

fiscal year. It seems to me the agreement I will ask for in a minute seems to achieve this 60-vote test without having to file cloture motions to comply with all other provisions of rule XXII.

I will now make the request.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.R. 1217

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9 a.m. on Thursday, I be recognized to make a motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 1217; that a vote occur on the motion to proceed at 10 a.m. on Thursday; that the time between 9 a.m. and 10 a.m. be equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that if the motion to proceed does not receive 60 or more votes, there then be a second vote on the motion to proceed at 11 a.m. on Thursday, with the time between votes to be equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that if the second vote on the motion to proceed does not receive 60 votes in the affirmative, the motion automatically be withdrawn.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think I have explained this. This, in effect, saves a couple of days going through the cloture route, intervening days and all these things. It seems to me we have so many differences on each side that this bill is in great difficulty, notwithstanding the splendid efforts made by the managers, particularly the chairman of the subcommittee.

But it also seems to me if we are not going to have any movement on the bill, we at least ought to make the effort and then withdraw the motion to proceed and lay the bill aside.

That would leave us one additional bill, State, Justice, Commerce appropriations to deal with yet this week, and also the continuing resolution, and also to complete in the Finance Committee and the Agriculture Committee our reconciliation obligations.

I think the other committees, as far as I know, have completed them. The Finance Committee will meet this evening as soon as we recess, which will be in a few moments.

So I hope this procedure will expedite something. I am not certain what. Maybe it will expedite getting out this week.

Hopefully, this may not happen, but I have discussed this with the manager, Senator SPECTER, after we have these two votes, if we do not receive 60 votes, maybe then we can convince our colleagues on each side to let us pass this by voice vote, send it to conference,

and get it down to the President. He already said he is going to veto it. There is no question about a veto. The veto cannot be overridden. Then we initiate a new bill in the House, it will come back to the Senate, and then we have our fight sometime probably late October. In the meantime, it will be wrapped in the continuing resolution.

MEASURE READ FOR FIRST
TIME—H.R. 927

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I inquire of the chair if H.R. 927 has arrived from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has arrived.

Mr. DOLE. Therefore, I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOLE. I now ask for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as a pro forma matter, I voice an objection at this time since there is no other Senator on the floor to raise that objection. I do so pro forma to protect the record, not because I would not like personally to see us proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOLE. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania. Senator DASCHLE would have objected and appreciates you doing that for him.

Mr. DOLE. As I understand, the bill remains at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read a second time on the next legislative day.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

THE RUSSELL, KS, DELEGATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for working out this procedure. I have been here almost 15 years. This is the first time, I think, that only Senator DOLE and I have been on the floor at the same time. I hope everyone in Russell, KS, who has C-SPAN 2 is watching this proceeding. This is a full Russell, KS, delegation now on the floor conducting the Senate business. I do hope if Russell High School has not yet initiated a course in Senate procedure, they do so very, very promptly. Perhaps Senator DOLE and I can nominate Mrs. Alice Mills, the sole remaining teacher who taught both of us, to be emeritus instructor of that course.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I do hope people in our hometown are watching. It is a small place, but a lot of good people there.

They are friends of both of ours. They are having great difficulties sorting out all this 1996 Presidential politics in Russell, KS.

Mr. SPECTER. That is the most encouraging thing I have heard today, Mr. President.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 927. An act to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2399. An act to amend the Truth in Lending Act to clarify the intent of such Act and to reduce burdensome regulatory requirements on creditors.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 927. An act to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on September 22, 1995 he had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bills:

S. 464. An act to make the reporting deadlines for studies conducted in Federal court demonstration districts consistent with the deadlines for pilot districts, and for other purposes.

S. 532. An act to clarify the rules governing venue, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1276. A bill to permit agricultural producers to enter into market transition contracts and receive loans, to require a pilot

revenue insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1277. A bill to provide equitable relief for the generic drug industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 1278. A bill to establish an education satellite loan guarantee program for communications among education, Federal, State, and local institutions and agencies and instructional and educational resource providers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. KYL, Mr. REID, Mr. SPECTER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BOND, Mr. D'AMATO, and Mr. GRAMM):

S. 1279. A bill to provide for appropriate remedies for prison condition lawsuits, to discourage frivolous and abusive prison lawsuits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1276. A bill to permit agricultural producers to enter into market transition contracts and receive loans, to require a pilot revenue insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE FARM INCOME TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate Agriculture Committee began marking up the commodity title to the 1995 farm bill. Although I am no longer a member of that committee, the farm bill has as much impact on my State as any other piece of legislation considered before this body.

For that reason, Mr. President, I have used my position on other committees to indirectly influence farm policy. I have also formed a group, the Farm Policy Coalition, that is co-chaired by Senator DORGAN and consists of 52 Members of the Senate. In order to more directly influence the debate.

Today, however, the Agriculture Committee was not able to agree on a farm bill to take to reconciliation. And there are rumors that the Budget Committee may have to act to make the necessary cuts in farm spending. As a member of the Budget Committee, I publicly stated that the Agriculture Committee, and not the Budget Committee, is the best place to write the farm bill.

But now with the Agriculture Committee deadlocked, I feel it necessary to send a clear signal, as a Budget Committee member and a Senator interested in the future of agriculture, on how I believe we should proceed on the 1995 farm bill; taking into consideration what is in the best interests of my State and American agriculture as a whole.

Therefore, Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Farm Income Transi-

tion Act of 1995. This bill is similar to one introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, PAT ROBERTS, known as the Freedom to Farm Act.

My bill represents a transition to a new era of farm programs; an era that will be characterized by limited Government intrusion in the market and the unleashing of the productivity of American agriculture. Yet the Federal Government will still play a role in providing a safety-net for the family farmer.

Mr. President, this bill is a dramatic departure from the farm programs of the past. We all know that our current farm programs were established during the Great Depression of the 1930's.

The intent of the program then, as it is now, was to stabilize farm income while ensuring a dependable, abundant, and inexpensive food supply. This is accomplished mainly by making direct payments to farmers when commodity prices are low, and implementing production controls to limit the supply of commodities.

To a large extent, the programs of the past have been successful. The American consumer spends less than 10 percent of their disposable income on food; the lowest of any Nation in the world.

Despite its success, the farm program has had many critics. Some criticize the program for its high degree of Government intervention. Others argue that the benefits go primarily to large, corporate farms. Many farmers, themselves, have grown tired of the endless amount of paperwork and redtape associated with the program.

Through all the criticism, however, the farm program has remained virtually unchanged for the last 50 years. But times have changed. And these changes mandate that a new direction be taken on farm programs.

The crisis of the 1930's was rampant unemployment and poverty. Drastic action was needed to support the income of ordinary Americans.

The crisis of the 1990's is rampant Government spending and intervention into the lives of ordinary Americans. The voters told us in no uncertain terms last November that they wanted the Government out of their lives and the budget deficit brought under control.

Mr. President, the Senate approved a budget resolution this spring that will bring the Federal budget into balance in the year 2002. This resolution contains a sense-of-the Senate calling for a cut in spending on agriculture commodity programs of about \$9.6 billion over the next 7 years.

During the debate on the budget, I voiced my strong opposition to further cuts in agriculture spending. I will not repeat all of the arguments I made at that time, but it is clear to me that agriculture has contributed disproportionately to deficit reduction in the past. All I asked for at that time, Mr. President, was that agriculture be

treated equitably in the budget process.

I also argued during the budget debate that agriculture, more than any other sector of this economy, has much to gain by achieving a balanced budget.

Agriculture is a capital-intensive business, its success dependent on low-interest rates. Only by getting our fiscal house in order can we ensure a sustained period of low-interest rates and the continued success of the family farmer.

So although Federal spending on agriculture will be reduced, because this reduction is within the context of a balanced budget, agriculture will benefit greatly in the long run.

But, Mr. President, it is vital that as Federal spending on agriculture is reduced, the regulations and restrictions on individual farmers are reduced accordingly. Because if farmers are getting less from the Government, they must have the tools to earn more income from the marketplace.

This bill meets both of these goals: It reduces spending to meet the requirements of my sense-of-the Senate in the budget resolution and it dramatically reduces the regulatory burden placed on farmers.

Mr. President, I will take a moment to describe how this bill accomplishes these goals. First, it mirrors the Freedom to Farm Act by providing farmers with a 7-year contract consisting of annual payments. In return, the farmer must maintain compliance with current conservation requirements. The total payments over the 7-year period are capped at \$43 billion, which meets the requirements of the budget resolution.

Furthermore, the regulatory burden on farmers is significantly diminished. For many years, the planting decisions of American farmers have been dictated, in part, by the U.S. Congress and the Department of Agriculture. This limits a farmer's ability to maximize his profit from the marketplace. These decisions must be removed from the hands of bureaucrats and put back into the hands of the farmers.

My bill provides for full planting flexibility. Farmers' planting decisions will no longer be restricted by their historical crop base. This will allow farmers to plant for the marketplace and not the Federal farm program.

The bill also eliminates the acreage reduction program. No longer will farmers be required to leave a portion of their productive land unplanted because of a mandate imposed by Washington.

Furthermore, the bill maintains certain aspects of the current farm program while reforming others. For instance, nonrecourse loans will continue to be made available. This is a necessary and important marketing tool for farmers that does not require direct Government spending.

On the other hand, the three-entity rule is eliminated. Payments will now be directly attributed to farmers instead of corporations and other entities.