



27 of 134 DOCUMENTS

Congressional Record -- House

Tuesday, October 1, 1985

99th Cong. 1st Sess.

131 Cong Rec H 7914

REFERENCE: Vol. 131 No. 125

TITLE: FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985

SPEAKER: Mr. ALEXANDER; Mr. BEDELL; Mr. BEREUTER; Mr. BOULTER; Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri; Mr. COMBEST; Mr. DASCHLE; Mr. de la GARZA; Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota; Mr. ENGLISH; Mr. EVANS of Illinois; Mr. FOLEY; Mr. FRANK; Mr. GLICKMAN; Mr. HATCHER; Mr. HUCKABY; Mr. MADIGAN; Mr. MARLENEE; Mr. PEASE; Mr. PENNY; Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH; Mr. ROBERTS; Mr. SLATTERY; Mr. SMITH of Iowa; Mr. STANGELAND; Mr. STENHOLM; Mr. VOLKMER

TEXT: Text that appears in UPPER CASE identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the House on the floor.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 267 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2100.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2100) to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumer an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes, with Mr. Bonior of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, September 26, title IV was open to amendment at any point to amendments printed in the Congressional Record before September 24, 1985.

Are there amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Glickman: Title IV of H.R. 2100 is amended by --

On page 65, after line 8, striking all through "shall" on line 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

On page 67, after line 5, striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of wheat, the Secretary shall";

On page 68, line 23 before the "." inserting the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a wheat acreage base of less than 15 acres for the crop.";

On page 70, after line 11, striking all through line 12, page 71 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) For each crop of wheat, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$4.50 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels and

"(ii) \$4.00 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that exceeds fifteen thousand bushels.";

On page 86, line 15 striking "may not" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall";

On page 86, line 18 striking "may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall"; and

Title V of H.R. 2100 is amended by --

On page 87, after line 15, striking all through "shall" on line 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(2)(A) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

On page 89, after line 11, striking all through "shall" on line 15 and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(B) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

On page 89, line 5, striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of corn the Secretary shall";

On page 90, line 21, striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of feed grains the Secretary shall";

On page 92, line 4, before the "." insert the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a feed grains acreage base of less than 15 acres for the crop.";

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

On page 93, after line 19 striking all through line 20, page 94 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) For each crop of corn, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$3.10 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed thirty thousand bushels and

"(ii) \$2.75 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that exceeds thirty thousand bushels.";

On page 109, line 12 striking "may not" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall"; and

On page 109, line 15 striking "may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall".

Mr. GLICKMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, rather than taking the time of the full House, rather than talking about the substance of the amendment, in order to expedite the process, I wonder if we might deal with the point of order right now, and if the Chair rules that it is out of order, there is no reason why I have to spend 5 or 10 minutes explaining the amendment.

POINTS OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on his point of order?

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Under a reservation of a point of order, the gentleman cannot yield time. If other Members have points of order, they can make them and they will be so recognized.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe a point of order would lie against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] because the amendment, if I understand the amendment that is being offered, goes to more than one title of the bill, and I think that because it goes to more than one title of the bill, it would not be in order at this point.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I speak to the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] is recognized.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment amends two titles of the bill. To be frank with the Chair, it was submitted as one amendment, but the intention of the author of this amendment as well as the other authors was to deal with the issues as they affected title IV and then title V. I put it in one title of the bill, but, to be honest with the Chair, the issues are divisible, they are separate. I could have amended it and put it in two separate amendments. I did not because that is not the way the issue came up in the Committee on Agriculture.

The issues relating to the issue of targeting deficiency payments to small- and medium-sized farmers and utilizing a device called the marketing loan as a way to deal with our exports; they are in the wheat section, title IV, and there is a separate matter, deals with it separately in the feed grains section, title V.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

The amendments are divisible. The language is divisible, and I would hope that the Chair would understand that it was the intent of the author of the amendment to really consider these two as two separate concepts, but I put them together for the ease of putting them in one amendment, since feed grains in the committee were dealt with as one basic issue.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, rule III of the rules provides that considerations can only be by title, not by section. I think the point remains that there is no question that this amendment does affect two titles. There are several other amendments, Mr. Chairman, that I will rise on this same issue affecting both sides of the aisle. I think to keep this whole discussion clean, we should follow the rule. The rule clearly states that you cannot amend two titles in one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there others who wish to be heard?

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland] make a point of order on this?

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to make a point of order. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman making a point of order on this amendment?

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I am arguing against the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. STANGELAND. I thank the Chair. I just want to make the point that the amendment was printed in two distinctly separate sections. One portion of the amendment dealt with wheat and target prices and marketing loans. The second section of the amendment deals with title V, the feed grain section. Two distinctly different amendments but introduced in the Record as, unfortunately, one amendment. But they deal with the two sections separately. I would just appeal to the Chair that the intent of the authors was that because they were handled en bloc in committee, we would run that way, but they are divisible, they can be addressed to title IV and title V very distinctly in the amendment.

I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr Bonior of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair would state that the Chair can only look at the form in which the amendment has been submitted for printing in the Record. According to the rule, the substitute shall be considered for amendment by title instead of by sections, and only amendments to the bill which have been printed in the Record by September 24 may be offered.

Therefore, the only way in which the amendment that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] wishes to offer could be considered is by unanimous consent.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

There was no objection.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon -- --

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I have the time, 5 minutes. The Chairman has given me 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask under what order the gentleman is speaking?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I moved to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moved to strike the last word. The Chair asked if there was objection. Hearing none, the gentleman was recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would just say to my colleague from Oregon that I am going to get these amendments offered in one way or the other. If they are not offered in this way, it is my understanding the gentleman from North Dakota is going to offer amendments on the wheat section and on the feed grains section separately, and I am going to move to amend those sections of the bill to include this language.

Now, given that that is the case, I wonder if the gentleman would object if I would divide the amendment I just offered and agree if I offer the wheat section only, because if the gentleman does not, I am going to come right back and amend his section. Why waste the committee's time?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I can only suggest that the gentleman should do what he can do within the rules. I am merely pointing out that technically it has been sustained by the Chair that the amendment in its form is not properly before the House.

Now, whatever avenues the gentleman might like to pursue he must take. I am going to continue to object to the kind of amendment that is here and will object to the division because the gentleman has another alternative.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman there probably might be more willingness to ignore the rules if we were not mixing various elements of various proposals here. Targeting is one thing; market loan is something else. To try to consider those jointly is perhaps objectionable to some people who might not consider one or the other objectionable, and that might be something the gentleman would want to think about.

I certainly do not want to frustrate the will of the House or the opportunity of any Member to present things to the House for them to work their will. But to tie on the targeting to the marketing loan concept is sort of to blackmail certain people who might be for the marketing loan and would have to accept the targeting because they wanted to vote for the marketing loan. I think the gentleman understands that.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I do understand it. I would object to the characterization of "blackmail." This is the way it was

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

offered in the full Committee on Agriculture and almost prevailed by a margin of 22 to 20. But I am not going to take the time of the House. I am going to try to work the legislative will of this body as the amending process continues.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota: Page 70, strike out line 19 and all that follows thereafter through page 71, line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) The established price for the 1986 through 1990 crops of wheat shall be \$5.25 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed twelve thousand bushels.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kansas indicated, a number of us have been working in different ways to try and provide some targeting to price supports in the bill reported out by the Committee on Agriculture.

Let me explain briefly what my amendment does and then indicate that I expect my amendment will be either amended or substituted for by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman].

My intent has been to see if we can turn the corner here on farm policy and use our money as effectively as we can to provide the strongest support price possible for the family farm. We have limited resources in this country to devote to agriculture. Yet, with limited resources we tend to use those resources in a manner that, in my judgement, is not in the best interests of agriculture.

Our dollars tend to follow production, those who produce the most get the most; those who produce the most and get the most need it the least. Therefore, using the same amount of money or less, why do we not consider providing a stronger target price for the first increment of production?

In the amendment that I have introduced, it would provide for a \$5.25 target price for the first 12,000 bushels of wheat production.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman], when he offers his amendment, will provide for a \$4.50 target price for wheat for the first 15,000 bushels and \$4 target price over that.

Now the approach here is to simply say this: We have to decide in this country whether our public policy is designed to promote a network of family farms. If it is not, then let us continue doing what we have been doing and we will see record farm failures, we will use a lot of money, and it will all follow production. Those who produce the most will get the most, and they need it the least.

But if we want to change all that, let us use our resources in a way that provides a much stronger support price for the first increment of production.

It is not an approach that says, "Big is bad," or, "Small is beautiful;" it simply says as a matter of public policy we think it is in this country's interests we think it is in this country's security interest to maintain a network of family

farms.

How best do you do that? You use whatever resources you have available to you to layer in with the best support price possible for that increment of production that you can cover with your resources, believing then that you have told family farmers that if they work hard and if they pay attention to management, they can make a living out there on the farm.

They have done this in Japan; they have done it in Western Europe. A number of countries have made that policy decision that, yes, we want, as a matter of public policy, to do what is necessary to maintain a network of family farms. We have not done that in this country. The manner in which we spend our money for support prices for agriculture determines whether we have a public policy that says we want a network of family farms in America's future. That is the reason I have introduced this amendment. Since I drafted this amendment earlier this year in a bill and then noticed it to the House as an amendment, I worked with the gentleman from Kansas, the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from South Dakota and others, to see if we could not agree to an approach that targets farm price supports in a responsible way.

I intend to support the gentleman from Kansas in his effort as a substitute to this to try to provide some targeting because that will be the first step in turning the corner to use our public dollars to promote the existence in the long term in America of a network of family farms.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from North Dakota for presenting this issue to the floor.

The gentleman from Minnesota will be offering a substitute to the gentleman's amendment. That substitute will modify the numbers on the targeting and add the marketing loan language. But I want to say to my colleagues that the issue here is a very important issue. The issue is: Do we think that the farm program benefits are to be targeted to small- and medium-size farmers who, for the most part, need that help more than do farmers in the largest 5 percent? And the second part of the substitute will be based on the marketing loan concept. But the Members should understand that this is an important issue in this bill. It has not gotten quite the play that the referendum language has. But the issue is: Should we target farm programs?

And I might say to my colleagues that the other body in their bill so far have in fact done this. They have targeted farm programs, essentially based on size, and I think as a matter of policy we ought to be doing that.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Reclaiming my time, let me say in conclusion that if you are a farmer in Western Europe, in France, in Germany, in Italy, and you raise wheat, you are provided a much higher support price than you are provided for raising wheat here in America. If you are a farmer in Japan, it is even higher than the support price you get in Western Europe.

Now, it is not because we are not spending the money. Lord knows, we spend lots of money on agriculture. It is because the money is moving in the wrong direction. We are, with a loan rate, undergirding every single bushel produced by those who produce the largest crops in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we are spending plenty of money. Let us spend it the right way.

I neglected, when I began, to say that I have worked with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland]. Part of

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

this is also the marketing loan, which I think is a good idea, that Congressman Stangeland has worked on, but, to me, targeting is what is essential in this amendment, and I hope the Members of the House of Representatives will see this as a new approach, a new way to use public dollars more effectively to save the family farm in America.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order was reserved by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith]. Does the gentleman wish to pursue his point of order?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STANGELAND AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Stangeland as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota:

Strike the amendment to page 70 in the Glickman (Dorgan as printed in the Record) amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) on page 68, line 23 before the "." inserting the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a wheat acreage base of less than 15 acres for the crop.";

"(b) on page 70, after line 11 striking all through page 71, line 12 and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(C) For each crop of wheat, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$4.50 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels and

"(ii) \$4.00 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that exceeds fifteen thousand bushels.";

and

(1) Title IV of H.R. 2100 is amended by --

"(a) on page 65, after line 8, striking all through "shall" on line 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(2) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

(b) on page 67, line 5 striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(3)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of wheat, the Secretary shall";

"(c) on page 68, after line 25, inserting the following new paragraph --

"(4)(A) The Secretary may, for each of the 1986 through 1989 crops of wheat, make payments available to producers who, although eligible to obtain a loan or purchase agreement under paragraph (3), agree to forgo obtaining such loan or agreement in return for such payments.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

"(B)(i) A payment under this paragraph shall be computed by multiplying --

"(I) the loan payment rate; by

"(II) the quantity of wheat the producer is eligible to place under loan.

"(ii) For purposes of the paragraph, the quantity of wheat eligible to be placed under loan may not exceed the produce obtained by multiplying --

"(I) the individual farm program acreage for the crop; by

"(II) the farm program payment yield established for the farm.

"(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the loan payment rate shall be the amount by which --

"(i) the loan level determined for such crop under paragraph (3); exceeds

"(ii) the level at which a loan may be repaid under paragraph (3)(B).

"(D) Any payments under this paragraph shall not be included in the payments subject to limitations under the provisions of section 1011 of the Food Security Act of 1985."

"(d) on page 68, line 23 before the "." inserting the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a wheat acreage base of less than 15 acres for the crop.";

"(e) on page 70, after line 11 striking all through line 12, page 71 and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(C) For each crop of wheat, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$4.50 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels and

"(ii) \$4.00 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels.";

"(f) on page 86, line 15 striking "may not" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall";

"(g) on page 86, line 18 striking "may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall"; and

Mr. STANGELAND (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say that the substitute amendment now before us is the original Glickman-Stangeland-Roberts-Daschle amendment with a minor technical change to assure that it costs no more than the present committee bill.

I think that's an important point to make. Our amendment does not spend more money than the committee bill, it merely allocates the limited Federal dollars available in a more efficient and cost-effective manner to assist family-sized farmers.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

In a nutshell, our amendment directs maximum farm program benefits to the middle 85-90 percent of all U.S. grain farmers having wheat bases from 15-535 acres and corn bases from 15-340 acres. It accomplishes this goal in two ways: First, by implementing a two-tiered target price which permits a higher level of support than the committee bill, but only up to a certain volume of production; and secondly, through the implementation of a recourse marketing loan.

I personally believe that the targeting of direct farm program payments -- which we are doing through our two-tiered target price proposal -- is a concept whose time has come. Ever since the enactment of the 1981 farm bill, numerous studies have shown that it is not the extremely small hobby farmers primarily dependent upon income earned off the farm, nor is it the large-scale superfarms, which are most in need of farm program benefits.

But the problem with current farm programs is that no such distinction is made. That is a major reason why farm program costs have exploded in recent years, while an ever-growing number of medium-sized family farmers continue to be driven from their land.

For example, in 1984, just 1 percent of the largest wheat farms in the United States received 14 percent of the total direct Government payments. Likewise, 2 percent of the corn producers received 16 percent of the payments.

The committee bill would merely extend this disparity for another 5 years. This amendment offers us the chance, during a time of limited budgetary resources, to direct scarce Federal dollars to commercial-sized family farmers who are most dependent upon income supports.

In addition, the recourse marketing loan feature in this amendment is a way to further insure that our farm programs benefit family-sized farmers.

I'm going to let the members of the House in on a dirty little secret. Our present farm programs indirectly subsidize those producers who are the very cause of our present surplus problems -- that is, the nonparticipants who plant fencerow-to-fencerow.

Any farmer will tell you that, historically, it is those farmers who have not participated in farm programs that have benefited the most. By planting every acre and indirectly benefitting from the market price floor -- in effect, an artificial subsidy -- that is created under the present nonrecourse farm law, there actually exists a perverse incentive for farmers to avoid supply management efforts.

Under the recourse marketing loan in this amendment, farmers who participate in the farm program will receive the same income protection as they receive under the present nonrecourse farm law. However, farmers who choose not to reduce their production and instead further exacerbate our severe oversupply situation will no longer be protected as they are under current law and the committee bill.

No longer can we afford to artificially prop up the returns received by farmers unwilling to contribute their fair share to resolving today's enormous supply and demand imbalance.

In addition, by permitting producers to repay their loans at the State average price when they redeem, the Government avoids the accumulation of costly and price-depressing surplus stocks while immediately improving farmers' export opportunities.

The essence of this amendment is that, by targeting deficiency payments and implementing a recourse marketing loan, we believe it is possible to more efficiently direct farm program benefits to the commercial-sized family farmer. The overriding question now before this body is: Will we in the Congress show the political will to reform Depression-era farm programs so that they might better meet the needs of American agriculture in the 1980's?

If we choose to continue with the same failed programs that have exacerbated the present crisis in agriculture, it will prove that we are so wedded to the familiarity of the past, that we are unwilling to risk any chances of success in

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

the future.

In conclusion, this amendment is supported by the National Corn Growers Association, the National Grange, Interfaith Action for Economic Justice, and others.

Let's offer farmers a program that can work and offer hope. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure as the debate continues on on this concept that we are going to hear in this House that the marketing loan will so reduce prices in the world market that we are going to cause severe impact and pain on Brazil, Argentina, on Mexico, on other countries, much as we heard arguments during the sugar program as to what that program would do to Central American economies.

Let me say that every farmer and every person in this country wants our friends from Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and from the lesser developed countries to prosper and grow. But I do not think it that the farmers of this country have the responsibility to bear the burden of those economies on their backs as well as the burdens of our economy. Our farmers' backs are bent under the burdens they are carrying in this economy today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Stangeland was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. STANGELAND. To add to the burden they are carrying on this economy in this country the economies of those other countries who are having to earn money and earn cash to pay back to international bankers would be to break their backs, and I think we can ill afford that. I think is time we stood up for American agriculture, that we pass a bill that not only preserves agriculture for today but gives opportunity for tomorrow.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a complicated issue; and, to our colleagues who have not followed the intricacies of the commodity programs, I am going to try to, basically, tell you what the difference is between this bill and the base bill that we have got and these amendments, and I think these are important amendments. I want to compliment my colleague from Minnesota, my colleague from Kansas [Mr. Roberts], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Daschle], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Slattery], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Penny], and a whole assortment of other people have indicated their interest in this concept.

Right now in the bill you get the same target price, or deficiency payment or subsidy payment, whatever you want to call, it up to \$50,000, no matter how many bushels you produce. So if you produce 100,000 bushels of wheat, you will get the target price payment per bushel up to the \$50,000 payment limitation and, as you go down from there, you will get the maximum allowable up to the \$50,000 payment limitation. That is all you can get under the target price program. And then if you are a smaller farmer, of course, you get the same dollar, or so, per bushel, and so you will be under that payment limitation. That is, current law does not differentiate between big and small farmers at all. The only thing that keeps this a so-to-speak means-tested program is that there is a \$50,000 cap that nobody can get any more in target price payments for. We support that. I think that cap is fair and reasonable, and I think it ought to be left at those levels.

Now, what we are trying to do here is to say that we think that since this is basically a deficiency payment, a subsidy payment, that more of it ought to be more targeted to those farmers who are in trouble, small- and medium-size farmers, based upon this particular proposal, that is, targeting at a higher level for the first 15,000 bushels of wheat \$4.50 a bushel and a lower level, anything afterward, \$4 a bushel, we are able to get more target price money to smaller and medium size farmers. And, actually, 97.5 percent of the farms in this country do better or as good or better under this

proposal than they do under the committee bill because most farmers would still be eligible for up to the maximum, \$50,000. It is only the very large farms that will not get as much money under this proposal as they would under the committee bill.

So if you are interested in trying to target the effort to those farmers who really need help in this period of farm crisis, this amendment is more suited to that. It is not a radical effort. What we do in this bill is we pay \$4.50 on the first 15,000 bushels, \$4 on the next 15,000 bushels. That is not a lot different than the current bill of \$4.38 on everything, but what it does is, it gets a higher target price to those smaller and medium size farmers who are probably among the ones who are hurting more than it does the larger farmers.

Now, the next thing it does is, it creates a marketing loan, a recourse marketing loan. And, basically, what we are saying there, it is not too different from what the committee bill is, but only in this sense: The committee bill provides two options to get grain competitively priced. The one option, which is the Findley or Foley option is one that gives the Secretary the authority to lower the loan rate up to 20 percent if he wants to do that. The other option is a marketing loan. The marketing loan, basically, says that the farmer must repay that loan but he will repay it at the world price, which means, honestly, that the price will probably go to world levels immediately. But the farmer is protected in the interim, because the farmer gets his loan at whatever the level is, \$3.14, and he repays it the world price, which might be \$2.50. So the farmer does not lose any money in the process.

Now, some people will argue: Is this not a boon to large farmers? Some people will argue that this is going to get the price down too fast. The fact of the matter is, this is probably the only way we are going to get competitive in the world markets immediately. The committee bill will not do this. The committee bill will continue keeping our loan levels to the point where the Government will end up owning lots of grain. This amendment provides that the Government will not end up owning lots of grain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Glickman was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Nothing we do here on the floor is going to produce miracles for our farmers. Nothing we do is going to save some folks who are in such bad trouble they cannot be salvaged. But this amendment does do a couple of things as a matter of policy. It targets aid to those who really need it, it targets it to small and midsized producers. That not only is popular, particularly in urban constituencies in this country, but it is right.

It also ensures that most farmers, well over 95 percent, are not prejudiced by this targeting. Only the very largest farmers may get a little bit less than they do right now, and not that much less.

Finally, what it would do is it to provide a situation where we can get the farmer competitive in the world markets and doing so in a way that shields him, that shields him for a lower market price.

So I would urge the Members to support this amendment knowing that it does represent a deviation from current farm policy. I am going to support this farm bill even if this amendment does not pass, but I want to tell the Members something: The current farm bill is really nothing more than an extension of current programs. This is the way it is written now with the exception of the Bedell amendment. This amendment makes some changes in the way we have done business, and a lot of people are scared of that because it reflects a difference in the way we provide for farm programs. I still happen to believe that it reflects a creative attempt to get dollars to those farmers who need it and to get us competitive in the world markets.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the important points that needs to be made is that in most areas of the country, most of the farmers' production will be covered under this kind of a support price. Now, some people say well, is this not discriminating against the big versus the small and so on. The answer to that is "No." What we are saying is that there is only a certain amount of money. We are going to use it for a stronger support price, and when we run out of money, we have run out of money. That is kind of the approach we are trying to take initially with the targeting amendment.

I think the gentleman's amendment, although it does not go as far as the amendment I had, is a good start in targeting farm program benefits. I would certainly commend the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the bottom line of these targeting amendments that are being offered. I rise in opposition to this concept as being alien to our concept of supporting the hands-on family farmer.

Rather than promoting the family farmer, it seems to me that by this kind of legislation we are promoting the absentee landlords around this country. We are promoting the doctor, who owns 100 acres of land or a half-section of land. We are promoting the attorney who owns a half-section or a section of land. This is the most prevalent group that received less than 15,000 bushels as a crop share. We are saying, Let us use our resources and give them more money than we are giving to the hands-on producers of this country, the people that need the help."

Of the 2.2 million farmers surveyed in the 1982 Census, 1 million of these people did not even consider themselves producers. When asked flat out: "Are you an agricultural producer?" They were carried on the Census forms as producers, but they said, "Hey, we are not farmers" when they were asked flat out. Now through this amendment we are targeting our precious resources, that should be going to the family farmer, that should be going to the hands-on producers, we are instead targeting it to some of these 1 million producers who said "Hey we are not farmers."

Also in that 1982 Census survey, farmers who had 100 acres or less were categorized 65 percent absentee landlords, and you want to target our resources to those people? To the doctors, the lawyers, the retired farmers who do not need the assistance? I think we are going about this all in the wrong way.

You know, the national wheat growers, the Montana wheat growers, any what-growing organization does not support this concept. They support the kind of commonsense legislation that was put together by Tom Foley and myself which attempts to help the hands-on producers. But instead, we have those here who are interested, interested once again, in seeing that we take it from those who have and give it to those who have not. They are trying to set up class differentials in all segments, not only in social programs that we have, but let us set up differentials in agriculture so that the bigger farmers and the commercial farmers are discriminated against. I say that we have got to reject this targeting concept; that we have got to get back to farm programs that help the hands-on producers and help establish a price for those people so they can stay in business.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARLENEE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman all I wanted to say is that all of us are concerned about a doctor or a lawyer that owns farm land and would collect price supports, but I think the gentleman uses an exception to try and demonstrate a rule.

The rule is out there that if you are in the Farm Program under these provisions you would, A, have to set aside 30

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

percent, you would have to idle 30 percent. Then you would, under these provisions, have a \$4.50 target price for certain income or production. The rule is that would apply to most of the working farmers in my district, in yours, and in other districts around the country. The question is simply how do we want to spend our money? Do you want to spread it around so that everybody gets an inadequate price support or do you want to target it so that we provide a stronger price support and when we run out of money we say, sorry, but we are out of money, we want to spend it the best way we can to help the most family farmers in America.

Mr. MARLENEE. The given fact is that most producers, most hands-on producers rent agricultural land. They usually rent not one, but two, and three, and four. Four different parcels of land. They do it on a crop share. Most of those people, those four or five landlords get a crop share and they are the ones that get these targeted dollars. If you give these landlords a higher target price than you give the actual producer, it is terrible discrimination. The four or five landlords each get a higher target price yet the poor hands-on producer that farms the five tracts does not get a higher target on each of the five tracts but on only one 15,000-bushel increment. Looks like to me landlords could get a higher target on up to 75,000 bushels and never even visit the farm. The action in adopting this concept shows it 75,000 to 15,000 against the farmer.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STANGELAND AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Volkmer to the amendment offered by Mr. Stangeland as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota: Wherever it appears in the amendment, strike "15 acres" and insert in lieu thereof "10 acres".

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like first to inform the gentleman from Montana who previously spoke in the well that there are many hands-on farmers throughout this country and especially in Missouri and northern Missouri that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota would do a great deal of benefit for. These are farmers that are very diversified and they have 600-, 700-acre farms, some 800-acre farms, 400-acre farms, but they also produce soybeans, milo, corn, and wheat on all those farms. They sometimes even have cattle and pork production also. So it is very diversified. They are hands-on, family farmers. Under the Stangeland amendment they would be greatly benefited.

The amendment I am offering is for some of those farmers who have small wheat bases while they may have 200 acres of beans or 200 acres of corn in addition to that, have a small wheat base, and on the other hand, they may have a larger base of wheat, some of them, but have a smaller corn. I will offer the same amendment when we get to corn.

This amendment is not to just take care of hobby farmers but full-time, family farmers who have small bases. I have many of them in my district, and this is just to try to recognize the fact that these are not all hobby farmers. I will admit that many of them are. This amendment is to make sure that they, too, come within the purview of the Stangeland amendment which I strongly support.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STANGELAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think the gentleman's concern is adequately addressed in the Stenholm bases and yield

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

provision of the bill. However, we have no objection to the amendment. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, there is another aspect to this proposal that I think is being more or less covered up by emphasizing targeting. That is that the amendment uses a statewide average price to determine the price at which the producer may buy back his commodity. In Missouri, the difference between the price of corn or wheat in northwest Missouri compared to the bootheel is 20 to 25 cents a bushel. It is a bad provision in this bill; using statewide averages. Some people -- down in the bootheel, for example -- could secure a loan under the program, get their loan money, and the next day sell it on the market for a quarter more in their area because the statewide average price is lower than the normal price in their area.

You cannot make a program work even as described that uses statewide averages. If we have such a program, it should use the backed-off price like ASCS uses for loan rates. It is not workable the way it is written.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me to proceed, that has to be addressed in another part of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No, it is in this part of the bill. Your amendment is to the part of the bill that includes statewide averages.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, but not in this amendment. What we are trying to address is the targeting concept for targeting prices.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It also includes the marketing loans.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Volkmer] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan].

The amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and rise in opposition to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland].

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will exercise the same good judgment it did last week by supporting the committee bill instead of attempting to rewrite on this floor what is an extremely complicated and difficult piece of legislation.

The particular substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland], I believe, would have been subject to a point of order as to the germaneness of the section on the marketing loan, had anyone chosen to raise that objection. Additionally, it brings together two very disparate ideas. The first of these is the so-called targeting concept, which is highly different from the original amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan].

The problem with targeting is that it will not help only small farmers, or the family farmer. What constitutes a

family farm depends very much on where in the country you are located. In that regard, the original Dorgan amendment would limit the entire support of the Government's farm deficiency payments to 12,000 bushels of wheat. In some areas that is not a family farm economic unit at all; it is below it.

Further, there is nothing in either the Dorgan amendment or the substitute to prevent large farmers, very large farmers, from taking advantage of the higher prices for the first 12,000 or 15,000 bushels of wheat by planting it instead of some other commodity which they now plant in large amounts. There is not a single feature of this so-called targeting amendment that limits its application to small- or medium-sized farmers. A very large corn, cotton, or soybean farmer could decide to plant wheat in order to get the benefit of this higher level of targeting. Indeed we may see some rather uneconomic, though perhaps personally advantageous, decisions made by some farmers' to change their farming patterns in order to benefit from this payment rate.

Second, the marketing loan is a concept that I think was explored in great detail in the Agriculture Committee and was rejected. Simply stated, the marketing loan, says that you can take out a production loan from the Government for X amount of money and then repay significantly less than the amount borrowed. Obviously that is a concept that has a great deal of appeal. I have no doubt we would all like to have similar opportunities in home mortgages and other loans to pass back to the Government whatever smaller share of the return of principle and interest the current price structure permits. I cannot quarrel with the motion that this is an innovative approach.

But let me say to those, like the gentleman from North Dakota and the gentleman from Kansas, who worry about these resources going to big producers that there is nothing in the marketing loan concept that prevents it from being taken advantage of by the larger producers in the country. Indeed it is exempt from the \$50,000 payment limitation which exists in all other programs. As a consequence it is an extraordinary opportunity for the largest farmers to take part in a program where they take out loans, and then, if the price conditions justify it, they pay back something less.

Again the amendment moves entirely in a different direction than the gentleman, in the well suggests. Practically speaking, it will, if anything, be a boon to larger producers.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have two things. No. 1, I want to say that the targeting in the substitute is not as draconian as the targeting in the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. I think I have made that clear.

Mr. GLICKMAN. It is \$4.50 for the 15,000 bushels and \$4 for anything thereafter. I seriously doubt whether people would make those kinds of judgment on what the gentleman is talking about considering that the current target price is \$4.38 a bushel right now. So we are just talking about a maximum targeting price that is 12 cents a bushel more.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will just allow me to respond to that, it must be either one thing or the other. It either provides a big boon to the first 15,000 bushels of production or it does not. If it does not provide that much difference, then the gentleman's argument as to why it is necessary to help family farmers tends to weaken. If on the other hand, it does provide that big a difference, it will encourage production.

Mr. GLICKMAN. The gentleman is trying to create a greater distinction than I think is actually in the amendment. It is trying to provide some additional incentive for the first bushels of production, but it is not a gigantic additional incentive that would cause a person to change dramatically his farm operation.

Second of all, I would point out that later on in the bill, where we for the first time have a \$250,000 limitation on nonrecourse loans, I intend to offer, if this amendment passes, that same kind of limitation on these loans. So the gentleman's argument about the giant farmer being eligible for these kinds of loans would not be accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Foley was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that it certainly is accurate as regards this substitute. However, whether it is advisable to try and limit production cooperation to farms other than large farms or not is a philosophical issue.

One of the problems we have had in our agricultural programs is that to some extent they have excluded some of the larger producers from having an incentive to participate and thus help control production. In any case, as offered now, there is no easy way to estimate the budget cost of a marketing loan because its only limit is the price at which the loan has to be repaid. Depending on where the prices go, it could involve a very large obligation of the Government just as it could involve a very large benefit to producers, regardless of size, in not having to pay back the full amount of their loans.

Also, I think the precedent that loans, as such, are not necessarily repaid to the Government, that there is a built-in forgiveness feature in the loan, is an awkward one to set.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my chairman of the Subcommittee on Wheat, Soybeans, and Feed Grains, is it not true that in many of the agricultural areas where we have commercial producers, because of the cost, because of the low prices that they have been receiving, and because of efficiency, farmers have banded together in small companies, and would this not destroy that banding together of maybe three or four families who are trying to continue to farm? Would this not destroy that effort?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me to reclaim my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concept.

May I just make an additional comment before my time has expired? I have not been as severe about the effect of this amendment as I should be. I suggested that its only requirement was that 70 percent of the loan has to be repaid. I spoke in error, however. That is a provision in the other body. There is no restriction on these loans we are discussing. Wherever the price goes, that is the only obligation that the farmer has, and possibly the entire loan, technically 50 percent of it, or more, is subject to being forgiven. So I think the House had better consider how far it wants to go with this concept.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, in analyzing the bill in subcommittee and again in full committee, on this concept that was offered as an amendment, was there not some concern about allowing this marketing loan concept, as you have so amply pointed out?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Marlenee, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Foley was allowed to proceed for 2 additional

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

minutes.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, was there no concern that when you allow absolutely no bottom, allow the price to go down and you pay back the loan at bottom, no matter where it goes down to, no matter what the market is -- that that means a great deal more budget exposure? Was there not a great deal of concern about that?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I think there is concern about the budget exposure. Second, it sends, I think, the wrong signal to farmers -- that it removes them almost totally from any responsibility for production levels in the country because someone, theoretically, will protect them regardless of where the price goes.

Third, farmers would not have to worry that much collectively about getting the best price in the marketplace because theoretically the Government again becomes the guarantor through forgiveness of the loan.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee chairman is exactly correct.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman if this is so: One of the things we have loan programs for is to help spread the marketing out during the marketing year.

Mr. FOLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Now, under this concept, the person who markets his grain right at harvest time, for example, gets the maximum amount of money that he is going to get from the Government, and he is penalized really for holding the grain another 6 months. He loses the storage, he ends up getting less or paying back more, because the statewide average price is going to be higher 6 months later into the marketing year.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman just yield on that point about the statewide average price? He has mentioned it twice. Will the gentleman yield for just one second to me?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. It is the statewide average price as adjusted for each county in the State. That is in the bill. It is not in the amendment. That is in the bill, and I think that ought to be reflected in order to correct the record.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on the gentleman's present point, I think he is right, that there is a tendency in this amendment to remove the normal judgments that farmers would have to make about appropriate orderly marketing of the crops because again the loan itself is repaid only at current current prices.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. So it really almost forces them, if they are not going to hold it until the end of the marketing season anyway and deliver it in lieu of the loan, it forces them to dump it right at harvest time.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the things I want to say to the gentleman is that I do not know how farmers are going to react to this. It is a totally new concept.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to my friend and colleague, the coauthor of the amendment, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland].

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to make a couple of points. First, the gentleman from Iowa expressed concern about the statewide price. This is found on page 68 under subsection (b) where that State price is adjusted to the county price. It is exactly the same as the way current loan levels are done.

Second, as far as evening out the marketing year, as far as the comments of the gentleman from Montana about the great costs are concerned, let me tell the Members that the price of wheat today is below the loan. Are the farmers marketing that wheat? Not if they can help it. They are holding it.

What are they doing with that wheat? They are forfeiting it to the Government, and there is cost of forfeiting that wheat to the Government. There is cost to the Government. We are paying the cost up front, putting that grain on the market and not putting it in Government storage.

We have had acreage reduction and other reduction programs for 3 of the last 5 years, and we have continually built up surpluses under the current program, and we will continue to build up surpluses unless we change the program. That is the key to this amendment. If we want to continue to build up surpluses, that is fine.

We talk about who this helps and who it supports. Let me tell the Members who it supports -- 87 percent of the wheat farmers in this country, better than 87 percent. And it does not support the higher 14 or 15 percent. But who has been adding to those surpluses? It is those large wheat farmers who have been protected at the \$3.30 loan level while the market is about \$3, and because they can cash-flow that \$3 wheat, they plant fencerow to fencerow and they continue to build up those surpluses. That is the problem we have.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I have the time, and I will reclaim my time. I would like to make my general statement in behalf of the marketing loan, and then I would be happy to yield to my chairman if I get additional time for any point that he might like to make.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. We have been discussing this farm program policy for better than 9 months now in the Committee on Agriculture, and we have been faced by a paradox of enormous irony -- how to become market-competitive without marching an entire generation of farmers into bankruptcy.

This, I would inform my colleagues, is meant to be a little background as to how we got to the marketing loan. So how indeed do we accomplish that chore? Well, the Reagan administration, in its quest for a responsible farm policy, quotes almost daily from the free-market bible. In order to be able to compete, we must try to regain our place as a viable exporter of agricultural commodities. So when one loses one's comparative advantage due to embargoes, high deficits, the value of the dollar, unfair trading practices by our competition, foreign subsidies, and even worldwide weather patterns, we cannot be in the business of raising our support prices and compounding the felony. That is how the argument goes, and that is right as far as it goes, except for the fact that Uncle Sam has repeatedly sent the farmer out to do battle with one hand tied behind him.

We embargoed his product under the banner of foreign policy. We put him at the bottom of the high-deficit, strong-dollar export barrel. We gave his competitors foreign assistance. We passed a budget that increases defense spending and Social Security and all the rest of our entitlement programs, but the farmer has to take less than last year.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Now what about the other alternatives that we are hearing on the floor? Why not put all of our eggs in a basket called mandatory supply management? Under these programs we have several mandatory horses that are coming out of the chute, one even called voluntary-mandatory. We do not send the farmer into the free market boxing ring. We declare the free market null and void. We more or less let him choose whether or not to farm under Government determined price, a marketing quota and also a set-aside.

So what is the alternative? If it is not mandatory supply management, if it is not the free market, what is the alternative? I submit to you it is something called a marketing loan.

So to the administration I say there is no free market and your policy recommendations mean more of the same, misery and adversity in farm country.

To my colleagues who honestly believe they can shut down one-half of American agriculture at the expense of the other half and mandate a price to boot, well I respect your intentions, but there is one other commodity involved and that is called individual freedom, not to mention a host of long-term management and policy problems.

So what is the marketing loan? I would tell my colleagues there is a chart that I used in my 58 -- county tour when I traveled the big First District back in August. That is the district, by the way, that produces more wheat than any State in this Union. If you follow that chart where we get supposedly market competitive under the committee bill that has been explained so eloquently by my chairman, you ratchet down those loan rates, and sooner or later, by 1990, you become market competitive with, say, Argentina. And if you look at the price at the county elevator, that price would go to about \$2.10. At the gulf, it would be about \$2.60. We will be competitive all right. There will not be anybody out there to compete. That is nothing but slow death, or what I call Death Valley Days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Roberts] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Roberts was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERTS. So how do we compete? How do we become market competitive and still save that generation of farmers, not march them off of a cliff?

Well, the marketing loan is the best answer. With the marketing loan the price goes to the world level and you compete, you move the grain in that commercial pipeline. You do not store it. You do not pay that USDA estimated \$1.6 billion that taxpayers are going to have to pay. The farmer has to pay back that market price and then he is covered from that amount on up to the loan, and then he gets his target price deficiency payment as well.

The primary value of the marketing loan is that it does not ask the farmer to bear the full burden of becoming market competitive, especially when he has had no control over the forces that have led to the price and cash flow and credit prices we are experiencing.

It is budget conscious. It does fit under budget according to CBO, if you still believe CBO in this budget. And a special word for all my colleagues who want Uncle Sam to get tough on trade.

Do you want a level playing field for American farmers? Does the slogan "Buy American or Bye, Bye" appear in each and every paragraph of your speeches back home? This is your program. Under the marketing loan we will match our competitors dollar for dollar in terms of support for our farmers to win back export market shares. No more of this business of our competitors trying to produce more than we ask our farmers to set aside.

I would say to my chairman, the honorable gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley], yes, this is an odd couple. We are mixing some targeting and we are mixing the marketing loan, but it is a marriage of convenience because we come under budget. And I share your concern about targeting. I have big farmers just as well. But let me point out that under current law, the wheat base, when you hit the \$50,000 payment limitation is 1,440 acres. Under the committee bill, it

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

increases to 1,650 acres, and under the Strangeland and Roberts and Glickman and Daschle and Dorgan plan, it is 1,765 acres. It is a wash. Targeting is a means to get the marketing loan under budget, and the marketing loan, as far as I am concerned, is the only way that we will get there from here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Roberts] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. Coleman of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Roberts, was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. First of all, let me say that I support the gentleman's proposal. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Kansas have been the leaders in this effort.

There was some discussion about the fact that this was voted down in the committee. Let the record show that it was by the narrowest of margins that this amendment failed -- I think it was one or two votes -- in the full committee, and that it was agreed to as a discretionary item in the regular commodities section. So I do not think this thing has already been decided. It is going to be decided right here on the floor. It was a very close vote and it ought to be reexamined.

I think one of the good features about the proposal is that it is something different from the present program. And let us not forget that that is really what we are talking about. We are not really talking about this being a substitute for the gentleman from North Dakota's amendment, but to the commodities section which is simply an extension of the present program that nobody likes. That is the real question. When we vote on this amendment, we are voting to change the present system. This is the only new initiative that we have in the commodities section. It is one that ought to be tried. The feature of targeting I think strengthens it, because it is those farms between \$40,000 and \$240,000 in total annual sales that are the ones under the most severe stress, not the big producers that somebody has been worried about here on the floor somehow taking advantage of this system. Less than 3 percent of them are under financial stress. But well over half of the smaller producers and mid-size farmers, people who look to their farm as their income source and not off farm income, those are the people this marketing loan concept will help.

So I support the concept. It is a new initiative. It is different from the present program that everybody admits ought to be changed. That is what we ought to be talking about, is this one versus the one that is in the bill now.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Roberts] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. Daschle, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Roberts was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my friend and colleague.

I want to make just a couple of very quick points. The gentleman from Washington indicates that we are going to have a lot of people moving out of one crop into another if this amendment passes. In the bases and yields section of the bill that was introduced by Mr. Stenholm and myself, you can only do that to the extent of 20 percent. So there is a limit in that regard.

Now, what is not being said in this whole argument is what we do in the committee bill. Everybody knows that we

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

have to lower that loan rate to become "market competitive." How do you do it? In the committee bill we give that discretion to the Secretary. You know the TV ad, "Let Mikey eat it. He will eat anything." Let the Secretary do it. We hand that job to the Secretary. Now if he does lower the loan rate, we can blame him for it if you are disposed in that way. If he does not, obviously we do not become market competitive. But if he does lower that loan rate, it goes from approximately \$3.30 down to \$2.47, the same kind of exposure with the marketing loan, only we don't say it, we do it. We come up front. This is a come-clean effort. If in fact we are going to get market competitive, let us do it, let us get there from here. Let us do not go through that valley of death for 5 more years with the kind of adversity that we are facing in farm country.

I appreciate the gentleman seeking more time on behalf of this amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

I think there are a couple of points that we all ought to take a hard look at. The one thing that I have heard from my farmers, and quite frankly I have heard from virtually every member of the House Agriculture Committee, is that the wheat and feed grains section of the farm bill just has not been working. The point that my farmers have made time and time again over the past year is that we need a change, we need something different, we want to take a different approach. What we have been doing has not been working.

Well, I have to say that this particular section of the bill is pretty much the same old approach. There is some difference, but it is not something that I think my farmers are going to be very enthusiastic about, because it simply ratchets down the price year after year if the Secretary feels that is necessary in order to be competitive in the world market. In effect what that does is that the U.S. Government is calling the farmers, "We want to use your bank account. We want to use your wallet. We want to make certain that prices go down."

I think that what we have to recognize is that there are two ways of becoming competitive. It is a question of whether we are going to set a new lower price for the rest of the world to undercut, and that is what other countries have been doing. Other farmers, for instance the French farmers, are subsidized so that their wheat prices are much higher than here in America. I have heard reports that those wheat prices are over \$5 a bushel. My wheat farmers in Oklahoma are paid less than \$2.75. But that French wheat is getting sold because the French Government has made the commitment that they will make up the difference. They are in fact making certain that those French wheat prices are below whatever the United States farmer is selling his wheat for.

Many of us have had people from other governments who have come to us and told us that, "They really do not care what level we are selling our commodities, our wheat, they are going to undercut us a nickel. It comes out of their government's treasury. They feel that it is important that they keep their farmers on the farm."

I do not think that we should give those nations comfort. I do not think that we should tell them in advance what the U.S. minimum price is going to be, what the new floor is as far as the U.S. markets. Let them guess.

I think the only way that we can do that is to establish a method similar to the marketing loan so that the determination of what the world price will be is determined by the market. It is not going to be determined by the U.S. Government. And we are also assured that the American family farmer will not be bearing the entire burden.

So regardless of how you want to become competitive in the world market, I think we have to recognize that it is the U.S. Government that must step forward and stand shoulder to shoulder with the American farmer. Without question, the American farmer each time he steps beyond the boundaries of our shores has been getting mugged. After all, the American family farmer is the only farmer of a major exporting country in this world that goes out and has to compete in the world market, to compete against foreign governments.

So I would suggest to you that if you want to do something different, if you want a change, if you want to make

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

certain that our competitors have guess for themselves what the new market price is going to be, then this approach is the way to go. It certainly is going to give the farmers an opportunity to vote either for this proposal or the Bedell proposal, a definite change in American agriculture.

I would also say that it is going to give us a chance to be competitive in the world market. It is going to give us a chance to provide some optimism for the American farmer -- some light at the end of the tunnel.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we could consider the marketing loan concept by itself, there might be a different sentiment reflected on the part of some Members of the House of Representatives. But because we are obliged to consider marketing loan and targeting together, some of us who might be sympathetic to at least giving the marketing loan concept some opportunity to be tried have to be against it.

In my case, there is a very simple reason why I have to be against it. The average corn farmer in Illinois under what is being proposed here would lose \$3,300 a year in cash. A farmer with a 500-acre corn base would lose \$3,300 a year in cash. He is going to lose money. That is not a big farm; that is an average farm in Illinois today. This is going to cause him to lose money. He has to make up that money somehow. They do not grow wheat now. But you have a provision in what we are looking at now, and the corn thing is to follow what we are looking at now, you have a provision that says on the initial production of wheat, he is going to get a lot of money, and a provision in the bill that says he can switch 20 percent of his base to wheat. So to make up that \$3,300 that he would lose under your next proposal, the next one to be offered on corn that will be the same as this one on wheat, to make up what he would lose on corn he is going to switch 100 acres into wheat and get in on this very rich program that you have for the initial targeting on wheat.

Now you have never seen wheat until you have seen the amount of wheat that can be produced on some of that very fertile corn land in the Midwest where they do not grow wheat now. If you think you have a surplus problem, you have not got any surplus problem at all compared to what we will have when everybody with 500 acres of corn concerned with losing \$3,300 in cash decides to put 100 acres into wheat to get in on this thing you are advocating here. That is possible.

It is the next amendment. I am explaining to you why I am against the next amendment that would do to corn what this amendment does to wheat, and I am explaining to you the impact that that would have on the total production of wheat in this country, which serves only to make the whole problem, the whole surplus problem, much worse that it is right now, and clearly should illustrate to everybody why this was rejected in the committee and why the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee], the ranking member of the subcommittee, who represent wheat growers almost exclusively I believe, are against this proposition.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADIGAN. I would yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, I would ask the ranking member of the full committee if the Farm Bureau supports this proposition?

Mr. MADIGAN. My understanding is that the American Farm Bureau does not support this idea.

Mr. MARLENEE. The wheat growers?

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Mr. MADIGAN. The wheat growers do not support this idea. I am at a loss to say, other than perhaps the American agriculture movement, at a loss to name any organization that does support it.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADIGAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Does the present committee bill protect farm income throughout the life of the bill?

Mr. MADIGAN. It maintains target prices at their current level throughout the life of the bill, and in addition to that, establishes the conservation reserve program of 25 million acres, which would take out of production, totally out of production, for a 10-year period of time 25 million acres presently in production.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MADIGAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, much has been made, I would say to the ranking member, of the fact that we need to take a new direction; that this farm bill that we have crafted carefully in committee does not take a new direction.

Does not the present committee bill protect farm income and yet allow the grain -- and this is the big point -- allow the grain price to fluctuate downward to loan price so that it becomes market clearing and competitive on the world market, and is that not a new direction in farm policy?

Mr. MADIGAN. My understanding is that under the Foley-Marlenee provision agreed to by the full Committee on Agriculture, the loan rate would be allowed to go down 5 percent a year, with a snapback provision, and further would be allowed to go down, at the Secretary's discretion, on the order of what we call the old Finley amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Boland). The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madigan] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Madigan was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADIGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, it is true that the chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee, the ranking member of the Wheat Subcommittee, and the ranking member of the committee absolutely are opposed to the amendments that are being offered at this time and support the Foley-Marlenee provision.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADIGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to emphasize the point that is being made here. If you believe that a target price of \$4.38 during the last 4 years of the previous farm bill has not accumulated surpluses, then how can you say that a higher target

price will not accumulate more surpluses?

The point being made here, I think, is that if we are looking at the total farm picture here in this country, we recognize that Government programs have dictated surpluses which have not only injured the taxpayer, but have injured the farmer throughout the existence of the farm bill. The committee structure recognized that, and it does something about it, and also brings us competitive in world prices.

The other point, I want to emphasize is simply that even though there is cross-compliance, if you have targeted wheat prices at this level, everybody in America will grow 15,000 acres of wheat, everybody. There are parts of this country where we can grow nothing but wheat; we have no alternatives. We have none. We cannot grow corn. We cannot grow soybeans. We cannot grow rice and cotton. We have one crop only. That is wheat.

What has been done in the past 4 years, the wheat production in this country has shifted. We are going to shift it again, this time to everybody with 15,000 acres, and I suggest that is social meddling. I suggest, again, the Government is trying to dictate how large farms ought to be, whether or not they ought to be family farms or something else, and I suggest this divides the country. This amendment divides the country into sections, and I think the committee bill does not do that. It recognizes that there are various parts of this country with needs and, therefore, I oppose the Glickman amendment to the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, several things have been said in the last 5 minutes that need rebuttal.

The gentleman from Illinois made mention of the fact that the majority of Illinois corn farmers would be adversely affected. According to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, 98 percent of all farmers in Illinois who grow corn would be favorably affected by this amendment. Those are not my figures. Those are Department of Agriculture statistics.

We are only dealing with wheat here, I might add, but nonetheless, I think it is extremely important that everyone realizes that when we are talking about benefiting the vast number of farmers today, this amendment would do so in ways that no other version of the bill can provide. In fact, according to the Department of Agriculture 97.5 percent of wheat farmers and 98.1 percent of corn farmers would actually do better under this amendment than they would under the committee print. That point needs to be made first and foremost.

Second, it has been argued that this is a new concept. When it relates to agriculture, obviously this is a new proposal. But it is a proposal that is no different than progressive income tax or means tests which have been part of law for years. In addition, it attempts to change what we have had in policy over the last 20 years. Something that cannot be denied. The big have clearly gotten bigger at the cost of Government.

The last bushel of wheat produced by each farmer is not as important as the first bushel of wheat when it comes to the Government. Clearly it is in the Government's interest to put some emphasis on a certain amount of production by farmers, by producers, and to discourage additional production in the bill itself.

That is what we are trying to do here. To say that there is a law of diminishing returns, and at long last it is time that farm policy recognize that fact. We cannot, at the expense of Government, help the big get bigger.

There is one other point that I think must be made. Our producers in agriculture benefit from the direct subsidy. But there is a subsidy that we have not talked about on the floor at this point yet which I think is extremely important. That subsidy is found in the tax law.

Under tax law, the bigger you are, the more you benefit from the direct tax expenditures that are provided to large producers. As we try to phase out part of their direct subsidy, they will continue to have that additional amount of

subsidization that comes from the tax law.

The last thing that I think is extremely important to reemphasize is the point mentioned by the gentleman from Oregon regarding the cross-compliance. The bill has a loophole that I think is extremely detrimental. As we try to put some tight constraints on supply control, there is nothing in the bill today that prevents a farmer from planting wheat where he once planted corn, and for planting corn where he once planted wheat. There is no provision on cross-compliance in the bill.

It is extremely important that if we are serious about bringing down the supply of both corn and wheat that we implement a cross-compliance feature, and this is the only amendment that addresses that effectively.

So for those reasons, progressivity, cross-compliance, the need to insure that we do not put the same value on a final product of wheat that we do on the first bushel of wheat, and the assurance that we all have that, according to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture itself, 98 percent of the farmers do better, I do not see that we can do any better than to pass this amendment on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify a couple of misconceptions that I think are misconceptions as well.

First of all, it has been said that there is going to be a tremendous shift in production of wheat on cornland. We are offering 12 cents a bushel more on 15,000 bushels of wheat than the committee print does, and I cannot believe that there is going to be a vast exodus of corn acres to wheat acres for that 12 cents a bushel for those 15,000 acres. That is No. 1.

No. 2: It was alleged by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee] that we were lowering the price support level over the life of this bill. Yes, we are, but so does the committee print. We lower our price support identical to what Foley-Marlenee does, and the committee.

So do not be misled that we are going to reduce the price more than the committee print does on that price support level.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Daschle] has expired.

(On request of Mr. English and by unanimous consent, Mr. Daschle was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. STANGELAND. If the gentleman will yield further, we are asking our farmers to be price competitive, and our farmers are in an economic situation not of their making.

First of all, they did not ask for the embargo of 1980. They did not ask for the high inflation rates of the late 1970's and early 1980's. They did not ask for the high interest rates. They did not ask for the strong dollar.

They are victims of an economy over which they have no control. And if they expect to be market competitive in the world market, and we expect our farmers to take that hit, we are going to see wholesale bankruptcies in agriculture.

So the market loan lets the Government take the hit, allows the Government to stand behind our farmers like foreign governments stand behind their farmers.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to point out that this is not a hastily drawn proposal. As people will note, there are Members on both sides of the political aisle who have stood up and said we would like to do something a little different. The point is that there are some who say let us keep doing what we are doing.

Does anybody here think that what we are doing is working? It is not. Prices are going down. Farmers are going broke. The cost of the programs are going up.

So people on this floor are saying, from both sides of the political aisle, let us try something different. Let us try a marketing loan concept. Let us try targeting. Let us see if we can turn this thing around.

That is what this debate is about. Some people would say, well, if we cannot provide the higher support price for the 2 or 3 percent of the producers in the country, most of whom are the largest corporate agrifactories in the country, then we do not want to try this new approach.

We cannot always do everything for everybody. We do not have the money. But we can do the right thing for the right people, and it seems to me as a matter of public policy that the right approach is to try and preserve the network of family farms in America. That is all we are trying to do.

To do that, we cannot continue doing what we have been doing because it has not been working. We have to try something different. That is what Republicans and Democrats who support this approach on the floor today are saying. Let us try something different because maybe there is a chance that it will work. Maybe there will be a brighter day for family farmers if we do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Daschle] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. English, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Daschle was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up I believe on the statement that was made that somehow this bill was going to provide, or this amendment is going to provide additional incentives for people to go out and expand their production, and expand generally speaking.

I simply do not understand how in the world there is any logic in that particular kind of argument. What we are talking about here is providing an incentive for people to reduce their production, not increase their production, but to reduce it. The question is how many people are going to participate in this program.

I think this measure offers an opportunity to increase the number of farmers who will actually participate in reducing their production and, therefore, bringing supply and demand into balance and, therefore, reducing the overall cost and offering farmers some hope that we are going to see better prices in the future. That is a very important point.

Second, with regard to those who say we are simply going to have a lot of other commodities that are going to

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

switch over and start growing wheat or something else, the Stenholm provision of the farm bill would still remain in effect. Anybody that goes out and switches their crop, then only 20 percent of that, for instance, if it were wheat, would be eligible for the program, only 20 percent if they are going to be able to participate. That means 80 percent would not be covered by the program. I do not know of anyone who is willing to take that kind of risk. It would be a very great risk indeed.

Third, I think again there is a very bottom-line important issue to consider. Do we really want to adopt a policy of going out and driving down market prices in agriculture at this time? That is the real issue. Do we want to drive down market prices? That is what the bill provides for. It allows the Secretary of Agriculture to drive down by reducing the loan rate and saying here is where the U.S. price was at X. Now we are going to reduce it down here X minus 30 or whatever the number might happen to be.

That means they are going to have lower prices. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have technical changes made in the Stangeland-Glickman substitute to correct improper page and line references and delete lines that were inadvertently repeated. I send to the desk a copy of the amendment with the changes marked in ink.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Stangeland asked unanimous consent to have technical changes made in the Glickman-Stangeland substitute to correct improper page and line references and delete lines that inadvertently were repeated, as follows:

Mr. STANGELAND [during the reading]. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the technical changes be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could the gentleman tell us what section of the bill this refers to?

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUCKABY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, this only has to do with this amendment, I respond to my good friend. It is just this amendment.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified and as amended, is as follows:

Amendment, as modified and as amended, offered by Mr. Stangeland as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota: Strike the amendment to page 70 in the Glickman (Dorgan as printed in the Record)

amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) On page 69, line 5 before the "." inserting the following: ", except that the Secretary shall not make available payments under this paragraph to any producer with a wheat acreage base of less than 10 acres for the crop.";

"(b) On page 70, after line 18 striking all through page 71, line 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) For each crop of wheat, the established price shall not be less than the following levels for each farm:

"(i) \$4.50 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that does not exceed fifteen thousand bushels, and

"(ii) \$4.00 per bushel for any portion of the crop produced on each farm that exceeds fifteen thousand bushels.";

and

Title IV of H.R. 2100 is amended by --

(a) on page 65, after line 15, striking all through "shall" on line 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(2) If the Secretary determines that the availability of nonrecourse loans and purchases will not have an adverse effect on the program provided for in paragraph (3), the Secretary may";

(b) on page 67, line 12, striking "The Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(3)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available nonrecourse loans and purchases to producers under paragraph (2) for a crop of wheat, the Secretary shall";

(c) on page 68, after line 25, inserting the following new paragraph --

"(4)(A) The Secretary may, for each of the 1986 through 1989 crops of wheat, make payments available to producers who, although eligible to obtain a loan or purchase agreement under paragraph (3), agree to forgo obtaining such loan or agreement in return for such payments.

"(B)(i) A payment under this paragraph shall be computed by multiplying --

"(I) the loan payment rate; by

"(II) the quantity of wheat the producer is eligible to place under loan.

"(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the quantity of wheat eligible to be placed under loan may not exceed the produce obtained by multiplying --

"(I) the individual farm program acreage for the crop; by

"(II) the farm program payment yield established for the farm.

"(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the loan payment rate shall be the amount by which --

"(i) the loan level determined for such crop under paragraph (3); exceeds

"(ii) the level at which a loan may be repaid under paragraph (3)(B).

"(D) Any payments under this paragraph shall not be included in the payments subject to limitations under the provisions of section 1011 of the Food Security Act of 1985."

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

(d) on page 86, line 19, striking "may not" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall";

(e) on page 86, line 22, striking "may" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall".

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Daschle] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Daschle was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some inconsistency, and I would like to ask the gentleman about this. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. English] said he thinks the policy is wrong that we take down the price, the market price of grain, and yet we heard the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland], one of the authors of the legislation, say that it does exactly as the committee print does. I would like to have that corrected for the record, if you would.

Does not this amendment take the price down also as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland] said?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time, and since the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. English] made that statement, I will allow him to rebut that if he would be brief.

Mr. ENGLISH. I would be delighted to.

I think the point is the question of whether we are going to set a new low price, or whether or not the United States is going to be competitive in the world market. That is the real issue.

What the bill does today under the provision that you offered, it drives it down. It says, Mr. Secretary, the price is too high at \$3.30 a bushel, so we are going to let you set it at \$2.50 a bushel.

That now is setting it as far as the new minimum loan rate, and it tells the rest of the world that if you want to sell below that new minimum loan rate, or the new minimum U.S. price, all you have to do is sell at \$2.45.

I think we ought to keep some suspense in here if we are going to keep in the world market. Let us keep them guessing. Why should we set a new minimum low price, and this provision take care of that.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me reiterate in the little time that I have left to those watching the debate who are unclear about the ramifications of this amendment and what we are trying to do. First, we are trying to prevent the big from getting bigger at government expense. Second, we are trying to provide an opportunity for farmers to develop market orientation in this legislation. Third, we recognize that what has happened over the last 4 years has not been good for agriculture, that we are suffering a very severe crisis in farm credit and farm production, and clearly we have to do something different if we are going to bring ourselves out of the crisis we are in. And fourth, we can do it with less budget.

I do not think one can do any better than what this amendment is trying to do at any less cost to the Government. I believe that it certainly warrants the support of this House, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise my colleagues that we have a very difficult situation, as well as you can see from the debate here by the members of our committee.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

But I have a responsibility, and I think we have a responsibility, to realize that this is a national problem, that the plight of rural America and the American farmer is a national problem that encompasses all regions, States -- and every producer is impacted.

I want to remind my colleagues that this legislation is not a panacea, but it was very carefully debated and crafted. I have the responsibility to state to you that there are many areas of agriculture that are not impacted by this legislation. The fruit and vegetable industry, for example, is very important in my area. The only thing they get basically from the Government is harassment. If their crop fails, they get no assistance from Government. There is no loan. There is no target price.

We have to weigh that. It is not a single issue for a single area. You need to stick with the committee version because that was the sense of a majority of the members as to how we should proceed.

For example, somehow there is a concept that the family farm is ma and pa and the kids, and two hogs, and a few chickens and a cow. But let me tell you that went a long time ago.

So when you say you support the family farm, you must realize that a family farmer may own 100,000 acres. In some areas, this would be a big producer, but maybe not in another State, maybe not in another region. But we are talking about the future of all American agriculture.

I will remind you that we could conceivably become an import-dependent Nation and we do not want this, especially in agriculture.

What farmers need is a price, not targeting. They need a price for their crop, and that is what we have to see that we do.

The current farm program is not working as well as we wanted it to, but other things disrupted it: the high value of the dollar, abnormal weather conditions, the high interest rates. If a farmer had a price for his crop, then he could make loan payments that are due, and this money is so very important to the community where he lives.

Now, under this marketing loan concept, you will be letting the rest of the world set the price. Yes; I would agree that where we set the loan has a tendency to set world prices also. But under this marketing loan concept, we would lose complete control. The farmer will sell his product at whatever low price is available and know the Government will still pay him a good price. This is bad policy.

And who is going to set the price? Our competitors. The price can be set every day. Our competitors around the world are going to look at our loan rate, and that is where they are setting their price? Not so.

If you turn it loose, they will set their price daily and our farmers will have no alternative but to sell. We will lose control of our input, as minimal as it might be, as to what the world price is going to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. de la Garza was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. de la GARZA. I also want to leave you with this thought: We do not know about this marketing loan. It is untried. It has not been utilized. We do not know if it will work.

The patient is too ill now to gamble. We have to stabilize his condition. I know of no better way to explain this than the time that I had an ailment called diverticulitis, and I had an attack, and they took me to the hospital. They said I was going to die. And the doctors had to then make the decision, do we do surgery or do we try to stabilize him?

Well, if they were to do surgery, then they read me the list of possible complications, and they left me to make the

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

decision. There was no way that I was going to have surgery. They said they could try and stabilize my condition. But for a while, I thought, well, maybe if I am going to die anyway, it might as well be now.

But I decided against it because of the instinctive reaction of the body. So they stabilized my condition. Three months later, I went and had the surgery and everything worked out fine.

And that is where we are now, if you will pardon me for using my own personal experience. It is now too risky to gamble. We do not know what the other nations are going to do. We do not know what other countries are going to do. And I tell you that we cannot lose control of influencing the price.

Under the amendment, we would give charity to a few small farms under helping the family farmer. But now is not the time to do that and I assure you that in my congressional district, the bulk are small and they are family farmers, but there is a tendency to say that the big should not participate in the American dream; that the big should not participate in the program, that only the small should participate. We call it a family farm to rationalize our concept that to us, philosophically, "big is bad."

We need to pass a bill that encompasses all American agriculture. We cannot put the big off on the side; we cannot let the little one fall by the wayside. This committee bill may not help all of them out there, but we have to stabilize the farm economy as best we can.

This is what the committee came up with. Yet, this amendment is a novel concept; it has not been tested. We cannot risk testing this concept now.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. de la Garza was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. de la GARZA. The Committee started with the premise to not drastically reduce the farmers' income and then see how we can sustain it as best we can.

So as enticing as the legislation sounds, as fervent as the plea is from those who support it, I submit to the Members, we must stay with the committee because the balance that is at stake is too dangerous to gamble with.

(On request of Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota and by unanimous consent, Mr. de la Garza was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. de la GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The distinguished chairman, for whom I have the greatest respect, is worried that the largest producers in America might not be able to take advantage of the American dream.

I just want to say that they take advantage handsomely because 10 percent of the largest producers -- --

Mr. de la GARZA. Let me reclaim my time. I did not say that, and if it came out that way, I did not mean that; but there is a concept here that "if you're big, you're bad" and this is what I am trying to negate.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, let me just say that the 10 percent of the largest producers in the country now take 50 percent of the benefits in the farm program. We simply do not have unlimited money. The question is, how can we use our money the right way to provide the best support we can to the family farmers in the country? That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. de la GARZA. To support the committee version, that is how you can best utilize your money to help all of the farmers of America.

That is why I ask my colleagues to support the committee version of the legislation. We cannot gamble; it is too

risky; we have tried and we can correct and have midcourse corrections; this would just be turned loose and then there will be no retrieving, regardless of what the consequences are.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise to associate myself with the very eloquent remarks of the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza], and to remind the Committee of the Whole that not only the gentleman from Texas but also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Foley), the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee, has also risen in opposition to this amendment, as has the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee].

I would like to say to my very distinguished friend from South Dakota, who argued with me about the statistics in Illinois, that I was referring to farms of 500 acres average size in Illinois, and said that specifically in my remarks. The information that the gentleman used from the U.S. Department of Agriculture referred to all farms in Illinois, and there are many hobby farms in Illinois, of 30 and 40 acres, and I am sure the gentleman would not want the Committee of the Whole to have been misled by the response that he gave to me.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the gentleman yield on that score?

Mr. MADIGAN. I do not have the time; the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith] has the time, but perhaps he would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I have the statistics, and I think for the record we might as well state them at this time.

We have 34,000 Illinois farmers whose farms have a base of 76 to 150 acres; we have 2,000 farmers in Illinois who have a base of 300 to 400 acres, and then we have 440 Illinois farmers with a base of more than 500 acres.

Mr. MADIGAN. If the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADIGAN. I said an average of 500 acres, and I referred to that as the average working farm in my state, and I think the 76-acre farms clearly are not working farms, and I think that point has been made, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the gentleman, and may I just point out again and enunciate what I believe the chairman was describing. A question I want to leave in everyone's mind about this substitute is, what does it do about the overall surpluses in America of wheat and later in feed grains; what does it do to the non-subsidized commodities that are still out there; and much of agriculture is nonsubsidized, there are just a few commodities, and what does it do to other subsidized crops?

The question I come back to again is the problem that you have in this bill, identified by the gentleman again from South Dakota, is that there is no cost compliance in this issue, in this measure, and that is dangerous because that means that you can move from one commodity to another without penalty.

The \$50,000 limitation differentiates between bigs and littles; that still is in the bill, you can receive no more than

\$50,000 deficiency payments. Plus the fact that everybody in America, tomorrow morning, can go and produce 20 percent of their acreage in wheat under this proposal, and the next year we can move 10 percent of our commodities around to produce wheat.

So the point is everybody is going to produce wheat. If corn follows this, everybody that has produced anything else, will also produce corn, because it appears that corn and wheat are the most profitable government subsidies. Remember this program moves us to farm the government. Our program approved by the Committee was trying to move farmer income from the government to the market place.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just think we need to repeat at this point a point that was made earlier by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee].

When we talk about these figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture; the size of this and the size of that and the size of something else, we are talking about ownership; we are not talking about operating farms.

As the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee] said a while ago, operating farmers rent as many as four pieces of farmland in order to put together an amount of land sizeable enough of them to make a living.

When we talk about somebody having 76 acres, we are talking about ownership; we are not talking about operating farms, and I think that point made earlier by the gentleman from Montana needs to be repeated when we try to calculate who benefits and who gets hurt by these kinds of things.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee].

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for those comments and I thank my good colleague from the State of Oregon for yielding.

If we would go over the 1982 Agricultural Census, we would see that various categories in the number of wheat producers, and we note that there are 309,000 producers who produce under 150 acres.

(On request of Mr. Marlenee, Mr. Robert F. Smith was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I note that there are 66,350 who are 150 to 300 acres. Well, if we take those two categories, the first one and say well, these basically are absentee or who produce wheat as a sideline, we can set that 309,000 producers aside. They are absentee or else they are producers who produce wheat as a sideline.

Then we take the 66,000 and we divide that, and we have about 33,000 who are actual hands-on producers. They are 150 to 300 acres. That is where targeting is targeted for; 33,175. Add up all of the rest of the wheat producers, all of the rest of them, and you come up with 70,000 wheat producers in this Nation.

And, maybe, that is why, maybe that is why the National Wheat Growers do not support this concept nor do the Wheat Producers of Montana or any other bona fide group like the Farm Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

For clarification, was it the gentleman's point that we do not in this amendment deal with supply control any more effectively than what is in the bill?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I am suggesting under the Stenholm provision approved by the committee that we still have the opportunity to move 20 percent of one crop to another, and are likely to do so because of an increased subsidy by the Government of the United States. If everybody did that in America, we would be growing wheat in more surplus than we are growing it now. That was my point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Daschle and by unanimous consent, Mr. Robert F. Smith was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I only say that first of all that that is what this amendment does too. This amendment does not change that. So as far as the comparison goes, we are dealing with exactly with regard to the same size farm as we were dealing with in that particular issue.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Reclaiming my time, and then I will yield. This amendment does make those changes. It raises the target price, it makes producing wheat more attractive, it moves people to grow wheat, and it will move people to grow corn.

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes; but the point that I have to make in regard to that is that the gentleman's understanding is that we have cross compliance here which prevents them from going to wheat, which prevents them from going to corn from another crop.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Reclaiming my time, it does not prevent them from initially moving 20 percent to wheat.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. PENNY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENNY. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify a couple of points because it has been raised on several occasions by opponents of this amendment that somehow this targeting provision is a big bonus to doctors, lawyers, and other absentee owners. It is not.

If you look at this in a fair manner, you will discover that those kinds of farmland owners are not benefited in any degree by this measure that is not also available to them under the current law or under the Foley-Marlenee proposal. So it is not as if this is a big windfall to those kinds of landowners.

Second, the question was asked by the gentleman from Oregon, what do we do under this approach with the current surplus? One thing we do not do is add to the current surplus under this approach, because under the marketing loan concept that grain is going to move. We are not going to turn it over to the Government at a huge cost the way we have under current programs and the way we will continue to under the Foley-Marlenee program.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

We need a new approach in agriculture. That is the key argument in favor of this concept.

We do not save our farm economy by giving them the same old program.

The chairman of our committee argued a few minutes ago that this is not the time to try something new, that we want to stabilize the farm situation. No, we do not want to stabilize the farm situation because today the farm situation is deteriorating at a rapid rate. We need to do a better job of protecting farm income than we are doing under current circumstances and current programs and a better job than we would do under the Foley-Marlenee approach.

The marketing loan and the targeting concepts included in this amendment give us a chance to do a better job.

First of all, it gives us a chance to improve our market competitiveness. You know, a lot of people here say they want to make agriculture competitive, they want to have it market oriented. But when you offer them the only plan that will really get us market competitive, then they shy away from it, then they say we have to have income support at certain levels so we do not let that market price drop too low.

If we want to find out where that market will really go and how much of that market we can have, the marketing loan program gives us that opportunity. Then to make sure that you do not lose farmers in the process, let us give them a decent target. Let us not give them the same old target price, let us give them better target protection if we can.

This approach, as proposed by Messrs. Stangeland, Daschle, Dorgan of North Dakota, Glickman, and others, gives us a chance to move that target price up on the first level of production so that a small- and mid-sized family operator has an opportunity for a better price. Targeting makes an awful lot of sense from the budget standpoint as well. Keep in mind we are spending far less under this bill than we have been spending under current policy. I believe we ought to target those program benefits so that the small- and mid-sized family operators get the best income protection. Again, the only targeting that we have available is through the adoption of this amendment.

Last but not least, the issue in agriculture is a better price. We need to have a price if we are going to offer hope for our family farmers. Look at what happened to price in just the last year. I know this amendment only addresses wheat, but I want to compare what has happened on corn as well because there should be a similar amendment to this adopted when we take up the corn provisions.

But on wheat a year ago in August, the price for wheat was \$4.60; this August, just a month ago, it was \$3.60. For corn, a year ago it was \$3.24; this past August it was \$2.58. That price is continuing to drop. Farmers' income is going down. We know that under the best approach we are not going to restore the kind of markets we need in order to get the market price up within the immediate future. That means we have to do something through targets or loans to give the farmers a better income than under a current farm programs. We offer one possibility under the Bedell amendment that will be debated later. The Bedell provision gives farmers a referendum vote to raise their price through a loan approach, and keeps us competitive in the world market by using our existing surplus in a bonus-bushel export plan. But if we want the fallback to that referendum to be something better than the current farm program, to provide us better income protection than the same old stuff for another few years, then I think we have to adopt this Stangeland-Glickman amendment, because under this amendment with a marketing loan and targeted payments to the family farmer in the small- and mid-sized category, we are going to provide better income protection.

If that referendum fails, I want a better fallback plan, and this marketing loan concept with its targeting provisions provides us that.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time. There has been a lot of discussion going on back and forth about this and other approaches to the wheat title of the farm bill. I certainly respect what the chairman indicated, that we should come with

a program that fits closer to the farm bill as reported by the committee. I believe that is the direction to take.

However, there are some portions in that which a number of us do not support, a number of us would like to see some other objectives.

I am not going to go into the argument of why this may work better than some others. I think there are two or three basic points I would like to make to my colleagues in the House. No. 1, I do not believe that given the budget constraints that we have in trying to deal with the farm program we are going to come up with a program that everybody in this body is going to support. I wish that were the case. I do not think we are going to come up with a program that every farm group, no matter whether we can read off lists of this group supports this program or this group supports that program; that is not really the criterion, in my opinion. What we need, in my opinion, to look for is a program which will provide some income protection to the farmer, a program which will provide the opportunity for us to remain competitive in the export markets. I think it is vital that we continue those. I think it is vital that we do not lose those market opportunities in other countries. But I think it is also vital that we do not put that on the back of the farmer. I think in the current situation that is the case. We are causing and creating the farmer to have to finance our competing in foreign markets. Let us put it back on to the administration, and let us deal with that from the level rather than trying to leave it with the farmer.

I believe it is a significant and important matter that we continue to do these markets, and in my opinion this is the best approach that we can reach both of those goals.

Additionally, I do not believe this bill gouges or hurts the end user of the commodity, the livestock, or dairy producers, or others who have so much at stake, with the market so low that we have to keep competitive. Certainly it is important to the price of beef and to the price of milk that they be able to buy extremely competitively. Certainly the farmer needs to have more of an income. But I do not believe we need to leave that totally on the backs of the farmer.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I would be happy to yield to the chairman of the full Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I do not say this in a derogatory way, but the gentleman is emphasizing that you are putting it on the back of the farmer. Not so. We are sharing now. We are having a difficult problem.

But one of the worse problems in our area and in the area of the gentleman is when we are going to balance the budget. That is the most that we can do for the farmer besides giving him a price, is to balance the budget. This market clearing amendment, here you are letting the world set the price and you are putting the costs then on the taxpayer. What we do here is not all agreeable to a lot of people. That is why I say we have to stick with the committee, because editorial after editorial about the big price the farmers are getting, we know it is not so. So the gentleman uses perhaps the wrong phraseology here that you are going to take it off the back of the farmer; you are going to put it on the back of the taxpayer without control, without limit. We have to do a balancing act.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. COMBEST. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think the point I am trying to make is under current conditions and I think under many of the programs that we are looking forward to under the proposal as it comes from the committee is going to reduce that price potential to the farmer. I think that is where he has to be protected. As I am sure the chairman knows over many years of dealing with agriculture, you look at the end of the year to see whether or not you made a profit based on what the Government program has been, based upon what the price one had received in the marketplace. You add them up, and if you received more than you paid out, then you have made a profit, certainly. But I think it is also very important to note that throughout this entire type of a farm policy what we have done is we

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

have used artificially high levels to set prices which some foreign countries can immediately come below and drive us out of that market and force the farmer into putting his commodity into storage. Certainly previous programs have not worked, we have continued to build up surpluses, we have continued to do that at the expense of the taxpayer, at the expense of the farmer because of the pricing it has. In my opinion, what it would do is to give that farmer that income protection which he needs, it would also give us an opportunity to move that commodity into the foreign markets to compete in those countries that are highly subsidizing their exports. And, yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, there is a level at which the taxpayer participates in the farm commodities. That has been the case for many, many years. I think it will continue to be the case for the next several, certainly if we are going to come out from under this program and out from under the problem.

The main point I would have to make is, I think we have to do something in the short term, not keep the status quo in agriculture but to do something that may be somewhat different because in my State the prices are so severe that we cannot let it fall simply as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Combest] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota and by unanimous consent, Mr. Combest was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I think the gentleman made an excellent statement, and I think he said it very clearly. I just wanted to point out to those who suggest that this is a budget problem, this approach, we are all familiar with budget problems; Lord knows, the cost of the farm program in recent years has exploded on us. And despite the fact that we have spent more and more money, we have not solved this problem. We have record farm failures. This approach is not a budget buster. In my judgment, this approach is the first step down that road to begin solving the farm problem and getting off the budget the kind of resources we have been spending in recent years, most of which, incidentally go to the largest producers from the pockets of the American taxpayers.

The farmers want a price, and they can either get it from the marketplace or from the Federal budget. We prefer the marketplace. In the short term, this approach is the right approach from the budget standpoint. This does not break the budget. The old approach breaks the budget. I think this approach is a first step toward solving our problem for the farmers and for the Federal budget.

And I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. COMBEST. The gentleman makes a very good point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Combest] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. de la Garza and by unanimous consent, Mr. Combest was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a very good point and one which, as is indicated, comes within the budget. And that is the reason for the targeting. We may have some problems with the way that is handled. I do not like targeting.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Mr. COMBEST. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. de la GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, we have heard so terribly much that we need to level the field here, we need a level playing field. This marketing concept, they reduce, they reduce, they reduce, they reduce, because our farmer then will just get it from the Federal budget and we will be at their mercy. Where will we wind up? Where will be the price that we leave for our farmers? Where will we be in 2 years, 3 years?

I have to think of the farmer to the end of this century, not in the next election or next year or 3 years. We have got to look to see how we can stabilize it in the long term. If we leave this to the vagaries of other countries, knowing that we are going to sell at any rate, then they will just go under and go a lot under where we would be. What have we done to stabilize the price for the farmer at the end? Nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Combest] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Combest was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COMBEST. I appreciate the Chairman's concern, and I think we have the same concern for the farmer. I also want to look into the future. My concern is that the alternatives that are there short of the marketing loan approach is not going to leave us with any alternative because, in my opinion, in the out years we are not going to have many people involved in agriculture.

(On request of Mr. Foley and by unanimous consent, Mr. Combest was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will consider very carefully before it votes to support this substitute.

We are troubled in our agriculture today by an enormous overproduction. It is part of a worldwide overproduction problem that is driving down the price of grain and creating public management and expense problems throughout most of the exporting agricultural world.

We have a \$2 billion-plus wheat crop today. In considering this amendment, we could be taking a step which I hope we do not take, that of providing so much protection to the farmer that all marketing decisions will be swept away, there will be almost a total guaranteed Government signal to produce, produce, produce.

There is a set-aside requirement in all of these bills. However the fertilizer that will be plowed into wheat acreage throughout this country to maximize production will create additional huge problems in the management of our public surpluses, that will be devilish in the future. This is a well-intended but bad amendment. It was rejected by the committee. It is opposed by the chairman of the committee, by its ranking minority member, by the chairman of the subcommittee and my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee]. While I am for protecting the farmer this will create almost a total Government guarantee to the farmer, and in doing so, takes away all signals of restraint in production.

The farmer will have an opportunity under this amendment to get whatever protection the price will lead to. Under it there are no limits. It creates an entirely new, untrusted and untried system which I think reckons to put us in even worse condition on price, on surplus and on farmer income.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Secondly, the taxpayers of this country will not permanently support a plan to provide unlimited amounts of grain to be produced in the United States and exported for overseas use. Some restraint has to be adopted in the production of crops here and abroad if we are ever going to get a restored price. This tends to weaken all of signals to the farmers here and abroad and creates a problem which I think will be devilish in the future.

Under the circumstances and despite my respect for those who have offered them an amendment on both sides of the aisle, I hope the general membership will reject both the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota and the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. COMBEST. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I know we are all very concerned about the direction of agriculture.

I would just simply say that this does, in my opinion, set up a supply management type program. It is voluntary mandatory, and I think it is one that will have some tremendous effects on actually what the result is. We are not setting ourselves up for the situation that will allow the Government to acquire and to take over great numbers of stocks because, simply, the program is a recourse loan rather than nonrecourse.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington made some excellent points in regard to this amendment. I would, though, point out that when it came up in the Committee it was defeated by one vote.

I wish at this point in time that we had done a little more cleaning up of this concept. We tried, and those of us who support it -- and I intend to support this amendment today on the floor. I do so, in pointing out the gentleman from Washington made some arguments regarding the message that this bill sends or that this amendment sends. But I also rise at this point in time to encourage all members of this committee, particularly those on the House Agriculture Committee, to listen to the arguments that have been made in opposition to, as well as in favor of the market loan approach.

We are going to have another opportunity in just a few moments to discuss the so-called Bedell amendment. It is very interesting to listen to the debate today and to guess what lies ahead as we talk about yet another concept. This one is not necessarily new. But I want to point out one thing. My name has been used quite often with the Stenholm base and yield bill, of which I take quite a lot of pride, with my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Roberts] who worked so hard in this particular section of the bill, in which we have attempted to meet the market-oriented needs of agriculture in allowing flexibility of producers. This particular section does not affect that.

It has been suggested that somehow cross compliance has been brought in. And let me refresh everyone's memory. Cross compliance has to do with an individual farmer participating in, let us say, the cotton program up to the maximum amount allowed under the limitation of payments and then producing wheat on the rest of his farm and staying out of the program, and that is allowed. If this amendment passes, that will no longer be allowed.

If you are for effective supply management, you need to be for cross compliance.

What do we mean by effective supply management?

For the last year and a half, I have defined effective market-oriented supply management around three basic principles. The first is, the United States will no longer act as the world surplus disposing agent. No. 2, the United States will not subsidize its producers to overproduce. And, No. 3, the United States will act to protect farm income up to a certain point.

Today we are talking about targeting of benefits. That is another way of saying that the United States and this Congress is going to have to come to grips with the budget implications of farm bills.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Now, I do not particularly subscribe to the targeting as it is done in this bill. It has got some real problems, and there is no point in continuing the debate. Those who have opposed it based on that I think are correct. But let me sum up by saying the first point that I mentioned can further be defined by saying we should not give price windfalls to nonparticipants in farm programs. Under the current farm program, and those who have come before it, we will see that we continue to give benefits to nonprogram participants. That is a very major weakness of current farm legislation.

No. 2, we should not encourage expansion by foreign producers. I submit should this amendment pass today it is a message that needs to be sent to the rest of the world. We are going to get very competitive. We are going to hold the farmer harmless in regard to this particular issue. It is budget responsible. And that argument has been well made, because the cost of the loan, if the Government ends up assuming that grain, that cost is paid by the same Treasury.

The third point that I would like to make to this argument is that we should avoid sudden demand shocks to agribusiness in rural communities, and this amendment proposes a certain amount of supply management. No question about that. It will not work any other way. In fact, I think it will be very effective supply management because it is truly a voluntary mandatory approach.

Now, you are going to hear in a moment those who argue that we ought to have mandatory controls. This one lets anybody produce. Anybody can farm, anybody can go out and raise all of the wheat that they particularly want to. They do not have to set aside anything if this amendment should pass. It is complete, total freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Stenholm] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Stenholm was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, it is complete and total freedom of an individual farmer to produce for that world market if he chooses not to participate in the supply management features that are a part of this amendment.

The last point that I would like to speak to in regard to this amendment and the one that is going to come later -- because again I point out it is very interesting to listen to the debate for and against this amendment and to guess what is going to come when we get into the Bedell amendment. The chairman said a moment ago we should not gamble at this time. I am going to point out that same statement on Bedell, because it is one that we have got to think about. We spent a lot of time in the Agriculture Committee doing this. We should not continue the status quo in the farm bill.

We should serve notice to our foreign competitors that we will compete in terms of both price and supply.

Now, if that is what we really want to do, folks, this amendment is one way to do it. This is a good, quick way for us to get there.

So again let me point out, this does not have an adverse effect upon the base and yield section. It is still an integral part of the farm bill as I had hoped that it would be. Cross compliance is a separate issue that must be taken into consideration. It is a part of this amendment. Individuals need to make their minds up on that judgment based on your own opinion.

As I said, this is not a perfect amendment. The House Agriculture Committee has spent many hours of debate on this. The chairman is perfectly correct in saying that we should not be rewriting farm legislation on the floor.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a number of cogent arguments. This Member of the House has been

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

particularly interested in agriculture export matters, and in that respect I think that the arguments that the gentleman has introduced for consideration by the House today are very persuasive to this Member. It is for this reason and many others already discussed that I support this proposal. This is a risk, in a proposal for a different approach it is true but there are much higher risk proposals before this body, on this body, and as part of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Stenholm] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Bereuter and by unanimous consent, Mr. Stenholm was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BEREUTER. I frequently meet with our urban colleagues, and I know that they must be perplexed with the debate that is taking place here today, with the Agriculture Committee making recommendations and so many of its Members on both sides of the aisle advancing another proposal. But I say to these people, especially those that I meet with every week at 5 o'clock, on every Tuesday and Wednesday, for example that I want you to give very serious and favorable consideration to this Stangeland-Roberts amendment now before you offered by the distinguished gentlemen from Minnesota and Kansas, members of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HUCKABY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very distressed with the gentleman's remarks that he sees no relationship or correlation between cross compliance and the bases and yields bill. I would like to point out to my colleagues, whether you are from North Carolina, Louisiana, or California, or any State where you produce more than one commodity, your average farmer, is going to be penalized and penalized significantly if this amendment passes.

The gentleman from Texas and I worked out, with others, after many long months, an understanding on cross compliance, and now the gentleman seems to be saying, "I no longer stand by that agreement as such."

Mr. STENHOLM. The gentleman is totally correct. In the base and yield section, as we worked it out, the gentleman is totally correct. But this amendment, if you are in favor of supply management, effective supply management, this amendment as offered is a way to get there. I do not argue at all with the gentleman's statement as far as what will happen to other areas and how it will affect other areas. I thought I made myself clear.

Mr. HUCKABY. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to also point out that the initial bill before us, the Foley-Marlenee proposal, which is very similar to the Huckaby-Stangeland proposal in cotton and rice, provides for acreage reductions and supply management without these exotic new things that I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington, is going to cause more chaos and more confusion in agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Stenholm] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Stenholm was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman made a very fine statement. I would certainly like to commend him for it. I would agree, as well, that this amendment does do much in moving in the direction of supply management. It applies to wheat and feed grains. That is where the principal problem is.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

I would also like to take issue with the statement that was made earlier that somehow the higher target price for that first 15,000 bushels of wheat is going to increase production. I do not see how in the world that is true if we use a bushel basis. How in the world could you increase production over the 15,000 bushels on the acreage base that we already have? I think most of us would agree that the bushel basis is certainly going to be a much tougher method as far as supply management is concerned, and I would agree with his assessment that this measure does offer hope in reducing the amount of carryover and therefore provides some hope, some light at the end of the tunnel for farmers, so they can look forward to better prices each year as we move along instead of looking forward to a system that is going to drive down the market price year after year after year by reducing the loan rate. And that is what we are really down to.

Again, I want to underscore that one thing there seems to be unanimous agreement about and that is the program we have been operating under the last 4 years simply has not worked. This is a change. The question is whether people want to change and move in a new direction or whether they want to stay with what has failed in the past 4 years.

Mr. STENHOLM. I might sum up my own remarks. I tried to make it very, very clear. There is a big difference in regard to the definition of cross compliance. The gentleman from Louisiana is totally correct in that. I thought I made my point extremely clear that if you are in favor of supply management, this is a way to get there.

I have got problems with two things about this amendment as offered. This is one of them.

The second point is the concerns that the gentleman from Washington brought up, and I have already summarized that. There is no point in going on.

I thank the House very much for indulging me this time in making these points.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refocus, if we can, on some of the fundamental facts that have gotten obfuscated in the discussion here this afternoon. I want to address my first remarks to the whole question of the targeting provisions in the bill.

I think it is important for us to understand the basic facts. The basic facts are that 5 percent of the farmers participating in the farm program get 39 percent of the total amount of money spent under the various commodity programs. Keep that point in mind: Five percent of the farmers get 39 percent of the money we are spending.

About 15 percent of the wheat program benefits go to 1 percent of the wheat farmers in this country. About 16 percent of the corn payments go to 2 percent of the corn farmers in this country. So let us keep that in perspective as we talk about the question of targeting.

The question is whether we can make this system fairer with respect to the distribution of the money -- the limited amount of money -- that we have to spend. I submit that the amendment that the gentlemen from Kansas and Minnesota and the other gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Roberts] are discussing here today, is a modest effort to address this fundamental problem of too few getting too much.

Any suggestion that farmers would dramatically increase their production of wheat, for example, because the target price would be raised from \$4.38 to \$4.50 as some of the previous speakers have suggested, just does not make a lot of sense to me. The other point that I think needs to be responded to is the whole question of the set-aside requirements. The set-aside requirements in the amendment and the set-aside requirements in the committee bill are identical, there is no difference.

We have heard people say that if we adopt this targeting provision amendment that we are going to increase and encourage increased production. Let us look at that for just a second. The fact of the matter is that under the committee

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

bill we are looking at a target price of \$4.38 for all production up to the limits of the deficiency payment and up to the limits of the loan. Under the amendment, for the 15,000 bushels of production, I will concede the target price will be a little bit higher, farmers would receive a little more income for the first 15,000 bushels of production. Twelve cents a bushel more.

Then what happens? After that point, the incentive is not to produce, because the target price drops a full 50 cents a bushel, 38 cents below what the committee bill is talking about. So for those people that are worried about whether this will actually encourage production, I contend clearly that it will not encourage production. I would argue that for those farmers that are producing more than 15,000 bushels of wheat in this specific example, it would discourage production.

Mr. Chairman, the other point I think we need to focus on is this question of whether corn farmers are going to reduce their production and then start increasing wheat production. Let us look at that for a moment. Under the targeting provisions that will be offered subsequent to this amendment, we will talk about the corn target price being raised slightly for the first 30,000 bushels of production. So I would contend that we are going to increase the incentive to produce for the early stages of production of corn which is going to decrease the incentive to switch to wheat or vice versa.

Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying that in the final analysis, what we are looking at here is a balanced approach. An approach that recognizes and responds to the desperate need to address the income problem that we have in rural America. It does that with both targeting provisions and with the marketing loan concept.

It also sends a powerful message to the international marketplace. We are telling our competitors around the world who are subsidizing their farmers that American farmers are going to be in the marketplace, in the international marketplace next year regardless how much they subsidize their production. I believe that will have a chilling effect on how much money the Europeans and other producers around the world want to spend to subsidize their farm production.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLATTERY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman suggests that because he is going to have a corn targeting proposal it will not affect the transfer of acreage of corn to wheat. I would remind the gentleman that many corn farmers produce more than 30,000 bushels, and they would undoubtedly produce the first 30,000 bushels.

It might also encourage many producers who are now producing crops other than corn or wheat to move their crops to corn and wheat, since these crops will have special terms for the first 15,000 or 30,000 bushels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Slattery] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Roberts and by unanimous consent, Mr. Slattery was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Let us not confuse the basic facts. The facts are that for wheat, during the early stages of production, we will be encouraging that first 15,000 bushels of production under the amendment with the \$4.50 target price as opposed to the \$4.38 in the bill. Beyond the 15,000 bushels in production that may affect wheat farmers in Washington, the target price will drop 50 cents, and that will discourage additional production.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLATTERY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas who has worked tirelessly on this amendment

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

and whose knowledge in this area I deeply respect and I say that with all sincerity.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleagues can see that we have a division in the committee made of the establishment on one side and those of us who want to get there from here on the other. I must plead guilty.

Nine months ago, as the author of this convoluted and radical and very different departure from farm policy, I was meeting with Mrs. Stockman's very brilliant son, and we were trying out new ideas on how we could get there from here with profit and price into agriculture. I said what about a two-tier plan, and he said no. What about a bushel allotment plan and he said no. I said what about the current plan and he said no. I said what about the marketing loan and he said what is that.

We got our boot in the door. I do not think we can have it both ways. I would say to my very distinguished chairman that the committee bill does freeze target prices at \$4.38. In terms of budget exposure, if you stop right there, yes, why we have less budget exposure. But also under the committee bill we give discretionary authority to the Secretary. We say, let him do it; let Jack Block do it. Then if he does that and he moves that loan rate down to \$2.47, that is outside the payment limitation and then you will have that same kind of budget exposure.

Now, under the marketing loan, if that price falls to \$2, you do make the payment from \$2 to that current loan; to \$3.14 all the way up to \$4.38. But you move the grain; you move the grain. You ask what will our competitors do? What are they doing now? If you put that loan down to \$2.50, they will sell it at \$2.47. If in fact this does not make sense that if the price goes to \$2 to move the grain and still protect the farmer up to \$4.38, what are we doing all this for? If the grain does not move at \$2, if we are not going to get market competitive and get there from here and end this 5-year agony, this "Death Valley Days" that the administration's projections show, if that is the case, if we cannot move the grain at \$2, then I would say to my chairman and to my distinguished colleague from Washington that the administration is wrong, the Farm Bureau is wrong, Mr. Madigan is wrong, the chairman is wrong, everybody in this body is wrong. I want to get there from here.

We have heard a long debate here on how we ratchet down the loan rate to become market competitive over a 5-year period. We will not have anybody left. Let us get there from here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Slattery] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Roberts and by unanimous consent, Mr. Slattery was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SLATTERY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, in the remaining time I want to come back to the basic facts again. The basic facts with respect to this targeting amendment are these: No. 1 fact to focus on, do we want to continue to give 39 percent of the money that we are spending on these commodity programs to 5 percent of the farmers in this country? I say we should change this, and I say this amendment makes a historic first step toward addressing that problem.

Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee [Mr. de la Garza].

Mr. de la GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise the Members that I think we have fully debated this amendment and we are ready to vote. But what I would like to leave my colleagues with is the thought that even though there are differences of opinions as to the philosophy or the thrust of the solution, we all agree the farmer is still in trouble out there.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Mr. Chairman, we need legislation, and the intensity of the debate is perhaps because of that. We have a disagreement basically, but we have no crystal ball. It is illusory at best that the grain will move. We started losing markets before the dollar started gaining strength and before the interest rates started going up, so it is hard to say that the grain is going to move. It may or it may not.

But the fact that I want my colleagues to understand is that we still have the problem. We still have the farmer in trouble. We need to address many issues. We need to bring down interest rates, keep inflation down, and reduce, if we can, the discrepancy between our currency and other currencies. So we cannot say that we will pass this amendment and all of a sudden everything is going to be bright and sunny and everybody out there is going to be buying our grain. No so.

I ask my colleagues to exercise some degree of caution. I hope they do not get too terribly confused with loan rates and target prices and marketing loans. If they are confused, I do not blame them. But the best thing Members can do under the circumstances is to stay with the committee version, stay with the leadership of the committee, because we have to remain together for the other parts of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the best way to arrive at a final product is to go with the carefully crafted parts of the legislation, and I would hope that the Members will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as amended and as modified, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Stangeland] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were -- ayes 200, noes 228, not voting 6, as follows:

(See Roll No. 322 in the ROLL segment.)

Messrs. GEKAS, DeLAY, STUMP, RUDD, PARRIS, and RALPH M. HALL changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ROBINSON, MATSUI, GUARINI, SWEENEY, FLORIO, MILLER of Ohio, BORSKI, FOGLIETTA, SOLARZ, SCHEUER, DYMALLY, SCHUMER, and NEAL, and Mrs. COLLINS and Mrs. BURTON of California changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, and as modified, offered as a substitute for the amendment, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Amendment offered by Mr. Frank as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota: Page 70, strike out line 19 and all that follows thereafter through page 71, line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) The established price for wheat shall be \$4.38 per bushel for the 1986 crop; \$4.16 per bushel for the 1987 crop; \$3.96 per bushel for the 1988 crop; \$3.76 per bushel for the 1989 crop; and \$3.57 per bushel for the 1990 crop, respectively.

Mr. FRANK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this bill, in its short stay on the floor, has apparently already outlasted the membership's attention span, but this is a very important amendment which I choose to offer anyway.

This is an amendment which embodies the position of the Reagan administration on this particular bill.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out to the gentleman from Oregon that it is too late to reserve a point of order. The point of order has to be reserved before the gentleman from Massachusetts begins his remarks.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. If I may, Mr. Chairman, it was very difficult to hear. I did not even hear the amendment proposed and I was timely in my reservation of my point of order, Mr. Chairman. I was attempting to get order, as the Chair was. I suggest that I did not even hear the amendment offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked if there was objection to the waiving of the reading of the amendment and the Chair did not hear an objection.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, with due respect, I did not even hear the amendment offered, and it has never been read. I was standing here before you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would note that there were literally dozens of people standing. The Chair was not addressed by the gentleman from Oregon and there was a waiving of the reading of the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank].

Mr. FRANK. I thank the Chairman, and I would repeat that I am sorry that this amendment, which embodies the position of the Reagan administration, has drawn the wrath of my friends, the gentleman from Oregon, on the other side. I did not mean to stir up any internecine warfare opposite by offering this position.

What this does is deal fundamentally with what seems to me to be the flaw in the agricultural programs. I voted for the past amendment that was defeated. I wish it had been adopted.

I am concerned about small farmers and family farmers, but particularly with the defeat of that amendment and with other language in this bill which in fact Members should be aware increases, in fact, the amount that can go per farm. The limit we have had per farm is increased by this bill by some technicalities.

We have here the premier means-tested program in America. Under the agricultural program perpetuated by this bill, the more you got the more you get. The President himself noted in his radio speech on agriculture about a month ago that in the past 5 years we will have spent \$59 billion in agricultural subsidies, about 3 times more than we spent in

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

the preceding 5 years. We are spending more on this than we are spending on AFDC and on food stamps. It is not only not means tested; it is antimeans tested. It is inversely means tested. The larger the farm, the more you get.

What this amendment does is embody the position of the administration, which says that the target price that we pay farmers for growing wheat for which there is no market -- if there was a market for the wheat and it could be sold at a reasonable price, this would not arise -- the target price that we are paying farmers for something for which there is no market would be frozen for this year but would then begin to drop 5 percent a year. The bill freezes it indefinitely in practical terms.

The position of the administration, with which I agree, is that we begin to drop it. The fundamental fact remains. Agriculture is the only profession in the country, to my knowledge, where we guarantee people to a certain extent the ability to stay there. We do not do it and should not do it with others. We do not guarantee to buy all the autos that are made or all the shoes that are made or all the shirts that are made. We are saying to wheat farmers, "Stay in business and we will buy all your wheat and we will pay you so much per bushel."

This does not amend that concept out of existence. It simply says that we will begin to reduce it by 5 percent a year. We continue to pay more people more money than we have to grow things that we do not need. I am in favor of methods of transition. Buy-outs, additional credit, efforts to ease people out of this business, I support. Continuing indefinitely to pay them more money than we have to produce what we have no conceivable market for is a mistake, and I congratulate the President on this position and I am proud to offer the amendment here.

This particular commodity, wheat, if we were to adopt this amendment drafted by the Department of Agriculture, would save, according to the estimates of the Department, over a 5-year period, \$5.5 billion. We will hear a great deal about the deficit in general, but there is one problem with deficits. We cannot reduce them in general. We can only reduce them in particular, and this happens to be a very appealing particular. It would still leave large amounts of money being paid to wheat farmers, but it would begin to reduce it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have to confess I am a bit surprised to see the gentleman from Massachusetts sound reasonably serious in offering a proposal President Reagan sent to Congress, a proposal which was rejected by both sides of the political aisle in both bodies of the U.S. Congress, and suggest that he does so in the interest of helping family farmers.

I am disappointed, awfully disappointed, that the last vote did not prevail. I think we should target the farm program, but I will tell my colleagues that when we lost the last vote, that ought not persuade anyone in this House to rush toward President Reagan's proposal on agriculture. That is, in my judgment, a death sentence for thousands and thousands of family farmers across this country.

Is the gentleman serious about this proposal?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Frank was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FRANK. I am very serious about this proposal, although the context is difficult. A context in which the Committee on Agriculture tells us that we should continue, for instance, to build a fort out of butter in Kansas with Federal subsidies, sets a tone for the debate in which it is hard to be totally serious. But, yes, I am serious about this.

I am serious about trying to save \$5.5 billion and not perpetuating a situation in which we pay to the larger farmers

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

more money. I did not argue that this particular amendment helps the family farmers. What I said was, I have supported earlier this year in the credit bill that was vetoed, in the gentleman's amendment which unfortunately was previously defeated, I have supported measures that have been targeted, but it is not now targeted.

What you are doing is taking billions of dollars and giving it out in a method which I know the gentleman agrees with me is not a fair one. I will continue to support efforts to target this money better, and I will continue to support efforts to ease people out who want to get out. But to continue to pay -- and I want to reiterate what I said before -- in this bill because we drop the loan rate and do not drop the target price rate, we exempt in this bill apparently, and I use "we" here in the broadest possible sense, we exempt that additional amount that is going to result from the limitation.

So the result of the bill as it came out of committee is that the limitation per farm will be increased. We will be giving more to people. We heard the statistics before about who gets the money. The gentleman from Kansas talked about who got the money. This is an effort to reduce that money which is being sent out inequitably.

I will continue to support efforts to target, but we are continuing, I think, to send large amounts of money to people who ought not to need it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, I have known the gentleman from Massachusetts, I guess, for probably a dozen years and have long known of his interest in agriculture and his abilities in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota and by unanimous consent, Mr. Frank was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I just want to say that the reason the President's proposal on these price supports was just widely rejected and quickly rejected was that in the middle of a farm crisis, with farm prices dropping, with record farm failures, you do not begin to solve this thing by taking the price supports away and reducing prices. It is the wrong way to deal with this problem.

Mr. FRANK. The problem I have with the gentleman is, yes, I have known him for a dozen years, and for all those dozen years people in the Committee on Agriculture have been for increasing the programs, and we are told that a farm crisis is a bad time to cut them, and when we do not have a farm crisis is a bad time to cut them.

The fact is that the fastest growing, most inequitably targeted entitlement program in the United States are the agricultural programs. You get entitled to money. The more money you have, the more money you get, regardless of the effect on the budget, regardless of the effect on crops. It is sui generis in our situation, and I congratulate the administration for trying to bring some sense to it.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Somebody just commented to me that when you find Barney Frank and Ronald Reagan in agreement, either they are both crazy or they are both right, and I prefer to think in this case that the former is the truth rather than the latter.

I do not mean that. Barney is on my subcommittee, and at least I do not mean it with respect to Barney.

First of all, let us get the record straight. The current farm bill that we brought to the floor does not increase target prices. It freezes target prices, does not increase them.

So to vote for this bill is not voting for an increase in target prices. What the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Frank, talks about is decreasing by 5 percent a year the target price payments to farmers.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Before you do that, you have to do it in connection with what the current economic situation is out in America. The farm credit crisis is real, people are hurting, people are struggling, people are going broke.

Now the farm prices are reaching their depression-year lows right now in the market prices out there out in the country for wheat and corn, and soybeans, and livestock.

The farmers make their money in two ways. One is through the marketplace and one is through the Government, particularly in this period of time. What I think we all would like to see is for farmers to make their money through the marketplace, but right now if they rely exclusively on the marketplace, they are dead. Everybody in this room has gone out and given lipservice to the farmers of America. Everybody has said how terrible it is that they are going broke, how bad it is that rural banks are going under, how bad it is that rural communities are in trouble.

If you vote for this amendment, you vote to accelerate the crisis that is occurring in rural America. And it is not just for the farmers, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank] but it is with the small towns throughout America that depend upon the agricultural economy to survive. It means small towns all over America will suffer more distress than they already do, it means that the farmers themselves will suffer that kind of distress.

So I am just saying to you that, yes, from a purely fiscal situation, we can save money by voting for the Frank amendment. But from a purely fiscal situation for farmers, you are going to bankrupt an awful lot of them.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. First I want to say I did not assert that this bill increases target prices. What I said was there is now in the law a \$50,000 per farm limitation on what a farmer could receive.

That is poverty assistance for you, \$50,000 per recipient, about 10 times the total AFDC payment.

What this bill does is allow you to go above that \$50,000, because it drops the loan rate and does not drop the target price, and it goes from the \$50,000 limit.

The second point I would like to make is that I am in favor of helping people in economic distress. But I have to comment on the grotesque inconsistency between voting the kind of cuts that have been voted to people in genuine need all across this country over the past four years, and voting for this bill which gives some help to people who are in need, but a vaster amount to people who are wealthy and above. This does not discriminate. This does not aim at the needy or the small farmer. However, the fact is that the bigger you are, the more you grow, the more money you get.

I would be glad to help respond to the problems that the gentleman is talking about. But this still throws all of the money to all of the people, and the wealthier, the bigger, the more solvent ones get more of the money than the others.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Unfortunately, I would say by this process, by cutting the target prices, you really cut the guts out of people that need it the most.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my friend for yielding, and I want to associate myself with his remarks.

The reason that this amendment is being introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank] is because I would not do it. I have more wheat than any other State in my district, and the administration came to me and said, "Won't you do the administration's bidding to get this under budget and to get a farm bill more market-oriented. Won't

you freeze the target prices?" I said I just wished that we could freeze spending around here all across the board.

This target price is frozen for the life of the bill at \$4.38. It is under budget. I mean for those of you who still really believe in the current budget, and I have been saying for some time this farm bill is being held hostage to a budget process that is a failure, we cut \$11.8 billion in a special task force on the House Agriculture Committee to get to that level.

I would make one other point. This is direct income to farmers, yes, but also payment for embargoes, for market interference, for all sorts of things, a lack of contract sanctity, for the high deficit.

If this amendment passes, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, it is going to be very similar to a salary or income freeze.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Roberts, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Glickman was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERTS. If my friend will continue to yield, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts it would be like salaries and incomes to the Boston Red Sox held level and the new York Yankees have extra.

I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the average size farm in my district is 1,000 acres. That is not because we are big farmers, that is not because we are 6 feet 1 inch or belong to the Farm Bureau as opposed to somebody 5 foot 2 inches who is a small family farmer in Massachusetts. Our average size farm is 1,000 acres because we do not have the rainfall to do otherwise and be efficient. We have to have 1,000 acres. So if we leave the dock of supply management and we get into severe targeting, which is what the gentleman has recommended, we do make the farm program a welfare program. And I do not mean to perjure it in that sense. But this is no welfare program. This is designed to get the surplus down and the price up.

I would suggest to the gentleman that he has a great deal of blood pressure for those 250-acre-size farms with six cherry trees, four peach trees, a farm pond, two dogs, one with a wooden leg, and a whole bunch of cats. And I would say to the gentleman that that is fine, and that is the family farm if he wants to describe it. But that family farm has not been an economically viable operation to produce food and fiber in this country for over 30 years.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to inquire of my friend from Kansas what the position of the American Farm Bureau is on this amendment.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I do not know, but I assume that they are in favor of this amendment.

Mr. PEASE. I wondered about that, because I am a little bit puzzled. My understanding is that the American Farm Bureau Federation is in favor of a market-oriented approach which would allow the target prices to go up or down by 5 percent a year.

Now how is that consistent with the 5-year freeze?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I think the Farm Bureau is in favor of the Frank amendment that allows a reduction in target prices. I do not know specifically.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, could I point out to my friend and colleague what the bill really says.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Glickman was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERTS. What the bill really says is we freeze the target price for two years, and then we make a determination with a farmer cost-of-production board working in conjunction with the USDA that is on board right now to determine if the farmers' cost of production goes down. If that is the case, we can move those target prices down.

I might add that the chairman of that board just happens to reside in my district, and in regard to lowering land values and things of that nature that could very well occur, that was the gentleman's amendment, along with this gentleman's, to make sure we freeze it for two years, but if, in fact, the farmer's cost of production went down, then we could lower the target prices.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would just make one point. I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Barney Frank] and anybody else here that there is kind of an implication that in a period of tough budgets that everybody should suffer, and I think that is true. But I want to tell you something. There are a tremendous number of people hurting as bad as they have hurt since the Great Depression right now in the midlands in America, and all throughout this country. And we are one family in this country, like when New York City was in trouble, and I like a majority of my colleagues helped that city out because I thought it would be an embarrassment to this country to see the largest city in this country in serious financial trouble. Our agricultural base is in serious trouble, and that is just not a statistic in the Washington Post. That is borne out by realities in bank failures, in suicides, in people who are hurting, in small towns closing up.

This amendment will help precipitate that.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say to my friend from Kansas on the other side, he was apparently under the impression that I would be somehow worried about a freeze in the salary of the Boston Red Sox. I would. If it was my money, they would not get nearly that much. If people want to pay them that much, that is OK with me. It seems to me they are probably substantially overpaid, but I have no problem with that.

Second, I would say to my friend here from Kansas, yes, I agree, for people in need, OK. But that is not what this bill does.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Roberts] said. He scoffed at the family farm. He said that is not for the family farm, it is to help a major industry that made some bad decisions.

I think we have to separate aid to individuals. Yes, I am for it. I voted for the farm credit bill. I voted for other things that would be helping those individuals.

This is a massive effort to continue an industrial policy for agriculture which says we will continue to subsidize people to grow, whether we need it or not. It does not begin to deal with the problem. It is not targeted and it is not aimed at people.

The gentleman from Kansas on the other side [Mr. Roberts] said that this is not a welfare program. Of course it is

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

not. You know how you can tell? Because the people in it get too much money. We do not treat people on welfare that well. They do not get \$50,000 and more a year. This program in the bill says that the \$50,000 limit may have to be increased, and that is how you know it is not a welfare program.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Wait a second. It does not say that.

Mr. FRANK. It says if the loan rate is dropped below what it is now, it is the difference between the lower loan rate and the target price, and no one can be allowed to go above the \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Glickman was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. First of all, what it says is if we take action to lower the market price arbitrarily by lowering the loan rate, we will make up the difference to the farmer.

Mr. FRANK. More than \$50,000 a year.

Mr. GLICKMAN. The other point I think has to be said that by doing what you are doing, I do not think the gentleman voted for the last amendment -- you did? I take it back and I appreciate the vote.

But what you are doing, what you are doing is you are cutting that target price for big farmers as well as small farmers, Barney, and you are not making any distinction yourself.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman would yield, I agree.

Mr. GLICKMAN. It is untargeted that way.

Mr. FRANK. And I want to make the distinction, but you are saying the arguments in favor of the amendment I agree with. They pointed out and persuaded me that a large share of the money now goes to the bigger people. I would not argue to help the AFDC problem by giving everybody in the State of New York a lot of money. That is what you are talking about, target it, aim it.

The gentleman from Kansas on the other side [Mr. Roberts] said forget about the family farm, this is the way to deal with the whole agricultural industry, and I think it is a very bad way.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my colleagues that I can well understand the gentleman's concern for the administration's position. In 1983, he voted 17 percent, according to the Congressional Quarterly, with the Reagan administration. According to the Congressional Quarterly, in 1984 he voted 30 percent of the time with the Reagan administration. And this great concern he has about these target prices and the Reagan administration, I mean it puts a glow in my heart that the gentleman may be coming over to the Reagan position.

Now I also understand that this gentleman has a great concern about tariffs and import limitations which affect the great Northeast corridor, which are nothing more, and I would repeat are or would be nothing more than a tax on the consumers. It is very inconsistent to be talking about limiting help to wheat producers and then taxing consumers by increasing restrictions on imports that raise the price.

Why does my colleague from Massachusetts propose reducing targets? So that they can buy their product cheaper.

Well I say that the American farmer has sold his product cheap enough and long enough and to the point to where he is at the point of bankruptcy, as is evidenced from the problems in the farm credit system. Even the banks are going

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

broke.

I would say that we must defeat this amendment so that we can put more income into the agricultural producers' pocket.

I thank the gentleman and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were -- ayes 93, noes 334, not voting 7, as follows:

(See Roll No. 323 in the ROLL segment.)

Mr. COBLE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out where we are. I offered the base amendment to try to target price supports.

That was substituted by the Stangeland-Glickman approach which included targeting price supports and the marketing loan concept. We have had a rather substantial debate on targeting price supports. We lost this afternoon. I am very disappointed by that loss.

I wish we had targeted price supports because I think it was the right thing to do.

I had worked with Congressman Glickman and others in the substitute that was offered to try to target these price supports. I supported that. I thought it was the right thing.

We are now left with the base amendment which I introduced, so that we could provide access to debate the Stangeland-Glickman amendment. I do not intend to seek a recorded vote on my amendment.

I did want to say this: that if the amendment does not prevail, inasmuch as we have had this debate this afternoon, the other body has taken action to target price supports. I am hoping the House of Representatives, as we move down this road toward conference, will still consider the interests of many of us in the House to target price supports. But I did want to take the floor to say that I do not intend, because of the debate we have had on the Glickman amendment and because of the result of that vote, to seek a recorded vote on my amendment.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOULTER

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boulter: Page 75, line 9, strike out "July 1" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1".

Page 77, line 24, strike out "July 1" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1".

Page 79, line 6, strike out "July 1" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1".

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, I have a very simple, straightforward amendment dealing with the announcement date for wheat. It is an idea I picked up in my town hall meetings in my district in Texas. If you all have wheat farmers in your districts and visit with them, you have heard the same thing. It would simply move the announcement date up from July 1 to May 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FIRST THING I WOULD LIKE TO DO IS EXPLAIN MY AMENDMENT WHICH IS DESPERATELY NEEDED BY WHEAT FARMERS IN THIS COUNTRY.

EACH YEAR THE WHEAT PROGRAM IS ANNOUNCED FOR THE FOLLOWING YEAR ALLOWING FARMERS TO PLAN THE NEXT YEAR'S CROP. THE ANNOUNCEMENT INCLUDES PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR CROP REDUCTION AND/OR SET-ASIDES, AS WELL AS INFORMATION ON ANY PLANS FOR A PAID DIVERSION.

IN MY DISTRICT AND ALL OF TEXAS, AND INDEED ALL WINTER WHEAT AREAS, THE PRESENT JULY 1 DATE FOR THE WHEAT PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT IS FAR TOO LATE TO BE OF BENEFIT TO FARMERS.

LET ME EXPLAIN WHY, CONTRARY TO POPULAR BELIEF, THE BEGINNING OF NEXT YEAR'S CROP STARTS ON HARVEST DAY AND NOT ON PLANTING DAY. IN FACT MANY FARMERS FOLLOW BEHIND THEIR HARVESTERS WITH A PLOW THAT STARTS PREPARING THE FIELDS FOR THE NEXT CROP. IN WINTER WHEAT AREAS, HARVEST BEGINS IN MAY AND USUALLY ENDS BY AUGUST. IN TEXAS AND SURROUNDING AREAS 25 PERCENT OF THE HARVEST IS COMPLETE BY JUNE 1 AND 75 PERCENT OF THE HARVEST HAS BEEN COMPLETED BY JULY 1.

A TYPICAL FARMER IN MY DISTRICT WILL PLOW HIS FIELD IMMEDIATELY AFTER HE HAS HARVESTED HIS CROP. IN THE NEXT 6 TO 8 WEEKS HE WILL WORK HIS FIELD TO KILL WEEDS, TREAT IT FOR DISEASES, AND FERTILIZE THE FIELD. ALL THIS BEFORE PLANTING. PLANTING STARTS IN SEPTEMBER.

FIELD PREPARATION COSTS CLOSE TO 70 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL EXPENSES THAT HE WILL EXPEND ON HIS CROP INVESTMENT. WITH THE CURRENT JULY 1 ANNOUNCEMENT DATE, DECISIONS MUST BE MADE WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF KNOWING NEXT YEAR'S PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS: HOW MANY ACRES TO PREPARE FOR PLANTING, QUESTIONS ABOUT FUEL, CHEMICALS, AND LABOR COSTS, UNNECESSARILY COSTING THE FARMER MONEY.

AS YOU CAN SEE, MANY FARMERS WHO HARVEST THEIR CROP BEFORE THE ANNOUNCEMENT DATE HAVE ALREADY INVESTED TIME AND MONEY INTO A CROP WHEN THEY FIND OUT WHAT THE

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

PROGRAM ACTUALLY WILL REQUIRE.

THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS HAVE ENDORSED MY AMENDMENT: THE TEXAS WHEAT GROWERS, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS, THE TEXAS FARM BUREAU, THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, AND THE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE MOVEMENT. IN ADDITION, THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION HAS ENDORSED MOVING THE ANNOUNCEMENT DATE FORWARD.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I HOPE MY COLLEAGUES WILL SUPPORT MY EFFORTS TO HELP THE FARMER DO THE JOB HE DOES SO WELL -- FEED AMERICA AND THE WORLD. THE WHEAT PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT SHOULD BE MADE IN TIME FOR THE FARMERS TO MAKE PRUDENT DECISIONS.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment of the gentleman, it would require the Secretary to make an announcement of the wheat program on May 1 but also allows him to amend it up to July 15.

Mr. BOULTER. Yes; we do not tamper with the current law which allows the Secretary to revise his estimates.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, we have examined the amendment on this side and have no objection to its adoption.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOULTER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Wheat producers are once again being forced to plant the winter wheat crop without knowing what the Government program will be next year. It seems, that it is a problem every year. When the process denies producers program decisions, they cannot make intelligent planting decisions.

Several years ago, I led an effort to mandate an early announcement of July 1. This was a vast improvement over the August 15 deadline that was in the law at that time. I commend the gentleman from Texas for taking the issue one step further and offering the May 1 deadline for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the wheat program.

This amendment will provide the farmer with what he needs most -- consistency and predictability and a better planning horizon to that he can make more rational business decisions on his cropping plans. As one producer told me recently, "Pat, I don't care what the USDA and the Congress do to me, just let me know." This amendment would let wheat producers know in time to make their decisions.

At the time, the House considered and passed the early announcement bill 2 years ago I argued for the May 15 deadline and the July 1 date was compromise. USDA made the valid point that sometimes the wheat supply picture changes so dramatically that a May announcement date would cause problems. The surplus is as great as ever, and it appears that we will be in a permanent state of surplus so I certainly don't see any problems with making that announcement date May 1, with the flexibility as the committee bill has to alter the program announcement if the wheat supply demand estimates change substantially.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Texas. His amendment is a good one.

I urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOULTER. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I join in support of the amendment. I think it is an outstanding one. It is certainly important to our part of the country in Oklahoma and Texas and all that region that we have an early announcement so that our farmers have some idea what the program is.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOULTER. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. COMBEST. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I totally and fully support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Boulter] and appreciate the fact that he would take the initiative to do it. It certainly has strong support from the wheat producers in my district as well.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, several speakers have risen to say that the present date of July 1 is simply too late. Farmers generally follow their harvesters with the plow. They need the information in time. Seventy percent of their crop investment is made before the announcement date comes out. I might just point out in closing, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment is supported by the Texas Wheat Growers, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Texas Farm Bureau, and the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the American Agricultural Movement, and the National Farmers Union have endorsed moving the announcement date forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Boulter].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows.

TITLE V -- FEED GRAINS

LOAN RATES, TARGET PRICES, DISASTER PAYMENTS, ACREAGE LIMITATION AND SET-ASIDE PROGRAMS, AND LAND DIVERSION PAYMENTS FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF FEED GRAINS

Sec. 501. Effective only for the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains, the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding after section 105B (7 U.S.C. 1444d) the following:

"Sec. 105C. Notwithstanding any other provision of law --

"(a)(1) For any crop of feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is not in effect under title V,

loans and purchases shall be made available to producers as provided in this subsection.

"(2)(A) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available loans to producers under paragraph (3) for a crop of corn, the Secretary shall make available to producers on each farm loans and purchases for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops of corn for an amount of corn of such crop produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm planted to corn for harvest times the farm's program yield for the crop. Loans and purchases under this paragraph shall be made available during each of the five marketing years for such crops of corn, beginning with the marketing year for the 1986 crop, at such level per bushel -- not less than 75 per centum nor more than 85 per centum of the simple average price per bushel received by farmers (as determined by the Secretary) during the immediately preceding five marketing years, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period -- as the Secretary determines will encourage the exportation of feed grains and not result in excessive stocks of feed grains after taking into consideration the cost of producing corn, supply and demand conditions, and world prices for corn, except that the level of corn loans and purchases for a marketing year, including the marketing year for the 1986 crop of corn, may not be established under the foregoing formula at a level that is less than 95 per centum of the level of loans and purchases for the preceding marketing year (as determined before any reduction in the level of loans and purchases made under the following sentence). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subparagraph, if the Secretary determines (i) that the average price of corn received by producers in the previous marketing year (including the marketing year for the 1985 crop of corn) was not more than 105 per centum of the level of loans and purchases for corn for such marketing year, or (ii) that the loan level computed under the foregoing provisions would discourage the exportation of corn and cause excessive stocks of corn in the United States, the Secretary may reduce the level of loans and purchases for corn for the marketing year by the amount the Secretary determines necessary to maintain domestic and export markets for grain, except that the level of loans and purchases shall not be so reduced in any year to a level less than 80 per centum of the level of loans and purchases as determined under the preceding sentence. The simple average price received by farmers for the immediately preceding marketing year shall be based on the latest information available to the Secretary at the time of the determination.

"(B) Unless the Secretary, at the Secretary's discretion, makes available loans to producers under paragraph (3) for a crop of grain sorghums, barley, oats, or rye, the Secretary shall make available to producers under this paragraph loans and purchases for each of the 1986 through 1989 crops of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level that loans and purchases are made available for corn under this paragraph, taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn and other factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

"(3)(A) The Secretary may make available recourse loans to producers during each of the five marketing years for corn, beginning with the marketing year for the 1986 crop, at such level per bushel -- not less than 75 per centum nor more than 85 per centum of the simple average price per bushel received by farmers (as determined by the Secretary) during the immediately preceding five marketing years, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period -- as the Secretary determines will encourage the exportation of feed grains and not result in excessive stocks of feed grains after taking into consideration the cost of producing corn, supply and demand conditions, and world prices for corn. The level of corn loans and purchases for a marketing year, including the marketing year for the 1986 crop of corn, may not be established under the foregoing formula at a level that is less than 95 per centum of the level of loans and purchases for the preceding marketing year. The simple average price received by farmers for the immediately preceding marketing year shall be based on the latest information available to the Secretary at the time of the determination. The maximum term for any loan under this paragraph shall be 270 days.

"(B) The Secretary may make available to producers under this paragraph recourse loans for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level that recourse loans are made available under this paragraph for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn and other factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

"(D) A producer may repay a loan made under subparagraph (A) or (B) at a level (per bushel) that is the lesser of --

"(i) the original loan level; or

"(ii) at any time through the date of maturity of the loan that the producer redeems the feed grain under loan --

"(I) the then current State monthly weighted average market price (per bushel) for the feed grain, as adjusted for each county in the State, received by farmers, as determined by the Secretary; or

"(II) the then current State weekly or daily weighted average market price (per bushel) for the feed grain, as adjusted for each county in the State, received by farmers, as determined by the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that it is administratively feasible and reduces the fluctuation in the repayment market price for producers.

"(b)(1)(A)(i) The Secretary shall make available to producers payments for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops of corn, grain sorghums, oats, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley for which a national marketing certificate program is not in effect under title V in an amount computed as provided in this paragraph. Payments for any crop of feed grains shall be computed by multiplying (I) the payment rate, by (II) the farm program acreage for the crop, by (III) the farm's program yield for the crop.

"(ii) Whenever an acreage limitation program is in effect for a crop of feed grains, if producers on a farm devote a portion of the farm's permitted feed grain acreage (as determined under subsection (e)(2)) equal to more than 5 per centum of the farm's feed grain crop acreage base for the crop to conservation uses or nonprogram crops, such portion of the feed grain permitted acreage in excess of 5 per centum of the base devoted to conservation uses or nonprogram crops shall be considered as part of the farm's feed grain program acreage and the producers shall be eligible for payments under this paragraph on such acreage, subject to the producers' compliance with the next sentence. To be eligible for payments under the preceding sentence, the producers on the farm must actually plant feed grains for harvest on at least 50 per centum of the farm's feed grain crop acreage base. The farm's feed grain crop acreage base and feed grain program yield shall not be reduced due to the fact that such portion of the farm's permitted acreage was devoted to conserving uses or nonprogram crops.

"(iii) Other than as provided in clause (ii), payments may not be made under this paragraph for any crop on a greater acreage than the acreage actually planted to feed grains.

"(B) The payment rate for a crop of corn shall be the amount by which the established price for the crop of corn (less 6 cents per bushel if the Secretary establishes a feed grain export certificate program for the crop under section 107F(a)) exceeds the higher of --

"(i) the national weighted average market price received by farmers during the first five months of the marketing year for such crop, as determined by the Secretary, or

"(ii) the loan level determined under subsection (a), before any adjustment made under the third sentence in subsection (a)(2)(A) for the marketing year for such crop of corn.

"(C) The established price for the 1986 and 1987 crops of corn shall be \$3.03 per bushel, and for each of the 1988, 1989, and 1990 crops of corn shall be a price determined by the Secretary that is not less than 110 per centum nor more than 125 per centum of the simple average price per bushel received by farmers (as determined by the Secretary) during the marketing years for the immediately preceding five crops, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest in such period. The established price for a crop of corn may not be established under the foregoing formula at a level that is less than 95 per centum of the established price for the preceding crop of corn, nor may the Secretary set the established price for the 1988, 1989, or 1990 crop of corn at a level less than the level for the preceding crop of corn unless the Secretary certifies to Congress at the time the Secretary announces the program for the crop that the costs of production for such crop of corn for all producers, as estimated by

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture in consultation with the National Agricultural Cost of Production Standards Review Board, will be 5 per centum below the cost of production for the previous crop of corn for all producers. The simple average price received by farmers for the immediately preceding marketing year shall be based on the latest information available to the Secretary at the time of the determination.

"(D)(i) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, if the Secretary adjusts the level of loans and purchases for corn in accordance with the third sentence in subsection (a)(2)(A), the Secretary shall provide emergency compensation by increasing the established price payments for corn by such amount as the Secretary determines necessary to provide the same total return to producers as if the adjustment in the level of loans and purchases had not been made.

"(ii) In determining the payment rate, per bushel, for established price payments for a crop of corn under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall use the national weighted average market price, per bushel of corn, received by farmers during the marketing year for such crop, as determined by the Secretary.

"(iii) Any payments under this subparagraph shall not be included in the payments subject to limitations under the provisions of section 1011 of the Food Security Act of 1985.

"(E) The payment rate for grain sorghums, oats, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley shall be such rate as the Secretary determines fair and reasonable in relation to the rate at which payments are made available for corn.

"(F) The total quantity of feed grains on which payments would otherwise be payable to a producer on a farm for any crop under this paragraph shall be reduced by the quantity on which any disaster payment is made to the producer for the crop under paragraph (2).

"(2)(A) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (C), if the Secretary determines that the producers on a farm are prevented from planting any portion of the acreage intended for feed grains to feed grains or other nonconserving crops because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or other condition beyond the control of the producers, the Secretary shall make a prevented planting disaster payment to the producers on the number of acres so affected but not to exceed the acreage planted to feed grains for harvest (including any acreage that the producers were prevented from planting to feed grains or other nonconserving crop in lieu of feed grains because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or other condition beyond the control of the producers) in the immediately preceding year, multiplied by 75 per centum of the farm's program yield for feed grains established by the Secretary for such crop times a payment rate equal to 33 1/3 per centum of the established price for the crop. Payments made by the Secretary under this subparagraph may be made in the form of cash or from stocks of feed grains held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"(B) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (C), if the Secretary determines that because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or other condition beyond the control of the producers, the total quantity of feed grains that the producers are able to harvest on any farm is less than the result of multiplying 60 per centum of the farm's program yield for feed grains established by the Secretary for such crop by the acreage planted for harvest for such crop, the Secretary shall make a reduced yield disaster payment to the producers at a rate equal to 50 per centum of the established price for the crop for the deficiency in production below 60 per centum for the crop.

"(C) Producers on a farm shall not be eligible for prevented planting disaster payments under subparagraph (A) if prevented planting crop insurance is available to them under the Federal Crop Insurance Act with respect to their feed grain acreage. Producers on a farm shall not be eligible for reduced yield disaster payments under subparagraph (B) if crop insurance on the growing crop is available to them under the Federal Crop Insurance Act with respect to their feed grain acreage.

"(D) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (C), the Secretary may make disaster payments to producers on a farm under this paragraph whenever the Secretary determines that --

"(i) as the result of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or other condition beyond the control of the producers, producers on a farm have suffered substantial losses of production either from being prevented from planting feed grains or other nonconserving crop or from reduced yields, and that such losses have created an economic emergency for the producers;

"(ii) crop insurance indemnity payments under the Federal Crop Insurance Act and other forms of assistance made available by the Federal Government to such producers for such losses are insufficient to alleviate such economic emergency; and

"(iii) additional assistance must be made available to such producers to alleviate the economic emergency.

The Secretary may make such adjustments in the amount of payments made available under this subparagraph with respect to individual farms so as to ensure the equitable allotment of such payments among producers taking into account other forms of Federal disaster assistance provided to the producers for the crop involved.

"(c)(1) The Secretary shall proclaim a national program acreage for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains. The proclamation shall be made not later than September 30 of each calendar year for the crop harvested in the next succeeding calendar year, except that for the 1986 crop the proclamation shall be made as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985. The Secretary may revise the national program acreage first proclaimed for any crop for the purpose of determining the allocation factor under paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines it necessary based on the latest information, and the Secretary shall proclaim such revised national program acreage as soon as it is made. The national program acreage for feed grains shall be the number of harvested acres the Secretary determines (on the basis of the weighted national average of the feed grain program yields for the crop for which the determination is made) will produce the quantity (less imports) that the Secretary estimates will be used domestically and for export during the marketing year for such crop. If the Secretary determines that carryover stocks of feed grains are excessive or an increase in stocks is needed to ensure desirable carryover, the Secretary may adjust the national program acreage by the amount the Secretary determines will accomplish the desired increase or decrease in carryover stocks.

"(2) The Secretary shall determine a program allocation factor for each crop of feed grains. The allocation factor for feed grains shall be determined by dividing the national program acreage for the crop by the number of acres that the Secretary estimates will be harvested for such crop, except that in no event may the allocation factor for any crop of feed grains be more than 100 per centum nor less than 80 per centum.

"(3) Except as provided in subsection (e)(2), the individual farm program acreage for each crop of feed grains shall be determined by multiplying the allocation factor by the acreage of feed grains planted for harvest on the farms for which individual farm program acreages are required to be determined. The farm program acreage shall not be further reduced by application of the allocation factor if the producers reduce the acreage on the farm planted to feed grains for harvest from the feed grain crop acreage base established for the farm for the crop under title VI by at least the percentage recommended by the Secretary in the proclamation of the national program acreage. The Secretary shall provide fair and equitable treatment for producers on farms on which the acreage planted to feed grains for harvest is less than the feed grain crop acreage base established for the farm for the crop under title VI, but for which the reduction is insufficient to exempt the farm from the application of the allocation factor. In establishing the allocation factor for feed grains, the Secretary may make such adjustment as the Secretary deems necessary to take into account the extent of exemption of farms under the foregoing provisions of this paragraph.

"(d) The program yields for farms for each crop of feed grains shall be determined under title VI.

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law --

"(A) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may provide for any crop of feed grains either a program under which the acreage planted to feed grains would be limited as described in paragraph (2) or a

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

set-aside program as described in paragraph (3) if the Secretary determines that the total supply of feed grains, in the absence of such a program, will be excessive taking into account the need for an adequate carryover to maintain reasonable and stable supplies and prices and to meet a national emergency. The Secretary shall announce any feed grain acreage limitation program or set-aside program under this subsection not later than September 30 prior to the calendar year in which the crop is harvested, and the Secretary may make appropriate adjustments in such announcement for the feed grain acreage limitation program or the set-aside program not later than October 30 before the calendar year in which the crop is harvested, if the Secretary determines that there has been a significant change in the total supply of feed grains since the earlier announcement. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall announce the feed grain acreage limitation program for the 1986 crop under subparagraph (B) as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985.

"(B)(i) For the 1986 crop of feed grains, the Secretary shall provide for an acreage limitation program, as described in paragraph (2), under which the acreage on the farm planted to feed grains for harvest will be limited to the feed grain acreage base for the farm for the crop reduced by a total of 20 per centum, except that, for producers who plant the 1986 crop of feed grains before the announcement by the Secretary of the feed grain acreage limitation program for that crop, the Secretary shall provide for a combination of (I) an acreage limitation program, and (II) a paid diversion program, as described in paragraph (5), under which the acreage on the farm planted to feed grains for harvest will be limited to the feed grain crop acreage base for the farm for the crop reduced by 10 per centum under the acreage limitation program and by an additional 10 per centum under the paid diversion program.

"(ii) With respect to any of the 1987 through 1990 crops of feed grains, if the Secretary estimates, not later than September 30 of the year prior to the calendar year in which the crop is harvested, that the quantity of feed grains on hand in the United States on the first day of the marketing year for that crop (not including any quantity of feed grains of that crop) will exceed 1,100,000,000 bushels, the Secretary (I) shall provide for an acreage limitation program, as described in paragraph (2), under which the acreage planted to feed grains for harvest on a farm would be limited to the feed grain crop acreage base for the farm for the crop reduced by not less than 10 per centum, and (II) may provide for a paid diversion program, as described in paragraph (5), or an additional acreage limitation for any desired reduction in planted acreage in excess of 10 per centum of the feed grain crop acreage base for the farm.

"(iii) As a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, and payments for any such crop of feed grains, the producers on a farm must comply with the terms and conditions of the acreage limitation program and, if applicable, the paid diversion program.

"(2) If the feed grain acreage limitation program is announced under paragraph (1), such limitation shall be achieved by applying a uniform percentage reduction to the feed grain crop acreage base for the crop for each feed grain-producing farm. Producers who knowingly produce feed grains in excess of the permitted feed grain acreage for the farm shall be ineligible for feed grain loans, purchases, and payments with respect to that farm. The Secretary may provide that no producer of malting barley shall be required as a condition of eligibility for feed grain loans, purchases, and payments to comply with any acreage limitation under this paragraph if such producer has previously produced a malting variety of barley for harvest, plants barley only of an acceptable malting variety for harvest, and meets such other conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Feed grain acreage bases for each crop of feed grains shall be determined under title VI. A number of acres on the farm determined by dividing (A) the product obtained by multiplying the number of acres required to be withdrawn from the production of feed grains times the number of acres actually planted to feed grains by (B) the number of acres authorized to be planted to feed grains under the limitation established by the Secretary shall be devoted to conservation uses, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary. The number of acres so determined is hereafter in this subsection referred to as 'reduced acreage'. If an acreage limitation program is announced under paragraph (1) for a crop of feed grains, subsection (c) shall not be applicable to such crop, including any prior announcement that may have been made under such subsection with respect to such crop. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), the individual farm program acreage shall be the acreage on the farm planted to feed grains for harvest within the permitted feed grain acreage for the farm as established under this paragraph.

"(3) If a set-aside program is announced under paragraph (1), then as a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, and payments authorized by this section, the producers on a farm must set aside and devote to conservation uses an acreage of cropland equal to a specified percentage, as determined by the Secretary, of the acreage of feed grains planted for harvest for the crop for which the set-aside is in effect. The set-aside acreage shall be devoted to conservation uses, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary. If a set-aside program is established, the Secretary may limit the acreage planted to feed grains. Such limitation shall be applied on a uniform basis to all feed grain-producing farms. The Secretary may make such adjustments in individual set-aside acreages under this paragraph as the Secretary determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, types of soil, soil and water conservation measures, topography, and such other factors as the Secretary deems necessary.

"(4) The regulations issued by the Secretary under paragraphs (2) and (3) with respect to acreage required to be devoted to conservation uses shall ensure protection of such acreage from weeds and wind and water erosion. The Secretary may permit, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, all or any part of such acreage to be devoted to sweet sorghum, hay and grazing, or the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, flaxseed, triticale, rye, or other commodity, if the Secretary determines that such production is needed to provide an adequate supply of such commodities, is not likely to increase the cost of the price support program, and will not affect farm income adversely.

"(5) The Secretary may make land diversion payments to producers of feed grains, whether or not an acreage limitation or set-aside program for feed grains is in effect, if the Secretary determines that such land diversion payments are necessary to assist in adjusting the total national acreage of feed grains to desirable goals. Such land diversion payments shall be made to producers who, to the extent prescribed by the Secretary, devote to approved conservation uses an acreage of cropland on the farm in accordance with land diversion contracts entered into the Secretary with such producers. The amounts payable to producers under land diversion contracts may be determined through the submission of bids for such contracts by producers in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe or through such other means as the Secretary determines appropriate. In determining the acceptability of contract offers, the Secretary shall take into consideration the extent of the diversion to be undertaken by the producers and the productivity of the acreage diverted. The Secretary shall limit the total acreage to be diverted under agreements in any county or local community so as not to affect adversely the economy of the county or local community.

"(6) Any reduced acreage, set-aside acreage, and additional diverted acreage may be devoted to wildlife food plots or wildlife habitat in conformity with standards established by the Secretary in consultation with wildlife agencies. The Secretary may pay an appropriate share of the cost of practices designed to carry out the purposes of the foregoing sentence. The Secretary may also pay an appropriate share of the cost of approved soil and water conservation practices (including practices that may be effective for a number of years) established by the producer on reduced acreage, set-aside acreage, or additional diverted acreage. The Secretary may provide for an additional payment on such acreage in an amount determined by the Secretary to be appropriate in relation to the benefit to the general public if the producer agrees to permit, without other compensation, access to all or such portion of the farm as the Secretary may prescribe, by the general public, for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking, subject to applicable State and Federal regulations.

"(7) An operator of a farm desiring to participate in the program conducted under this subsection shall execute an agreement with the Secretary providing for such participation not later than such date as the Secretary may prescribe. The Secretary, by mutual agreement with producers on the farm, may terminate or modify any such agreement if the Secretary determines such action necessary because of an emergency created by drought or other disaster or to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of agricultural commodities.

"(8) In carrying out the program conducted under this subsection, the Secretary may prescribe production targets for participating farms expressed in bushels of production so that all participating farms achieve the same pro rata reduction in production as prescribed by the national production targets.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

"(f) If the failure of a producer to comply fully with the terms and conditions of the program conducted under this section precludes the making of loans, purchases, and payments, the Secretary, nevertheless, may make such loans, purchases, and payments in such amounts as the Secretary determines to be equitable in relation to the seriousness of the failure. The Secretary may authorize the county and State committees established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to waive or modify deadlines and other program requirements in cases in which lateness or failure to meet such other requirements does not affect adversely the operation of the program.

"(g) The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(h) The Secretary shall carry out the program authorized by this section through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"(i) The provisions of section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (relating to assignment of payments) shall apply to payments under this section.

"(j) The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of payments made under this section for any farm among the producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis.

"(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, compliance on a farm with the terms and conditions of any other commodity program may not be required as a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, or payments under this section if an acreage limitation program is established under subsection (e)(2), but may be required if a set-aside program is established under subsection (e)(3)."

NONAPPLICABILITY OF SECTION 105 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Sec. 502. Section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1444b) shall not be applicable to the 1986 through 1989 crops of feed grains.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VA.

The text of title VA is as follows:

TITLE VA -- PRODUCER-APPROVED WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

REFERENDA AND PRODUCTION ACREAGES, MARKETING CERTIFICATES, AND MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

Sec. 551. Effective only for the 1986 through 1990 crops, the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title V as follows:

"TITLE V -- REFERENDA AND PRODUCTION ACREAGES, MARKETING CERTIFICATES, AND MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

"FINDINGS AND POLICY

"Sec. 501. (a) Congress finds that --

"(1) wheat and feed grains are essential agricultural commodities for the Nation, are produced throughout the United States by hundreds of thousands of farmers, and along with their products flow in substantial amounts through instrumentalities of interstate and foreign commerce from producers to consumers;

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

"(2) abnormally excessive and abnormally deficient supplies of wheat and feed grains on the country-wide market acutely and directly affect, burden, and obstruct interstate and foreign commerce; and

"(3) interstate and foreign commerce in wheat and feed grains, and their products, should be protected from burdensome surpluses and disruptive shortages, a supply of the commodities should be maintained to meet domestic consumption needs and export demand, and soil and water resources of the Nation should not be squandered in the production of surplus burdensome supplies of the commodities.

"(b) It hereby is declared to be the policy of Congress that it is in the interest of the general welfare to assist in the marketing of wheat and feed grains for domestic consumption and export; to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in the commodities to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of the commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; and to provide loans and other means to maintain farm income for producers of the commodities, reduce excess production, and enable consumers to obtain an adequate and steady supply of such commodities at fair prices.

"CONSUMER SAFEGUARDS

"Sec. 502. The powers conferred under this title shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of food and animal feed sufficient to meet normal domestic and export needs, as determined by the Secretary. In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall give due regard to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities from domestic production adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair both to producers and consumers.

"WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN REFERENDA

"Sec. 503. (a) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum by secret ballot of wheat and feed grain producers every two years to determine whether they favor or oppose the national marketing certificate program under this title. In the case of the 1986 and 1987 crops, the referendum shall be conducted as soon as practicable after enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than February 1, 1986. For the 1988 and 1989 crops, the referendum shall be conducted not later than July 1, 1987, and for the 1990 crop, year not later than July 1, 1989.

"(b) Any producer on a farm with a wheat or feed grain crop acreage base of fifteen or more acres for the then current crop, as determined under title VI, shall be eligible to vote in a referendum. For the purposes of this section, the term 'producer' shall include any person who is entitled to share in a crop of the commodity, or the proceeds thereof, because the person shares in the risks of production of the crop as an owner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper. A landlord whose return from the crop is fixed regardless of the amount of the crop produced shall not be considered a producer.

"(c) The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within fifteen days after the date of such referendum, and if the Secretary determines that 60 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and feed grains (including 50 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and 50 per centum or more of the producers of feed grains) voting in the referendum in favor of the implementation of a national marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall proclaim that a national marketing certificate program will be in effect for the crops of wheat and feed grains produced for harvest in --

"(1) with respect to the referendum held not later than February 1, 1986, the 1986 and 1987 crops of wheat and feed grains;

"(2) with respect to the referendum held not later than July 1, 1987, the 1988 and 1989 crops of wheat and feed grains; and

"(3) with respect to the referendum held not later than July 1, 1989, the 1990 crops of wheat and feed grains.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

"(d) In the event that a national marketing certificate program is approved for the 1986 crops of wheat and feed grains, the Secretary shall provide fair and equitable compensation to producers who planted a crop in excess of their farm program acreage prior to the proclamation by the Secretary that marketing certificates will be in effect with respect to that crop. Such compensation shall cover, at a minimum, the costs incurred by the producer for planting such crop, as determined by the Secretary.

"(e) If marketing certificates are not approved by producers in a referendum conducted under this section with respect to any crop of wheat or feed grains, in lieu of a national marketing certificate program for that crop, the Secretary shall provide such loans, purchases, payments, and other assistance to producers of wheat and feed grains as provided for elsewhere in this Act.

"NATIONAL MARKETING CERTIFICATE PROGRAM -- WHEAT

"Sec. 504. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a national marketing certificate program for a crop of wheat is approved under section 503, the Secretary shall make available to producers on each farm loans and purchases for such crop of wheat for an amount of wheat produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm that may be planted to wheat for harvest, as determined under subsection (c) or (e) of section 107D, times the farm program yield for the crop, as determined under title VI. Loans and purchases shall be made available during the marketing year for any such crop of wheat at such level as the Secretary determines will maintain the competitive relationship of wheat to other grains in domestic and export markets after taking into consideration the cost of producing wheat, supply and demand conditions, and world prices for wheat, except that the level of wheat loans and purchases for any such marketing year may not be established at less than \$4.50 per bushel of wheat.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall make available to producers marketing certificates for any of the 1986 through 1990 crops of wheat for which a national marketing certificate program is in effect. The amount of such marketing certificates made available to the producers on a farm shall equal an amount of wheat produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm that may be planted to wheat for harvest as determined under subsection (c) or (e) of section 107D, times the farm program payment yield for the crop, as determined under title VI.

"(2) A marketing certificate applicable to a marketing year issued to a producer of wheat shall authorize such producer to market, barter, or donate, without restriction, during such marketing year an amount of wheat equal to the amount of such marketing certificate. Wheat may not be marketed, bartered, or donated domestically without a marketing certificate, except that wheat not accompanied by a marketing certificate may be used for feed, human consumption, or other purposes on the farm of the producer, or may be sold for export.

"(3) Wheat accompanied by a marketing certificate that is sold for export shall be eligible for an export incentive payment on such wheat, as provided in section 1125 of the Food Security Act of 1985.

"(4) If for any crop, wheat that the producer harvests exceeds the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate, the excess may be carried over by the producer from one marketing year to the succeeding marketing year and marketed under a certificate in the succeeding marketing year to the extent that (A) the total amount of such wheat available for marketing under a certificate from the farm in the marketing year from which such commodity is carried over does not exceed the amount of the marketing certificate made available to the producers for that crop, and (B) the total amount of wheat available for marketing under a certificate in the succeeding marketing year (that is, the sum of the amount of such wheat carried over and the amount of such wheat produced on the farm eligible for marketing certificates in the succeeding year) does not exceed the amount of marketing certificates made available to the producers for the succeeding marketing year.

"(5) Marketing certificates made available to a producer of wheat shall not be transferable, except to the extent that such certificates accompany wheat that is marketed, bartered, or donated under paragraph (2).

"(6) Wheat harvested in a calendar year in which marketing certificates are made available to producers for the

marketing year beginning therein may not be marketed, except as provided in paragraph (2), prior to the date on which such marketing year begins.

"(7) A person may not purchase or otherwise acquire an amount of wheat from a producer in excess of the amount of wheat that may be marketed, bartered, or donated by such producer under a marketing certificate, except that wheat that must be exported may be acquired as provided under paragraph (2).

"(8) If marketing certificates for wheat are not made available to producers for any marketing year, all previous marketing certificates applicable to wheat shall be terminated, effective as of the first day of such marketing year.

"PENALTIES WITH RESPECT TO WHEAT

"Sec. 505. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), if a producer fails to comply with any term or condition of a wheat program conducted under this title, the producer shall be ineligible for any loan, purchase, or payment under this Act for the crop of wheat involved.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (c), if anyone markets, barter, or donates wheat other than for export without a marketing certificate required under section 504 or markets, barter, or donates an amount of wheat for use in excess of the amount of wheat the person or entity is permitted to market, barter, or donate under such certificate, the Secretary shall --

"(A) assess a civil penalty against such person or entity in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the wheat so marketed, bartered, or donated, or

"(B) with respect to a producer, decrease the number of acres of the farm's wheat crop acreage base such producer may devote to production for the succeeding crop of wheat by a number of acres that, if planted, would result in the production of a quantity sufficient to satisfy the penalty referred to in subparagraph (A).

"(3) If a person knowingly purchases or otherwise acquires an amount of wheat in excess of the amount of wheat that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate issued under this title, the Secretary shall assess a civil penalty against such person in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the wheat so purchased or acquired.

"(b) If a producer fails to comply fully with the terms and conditions of a wheat program conducted under this title and the Secretary believes the failure should not preclude the making of loans, purchases, or payments to the producer, the Secretary may make loans, purchases, or payments in such amounts as the Secretary determines to be equitable in relation to the severity of the program violation.

"(c) If the Secretary determines that the penalties provided for in subsection (a) are not warranted by the severity of the program violation, the Secretary may reduce or waive such penalties.

"(d) Penalties collected under this section shall be deposited into the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"NATIONAL MARKETING CERTIFICATE PROGRAM -- FEED GRAINS

"Sec. 506. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a national marketing certificate program for a crop of feed grains is approved under section 503, the Secretary shall make available to producers on each farm loans and purchases for such crop of feed grains for an amount of feed grains produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm that may be planted to feed grains for harvest, as determined under subsection (c) or (e) of section 105C times the farm program yield for the crop, as determined under title VI. Loans and purchases shall be made available during the marketing year for any such crop of feed grains at such level as the Secretary determines will maintain the competitive relationship of feed grains to other grains in domestic and export markets after taking into consideration the cost of

producing feed grains, supply and demand conditions, and world prices for feed grains, except that the level of feed grain loans and purchases for the 1986 through 1990 marketing years may not be established at less than \$3.25 per bushel of corn.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall make available to producers marketing certificates for any of the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is in effect. The amount of such marketing certificates made available to the producers on a farm shall equal an amount of feed grains produced on the farm equal to the acreage on the farm that may be planted to feed grains for harvest, as determined under subsection (c) or (e) of section 105C, times the farm program yield for the crop, as determined under title VI.

"(2) A marketing certificate applicable to a marketing year issued to a producer of feed grains shall authorize such producer to market, barter, or donate, without restriction, during such marketing year an amount of such feed grains equal to the amount of such marketing certificate. Feed grains may not be marketed, bartered, or donated domestically without a marketing certificate, except that feed grains not accompanied by a marketing certificate may be used for feed, human consumption, or other purposes on the farm of the producer, or may be sold for export.

"(3) Feed grains accompanied by a marketing certificate that is sold for export shall be eligible for an export incentive payment on such feed grains, as provided in section 1125 of the Food Security Act of 1985.

"(4) If for any crop, feed grains that the producer harvests exceed the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate, the excess may be carried over by the producer from one marketing year to the succeeding marketing year and marketed under a certificate in the succeeding marketing year to the extent that (A) the total amount of such feed grains available for marketing under a certificate from the farm in the marketing year from which such commodity is carried over does not exceed the amount of the marketing certificate made available to the producers for that crop, and (B) the total amount of feed grains available for marketing under a certificate in the succeeding marketing year (that is, the sum of the amount of such feed grains carried over and the amount of such feed grains produced on the farm eligible for marketing certificates in the succeeding year) does not exceed the amount of marketing certificates made available to the producers for the succeeding marketing year.

"(5) Marketing certificates made available to a producer of feed grains shall not be transferable, except to the extent that such certificates accompany feed grains that are marketed, bartered, or donated under paragraph (2).

"(6) Feed grains harvested in a calendar year in which marketing certificates are made available to producers for the marketing year beginning therein may not be marketed, except as provided in paragraph (2), prior to the date on which such marketing year begins.

"(7) A person may not purchase or otherwise acquire an amount of feed grains from a producer in excess of the amount of feed grains that may be marketed, bartered, or donated by such producer under a marketing certificate, except that feed grains that must be exported may be acquired as provided under paragraph (2).

"(8) If marketing certificates for feed grains are not made available to producers for any marketing year, all previous marketing certificates applicable to feed grains shall be terminated, effective as of the first day of such marketing year.

"PENALTIES WITH RESPECT TO FEED GRAINS

"Sec. 507. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), if a producer fails to comply with any term or condition of a feed grain program conducted under this title, the producer shall be ineligible for any loan, purchase, or payment under this Act for the crop of feed grains involved.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (c), if anyone markets, barters, or donates feed grains other than for export without a marketing certificate required under section 506 or markets, barters, or donates an amount of feed grains for

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

use in excess of the amount of the commodity the person or entity is permitted to market, barter, or donate under such certificate, the Secretary shall --

"(A) assess a civil penalty against such person or entity in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the feed grains so marketed, bartered, or donated, or

"(B) with respect to a producer, decrease the number of acres of the farm's feed grain crop acreage base such producer may devote to production for the succeeding crop of feed grains by a number of acres that, if planted, would result in the production of a quantity sufficient to satisfy the penalty referred to in subparagraph (A).

"(3) If a person knowingly purchases or otherwise acquires an amount of feed grains in excess of the amount of feed grains that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate issued under this title, the Secretary shall assess a civil penalty against such person in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the feed grains so purchased or acquired.

"(b) If a producer fails to comply fully with the terms and conditions of a feed grain program conducted under this title and the Secretary believes the failure should not preclude the making of loans, purchases, or payments to the producer, the Secretary may make loans, purchases, or payments in such amounts as the Secretary determines to be equitable in relation to the severity of the program violation.

"(c) If the Secretary determines that the penalties provided for in subsection (a) are not warranted by the severity of the program violation, the Secretary may reduce or waive such penalties.

"(d) Penalties collected under this section shall be deposited into the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"REGULATIONS

"Sec. 508. The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this title."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. de la Garza: On page 124, line 14, strike the quotation mark and the second period.

On page 124, after line 14, add a new section as follows:

"PROGRAM BASES

"Sec. 509. Notwithstanding section 605, for any crop of wheat or feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is approved under section 503, no producer of such crop may adjust the producer's crop acreage base for the crop as provided for in section 605, and the producer's base for such crop shall be as determined under title VI without regard to section 605."

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the marketing certificate program as appears in our bill was made necessary by reestimate of the provisions caused by the Congressional Budget Office following adoption of H.R. 2100 by the committee.

This amendment will provide an additional 3 years' saving of over \$2 billion.

This amendment will simply prevent any producer from increasing his wheat or feed grain base during the

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

operation of the market certificate program. There may be a possibility that would entice someone because of the high support to get into the program. This will, in effect, not do any harm to the so-called Stenholm provisions of base and yield.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. de la GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of moving the process along, we have had the opportunity to review this amendment and have no objection to it on this side.

Mr. de la GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Volkmer: Page 110, strike out line 1 and all that follows thereafter through page 124, line 14, and insert the following new title:

TITLE VA -- PRODUCER-APPROVED WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

REFERENDA AND QUOTAS, PRODUCTION ACREAGES, MARKETING CERTIFICATES, AND MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1991 CROPS OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

Sec. 551. Effective only for the 1986 through 1991 crops, the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title V as follows:

"TITLE V -- REFERENDA AND QUOTAS, PRODUCTION ACREAGES, MARKETING CERTIFICATES, AND MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR THE 1986 THROUGH 1991 CROPS OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

"Subtitle A -- Findings and Policy; Consumer Safeguards

"FINDINGS AND POLICY

"Sec. 501. (a) Congress finds that --

"(1) wheat and feed grains are essential agricultural commodities for the Nation, are produced throughout the United States by hundreds of thousands of farmers, and along with their products flow in substantial amounts through instrumentalities of interstate and foreign commerce from producers to consumers;

"(2) abnormally excessive and abnormally deficient supplies of wheat and feed grains on the country-wide market acutely and directly affect, burden, and obstruct interstate and foreign commerce; and

"(3) interstate and foreign commerce in wheat and feed grains, and their products, should be protected from burdensome surpluses and disruptive shortages, a supply of the commodities should be maintained to meet domestic consumption needs and export demand, and soil and water resources of the Nation should not be squandered in the production of surplus burdensome supplies of the commodities.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that it is in the interest of the general welfare to assist in the marketing of wheat and feed grains for domestic consumption and export; to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in the commodities to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of the commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; and to provide loans and other means to maintain farm income for producers of the commodities, reduce excess production, and enable consumers to obtain an adequate and steady supply of such commodities at fair prices.

"CONSUMER SAFEGUARDS

"Sec. 502. The powers conferred under this title shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of food and animal feed sufficient to meet normal domestic and export needs, as determined by the Secretary. In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall give due regard to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities from domestic production adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair both to producers and consumers.

"Subtitle B -- Producer-Approved Wheat and Feed Grain Program

"PROCLAMATION OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN MARKETING QUOTAS

"Sec. 511. (a) Whenever prior to April 15 in any calendar year the Secretary determines that the total supply of wheat or feed grains, or both, in the marketing years for such commodities beginning in the next succeeding calendar year, in the absence of a marketing year program, will likely be excessive, the Secretary shall proclaim that a national marketing quota for wheat or a national marketing quota for feed grains, as the case may be, or marketing quotas for both, shall be in effect for such marketing years and for the marketing years for the next crop of such commodities. In the case of the marketing years for the 1986 and 1987 crops of such commodities, such determination and proclamation shall be made as soon as practicable after the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than January 1, 1986.

"(b) If a national marketing quota for wheat or feed grains has been proclaimed for any marketing year, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the amount of the national marketing quota for such marketing year not earlier than January 1 nor later than April 15 of the calendar year preceding the year in which such marketing year begins, except that in the case of the marketing years for the 1986 and 1987 crops, such determination and proclamation shall be made as soon as practicable after the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than January 1, 1986. The amount of the national marketing quota for wheat or feed grains for any marketing year shall be an amount of wheat or feed grains that the Secretary estimates is required to meet anticipated needs during such marketing year, taking into consideration domestic requirements, export demand, food aid needs, and adequate carryover stocks.

"(C) If, after the proclamation of a national marketing quota for wheat or feed grains for any marketing year, the Secretary determines that the national marketing quota should be terminated or increased to meet a national emergency or a material increase in the demand for wheat or feed grains, the national marketing quota shall be increased or terminated by the Secretary.

"FARM MARKETING QUOTAS

"Sec. 512. (a) For each marketing year for wheat or feed grains for which a national marketing quota has been proclaimed under section 511 of this title, the Secretary shall establish farm marketing quotas in accordance with this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall establish a marketing quota apportionment factor for each wheat or feed grain marketing year for which a national marketing quota is proclaimed under section 511. The marketing quota apportionment factor shall be determined by dividing the national marketing quota for such marketing year for wheat or feed grains by the product obtained by multiplying (1) the Secretary's estimate of the average of the then current program yields for wheat

or feed grains assigned to each farm by (2) the total of each farm's then current wheat or feed grain crop acreage base.

"(c) The Secretary shall assign a farm marketing quota to each farm with a wheat or feed grain crop acreage base of fifteen acres or more for the crop involved by multiplying the marketing quota apportionment factor determined under subsection (b) of this section by the product obtained by multiplying (1) such farm's then current program yield for wheat or feed grains by (2) such farm's then current wheat or feed grain crop acreage base.

"(d) Farm marketing quotas shall be established by the Secretary under this section by June 1 of the calendar year preceding the marketing year for which a national marketing quota has been proclaimed under this title, except that in the case of the 1986 and 1987 crops, such quotas shall be established as soon as practicable after the enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than January 1, 1986.

"PROCLAMATION OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS NATIONAL PRODUCTION ACREAGES

"Sec. 513. (a) If a national marketing quota has been proclaimed for any wheat or feed grain marketing year under section 511 of this title, the Secretary shall proclaim a wheat or feed grain national production acreage for the crop of wheat or feed grains covered by such marketing year on the date that such national marketing quota is proclaimed.

"(b) The amount of the national production acreage for any crop of wheat or feed grains shall be the number of wheat or feed grain acres that the Secretary determines on the basis of the projected national yield and expected underplantings (acreage other than acreage not harvested because of program incentives) of the farm production acreages for such crop will produce an amount of wheat or feed grains equal to the national marketing quota for the commodity for the marketing year for such crop.

"(c) If, after the proclamation of the national production acreage for wheat or feed grains for any crop, the Secretary determines that the national production acreage should be terminated or increased to meet a national emergency or a material increase in the demand for wheat or feed grains, the national production acreage shall be increased or terminated by the Secretary.

"FARM PRODUCTION ACREAGES

"Sec. 514. (a) The national production acreage determined under section 513 of this title for a crop of wheat or feed grains shall be apportioned by the Secretary among farms in accordance with this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall establish a production acreage apportionment factor for each crop of wheat or feed grains for which a national production acreage is determined. The production acreage apportionment factor shall be determined by dividing the national production acreage for such crop of wheat or feed grains by the total of the acres of wheat or feed grains included in each farm's wheat or feed grain crop acreage base, as determined under title VI of this Act.

"(c) The Secretary shall determine the wheat or feed grain farm production acreage for each farm (with a crop acreage base for the commodity and crop involved of fifteen acres or more) on which wheat or feed grains are produced by multiplying the production acreage apportionment factor determined under subsection (b) of this section by the farm's wheat or feed grain crop acreage base.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, the farm production acreage for each farm --

"(1) in the case of each crop of wheat, shall be equal to 65 per centum of the farm's crop acreage base for wheat, unless the Secretary estimates that, by the end of the marketing year for that crop of wheat, ending stocks of wheat will be equal to or less than the domestic consumption of wheat for the marketing year; and

"(2) in the case of each crop of feed grains, shall be equal to 80 per centum of the farm's acreage base for feed

grains, unless the Secretary estimates that, by the end of the marketing year for that crop of feed grains, ending stocks of feed grains will be 10 per centum or less of the total use of feed grains for the marketing year.

"(e) Subject to the provisions of section 535(b) of this title, whenever a wheat or feed or feed grain production acreage for a crop is established for a farm, other than for a crop which the producers on the farm uses for on-farm feeding purposes and which the producers on the farm certify in writing will be used exclusively for on-farm feeding purposes during the period for which a national production acreage is in effect, under this section, the producers on the farm may not plant an acreage on the farm to the commodity for harvest for the crop in excess of the farm's production acreage for the commodity; and with respect to farms with a crop acreage base for the commodity and crop involved of less than fifteen acres, producers on the farm may not plant an acreage on the farm to the commodity for harvest for the crop in excess of fifteen acres.

"REFERENDA

"Sec. 515. (a) If national marketing quotas for wheat, feed grains, or both wheat and feed grains for two marketing years, are proclaimed under section 511 of this title, the Secretary shall, not later than July 1 of the calendar year in which such national marketing quotas are proclaimed, conduct a referendum by secret ballot of wheat and feed grain producers to determine whether they favor or oppose marketing quotas and production acreages for the marketing years and crops for which proclaimed. In the case of the 1986 and 1987 crops, the referendum shall be conducted as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, but not later than February 1, 1986.

"(b) Any producer with a wheat or feed grain crop acreage base of fifteen or more acres for the than current crop, as determined under title VI of this Act, shall be eligible to vote in the referendum. For purposes of this section, the term 'producer' shall include any person who is entitled to share in a crop of the commodity, or the proceeds thereof, because the person shares in the risks of production of the crop as an owner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper. A landlord whose return from the crop is fixed regardless of the amount of the crop produced shall not be considered a producer.

"(c) The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within fifteen days after the date of such referendum and if the Secretary determines that 60 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and feed grains (including 50 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and 50 per centum or more of the producers of feed grains) voting in the referendum voted for marketing quotas and production acreages, the Secretary shall proclaim that marketing quotas and production acreages will be in effect with respect to the crops of wheat or feed grains, or both, produced for harvest in the two calendar years following the year in which the referendum is held (or in the case of the referendum held no later than February 1, 1986, for crops harvested in 1986 and 1987).

"(d) In the event that marketing quotas and production acreages are approved with respect to the 1986 crop of wheat or feed grains, the Secretary shall provide fair and equitable compensation to producers who planted a crop in excess of their farm production acreage prior to the proclamation by the Secretary that marketing quotas and production acreages will be in effect with respect to that crop. Such compensation shall cover at a minimum the costs incurred by producers for planting such crop, as determined by the Secretary.

"(e) If the Secretary determines that 60 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and feed grains (including 50 per centum or more of the producers of wheat and 50 per centum or more of the producers of feed grains) voting in a referendum approved marketing quotas and production acreages for a period of two marketing years, no referendum shall be held for the next year of such period.

"(f) If marketing quotas and production acreages are not approved by producers in a referendum as provided under this section, with respect to the crops harvested in the succeeding year, in lieu of such marketing quotas and production acreages, the Secretary shall provide such loans, purchases, payments, and other assistance to producers of wheat and feed grains as provided elsewhere in this Act.

"LOANS AND PURCHASES

"Sec. 516. (a) If producers of wheat and feed grains approve marketing quotas and production acreages, as provided in section 515 of this title, loans and purchases shall be made available to producers as provided in sections 105C and 107D of this Act, except that the minimum loan rates for the crops of wheat or feed grains with respect to which marketing quotas and production acreages are in effect --

"(1) in the case of wheat, shall be not less than \$5.03 per bushel for the 1986 crop, and, for each of the 1987 through 1991 crops of wheat, shall be not less than a level that represents an increase of two parity index points over the previous crop's minimum loan level, or the level provided in the following table, whichever is less:

"for the 1987 crop	\$5.17 per bushel
for the 1988 crop	5.31 per bushel
for the 1989 crop	5.45 per bushel
for the 1990 crop	5.59 per bushel
for the 1991 crop	5.73 per bushel.

"(2) in the case of corn, shall be not less than \$3.49 per bushel of corn for the 1986 crop, and, for the 1987 through 1991 crops, shall be not less than a level that represents an increase of two parity index points over the previous crop's minimum loan level, or the level provided in the following table, whichever is less:

"for the 1987 crop	\$3.59 per bushel
for the 1988 crop	3.69 per bushel
for the 1989 crop	3.79 per bushel
for the 1990 crop	3.89 per bushel
for the 1991 crop	3.99 per bushel.

"(3) in the case of feed grains other than corn, for each of the 1986 through 1991 crops, shall be such rate as the Secretary determines fair and reasonable in relation to the rate at which loans are made available for corn.

"(b) Loans referred to in subsection (a) shall not be subject to the limitation on nonrecourse loans set forth in section 405(b) of this Act.

MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"Sec. 531. (a) At the time a producer of wheat or feed grains is assigned a farm marketing quota under section 512 of this title for any marketing year, the Secretary shall issue a marketing certificate to such producer for the crop of such commodity covered by such marketing year. The Secretary shall also issue marketing certificates to producers with a wheat or feed grain crop acreage base of less than 15 acres (producers not assigned a farm marketing quota) for such commodities to be produced on such crop acreage base for the crop covered by such marketing year.

"(b) A marketing certificate applicable to marketing year issued to a producer of wheat or feed grains shall authorize such producer to market, barter, or donate, during such marketing year, an amount of such commodity equal to the farm marketing quota assigned to such producer (or, in the case of a producer not assigned a marketing quota because the producer's crop acreage base for the commodity crop is less than 15 acres, an amount of such commodity equal to the producer's production of the commodity on the acreage -- if the acreage is less than fifteen acres -- planted to the commodity for harvest.

"(c) The Secretary shall adjust the amount of wheat or feed grains that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate to reflect the amount of such commodity that will be used for feed, human consumption, or other purposes on the farm of the producer.

"(d) If for any crop, the wheat or feed grains that the producer harvests exceeds the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated under a marketing certificate, the surplus amount of such commodity may be used for feed, human consumption, or other purposes on the farm of the producer, or may be carried over by the producer from one marketing year to the succeeding marketing year and may be marketed without penalty imposed under section 532 of this subtitle in the succeeding marketing year to the extent that (1) the total amount of such commodity available for marketing from the farm in the marketing year from which such commodity is carried over does not exceed the farm marketing quota, and (2) the total amount of such commodity available for marketing in the succeeding marketing year (that is, the sum of the amount of such commodity carried over and the amount of such commodity produced on the farm subject to a farm marketing quota in the succeeding marketing year) does not exceed the farm marketing quota for the succeeding marketing year.

"(e) Wheat for feed grains harvested in a calendar year in which marketing quotas are in effect for the marketing year beginning therein shall be subject to such quotas even though such commodity is marketed prior to the date on which such marketing year begins.

"(f) A person may not purchase or otherwise acquire an amount of a commodity from a producer in excess of the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated by such producer under a marketing certificate.

"(g) If marketing quotas for a commodity are not in effect for any marketing year, all previous marketing certificates applicable to such commodity shall be terminated, effective as of the first day of such marketing year.

"PENALTIES

"Sec. 532. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, if a producer fails to comply with any term or condition of a program conducted under this title, the producer shall be ineligible for any loan, purchase, or payment authorized under this Act.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, if a producer markets, barter, or donates a commodity without a marketing certificate required under section 532 of this subtitle or markets, barter, or donates an amount of a commodity for use in excess of the amount of the commodity the producer is permitted to market, barter, or donate under such certificate, the Secretary shall --

"(A) assess a civil penalty against such producer in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the commodity so marketed, bartered, or donated; or

"(B) decrease the number of acres of the producer's wheat or feed grain crop acreage base such producer may devote to production under section 514 of this title for the succeeding crop of the commodity by a number of acres that, if planted, would result in the production of a quantity sufficient to satisfy the penalty referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

"(3) If a person knowingly purchases or otherwise acquires an amount of a commodity from a producer in excess of the amount of the commodity that may be marketed, bartered, or donated by such producer under a marketing certificate issued under section 531 of this subtitle, the Secretary shall assess a civil penalty against such person in an amount equal to three times the current minimum loan rate for the commodities so purchased or acquired.

"(b) If a producer fails to comply fully with the terms and conditions of a program conducted under this title and the Secretary believes the failure should not preclude the making of loans, purchases, or payments to the producer, the Secretary may make loans, purchases, or payments in such amounts as the Secretary determines to be equitable in relation to the severity of the program violation.

"(c) If the Secretary determines that the penalties provided for in subsection (a) of this section are not warranted by the severity of the program violation, the Secretary may reduce or waive such penalties.

"(d) Penalties collected under this section shall be deposited into the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"TRANSFER OF FARM MARKETING QUOTAS

"Sec. 534. Farm marketing quotas assigned to a farm under this title generally shall not be transferable, but, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary for such purpose, the farm marketing quota assigned to a farm for any marketing year, or any portion thereof, may be voluntarily surrendered to the Secretary by the producer, and the Secretary may reallocate the amount of any farm marketing quotas so surrendered to other farms having farm marketing quotas on such basis as the Secretary may determine.

"CONSERVATION OF ACREAGE REMOVED FROM PRODUCTION

"Sec. 535. (a) A producer of a commodity shall devote to approved conservation use all acreage of the farm's wheat or feed grain crop acreage base that may not be devoted to the production of the commodity involved under the rules applicable to farm production acreages under sections 514 and 524 of this title.

"(b) The Secretary may make such adjustments in the amount of such acreage removed from production as the Secretary determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, types of soil, soil and water conservation measures, topography, and such other factors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

"(c) Regulations issued by the Secretary under this section with respect to acreage required to be devoted to conservation uses shall require appropriate measures to protect such acreage against noxious weeds and wind and water erosion.

"(d)(1) Any acreage removed from production may be devoted to wildlife food plots or wildlife habitats in conformity with standards established by the Secretary in consultation with wildlife agencies.

"(2) The Secretary may pay such amount as the Secretary considers appropriate of the cost of the practices designed to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) The Secretary may provide for an additional payment on such acreage in an amount determined by the Secretary to be appropriate in relations to the benefit to the general public if the producer agrees to permit, without other compensation, access to all or such portion of the farm, as the Secretary may prescribe, by the general public for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking, subject to applicable State and Federal regulations.

"(e)(1) A producer of a commodity shall execute an agreement with the Secretary that describes the means the producer will use to comply with this section not later than such date as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(2) The Secretary may, by mutual agreement with such producer, terminate or modify any such agreement if the Secretary determines such action necessary because of an emergency created by drought or other disaster or to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of agricultural commodities.

"REGULATIONS

"Sec. 536. The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this title.

"COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

"Sec. 537. The Secretary shall carry out the program authorized by this title through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 538. The provisions of sections 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 372(d), 373, 374, 375, and 376 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by section 452 of the Food Security Act of 1985, shall apply to the programs in effect under this title for any of the 1986 through 1991 crops of wheat and feed grains."

"LIMITATION ON IMPORTS

"Sec. 539. If imports of grain or processed grain threaten to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the national marketing quota program, Congress expects the Secretary will take appropriate action available under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1933 as is necessary in order that such imports will not render ineffective or materially interfere with this program."

Amend the table of contents in section 2 accordingly.

Mr. VOLKMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Volkmer] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER TO THE ADMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I also have a perfecting amendment at the desk.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the amendment is the same as the one just offered by the Chairman, we would have no objection to it on this side and would ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Volkmer] needs unanimous consent to offer an amendment to his own amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, then, to offer the perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

The text of the perfecting amendment offered by Mr. Volkmer, to the amendment offered by Mr. Volkmer is as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. Volkmer to the amendment offered by Mr. Volkmer: After section 532, insert a new section as follows:

"PROGRAM BASES

"Sec. 533. Notwithstanding section 605, for any crop of wheat or feed grains for which a national marketing certificate program is approved under section 515, no producer of such crop may adjust the producer's crop acreage base for the crop as provided for in section 605, and the producer's base for such crop shall be as determined under title VI without regard to section 605."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Volkmer) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment to his amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, are we moving on the gentleman's perfecting amendment at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. His other amendment is still open and subject to debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. I thank the Chair.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, we are now on the mandatory program amendment. I would like to first reflect a little bit, as has been discussed earlier during the debate on the Stangeland-Roberts-Glickman, et cetera, amendment, the condition of agriculture throughout the Midwest especially, and especially in northern Missouri. If you go from the northern Missouri River, from St. Joseph to Hannibal, my home town, you will find many farmers out there who are in very serious difficulty. And I am sure that people from Iowa and Illinois and Nebraska and other parts of this country can say the same thing.

Three out of the last 5 years, though, in our area have been disasters. 1981 was a wet year, 1983 and 1984 were drought years. We had such things as 12-bushel-an-acre soybeans and 10-bushel-an-acre corn. Some fields were without any ears at all on their corn. As a result of that, many farmers who had borrowed in order to put their crops in did not have any money to pay it back, and they had to go back and borrow again for another year. So as a result of all of these circumstances, plus buying the machinery in the late 1970's, they find themselves with a debt-asset ratio of anywhere from 50 percent to 75 percent, many of them. They are not able at today's prices to be able to pay those debts, principal, and also have a living off of that farm. So it has been a devastation. In fact, the University of Missouri, the Agriculture School and Economics Department, in a meeting that I had with them a couple weeks ago, estimated that if we continue on down the line with the programs that we presently have -- and that is basically what is in the permanent provisions in this bill -- that one-third to one-half of the farmers of northern Missouri are gone at the end of 4 years.

It has been alluded to earlier that that is not just farmers who are going to be gone. That is also small businesses, implement dealers. And I know many of you could tell the same story, that 4 years ago there were small towns that had three or four implement dealers and today they have one, where before they maybe had two hardware stores, they have

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

got one. Many of my small towns have windows in stores that are boarded up. Nobody is willing to go back in them. Agriculture has been the main economy for that area, and agriculture is the number one industry for the State of Missouri. Agriculture is sick and hurting.

Now, there are only two alternatives for my farmers, as far as getting out of this. One is if interest rates would go down about 3 percent or 4 percent, they could finance their indebtedness on that basis; but that is not going to happen, and we all know that is not going to happen. And the other alternative is for their income to go up.

Well, under the provisions that are in the bill presently, outside of the Bedell amendment, but the permanent provisions, their income is not going to go up. In fact, their net income will decline each year for the next 4 years because the cost of production will go up while the income maintenance stays the same.

So they are looking for a devastation. We are looking for a loss of schools. The land values will continue to deteriorate. We have had a deterioration of anywhere from 30 percent to 40 percent already of land values in the last 3 1/2 years. That will continue. That erodes the base of my counties, of my schools, my cities, to where they do not have any base any longer, and it has a detrimental effect on the total social and economic structure of rural Missouri, and I say rural United States also.

Now, projections are if we go along with the permanent parts of this bill we are going to continue to have large carryover stocks. Let us just take this year. Wheat, 1.6 billion bushel carryover. That is not going to help prices get up. Corn nearly 3 billion, almost where we were in 1982. With soybeans, we are going to have a record carryover, more than we have ever had.

You can look at the prices. In 1983 in my area our local price for corn was \$3.45.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Volkmer] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Volkmer was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. In 1983, the corn price was \$3.45; in 1984, \$2.89; and today they run, depending on whether you are on the Mississippi barge or whether you are inland, \$2.00 to \$2.20 a bushel.

Wheat in 1983 was \$3.41 on the average; in 1984 it was \$3.36. We are now down to \$2.40 to \$2.71.

Soybeans in 1983 was \$8.56. In 1984 it dropped down to \$5.94. And now it is down to less than \$5, around \$4.92 to \$5, depending, again, on the market.

These are declining prices, and we are going to continue to see declining prices unless we do something about the type of legislation that we offer to the farmers.

We are going to continue to have what we have had this year over last year, declining exports.

Now, the administration has taken a position that we need to get down to market clearing prices. Well, you are not going to clear the markets, you are going to clear out the farmers if you go to that.

They say we have to get to market clearing prices in order to continue to increase our exports. Yet I would like to point out to you that this year over last year we have lower farm prices, yet our exports are not increasing, our exports are actually still declining.

So the administration's answer to the solution as we have seen from the last record vote on the Frank amendment has been rejected by the House and the Senate and about everybody. We cannot have lower cash prices without some kind of government support.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

The budget does not permit us, however, to support the farmers to the extent that they should be supported. So there is only one other way, and that is to reduce production through what I call a mandatory program. Under the provision that I am offering to the House as we have it today, it goes to the vote of the farmers. Given the farmers a choice, whether they wish to reduce production, increase their income, or they wish to continue, basically, all-out production and have lower prices for their commodities. In other words, I say that the farmer should be entitled to make that choice. Let the farmer decide whether or not he wishes to have such a program.

We already have a provision in the bill that, basically, provides for a referendum, known as the Bedell amendment, which I support. However, I just feel it does not go far enough. Under the Bedell amendment, wheat price would be at \$4.50. Under the mandatory program, with marketing certificates on a bushel basis, we can have the wheat next year at \$5.03.

In the Bedell amendment, corn is at \$3.25. Under a mandatory price program, we could have corn at \$3.49.

By using a marketing certificate and without farmers being able to move their bases and basing the marketing certificate on bushels, we can hold our production in line and, as a result, we can have a program whereby our farmers can make it through at least a couple of years, we can stabilize land values, we can help our small business people in our local towns, we can increase or at least stabilize the tax base for these communities, and at less cost to the taxpayers than any other program that we have, at less cost than what is in the bill.

Now, I will admit that with the increased prices to the farmers, the price of a loaf of bread in the grocery store, a pound loaf of bread, will probably have to go up three-fourths of a cent or one cent to take care of that increased price to the farmer. A box of cereal will probably have to go up 2 or 3 cents to provide for income for the farmer. A pound of hamburger may have to go up 2 or 3 cents.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we need to realize that the people in this country today live better for less than anyplace else in the world. We eat better for less than any place else in the world. Right now the amount that the American family spends of disposable income on food ranks about 13 percent of their disposable income.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Volkmer] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Volkmer was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Basically, that is less than any other industrialized country or any other country in this world in which statistics are kept. In no other place can you eat so well for so little. It has been the American farmer that has been basically subsidizing the consumer because he has been getting lower prices. The consumer has not necessarily been benefiting from those lower prices that the farmers got.

All we are asking is that the farmer be able to get a little bit more for the productivity that he has given to the American consumer throughout these years. Under this program, which I want to reiterate, it would only be enacted if voted upon favorably by 60 percent of the farmers. I feel that we can get the American farmer back on his feet again, and that we can stabilize farm income and our farm land values to where we can be proud to say that we finally have done something in this Congress for the American farmer rather than doing something to him.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair please state to the Committee the prevailing amendment together with the parliamentary situation. I was not able to hear.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Volkmer] has an amendment pending to his own amendment. Once we dispose of that, then the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith] will be recognized to further amend the Volkmer amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Volkmer] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Volkmer].

The perfecting amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBERT F. SMITH TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER, AS AMENDED

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Robert F. Smith to the amendment offered by Mr. Volkmer, as amended: the Volkmer amendment is amended by striking all after title VA and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

PRODUCER-APPROVED WHEAT, FEED GRAIN, COTTON, RICE, AND SOYBEAN PROGRAMS

REFERENDA FOR THE 1987 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF WHEAT, FEED GRAINS, COTTON, RICE, AND SOYBEANS

Sec. 551. Effective only for the 1986 through 1990 crops, the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title V as follows:

"TITLE V -- REFERENDA FOR THE 1987 THROUGH 1990 CROPS OF WHEAT, FEED GRAINS, COTTON, RICE, AND SOYBEANS

"WHEAT, FEED GRAIN, COTTON, RICE, AND SOYBEAN REFERENDA

"Sec. 501. (a) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum by secret ballot of wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybean producers February 1, 1986 to determine whether they favor or oppose the agricultural programs set forth in sections 107D, 105C, 103(i), 101(j), and 201(g) of this Act. This vote shall be applicable to the 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990 crops of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, rice, and soybeans.

"(b) Any producer on a farm with a wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, or soybeans crop acreage base of fifteen or more acres for the then current crop, as determined under title VI, shall be eligible to vote in a referendum. For the purposes of this section, the term "producers" shall include any person who is entitled to share in a crop of the commodity, or the proceeds thereof, because the person shares in the risks of production of the crop as an owner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper. A landlord whose return from the crop is fixed regardless of the amount of the crop produced shall not be considered a producer.

"(c) The Secretary shall proclaim the results of the referendum held hereunder within fifteen days after the date of such referendum. If the Secretary determines that 60 per centum or more of the producers of wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybeans (including 50 per centum or more of the producers of each of the following crops: wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybeans) vote against continuing the agricultural programs set forth in sections 107D, 105C, 103(i), 101(j) and 201(g) of this Act, then such sections shall have no effect for the 1987 through 1990 crops of such commodities.

"(d) If voters in the referendum vote against continuing the agricultural programs set forth in section 2 107D, 105C, 103(i), 101(j) and 201(g) of this Act as set forth in subsection (c), the Secretary shall provide such loans, purchases, payments, and other assistance to producers of wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybeans as provided for elsewhere in this Act.

"REGULATIONS

"Sec. 502. The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this title."

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that the amendment goes to other titles including the referendum pertaining to not only wheat and feed grains but also cotton, rice, and soybean programs where the title VA does not pertain to those programs or referendum on those programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith] for his response to the point of order.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is considered in the referenda portion of the bill. The referenda portion refers several titles to the people of this country, and my referendum does follow the rest of the referenda.

If this one is to be out of order, I assume we cannot discuss any referenda under this title VA.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, continuing under my point of order, in perhaps assistance to the gentleman from Oregon, it would appear to me that such an amendment would be in order at the end of the bill or at the end of all titles, pertaining to all the titles. But this title VA, basically only pertains to wheat and feed grains.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike everything in my amendment except wheat and feed grains.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first dispose of the point of order, unless the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith] please restate his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the gentleman is going to change his amendment so it only applies to wheat?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith] has withdrawn his request.

Mr. BEDELL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleagues for their concern about this issue.

Mr. Chairman, there will be placed before us today several methods of allowing farmers in America to vote on various kinds of programs, and it seemed to me that at least one alternative should be the best interests of the Committee on Agriculture, recognizing that for the past 9 months and certainly for the past 4 months, the Committee on Agriculture has been working, in most cases, without dissension trying to find the best avenue to draft a farm bill under very difficult circumstances in this country. Certainly with limited, which the Members have heard, and with tragic circumstances in America regarding agriculture. The best efforts of the best minds of Democrats and Republicans, seriously and sincerely.

In practically every case, without partisanship, they have drafted a bill and are bringing it before you today. You have seen some efforts to amend it, and you will see some efforts to refer questions about agriculture which, by the way, I must say have been untested. The committee has not heard the impact or the implications of them, but yet, we do have a bill which is before us, which is still open to amendment, but in most cases already this Congress has followed the lead of the very able chairman and the ranking member and those people who have been working on this bill diligently.

As regard for that, it seemed to me that if we are going to really be in favor of allowing the farmer to make a choice in whether or not a farm bill ought to be defeated or not in the country, we ought to give the farmer the best efforts of our achievement. There is no question that the best efforts, the time-tested efforts, come from the committee. They come from a majority of the committee, and as I say, come without prejudice.

So, if indeed it is true that we ought to let the farmer make a decision, let us give him the best we have, or her. Let us give him the result of the hearings tested farm program, of the input from people all over this Nation, North, East, South, and West, that we have in the basic bill before us. Let us not mislead the farmer with an untested program in one direction or another.

So my amendment, very basically, is simply an effort to bring the best efforts of the Agriculture Committee to the people in this country. I ask you to support it if you believe in a referendum, and I do. If you believe that farmers ought to determine what should happen, and I do. My dates follow exactly the Bedell amendment dates; they follow exactly those people who are qualified to vote under Bedell, they are qualified to vote here in my amendment. I have carefully followed that simply because those folks have done a great deal of work in trying to find the best referendum that they could manufacture. I think they have.

Basically, my amendment follows the Bedell referendum; those qualified to vote. It provides, however, differently that we give the best efforts of the bill that passes the House of Representatives to the farmers and allows them to make a decision about their future.

It seems to me that this is the best reasonable approach for those who want a referendum and for those who feel that maybe we are not doing the right thing. We can come back and write a new bill, but let us find out how the farmers feel about the best effort of the Agriculture Committee, Democrats and Republicans representing North, West, East, and South.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go through some specifics of the gentleman's amendment to see if I fully understand his amendment.

In the first place, it applies, as he has stated, to wheat, feed grains, cotton, rice, and soybeans, all those commodities, to begin with. Second, it pertains to a referendum on the programs that are existing in the present bill; is that correct? In other words, you would be asking the farmers to vote on the wheat program as we have it in the bill, or on the corn or feed grain program and the cotton, soybean, and rice programs, as to whether or not they favor it?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, if I may answer the gentleman, I am asking those people to vote on what may result in being the final farm bill as it is produced by this House of Representatives.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is correct. You are going to ask them to vote on all these things, and then the alternative, in the event the farmers would vote against it, would be to go back to the 1949 act and let the Secretary implement the provisions of the 1949 act or the 1949 law?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. That is not correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Robert F. Smith] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Volkmer, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Robert F. Smith was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for obtaining extra time for me.

That is not correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. Then what would we have.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Let me answer the gentleman, please.

Mr. VOLKMER. All right.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. The bill that passes the House of Representatives becomes the law. The question will be referred, as with the Bedell issue, in February of 1986, and it will be the law for 1986. If at that point it is voted down, then the Congress has 1986 until the next crop year to produce another farm bill. That is my amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. I do not find that. It says in here: "If voters in the referendum vote against continuing the agricultural programs *** as set forth *** the Secretary shall provide such loans, purchases, payments, and other assistance to producers of wheat, feed grain, cotton, rice, and soybeans as provided for elsewhere in this act."

Now, as to the referendum, then, are you saying it is only for that year? I see it is 1987, only 1987. So the present law would apply to 1986 only?

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. That is correct, unless it were passed, as does the Bedell amendment, as the gentleman well knows. If it were approved by the farmers, then it would become the law, just as the Bedell amendment does. I followed the Bedell language very carefully. I merely referred to the question of the farm bill that passes the House, which is the best efforts of the House of Representatives.

It is not a new idea, not something that has come off the shelf without hearings. It is a bill that we have worked over, that we have had hearings on and have had the best input from the Members of the House of Representatives, as well as all commodity groups across the Nation. That is what we are referring to, the best effort of the House of

Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message from the President.

ROLL:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES -- 200

Ackerman	Alexander	Applegate
Armey	Atkins	Barnes
Bartlett	Barton	Bates
Beilenson	Bennett	Bentley
Bereuter	Berman	Biaggi
Bliley	Bonior (MI)	Borski
Bosco	Boulter	Boxer
Broomfield	Brown (CO)	Bryant
Burton (CA)	Clinger	Coats
Cobey	Coble	Coleman (MO)
Collins	Combest	Cooper
Coyne	Crockett	Dannemeyer
Daschle	Daub	Dellums
Dorgan (ND)	Dornan (CA)	Downey
Durbin	Dymally	Dyson
Eckart (OH)	Edgar	Edwards (OK)
Emerson	English	Evans (IL)
Feighan	Fields	Fish
Flippo	Florio	Foglietta
Fowler	Frank	Frenzel
Frost	Gallo	Gephardt
Gingrich	Glickman	Goodling
Gordon	Gradison	Gray (PA)
Green	Gregg	Guarini
Gunderson	Hamilton	Hartnett
Hayes	Hefstel	Hertel
Hiler	Hopkins	Howard
Hubbard	Hughes	Ireland

Jacobs	Jenkins	Johnson
Jones (OK)	Kasich	Kastenmeier
Kennelly	Kildee	Kostmayer
LaFalce	Lantos	Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)	Lent	Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)	Lipinski	Loeffler
Lujan	Luken	Lundine
Markey	Martin (NY)	Matsui
Mavroules	McCloskey	McCurdy
McDade	McEwen	McGrath
McKernan	McKinney	Meyers
Mikulski	Miller (OH)	Molinari
Moody	Mrazek	Murphy
Natcher	Neal	Nielson
Nowak	Oberstar	Owens
Packard	Pease	Penny
Pepper	Perkins	Petri
Pursell	Regula	Ritter
Roberts	Robinson	Rodino
Roe	Rogers	Rostenkowski
Roth	Sabo	Savage
Saxton	Scheuer	Schneider
Schroeder	Schulze	Schumer
Seiberling	Sensenbrenner	Sharp
Shuster	Sikorski	Skeen
Skelton	Slattery	Slaughter
Smith (FL)	Smith (NE)	Smith (NJ)
Snowe	Snyder	Solarz
Stangeland	Stark	Stenholm
Strang	Studds	Sweeney
Synar	Tauke	Taylor
Torres	Torricelli	Towns
Traficant	Udall	Vento
Volkmer	Walgren	Walker
Watkins	Waxman	Weber
Weiss	Wheat	Whittaker
Whitten	Williams	Wirth
Wolf	Wolpe	Wortley

Yates	Yatron	
	NOES -- 228	
Akaka	Anderson	Andrews
Annunzio	Anthony	Archer
Aspin	AuCoin	Badham
Barnard	Bateman	Bedell
Bevill	Bilirakis	Boehlert
Boggs	Boland	Boner (TN)
Boucher	Breaux	Brooks
Brown (CA)	Broyhill	Bruce
Burton (IN)	Bustamante	Callahan
Campbell	Carper	Carr
Chandler	Chapman	Chappell
Chappie	Cheney	Clay
Coelho	Coleman (TX)	Conte
Conyers	Coughlin	Courter
Craig	Crane	Daniel
Darden	Davis	de la Garza
DeLay	Derrick	DeWine
Dickinson	Dicks	Dingell
DioGuardi	Dixon	Donnelly
Dowdy	Dreier	Duncan
Dwyer	Early	Eckert (NY)
Edwards (CA)	Erdreich	Evans (IA)
Fascell	Fawell	Fazio
Fiedler	Foley	Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)	Franklin	Fuqua
Garcia	Gaydos	Gejdenson
Gekas	Gibbons	Gilman
Gonzalez	Gray (IL)	Grotberg
Hall (OH)	Hall, Ralph	Hammerschmidt
Hansen	Hatcher	Hawkins
Hefner	Hendon	Henry
Hillis	Holt	Horton
Hoyer	Huckaby	Hunter
Hutto	Hyde	Jeffords

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Jones (NC)	Jones (TN)	Kanjorski
Kaptur	Kemp	Kindness
Kleczka	Kolbe	Kolter
Kramer	Lagomarsino	Latta
Lehman (CA)	Lehman (FL)	Leland
Lewis (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Lightfoot
Livingston	Lloyd	Long
Lott	Lowery (CA)	Lowry (WA)
Lungren	Mack	MacKay
Madigan	Manton	Marlenee
Martin (IL)	Martinez	Mazzoli
McCain	McCandless	McCollum
McHugh	McMillan	Mica
Michel	Miller (WA)	Mineta
Mitchell	Mollohan	Monson
Montgomery	Moore	Moorhead
Morrison (CT)	Morrison (WA)	Murtha
Myers	Nelson	Nichols
O'Brien	Oakar	Obey
Olin	Ortiz	Oxley
Panetta	Parris	Pashayan
Pickle	Porter	Price
Quillen	Rahall	Rangel
Ray	Reid	Richardson
Ridge	Rinaldo	Roemer
Rose	Roukema	Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)	Roybal	Rudd
Russo	Schaefer	Schuette
Shaw	Shelby	Shumway
Siljander	Sisisky	Smith (IA)
Smith, Denny (OR)	Smith, Robert (NH)	Smith, Robert (OR)
Solomon	Spence	Spratt
St Germain	Staggers	Stallings
Stokes	Stratton	Stump
Sundquist	Swift	Swindall
Tallon	Tauzin	Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)	Traxler	Valentine
Vander Jagt	Visclosky	Vucanovich

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Weaver	Whitehurst	Whitley
Wilson	Wise	Wright
Wyden	Wylie	Young (AK)
Young (FL)	Young (MO)	Zschau

NOT VOTING -- 6

Addabbo	Bonker	Byron
Carney	Miller (CA)	Moakley
	[Roll No. 323]	

AYES -- 93

Ackerman	Anderson	Archer
Armey	Barnes	Bartlett
Bates	Beilenson	Berman
Bilirakis	Bosco	Broomfield
Carper	Carr	Chandler
Cheney	Clinger	Cobey
Coble	Conte	Coughlin
Courter	Crane	Dannemeyer
DeLay	DioGuardi	Dornan (CA)
Dreier	Early	Eckert (NY)
Fawell	Fields	Florio
Frank	Gallo	Gibbons
Gingrich	Goodling	Gradison
Green	Gregg	Hansen
Hunter	Ireland	Jacobs
Johnson	Kolbe	Kostmayer
Lagomarsino	Livingston	Lowery (CA)
Lujan	Luken	Lungren
Mack	Markey	Mazzoli
McCain	McCandless	McCollum
McDade	McKinney	Miller (WA)
Monson	Moorhead	Morrison (CT)
Mrazek	Nelson	Nielson
Owens	Packard	Pease
Petri	Porter	Ritter

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Schroeder	Schulze	Shaw
Shumway	Smith (NH)	Snowe
Solarz	Studds	Swindall
Thomas (CA)	Torricelli	Vento
Walker	Waxman	Weiss
Whitehurst	Young (FL)	Zschau

NOES -- 334

Akaka	Alexander	Andrews
Annunzio	Anthony	Applegate
Aspin	Atkins	AuCoin
Badham	Barnard	Barton
Bateman	Bedell	Bennett
Bentley	Bereuter	Bevill
Biaggi	Bliley	Boehlert
Boggs	Boland	Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)	Bonker	Borski
Boucher	Boulter	Boxer
Breaux	Brooks	Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)	Broyhill	Bruce
Bryant	Burton (CA)	Burton (IN)
Bustamante	Byron	Callahan
Campbell	Chapman	Chappell
Chappie	Clay	Coats
Coelho	Coleman (MO)	Coleman (TX)
Collins	Combest	Conyers
Cooper	Coyne	Craig
Crockett	Daniel	Darden
Daschle	Daub	Davis
de la Garza	Dellums	Derrick
DeWine	Dickinson	Dicks
Dingell	Dixon	Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)	Dowdy	Downey
Duncan	Durbin	Dwyer
Dymally	Dyson	Eckart (OH)
Edgar	Edwards (CA)	Emerson
English	Erdreich	Evans (IA)

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Evans (IL)	Fascell	Fazio
Feighan	Fiedler	Fish
Flippo	Foglietta	Foley
Ford (MI)	Ford (TN)	Fowler
Franklin	Frenzel	Frost
Fuqua	Garcia	Gaydos
Gejdenson	Gekas	Gephardt
Gilman	Glickman	Gonzalez
Gordon	Gray (IL)	Gray (PA)
Grotberg	Guarini	Gunderson
Hall (OH)	Hall, Ralph	Hamilton
Hammerschmidt	Hartnett	Hatcher
Hawkins	Hayes	Hefner
Heftel	Hendon	Henry
Hertel	Hiler	Hillis
Holt	Hopkins	Horton
Howard	Hoyer	Hubbard
Huckaby	Hughes	Hutto
Hyde	Jeffords	Jenkins
Jones (NC)	Jones (OK)	Jones (TN)
Kanjorski	Kaptur	Kasich
Kastenmeier	Kemp	Kennelly
Kildee	Kindness	Kleczka
Kolter	Kramer	LaFalce
Lantos	Latta	Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)	Lehman (CA)	Lehman (FL)
Leland	Lent	Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot	Lipinski	Lloyd
Loeffler	Long	Lott
Lowry (WA)	Lundine	MacKay
Madigan	Manton	Marlenee
Martin (IL)	Martin (NY)	Martinez
Matsui	Mavroules	McCloskey
McCurdy	McEwen	McGrath
McHugh	McKernan	McMillan
Meyers	Mica	Michel
Mikulski	Miller (OH)	Mineta

131 Cong Rec H 7914 Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Molinari	Mollohan	Montgomery
Moody	Moore	Morrison (WA)
Murphy	Murtha	Myers
Natcher	Neal	Nichols
Nowak	O'Brien	Oberstar
Obey	Olin	Ortiz
Oxley	Panetta	Parris
Pashayan	Penny	Pepper
Perkins	Pickle	Price
Pursell	Quillen	Rahall
Rangel	Ray	Regula
Reid	Richardson	Ridge
Rinaldo	Roberts	Robinson
Rodino	Roe	Roemer
Rogers	Rose	Rostenkowski
Roth	Roukema	Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)	Roybal	Rudd
Russo	Sabo	Savage
Saxton	Schaefer	Scheuer
Schneider	Schuette	Schumer
Seiberling	Sensenbrenner	Sharp
Shelby	Shuster	Sikorski
Siljander	Sisisky	Skeen
Skelton	Slattery	Slaughter
Smith (FL)	Smith (IA)	Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)	Smith, Denny	Smith, Robert
Snyder	Solomon	Spence
Spratt	St Germain	Staggers
Stallings	Stangeland	Stark
Stenholm	Stokes	Strang
Stratton	Stump	Sundquist
Sweeney	Swift	Synar
Tallon	Tauke	Tauzin
Taylor	Thomas (GA)	Torres
Towns	Traficant	Traxler
Udall	Valentine	Vander Jagt
Visclosky	Volkmer	Vucanovich
Walgren	Watkins	Weaver

Weber	Wheat	Whitley
Whittaker	Whitten	Williams
Wilson	Wirth	Wise
Wolf	Wolpe	Wortley
Wright	Wyden	Wylie
Yates	Yatron	Young (AK)
Young (MO)		

NOT VOTING -- 7

Addabbo	Carney	Edwards (OK)
Miller (CA)	Mitchell	Moakley
Oakar		

SUBJECT: AGRICULTURAL MARKETING (89%); AGRICULTURAL PRICES (79%); GRAIN FARMING (79%); FARMERS & RANCHERS (79%); AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES (59%); AGRICULTURAL LAW (59%); FAMILY FARMS (59%);