

people of the importance of trade, trade not only for the agricultural sector of our country but trade in general. And let me tell you my view.

If you're good at something, you ought to try to encourage it to become a bigger part of your world. And if you're good at growing crops, we ought not to diminish the ability to grow crops in America; we ought to encourage. And the way to do that is to find other places to sell crops. If you're the best in the world at what you do—which we are in farming—then it seems like to me, we ought to encourage that product to be sold not only here in America but level the playing field so it can be sold all across the world.

I know there's a lot of farmers around who say, "You know, we've heard that before. Every trade agreement trades out the farmer. Here comes old Bush from Texas, and he says he's for the farmer. Yet, you watch. They'll worry more about other products, and when it comes time to argue for the agricultural sector, they'll just leave us out."

But that's not the way it's going to be, folks, because I understand how important agriculture is, not only for America, but how important it is for international trade for our country. Not only domestically but internationally, agriculture is important.

And I'd just ask you to look at the record. In China, I argued that China ought to be in the WTO because it's good for the American agriculture. Look at the agreement. We've opened up the Chinese markets to U.S. farmers. It's good for China, and more importantly, it's good for the U.S. farmers to have that market available. We've got to trade. It's in our Nation's interest to trade, and it's a sure way to help create jobs.

We've also got to have an energy policy if we're going to grow for the long term. One of the great things about America is, is that we're self-sufficient in food. It's a national security interest to be self-sufficient in food. It's a luxury that you've al-

ways taken for granted here in this country, but imagine if we have to rely upon somebody else to provide us food. It would be a problem. The good news is, we can not only grow food for ourselves; we can grow food for others.

That's not the way it is in energy. We're too reliant upon foreign sources of energy. We're too reliant upon parts of the world that may like us, may not like us, for our sources of energy. It seems like to me that we ought to work hard to become more self-sufficient, less reliant, by having an energy plan that encourages conservation—encourages the use of ethanol, for example—value-added processing, and also explores for energy in our own hemisphere and in our own States, in an environmentally friendly way.

Finally an administration has come along and said, "Let's have a national energy plan." And that's exactly what passed out of the House, and hopefully, we can get it out of the Senate, just like the trade bill that came out of the House. Hopefully, we can get it out of the Senate. Hopefully, when they come back, they listen to the American people and put plans in place that will help our economy grow so that people can find work.

Finally, I want to talk to you about economic policy out of Washington. It seems like to me that the question we ought to be asking in Washington is, what does it take to help people create jobs? What's it take? I started with this part: I said that if you give people their own money back, if you let them keep more of their hard-earned dollars, that's good for the economy. If a consumer has got more money, he or she spends it on a product, causing the person who manufactures the product to keep jobs in place and/or increase jobs.

And so we worked together and passed meaningful, real tax relief. It came at exactly the right time. The economy started to show signs of slowing down in March of 2001. A way to stimulate growth during recession is to give people—let them keep