

have discussed this with the Senator from North Dakota. We are in the process—the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator LUGAR, Members on both sides of the aisle, Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa, Senator PRESSLER from South Dakota, the Democratic leader and others on both sides—to see if we cannot come to some agreement by Thursday of next week.

It is my hope we can lay out some process where, first of all, we would try to bring up or at least proceed to the bill we passed one other time. We would have to obtain cloture. That would probably not be invoked.

Then perhaps the Senator from North Dakota could lay down his 1-year extension, and if at that time we should have a bipartisan compromise, we would offer that as a substitute. That is what we have been discussing. I have talked to the Democratic leader two or three times today. I know the farmers are anxious in all parts of the country. We hope we can work it out. It may not be possible to do it that quickly, but we are working on it. Our staffs will continue to work in a bipartisan way, and we hope we can have it done by next Thursday.

Therefore, I feel compelled to object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield for one moment, I understand that, and I hope we can reach a bipartisan compromise on this. I think, to the extent we will move to it and address it next week, that is real progress. I think farmers and others in rural America will be pleased by that, and I hope we can make some significant progress next week on this issue. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. I will just indicate to my colleagues, I know others have planes to catch. I will come back on the floor later. It is quite possible we will be in session on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week for morning business.

I think on Tuesday there will be maybe 3 hours equally divided, on Wednesday 4 hours equally divided, and on Thursday it would be my hope that we could have completed the telecommunications conference by then and have that conference report on the floor; also, that we might have some agreement on the farm legislation, at least on the Senate side, and have that vote on Thursday, and any other votes that may come up. We could have a vote on Thursday of next week. I do not anticipate any votes prior to Thursday. If something should occur so that those votes should become unlikely, we could still be in morning business. But we would notify our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me thank the majority leader for that in-

formation. We have had a good discussion about the schedule next week, and I am pleased that there is a possibility that we could address both the farm legislation and the telecommunications bill. So next week could be a very productive week, and hopefully we can continue to ensure that that can be done on Thursday.

TRIBUTE TO LYNN TERPSTRA

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the Democratic Policy Committee's assistant editor, Lynn Terpstra, will retire from the Senate next week. This marks the end of the long and productive career of a vigilant and dedicated congressional staff member.

Hers is a career that spans 25 years, from 1969 to 1996.

Lynn Terpstra began her congressional career in July, 1969, on the staff of Senator George Aiken of Vermont. Her next Senate assignment was on the staff of the Commission on the Operation of the Senate. In February 1977, she brought her quick mind and diligent habits to the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. Her technical skills and her grasp of how to help organize the ever-increasing DPC graphics and publications workload made Lynn an invaluable player on the DPC team.

Lynn Terpstra's keen eye, creative talent and dedicated approach to the work of the Senate's Democratic Policy Committee will be missed. The DPC is grateful for her contribution to our work, and I want to thank Lynn and wish her well in her future endeavors.

I yield the floor.

BILL READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1541

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished majority leader, Mr. DOLE, I send a bill to the desk and ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1541) to extend, reform and improve agricultural commodity, trade, conservation, and other programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read on the next legislative day.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, given this turn of events, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Tuesday, January 30, 1996, for the majority leader or his designee to file a cloture motion with respect to the farm bill to be introduced this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair. I will simply say, parenthetically, this is the farm bill that has been referenced by the majority leader, and cloture will attempt to be obtained on this. I appreciate the procedure of the Senate.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to take a moment, if I might, to congratulate the Senator from South Carolina, Senator THURMOND, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, on which I am pleased to serve, and his counterpart on the Democratic side, Senator Sam NUNN from the State of Georgia. They did an exceptional job in getting finally a defense authorization bill approved that the President said he will sign after vetoing the previous bill.

I thought the President was right in that timeframe when he vetoed the bill. I am not happy completely with the bill, as I outlined earlier in remarks on the Senate floor before the vote. But certainly the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Georgia did an admirable job in eliminating some of the most obnoxious parts of the defense authorization bill originally and coming to a successful conclusion today where we have passed it in the U.S. Senate.

START II TREATY

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to move on and thank my dear friend and colleague who has just spoken with regard to the START II Treaty. There is nothing that has a better chance for the hope of mankind in the future than the overwhelming approval of the START II Treaty. When it is implemented, it will reduce the number of nuclear warheads both in Russia and the United States of America. I congratulate the ranking member and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for a job very well done.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, I want to say what a wonderful job the chairman, Mr. HELMS, and my fellow floor manager, Senator LUGAR, have done. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his kind remarks.

I think this is truly a historic day. I am glad my retirement from the Senate is coming after this and not before.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend, Senator PELL, so very, very much.

TOUGH TALK ON THE FARM BILL IS DOUBLETALK

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, on another matter, very briefly—and I will not tie up the Senate, it will take me 3 or 4 minutes—I want to talk briefly about what I was surprised to see, which I term "Tough Talk on the Farm Bill Is Doubletalk."

Mr. President, in the Friday edition of the Omaha World Herald there was a curious story. In it, Dean Kleckner of the American Farm Bureau takes to task several farm State Senators and seems to blame us for the impasse on the farm bill. He goes so far as to say, and I quote: "I have heard some Members of Congress say that the (Freedom to Farm) bill will pass over their dead bodies. If there is no farm bill, there will be a lot of dead bodies."

Mr. President, this is, indeed, curious and offensive hyperbole. Some of us have been encouraging a farm bill to be brought up for debate and to be acted on for a long time. But where was the Farm Bureau? They certainly were not taking that line on December 13.

On that day, I received a letter from Mr. Kleckner which took just the opposite position. The Farm Bureau wanted a farm bill only, quoting from that letter, "provided it is part of the budget reconciliation package."

This bit of now you see it and now you don't from the Farm Bureau should come as no surprise, however. On November 6, I received a letter from Mr. Kleckner which said in part, "Particularly troubling throughout this debate has been the inability of the budget process to encourage programs which provide higher income supports when market prices are low and lower supports when prices are high."

And he added at that time in that message, "Continued linkage of market prices and producer payments is very necessary."

In essence, the Farm Bureau staked out a position that is absolutely contrary to the Freedom to Farm bill that it now endorses. That is a 180-degree change. Now they support a farm welfare bill that, I believe, will fail our farmers who do not want welfare payments to do nothing. It cannot withstand the light of day, and I predict that it will not. I am at a loss to explain the schizophrenic behavior of the Farm Bureau. Perhaps they want to hurry up and clear the tracks so they can campaign in the Iowa caucuses and New Hampshire primary. I, for one, however, would prefer that Congress stay in session to work out a farm policy that makes sense, and maybe what was decided tonight is going to allow us to do that.

Certainly, if we do that, it will give us the time for the Farm Bureau to change their minds once again.

I ask unanimous consent that communications of different views from the Farm Bureau of November 6, 1995, December 13, 1995, January 26, 1996, and the Omaha World Herald story of January 26, 1996 be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, December 13, 1995.

DEAR SENATOR: Farm Bureau members are concerned about reduced farm program spending levels but support the framework of the Congressional farm program compromise

provided it is part of the budget reconciliation package.

It is urgent that a budget agreement be reached before the end of 1995. The situation is especially critical for America's farmers and ranchers who need to make planting decisions for the 1996 crop year now.

The American Farm Bureau Federation supports the overall reconciliation package as developed by Congress which includes tax relief, spending restraint and a balanced budget within seven years.

The people have spoken in support of significant government reform and reduced federal spending to balance the budget in seven years. The 4.5 million Farm Bureau families across the nation urge swift and responsible action to resolve the budget impasse.

DEAN R. KLECKNER,
President.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, November 6, 1995.

HON. JAMES J. EXON,
528 Senate Hart,

Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR EXON: The agriculture components of both the House and Senate Budget Reconciliation packages propose substantial changes in farm policy. Both proposals significantly restructure the income safety net for farmers and drastically reduce the dollar amount of that support over the seven-year period. This leaves farm program crop producers more exposed to the production and price risk inherent in farming. The level of spending reductions currently under consideration represents far more than a fair share for agriculture. Even at reduced levels of spending reductions, agriculture would still provide a significant contribution to deficit reduction.

Neither the Senate nor House proposal contains all the answers. In fact both, to a great extent, are too directly driven by the vagueness of budget scoring rather than effective long-term agricultural policy.

Within the Senate and House proposals there are several key elements of an income safety net which should become part of the final reconciliation package.

- These elements include:
1. Increased planting flexibility;
 2. Minimal use of supply management tools;
 3. Increased non-paid flex acres to meet budget requirements;
 4. Continued linkage of market prices and producer payments;
 5. Protections for non-program crop producers; and
 6. Utilization of all budgeted outlays for mandatory program spending.

Particularly troubling throughout this debate has been the inability of the budget process to encourage programs which provide higher income supports when market prices are low, and lower supports when prices rise, while utilizing available budget outlays. In order to provide a long-term safety net the conference committee should develop a program which maintains a price-payment linkage and allows budgeted funds not expended in years of high prices to be available in years in which farm income is low. Failure to resolve this issue will render farm programs either an ineffective income support mechanism or subject them to being an irresistible political target. Unless good policy prevails over budget rules and scoring limitations, American farmers will lose.

The American Farm Bureau supports the Senate language with regard to the dairy provisions. We do not believe that complete deregulation of the dairy industry is in the best interest of our producers across the United States. Full funding for the Dairy Export Incentive Program (DEIP) to the max-

imum extent allowed by the Uruguay Round of GATT should be included in the conference agreement.

Likewise, we ask conferees to build on the growing opportunities for agricultural exports made possible by the passage of GATT and NAFTA. U.S. agricultural exports are expected to reach \$53 billion in 1995. The continuation of effective trade policy is paramount to maintaining market share in the world agricultural economy. Cuts in trade programs would jeopardize the hard fought battle to combat unfair foreign subsidies and regain world market share. We strongly urge you to restore funding for agricultural export promotion and development programs to GATT-permissible levels. We would support increases in unpaid flex to accomplish this goal.

We support the EQUIP, livestock cost-share program, and the elimination of the authority for permanent easements within the Wetlands Reserve Program and on properties acquired by the Farmers Home Administration. We believe these ideas promote sensible agricultural policy that can also generate needed budget savings.

Establishing long-term priorities for agricultural policy should be a part of the new farm bill. As the income safety net is reduced, discussions should be focused on research needs, trade opportunities, credit requirements and risk management alternatives for U.S. farmers. We support the establishment of a national farm policy impact review process.

We appreciate your interest in our views on farm policy. We look forward to working with you to ensure that a farmer-friendly farm policy becomes law.

Sincerely,
DEAN R. KLECKNER,
President.

AFBF CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION ON SEVEN-YEAR FARM BILL

PARK RIDGE, IL.—January 25, 1996.—With the absence of progress on federal budget reform, the American Farm Bureau Federation said a farm bill like the one formerly linked to the congressional budget reconciliation proposal is needed immediately.

The AFBF Board of Directors today said the organization would support a seven-year farm bill now being proposed by House Agriculture Chairman Pat Roberts (R-Kan.), as a stand-alone measure or attached to other legislation. The Roberts proposal includes greater planting flexibility so farmers can better respond to the marketplace and financial support in the form of "market transition payments."

The reasons for this move are numerous, according to AFBF President Dean Kleckner. The two alternatives—an extension of the 1990 farm bill, or reverting to the 1949 farm act—are unacceptable to America's farmers.

Kleckner said the 1949 act is incompatible with U.S. farmers selling their commodities in the world market, and an extension of the 1990 act would fail to provide farmers needed planting flexibility and would invite deeper cuts in agriculture spending during future budget reconciliation efforts.

"Spring planting season in many southern states is just around the corner," Kleckner said. "Farmers must be able to make their planting decisions and secure financing from lenders with full knowledge of the farm program. A stand-alone farm bill, like the framework proposed by Chairman Roberts is essential to the viability of American agriculture over the next seven years."

According to Kleckner, immediate action is required because the longer it takes to approve a farm bill, the lower agriculture's funding baseline will be. He also said a delay

would increase the budget pressures on agriculture in any future budget reconciliation efforts.

"Farmers will continue to push for the tax reform measures included in the stalled budget reconciliation measure," Kleckner said. "Securing an increase in the estate tax exemption and a decrease in the capital gains tax rate are as important to the agriculture economy as nailing down a sensible farm bill. We will continue to highlight the importance of those tax measures as the budget debate continues, but America's farmers need a farm bill now. AFBF and state Farm Bureaus will be making a concerted push in Washington, D.C. and at home in the coming weeks, during Congress' ill-timed February recess."

[From the Omaha World Herald, Jan. 26, 1996]

FARM BUREAU TRIES TO FREE MIREN FARM BILL

(By David C. Beeder)

WASHINGTON.—Members of the American Farm Bureau Federation are seeking immediate action on farm legislation that has been stalled along with the balanced-budget bill. Farm Bureau President Dean Kleckner said Thursday.

Kleckner said the 4.5 million-member Farm Bureau, the country's largest agricultural organization, has started working in every congressional district to urge House and Senate members to separate farm legislation from the long-delayed budget bill.

"Our intention now is to lead the charge in getting a farm bill passed as soon as possible," said Kleckner, a farmer from Rudd, Iowa. "Spring planting season in many Southern states is just around the corner."

Without farm legislation, some farmers are finding it difficult to borrow money, Kleckner said.

A stand-alone farm bill introduced by Rep. Pat Roberts, a Republican from Kansas who heads the House Agriculture Committee, would allocate \$44 billion over seven years to make declining annual payments to farmers based on subsidies they received in the past.

The Roberts bill, co-sponsored by Rep. Bill Barrett, R-Neb., would eliminate acreage restrictions and a requirement that farmers grow the same crop year after year to qualify for payments. Farmers could plant any crop, or no crop, under the bill.

Kleckner said everyone involved in U.S. agriculture recognizes that "declining payments are a fact of life we will have to live with."

However, he said, "My gut feeling is there will always be payments made on agriculture. They may not be related to crop production. They may be made for environmental reasons."

The Roberts-Barrett bill has run into opposition in the Senate.

Opponents include Sens. Tom Daschle, D-S.D., the minority leader, Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., Bob Kerrey, D-Neb., J.J. Exon, D-Neb., and Tom Harkin, D-Iowa.

"I have heard some members of Congress say the bill would pass over their dead bodies," Kleckner said, "If there is no farm bill, there will be a lot of dead bodies."

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have another matter on which I wish to speak, but I want to thank the Senator from Nebraska for bringing this issue

to the floor. For the life of me, I cannot understand why we do not have a farm bill this year. We passed a farm bill out of the Senate Agriculture Committee. It was not what I wanted. But we had our votes, we debated it. Yet, we never brought it on the Senate floor to debate and vote on it. Never. Here it is, almost February 1996, and farmers in our area do not know what to do, how much credit to apply for, or what seed to buy, or what kind of program we are going to have this year. Then listening to the Senator from Nebraska repeat the rapid changes in the national president, or chairman, whatever his position is, of the Farm Bureau, is disconcerting at best.

The Senator from Nebraska, if I understand this right, said that as recently as a month ago, the leader of the Farm Bureau was saying in a letter that was written publicly, I guess, that the Farm Bureau was in favor of a farm program that would have some connection between commodity programs and support prices, and that they were in favor of a program that would support farmers in years when prices were low, but not necessarily when prices are high. Was that just a month ago, I ask the Senator?

Mr. EXON. I believe the date was November 6, maybe 60 days ago. The timeframe may be a little over a month. But the Senator is absolutely correct, regardless of the date, there was a dramatic change overnight, without any explanation from the Farm Bureau of being against the program they are now for, and that boggles my mind.

Mr. HARKIN. I add, on the Agriculture Committee last summer—and I forget the exact date—the same individual, the president of the American Farm Bureau, was before our committee. Then we were talking about the budget, of which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska knows a lot, since he is a ranking member on our Budget Committee. I was asking him about the budget. I said that the Clinton budget cuts about—I think at that time it was around \$4 billion, over a period, from agriculture, and I think the House budget cut something like \$13 billion or \$14 billion from agriculture. I asked him, "Given those two options, which would you prefer? Which would the Farm Bureau be for?" He said they would prefer the Clinton budget.

Now it seems like there is another big turnaround where they want this so-called freedom to farm bill, which, as the Senator said, is really the farm welfare bill. I do not know how anyone could ask us to pass a bill that would give a Government check to a farmer when prices were extremely high in the marketplace. But that is what they are asking for. It is a siren song for farmers. If they buy into that, in a few years there will not be any farm program or any farm bill at all to protect them when prices are low. I thank the Senator for bringing this up.

Mr. EXON. If the Senator will yield for a minute—

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. I yield.

Mr. EXON. My friend has been at the forefront of workable farm programs for a long time. I am as mystified as he is. To build upon what the Senator just said, I placed in the RECORD the other day the farm welfare program, the so-called Freedom to Farm Act. It would provide a massive amount, thousands of dollars a year, to a farmer whether or not the farmer even planted, on one hand, and he would get the same amount of thousands of dollars—I figured out that a typical farm of 500 acres, a corn farmer, at \$3.10 a bushel, under the Freedom to Farm Act, even though that farmer at 500 acres, 120 bushels return, which is somewhere near normal—

Mr. HARKIN. We get more than that in Iowa.

Mr. EXON. It would be \$186,000 gross income the farmer would make. That is gross, not net. But on top of that \$186,000, that particular farmer would receive a check of about \$16,000. Or, I might add, if the price of corn went up to \$4 a bushel, he would still get the \$26,000, or at \$5 a bushel, the farmer would get the \$26,000; or if the farmer did not want to do anything and just sit home and watch television and surf the channels and not even go out and plant, he still gets \$26,000 from the Federal Government.

If that is not a form of welfare—as I said in my remarks, once the Sun shines in on that, once the members of the Farm Bureau realize and recognize that their leadership is trying to convert a farm program based on production that supports them when prices are low but does not support them when they are getting \$3.10 a bushel, there is going to be a revolution in the Farm Bureau. There is also going to be, what is more serious, a revolution that the Senator from Iowa commented on when the people of the United States and the Members of the House of Representatives and U.S. Senate recognize that you are throwing that kind of money away, regardless of what the price of corn is, even at \$5 a bushel, you get it whether or not you earn it, and that is welfare.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I compliment him. He has been a great leader in agriculture. I am going to miss his leadership in the years to come on the Senate floor.

REDUCING NUCLEAR TENSIONS IN THE WORLD

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise on a matter of great concern to me and all those who are concerned about reducing nuclear tensions in the world, who are concerned about nonproliferation, and who are in favor of and concerned about a comprehensive test ban treaty. I might point out that in the State of the Union Message last Tuesday, President Clinton said that one of the things he wanted to accomplish was a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

Most experts agree that nowhere on Earth is the potential for a nuclear