

an affirmative choice because we know what the consequences will be.

I cannot think we will do this. If there is any Member of the Senate who thinks we ought, he or she is welcome to come to the floor. There will be none. We know what to do, I hope in a bipartisan spirit as we have done in the past. This is something that the Nation needs, and no party would wish to deny. I hope we do this, Mr. President. I dare not think of the consequences if we do not.

I see my friend, the distinguished member of the Finance Committee on the floor. I yield the floor.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few minutes as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, not as a colleague of my colleague from New York as a member of the Finance Committee, and I want to discuss the 1995 farm bill, which obviously is not going to be a 1995 bill. It will be a 1996 farm bill if and when we ever get one passed.

It is January 23, 1996, but the farm bill that should have been in place by early fall, 1995, is still unresolved. So all across the country farmers are buying their seed, meeting with their bankers, making plans to cultivate and grow crop, all without knowing what the next farm program will be.

When I say it should have been done by early fall, I want to make clear to my colleagues that the reason for this is that when you do fall tillage, preparing the fields for the seed of the next spring, you need to make those decisions at harvest time of the crop that grew in 1995.

In a very real sense of the word for people who are planting crops in the Southern States of our great country, those are important agriculture regions, as well, they are only 2 or 3 weeks away from planting. In my State, it is going to be 2 months until we reach that point.

Everybody ought to understand that it is not the day you go to the field that you decide on certain things related to the 1996 crop. You need to know that months ahead of time. One of those factors—maybe farmers would rather not have this be a factor—but one of those factors is, what is the Government program toward agriculture? Probably in each of the last, except for 1 or 2 years out of the last 20 years, there has not been any slowness on the part of the Congress in this regard. Farmers have known well in advance what the Government's position was on agriculture and their decisions could wisely and timely be made in preparation for the next year's crop.

Now here we are, January 23, 1996, and we still do not let the farmers of America know what the Government's program is toward agriculture.

In the last few weeks, Mr. President, there has been a lot of finger pointing as to who was responsible for this situ-

ation. Some Members of the other side of the aisle would have you believe that Congress failed in its responsibilities to act on the farm bill last year. They would have you believe that Congress held no hearings, had no floor debate, and passed no farm bill.

Mr. President, not only do I come to the floor to urge quick resolution of the lack of a farm bill, but I think that we should also set the record straight. Basically it means taking the politics out of this debate. It is time to leave the ideology to the side. It is time to get down to the very important practical aspect that in the upper Midwest where my State of Iowa is, within 2 months of farmers going to the field, and right now in the Southern States of the United States they are probably 2 weeks from that point. It is time to put our constituents and our farmers above political posturing in Washington and enact a farm bill into law.

Contrary to the rhetoric coming from our Democratic colleagues in this body, in this Chamber, and also through the media, particularly my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, this Congress did act on the commodity provisions of the farm bill. Last year the Senate Agriculture Committee held at least 15 hearings, heard testimony from over 150 witnesses. Then in October the Senate debated and passed the commodity provisions of the farm bill as part of the Balanced Budget Act.

While I am talking about the Balanced Budget Act, and farmers are asking about the farm provisions that were in it, I also take advantage of the opportunity to say to the farmers of the United States, there are probably more important provisions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 than the commodity provisions that they ought to be aware of that are going to benefit agriculture to a greater extent than even the commodity provisions.

That would be, first of all, balancing the budget, reducing interest rates 1.5 to 2 percentage points a year. Multiply that times a \$160 billion debt in agriculture and that adds up to real money in the pockets of farmers of America, just from balancing the budget.

Two other provisions very helpful to getting young people into agriculture, passing land and operations on from one generation to another generation of farmers, are the capital gains tax reduction and increasing the exemption, the estate tax exemption, and also having a special exemption, which was in this bill, when small businesses and farms are passed on to people within the family, an exemption of \$1 million. This is what it is going to take, in rural America, to get young people into agriculture.

But I want to repeat that even though there were all these other good things for agriculture in the Balanced Budget Act, we did have the commodity provisions of the 1995 farm bill in that act. The Senate did debate and did pass a farm bill in 1995. Not only was

there debate on the floor of the Senate at that time, but there were at least five amendments relating to the farm bill that were offered, debated, and voted on by the Senate.

These amendments included a very comprehensive farm bill alternative, a proposal put forward by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That specific alternative was rejected by the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 68 to 31.

So, what happened to the farm bill that we passed last year? As you know, it passed both Houses of Congress and was sent to the President for his signature. Unfortunately, the farm bill, as well as all these other good provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, was vetoed by the President. That is the reason why, on January 24, 1996, we are still discussing a 1995 farm bill.

Let us start this year with a clean slate by setting the record straight. The Republican Congress debated, voted on and passed a farm bill in 1995. Now maybe we can get beyond the politics of this issue and do what is best for our farmers. The farmers of this country deserve to know what the farm program will be this year and they need to know as soon as possible. The time for delay is over. The farmers also need to know what both sides want in a new farm bill.

The farm bill passed by the Republican majority in 1995 represents the most significant reform in farm legislation in the last 60 years. Under this provision, farmers will no longer have their planting decisions dictated by the politicians and the bureaucrats in Washington, DC. The reality of the budget crisis in Washington dictates that farmers must—and it is what farmers want to do—earn more of their income from the marketplace as opposed to the Federal Treasury.

If that is the case—and that is the environment we are in, the budget realities as well as the realities of the foreign trade environment, the freeing up of foreign trade—if this is the case, then, the farmers are going to get less support from the Federal Treasury. The shackles of Government regulation and the red tape that is inherent therein must be removed so that U.S. farmers have a fair chance to compete with our foreign competitors.

The farm provisions contained in the Balanced Budget Act do this. They remove the planting restrictions imposed on the farmers. They remove the Federal Government's authority to require that productive farmland be removed from production. In short, they send a very clear signal to the rest of the world that the U.S. farmer will compete for every sale in every marketplace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I was not aware of a time restriction. Could I ask for 5 additional minutes?

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Now, what has the other side had to offer as an alternative to the Republican plan? Most often, although not totally, we hear about a 1-year extension of the current program. To me, this idea has several problems. An extension of the current program ignores the reforms that have been made and that farmers have now come to expect. The farmers in my State want, they expect, and they deserve the regulatory relief provided by the Republican farm bill provisions. Furthermore, an extension would literally deprive rural America of billions of dollars. First, a 1-year extension would require farmers to pay back money they have already received as advance deficiency payments. Many of the farmers in Iowa had very poor crops this year due to heavy rain during the planting season. Particularly that is true of southern Iowa, northern Missouri, and western central Illinois. Yet by a 1-year extension, people are suggesting that they would force these farmers to write checks to the Treasury to pay back their advance deficiency payment. It is estimated that these provisions would cost farmers more than \$2.1 billion nationwide and, in my State of Iowa, \$217 million.

Second, any delay in passing a new farm bill could have a devastating effect on future farm programs. This is due to the Congressional Budget Office's baseline revision that continually shows that Congress will have less money to spend on farm programs in the future. When CBO revised its baseline in November, agriculture lost \$7.8 billion from that baseline. This is \$7.8 billion that we could have spent under the baseline if the President would have signed the farm bill enacted in October but now is lost, due to delay.

If we pass a 1-year extension, the House Agriculture Committee estimates that agriculture could lose an additional \$6 billion—an additional \$6 billion. So, it is time to be very candid with our constituents. An extension will take billions of dollars out of that baseline, or, another way of saying it, out of the pockets of the family farmers, and, at the same time, out of rural America. To this Senator, these numbers make a mere extension of the current program an unacceptable alternative. And, when the truth is known to the farmers and to our constituents, I think they will find it equally unacceptable.

I think it is interesting that the same Senators who have accused the Republican Congress of gutting rural America are willing to deprive these areas of billions of dollars by putting off the passing of a farm bill for another year, through a 1-year extension.

Mr. President, the conclusion is very clear to this Senator. The Senate should pass the farm bill provisions contained in the Balanced Budget Act once again. We should do this as soon as possible, preferably this week on the continuing resolution. The farmers, the

bankers, and the rest of rural America need the certainty as to what the next farm program will be.

It is high time that we put ideology aside and enact a new farm bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. EXON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1523 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I came down for another matter that will take about 2 minutes, to clear some resolutions saluting the Nebraska Cornhuskers football team and the volleyball team which have been cleared on both sides.

I ask unanimous consent at this time I be allowed to proceed for a few more minutes for that purpose.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will not object. The measures the Senator from Nebraska is presenting have been cleared by this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

COMMENDING THE CORNHUSKERS FOR WINNING THE 1994 AND 1995 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 210) to commend the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for winning both the 1994 and 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football championships back-to-back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate one of the top college football programs in history—the Nebraska Cornhuskers. The Huskers have once again clinched a national championship earning back-to-back titles in 1994 and 1995. Nebraska won two consecutive championships also in 1970 and 1971. This year's repeat was made special by the fact that this is only the second time ever in college football history that a team was a consensus, undisputed champ in the major polls 2 years in a row. The last time this occurred was in the 1950's.

The Huskers decisively defeated the Florida Gators 62-24 in the Fiesta Bowl on January 2. This victory not only brought with it the national championship, but a perfect 25-0 record for the

past two seasons, a 36th victory for the Huskers in the last three seasons and the worst defeat of a number 1 versus number 2 in a championship game. As for the 36 victories, the Huskers are the only team to win that many games in 3 years time. Nebraska was 36-1 overall and the 1 loss came down to a last-second field goal attempt. That field goal was the difference between a repeat and a threepoint of the national title. The Huskers defeated the Miami Hurricanes in Miami 24-17 last year for the championship.

The Huskers this year managed to play nearly everyone on the roster in many of the games and crush opponents by averaging 52.4 offensive points per game. Also when matched against Top 10 opponents this season—Florida, Colorado, Kansas, Kansas State—the Huskers smacked each by an average of 49-18.

The Nebraska program has risen above all others on the field. The Huskers have the record for the most straight bowl game appearances at 27. Between 1970 and now, they have finished 19 times in the Top 10 and 4 of those were at number 1. Additionally, in this the final year of the Big Eight, the Huskers have dominated with the most Big Eight conference championships at 20. The Huskers were victorious in the Big Eight consecutively for the last 5 years. The Huskers likewise hold the record for overall conference championships—Big Six, Big Seven, Big Eight—at 41.

As it is clear that the Huskers have been winners on the field, they have been winners off the field as well. Coach Osborne, the coach with the highest winning percentage in college football, wrote "More Than Winning," a book which describes his philosophy. There is certainly more than winning and Coach Osborne, who holds a doctorate in educational psychology, tries to teach each of his players how to be winners in the bigger game of life. For example, the University of Nebraska has had the most Academic-All-Americans on its teams at 132 players. The next closest college has 82. The football program itself is number 1 with a total of first team Academic-All-Americans at 49. The next closest college has 35.

I am very pleased with the Huskers for the success that they have had over the years and another repeat of the national championship. While the 1971 match-up between Nebraska and Oklahoma has often been called the game of the century, the run the Huskers have made in the last three seasons, 1993, 1994, and 1995, deserves the caption—"the Team of the Century."

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

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows: