But there is so much more that our farmers can do, if only we would free them from the burdens of inflexible regulations, high taxes, and the overreaching arm of Government. Government should not get in the way of farmers. It should set a level playing field so that farmers from across the country can compete fairly with each other, regardless of geographic region or commodity item. We owe it to our farmers to do nothing less—and nothing more.

We also owe it to the American taxpayers—the people who pay for the jumbled agricultural policy Washington has created—to fix the failed policies of the past and ensure that their tax dollars are put to work most efficiently.

First and foremost, we must provide greater flexibility for our farmers. Current Federal policies dictate decades-old planting patterns set by Washington and require every farmer to visit USDA annually to comply with its seemingly endless paperwork requirements.

Today, the Senate can help alleviate some of those burdens by passing a bold, new approach called the Agricultural Market Transition Act.

This innovative plan, initially crafted by Majority Leader DOLE, Agriculture Committee Chairman LUGAR and other members of the Agriculture Committee, offers farmers the flexibility they will need to remain strong into the next century.

Under this proposal, farmers can plant for what the marketplace demands, not what traditional Government crop subsidies have dictated. It would give farmers in Minnesota additional flexibility in meeting the needs of value-added cooperatives and their customers who use products like ethanol.

This bill also simplifies paperwork requirements for farmers. Instead of the current annual paperwork load they face today, passage of this legislation means many farmers may only need to visit the local CFSA once as part of a 7-year contract.

The Agricultural Marketing Transition Act also gives farmers the needed certainty of a fixed, 7-year payment with fixed parameters. Many farmers in Minnesota, especially in the younger generation, need this certainty for long-term loans and other financial decisions.

For these and other reasons, farm groups in Minnesota, such as the wheat growers, barley growers, corn growers, bean growers, the Minnesota Farm Bureau, and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture have endorsed passage of this bill. They know it will give them the flexibility and the opportunity for long-term growth potential in farm income.

But while I enthusiastically support much of this bill because it helps both Minnesota's farm community and the American taxpayer, I must raise my strong concerns about its failure to enact substantial progress in the area of dairy reform.

Having sought the counsel of Minnesota's dairy industry, I am well aware of the problems caused for milk producers, taxpayers, and consumers by our archaic dairy program. For instance, Federal milk marketing orders have helped cause the loss of thousands of dairy farms in Minnesota alone over the last decade.

Under this troubled business climate, Minnesota continues to lose an average of nearly three dairy farms per day.

In addition, the Minnesota dairy industry is adamantly opposed to the Northeast Dairy Compact. I firmly believe this well-intentioned proposal will lead to a regional balkanization of the dairy industry and threatens to make our dairy program even more unwieldy for the dairy processors and producers that I represent.

Instead of letting protectionism get in the way of our dairy producers, we should begin enacting long-term, common-sense reforms that deregulate the Federal Dairy Program.

I understand that the regional politics currently tying up this bill prevent us from making these long-term dairy reforms. At the very least, however, I believe we should consolidate milk marketing orders, eliminate costly producer assessments, and reduce the price supports for dairy commodities to a reasonable level.

By establishing a level playing field for dairy producers, we can dramatically improve and preserve a vital segment of our agriculture industry as a whole. I hope to have the commitment of the chairman and the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee to work with me in the future on these and other reforms.

Enacting a more productive farm policy must be our goal, and we can begin this process by freeing farmers from Government interference, encouraging the use of market discipline in farm decision-making, while at the same time protecting the American taxpayers.

This bill makes that important first step and gives our farmers, small business owners, and lenders what they need—a roadmap to guide them in the important decisions ahead.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation and the cloture motion before us today.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, what is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators can speak up to 5 minutes in morning business.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

SUPPORT FOR THE CLOTURE VOTE

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to ask my colleagues to support the cloture vote so we can enact a farm bill not only this year, but in time for farmers to make the decision about what they are going to plant. Right now, our farmers are in a most precarious position. In my State of Texas, it is planting season, and yet they do not know if the freedom-to-farm provisions are going to be available to them, or whether they are going to have a 1949 law to comply with.

Mr. President, that is not reasonable, and it is not responsible for Members of Congress not to take up this bill and offer their amendments, but to refuse to take up the bill is irresponsible. I urge my colleagues not to do that to the farmers of America. Their lives are tough enough. The last thing they need is to make the wrong guess and have a disastrous year.

That is what is going to happen. The bill is very clear. It is a freedom-to-farm bill, so that you will have the ability to make your own decisions based on your soil and what you think is your best ability to farm the commodity that you like the best. That is new and it is very important.

It also eliminates the costly, timely paperwork required to comply with current regulations. It eliminates the need for most of the regulations now necessary to govern current programs. The freedom-to-farm portions contribute to the deficit reduction by reducing agriculture spending by more than $12 billion over 7 years.

What happens, Mr. President, if we do not invoke cloture and pass this bill today? Reversion to the permanent law, which is what will happen if we do not enact this bill, would be disastrous. First, it would give farmers a parity price based on 1914 economic conditions. That would result in domestic prices double or triple the world price, which would, of course, erode our carefully cultivated export markets. We have just passed GATT, which is supposed to break down the barriers in our agriculture exports, and yet this bill would be a reversion. That is, if we do not pass this bill, it will be a reversion to the old ways of doing things which are not best for today.

It would mean that the USDA would have to buy all the excess wheat that was not taken up on the world market. It would obliterate our ability to have a balanced budget. Reversion to permanent law, by USDA's account, would cost taxpayers an additional $2.3 billion in the first year alone.

I share the concerns that my colleague from Minnesota has just stated about the dairy portions of this bill. I do not like it. That Northeast compact is going to hurt other dairy markets around the country. I do not think that is right. We will have a chance to vote on that because amendments will be in order if we invoke cloture.

There is no reason that I can see that a Member of this body can responsibly vote against cloture to allow us to debate this bill and pass something that will give our farmers the ability to plant according to their own needs in

time for them to do it. It would be just like Washington, DC, which is out of touch with everything else, to finally pass this bill in March or April when the planting season has passed for many of the farmers in our country. Mr. President, we cannot do that. It is not responsible. I am speaking for the farmers, the hard-working small business people of my State and all the States for which agriculture is so important for their economies and for their families.

I urge my colleagues, vote for cloture. There is no reason to fear debate on this bill. There is every reason for us to do the responsible thing so that our farmers and ranchers have the ability to make the decisions that they need to make in a responsible way. It is the least they can expect from the U.S. Congress. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from New Mexico.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. DOMENICI. I will depart from the subject matter and just call to our attention and to the American people's attention a situation with reference to the President's so-called submission of a balanced budget.

First, as chairman of the Budget Committee, I was advised last week by the White House that they were going to submit this kind of document. Of course, I cannot do anything about whether they should submit this 20-page brochure in lieu of a balanced budget, but I suggested that it would not be a budget. The response was that it would be submitted in this manner.

I want everybody to know that the February 5 deadline for the submission of a budget which can be reached—I am not suggesting that it cannot be delayed, but to tell the American people that the President has submitted a balanced budget in compliance with the requirements of the law is just not true. This is 15 pages of political prose and advertisements and 5 pages of technical economic assumptions and the like. It is as if there really is nothing formal and specific about the Nation's budget.

Some may recall in the past when budget directors submitted their budgets, they were more than a few hundred pages. They had supplements to amend. That is because every item in the Federal budget was itemized in terms of expenditure. This budget is 15 pages of prose, 5 pages of tables. It says nothing about how the President proposes to spend the $12.2 trillion he has proposed to expend over the next 7 years.

I want the Senate and the people to know that this is not just a Senator speaking. There is a law about budgets. The law says in 31 U.S.C. 1105 that there are 31 specific requirements for a budget to be a budget. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD for anyone who would like to peruse this, the 31 requirements of a budget.

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

§ 1105. Budget contents and submission to Congress

(a) On or after the first Monday in January but not later than the first Monday in February of each year,[1847] the President shall submit a budget of the United States Government for the following fiscal year. Each budget shall include a budget message and summary and supporting information. The President shall include in each budget the following:

(1) information on activities and functions of the Government.

(2) when practicable, information on costs and achievements of Government programs.

(3) other desirable classifications of information.[1848]

(4) a reconciliation of the summary information on expenditures with proposed appropriations.

(5) except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations the President decides are necessary to support the Government in the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted and the 4 fiscal years after that year.

(6) estimated receipts of the Government in the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted and the 4 fiscal years after that year under—

(A) laws in effect when the budget is submitted; and

(B) proposals in the budget to increase revenues.

(7) appropriations, expenditures, and receipts of the Government in the prior fiscal year.

(8) estimated expenditures and receipts, and appropriations and proposed appropriations, of the Government for the current fiscal year.

(9) balanced statements of the—

(A) condition of the Treasury at the end of the prior fiscal year;

(B) estimated condition of the Treasury at the end of the current fiscal year; and

(C) estimated condition of the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted of financial proposals in the budget are adopted.

(10) essential information about the debt of the Government.

(11) other financial information the President decides desirable to explain in practicable detail the financial condition of the Government.[1849]

(12) for each proposal in the budget for legislation that would establish or expand a Government activity or function, a table showing—

(A) the amount proposed in the budget for appropriation and for expenditure because of the proposal in the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted; and

(B) the estimated appropriation required because of the proposal for each of the 4 fiscal years after that year that the proposal will be in effect.

(13) an allowance for additional estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations for the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted.

(14) an allowance for unanticipated uncontrollable expenditures for that year.

(15) a separate statement on each of the items referred to in section 301(a)(1)–(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(1)–(5)).

(16) the level of tax expenditures under existing law in the tax expenditures budget (as defined in section 3(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622(a)(3)) for the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted, considering projected economic factors and changes in the existing levels based on proposals in the budget.

(17) information on estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted for grants, contracts, and other payments under each program for which there is an authorization of appropriations for that following fiscal year when the appropriations are authorized to be included in an appropriation law for the fiscal year before the fiscal year in which the appropriation is to be available for obligation.

(18) a comparison of the total amount of budget outlays for the prior fiscal year, estimated in the budget submitted for that year, for each major program having relatively uncontrollable outlays with the total amount of outlays for that program in that year.

(19) a comparison of the total amount of receipts for the prior fiscal year, estimated in the budget submitted for that year, with receipts, a comparison of the amount of receipts estimated in that budget with the amount of receipts from that source in that year.

(20) an analysis and explanation of the differences between each amount compared under clauses (18) and (19) of this subsection.

(21) a horizontal budget showing—

(A) the programs for meteorology and of the National Climate Program established under section 5 of the National Climate Program Act (15 U.S.C. 2904);

(B) specific aspects of the program of, and appropriation, for, each agency; and

(C) estimated goals and financial requirements.

(22) a statement of budget authority, proposed budget authority, budget outlays, and proposed budget outlays, and descriptive information in terms of—

(A) a detailed structure of national needs that refers to the missions and programs of agencies (as defined in section 101 of this title); and

(B) the mission and basic programs.

(23) separate appropriation accounts for appropriations under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) and the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 801 et seq.)

(24) recommendations on the return of Government capital to the Treasury by a mixed-ownership corporation (as defined in section 9101(2) of this title that the President decides are desirable.

(25) a separate appropriation account for appropriations for each Office of Inspector General of an establishment defined under section 11(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978.

(26)[1850] a separate statement of the amount of appropriations requested for the Office of National Drug Control Policy and each program of the National Drug Control Program.

(28)[1851] a separate statement of the amount of appropriations requested for the Office of Financial Management.

(b) Estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations for the legislative branch and the judicial branch to be included in each budget under subsection (a)(5) of this section shall be submitted to the President before October 16 of each year and included in the budget by the President without change.

(c) The President shall recommend in the budget appropriate action to meet an estimated deficiency when the estimated receipts for the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted (under laws in effect when the budget is submitted) and the estimated amounts in the Treasury at the end of the current fiscal year available for expenditure in the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted, are less than the estimated expenditures for that year. The President shall

Footnotes at end of article.