

AGRICULTURE, FOOD, TRADE, AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1985

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill (S. 1714).

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an explanation of the amendment that is being read, which includes cost savings and the highlights of the bill, including the TOP program—Target Option Program—for wheat. I think it might be helpful to Members if that is placed in the Record.

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

LUGAR/DOLE COMPROMISE

SAVES \$7.6 BILLION &+.6 BILLION—BUDGET MARK UNDER JANUARY BASELINE

For feed grains, cotton, and rice, freeze the 1986 target price at the 1985 level and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce levels by no more than 5 percent annually for 1987, 1988, and 1989. The target price levels would not be below 110-125 percent of the 5-year average market price.

WHEAT

For 1986 through 1988, target prices would be tied to a specific acreage reduction percentage. Producers choose their own target price and corresponding acreage reduction (ARP) as follows:

Wheat
(replaces wheat referendum)

ARP (percent)	1986	1987	1988	1989
10.....			3.80	\$3.72
15.....	4.20	3.95	3.95	MI
20.....	4.38	4.15	4.15	
25.....	4.60	4.35	4.35	
30.....	4.85	4.60	4.55	
35.....	5.15	4.85		
40.....	5.50	5.20		

¹ No ARP

In crop year 1989, set target prices at 110-125 percent of a 5 year average of past prices, or at 85 percent of the 1985 target price, whichever is higher.

Total savings on target prices: \$2.3B.

Retain the committee-approved maximum acreage set-asides of 15 percent for feed grains, 20 percent for cotton, and 35 percent for rice for the 1986 through 1988 crop years. Authority for set-asides would terminate beginning with the 1989 crop for wheat, feed grains, cotton, and rice.

Savings: \$0

Require the establishment of a 3-year 15 million acre emergency conservation reserve. Cropland eligible for the reserve must be classified as erosion prone. (Payments for entering the reserve would be made using CCC-owned surplus commodities) (No cost: CBO)

Savings: \$0

Alter the conservation reserve program to require the Secretary to enter no more than 9 million acres in 1986, 4 million acres in 1987, 4 million acres in 1988, and 8 million acres in 1989. The committee-approved bill had required 10 million acres in 1986, 10 million in 1987, and 5 million in 1988.

Savings: \$2.3B

Require a 50 percent cost sharing in establishing the appropriate cover crops for the conservation reserve.

Require that target price deficiency payments be calculated on a 12-month average price instead of the current 5-month average market price.

Savings: \$1.0B

Require the Secretary to issue advanced deficiency payments for the 1986 crop with 15 percent of the advanced coming from in-kind payments.

Savings: \$0

Reduce the intermediate term export credit program from \$1 billion in direct credits annually to \$500 million annually in loan guarantees.

Savings: \$1.3B

Reduce from 25 percent to 20 percent the Secretary's authority to transfer FmHA guaranteed loan funds into direct loan funds.

Savings: \$300M.

Interest savings: \$400M.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I no longer insist on the reading of the amendment. I think if the majority leader wishes to let the Senate go out, we will have no further objections to dispensing with the reading of the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The text of the amendment (No. 940) is printed in routine morning business under amendments submitted.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate before we recess that I am hopeful that we can have a vote on this amendment tomorrow. I think most of the Members on both sides, whether they are for or against the amendment, want a farm bill. If we take a look at the so-called fall logjam, we have all these balls in the air. We indicated if the reconciliation measure came back to us we would set aside the farm bill. There is no question that when the debt ceiling matter is before us, we shall have to set aside the farm bill.

It is my view that if we can act decisively on this amendment tomorrow, we can bring the farm bill debate to a close. If not, it is not a threat or speculation, but a reality that probably by sometime next week, we are going to be back on reconciliation and all bets are off for the American farmer. The same is true if we get into another extended debate on Gramm-Rudman-Hollings with respect to the debt ceiling. I hope we can make some progress tomorrow.

Mr. President, there being no—

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the Senator for yielding.

It is my understanding that there is a desire by the majority leader to go to another appropriations bill tomorrow morning.

Mr. DOLE. Because there is another morning farm credit hearing in the Senate Agriculture Committee and most of the members of the Agriculture Committee who would be active in the floor debate feel that is an important issue.

Mr. MELCHER. I certainly agree with the majority leader on that point, but I think perhaps the majority leader is inferring that everybody understands these 165 pages that were dropped on the desk and will be ready for a vote. I just want to say this: It is common sense that Senators want to know what they are voting on.

For the various commodities that are involved and with the various changes in the other parts of the bill that are not directly identified or directed at commodities themselves, they are going to want to know what their producers think. I do not want to see us in a prolonged stalemate here on the Senate floor, but I think it is apparent that this is a complicated amendment and I would not ask Senators who are interested in what is in the bill under any condition to be ready to vote tomorrow afternoon.

I know the majority leader has a task to move legislation along through the Senate and get it out of Congress so the President can sign it, but the constant remarks that are made by the majority leader are misleading. I think to a lot of people in that somehow we are being dilatory around here when we are going to look at 165 new pages in an amendment to a bill that is pretty long itself. I hope the majority leader can refrain from indicating that because the Senators on this side—and I assume there are some on that side; I know I get questions from that side from individual Senators—have some decency and regard for their understanding of what is in the particular amendment. Can the majority leader tell me what he hopes to do for next week?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am not going to start a debate tonight at 9 o'clock, but I heard that same statement from the Senator from Montana in July. I have listened to it for 6 months in the Agriculture Committee. The American farmers would like us to pass a farm bill. We cannot delay and delay and delay. We delayed too long in convenience to the Senator from Montana. I think it is time we worry about the American farmer. We are going to try to pass the bill. Obviously, if the Senator is indicating there will be no votes tomorrow, he can certainly prevent them. But we are going to be here. We are going to try to get votes tomorrow. This is not complicated. It has been in the farm bill itself for weeks. Some of the language is the very language the Senator from Montana proposed last night. All this talk about being so complicated

just does not wash anymore. If this bill had never been brought up on the floor, that would be one thing.

We discussed these same issues all spring, all summer, and now we are here in the fall. Every time we bring up the farm bill the Senator from Montana is here to do one thing: complain about the rush.

Maybe the Montana farmers are in good shape. Maybe they do not want a farm bill. But I am a little tired of hearing all this talk on the Senate floor when farmers in my State are demanding action. We can delay as long as the Senator wants, but I want the Kansas farmers to understand the reason for the delay. We are ready to vote. We are ready to vote tonight. There is nothing complicated about this amendment. We can go on and on and on and on, but it serves little purpose.

The point I am making to the Senator from Montana, if he worries about farmers, if he does not want to cost them millions and millions of dollars more, he will let us vote on this bill. We are going to get tied up in the reconciliation, we are going to get tied up in the debt ceiling, and we are going to

be back here after Thanksgiving still working on the farm bill.

If that gives the Senator from Montana pleasure and if that makes his farmers happy, that is all right. But it does not make this Senator's farmers happy. I think sooner or later we are going to have to decide who is the self-appointed protector of the farmer.

I understand that the Senator from West Virginia wants the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the Senator yield to me for the purpose of asking for the yeas and nays?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the yeas and the nays have been ordered on the motion to recommit and on the first-degree amendment thereto. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. They have not been ordered on the second-degree amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is also correct.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and the nays on the second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the majority leader.

RECESS UNTIL 8:45 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 8:45 a.m. on tomorrow, Friday.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 9 p.m., the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Friday, November 1, 1985, at 8:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 31, 1985:

THE JUDICIARY

Deanell Reece Tacha, of Kansas, to be U.S. circuit judge for the 10th circuit vice a new position created by Public Law 98-353, approved July 10, 1984.