we cannot respond to it. That is also part of the Freedom-to-Farm approach. I want to show you what has happened to family farmers in North Dakota.

This is only one State. The red area means that these counties and those farmers living in those counties have been living in a county declared a disaster area for 5 years in a row. The orange areas have had disasters 4 out of 5 years. You can see that takes up the entire eastern half of the State. Incidentally, this half of my State is equal to five times Massachusetts in land mass. North Dakota is 10 times the size of Massachusetts in land size. But this half of North Dakota has had a disaster declaration for every county 4 out of 5 years. A third of our counties have been declared a disaster every year. All of our counties were declared a disaster area this past year.

Family farmers can't make it when they have disaster after disaster after disaster. Yet, we have people in Congress saying to them, ''Well, so what. Go to the marketplace. It's a free market.'' It is not a free market.

When you have crop disease and disasters, resulting from the wet cycle, and collapsed prices, here is what happens to income: In 1 year, there was a 98 percent reduction in net farm income. Family farmers as a group in North Dakota lost 98 percent of their net income. Think of it. Can you think of anyone else in your neighborhood, anyone in your town, who would still be on their feet if they lost 98 percent of their net income? I don't think so; not with a 98 percent loss in net income.

Here is what happened to the production costs for family farmers. They have to buy tractors, right? In 20 years, here is what happened to the price of a tractor? In the past 20 years, here is what happened to the price of a combine. Look at what has happened to the fertilizer costs and what has happened to the price of diesel fuel. And then I showed you what happened to wheat prices. All of those input costs increased dramatically and wheat prices come down.

Well, there are a lot of solutions to this, some of which will appease no one in this Chamber, I suppose. Yet, we must decide as a Congress whether this matters.

If we have big corporations in this country that get into trouble, gosh, there are all kinds of friends there willing to fluff up their pillow and give them an aspirin and get them to bed for a short nap, maybe give them a transitional loan.

It is really interesting. While I am describing to you the problems in family farming, think of what has happened during this period of time when family farmers like Jim McAllister and Joni Flaten and others are losing everything they have. Yes, absolutely everything. What is happening on the front page of your newspaper? All the biggest companies in the country are finding romance once again. They are dating, and then they are getting married, and so we have these big mergers and combinations. Gosh, they love each other. The bigger, the better. At the upper end of this economic system, things are just swimming, I guess. There are record profits, and the largest mergers in the history of humankind. And at the bottom, the folks who are out there trying to raise a family

and keep a yard light on and run a family farm are going broke in record numbers.

There is something really wrong with that. There is something wrong with a system that doesn't reward what this country should value most and that doesn't connect effort and reward. You talk about effort? You know, family farmers are the ones who invest everything they have, work hard, risk everything they have, and then discover at the end of it that they don't have the capability of continuing. And this country has a policy that says that is fine; we don't care about that?

We are going to have a big fight in this Chamber this summer to see who cares. Some people may say they don't care. Or they may say they care, but they have constructed these goof-ball policies and they just want to stand over in a corner and chant about free markets. That is one solution, I guess. But that solution will simply continue this decline, this spiral of failing our family farms.

But there are other ways to address this. One is for this Congress to write a simple farm plan that starts with one single sentence, and that sentence says: The purpose of this farm bill is to maintain a network of family farms in this country.

Otherwise, you will have corporate agrifactories farm from California to Maine. There won't be anybody living in the country, and the price of food will go up. That can happen and probably will happen unless this country decides that family farmers are in this country's best interests. Thomas Jefferson used to say that it is in this country's best interests to maintain a broad network of ownership in this country. Broad-based economic ownership is critical to the success of this country.

Even if one doesn't care about family farmers, one ought to care about the disparity that exists here. We should care about the massive failure at the bottom of the system affecting people who really produce real things, and the orgy of mergers that is occurring at the top with the big getting bigger.

One of the things that bothers me the most about all of this is the people who are out there raising a kernel of wheat or corn or barley to take it to the market are the very ones who are failing. And then everybody else who gets hold of that seems to be making record profits. Go to the grocery store and buy a box of cereal and look at the price. Somebody took that kernel of wheat or corn or grain of rice and they might have puffed it. Now that it is made into puffed wheat, does its price bear any relationship to the price that the farmer gets for the wheat? No, not at all. The farmer gets a pitiful price that is insufficient to keep the farmer in business. But those who process it, those who haul it, those who puff it, those who crisp it, those who shred it, they are all making record profits. There is something wrong with that. There is something wrong with the method by which this system values what people contribute to our economic system.

Some people might say to me, ''Gee, you come from North Dakota and you have a different view of economics. You didn't go to the University of Chicago, the School of Economics; you don't understand free markets,'' and so on. No, I understand it. I understand the difference between the theory, the chanting and all the nonsense and the reality that exists every day confronting people who produce every day.

So I know there will be some in this Chamber who will be upset this summer that we are going to push them very hard on these policies. Those of us who have other ideas and believe there is a better way and different approach and believe there is a way for this Congress to stand up for family farming. We need to say to our family farmers, just as the Europeans have said to their family farmers and other countries have said to theirs, that you matter. Your presence as a producer, as a family farmer in this country, makes a difference to us. It strengthens this country. It nurtures this country.

The formation of family values in America always came from family farms. The seed bed of family values came from family farms. They have rolled into small towns and rolled into the cities, nurturing and refreshing the family values of this country. So, therefore, family farming matters. It is more than just dollars and cents, and it is more than just economics. Family farming, as an economic and social policy, matters in this country.

Those who have currently gained the upper hand politically on this issue have constructed a farm policy that says, ''We are going to pull the rug out from under you even as we negotiate bad trade agreements. We are going to pull the rug out from under you on support and there will be no disaster programs for massive crop disease.'' Those folks are not going to like what some of us feel we must do this summer to try to force the issue to deal with family farming.

Mr. President, I think of Joni Flaten, a 38-year-old woman from Langdon, ND, who writes a letter with resignation. She and her husband have invested in their farm and in fact they are losing their farm, and they wonder what to do next. She says, ''. . . I'm not sure if there is a lot of need for a 38-year-old combine operator/tractor driver/trucker/run for parts person and be a mother in the workforce in North Dakota.'' That is what you do to run a farm. Everybody does everything.

Some, I guess, as the old saying goes, understand the cost of everything and the value of nothing. That is what we have here, in my judgment. We went through this debate a couple of years ago on the Freedom to Farm bill and I was never made quite so despondent about a U-turn in public policy as I was by those who said, ''Gee, family farmers really don't matter very much. We have this market system they can work in.''

Everybody here knows. The statistics I have just used are not foreign to anybody here. They say to the family farmer: You operate in this market system. We understand the grain trading firms have a hammerlock on price; we understand the railroads have a hammerlock on your transportation; we understand that meat packing plants have a hammerlock on your marketing system, but, still, you go ahead and operate in the free market.

I think it would be perfectly understandable for farmers to start their tractors and gas them up and head them towards the byways and highways that haul policy makers to legislative forums where they extol about a free market that doesn't exist and see if they cannot persuade them that family farming matters and that their futures and their fortunes matter as well.

We expect in the coming weeks to have discussions about a disaster program or an indemnification program, either one; about a price support program; about a range of other issues that need to be addressed, including the question of concentration in the meat packing industry and other issues. But through it all, I expect we will debate these issues in the month of July.

Now that the Senate will be back voting tomorrow, we will see work on appropriations bills. Will we see business as usual? Will we see the kind of legislative sleight of hand that I mentioned at the start of this discussion? Will we see conference committees come to the floor of the Senate in which a $2 billion item was offered in legislative darkness that will butter the bread of the richest folks in America? Then the same people who decide they want to do that will say, ''Gee, we don't have enough money to help poor people who can't afford home heating.''

We will see all that kind of thing that goes on around here because people can do it, and they do do it, and that is unfortunate. That is not the bright side of legislating. That is the dark side of legislating. But, hopefully, enough of us will force enough of others of us in this Chamber to confront these questions. Does farm policy work when farmers are told that whatever they get in the marketplace is all there is, and the marketplace collapses like a used accordion, and the farmers are then told, well, it's tough luck; some big corporation will come and farm all that land and America will be just as well off with an agrifactory?

In my judgment, it won't. I recognize I come from a town of 300 people in a small rural area of North Dakota. But the people who farm in North Dakota and up and down the farm belt are some of the best people in this country. They don't deserve to be whipsawed by an economic system that is unfair to them, that treats them fundamentally unfairly with respect to trade agreements and sanctions, and markets that are unfair, markets that are clogged. It is not the right way for this country to treat its family farmers.

So, again, Mr. President, in the coming couple of weeks, the leadership of the Senate should expect to confront these issues. I hope those who feel strongly about the current farm policy will bring their notebooks, bring their theory, and sharpen their chants, because they are going to have an opportunity to tell us about free markets once again. We will have an opportunity to visit about farm families who are going broke under that very same set of circumstances.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, under the previous order, will stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 7, 1998.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:19 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 7, 1998, at 9:30 a.m.