

S. RES. 210

Whereas Dr. Tom Osborne, the winningest coach in college football, has led the Nebraska Cornhuskers to the last five Big Eight titles, a second perfect season, and repeat of the National Championship;

Whereas the Huskers have gone undefeated at 25-0 in the last two seasons and 36-1 in the last three seasons, the most victories ever in that time span for any collegiate team;

Whereas Tommie Frazier, the great Husker quarterback, continued the unmatched Nebraska tradition by being named Most Valuable Player in the last three Championship games and finished his brilliant career with a rushing high 199 yards in the 1996 Fiesta Bowl;

Whereas the Huskers decisively won the Fiesta Bowl becoming the second football team ever in collegiate history to earn a consensus #1 rank in the major polls for two consecutive years.

*Resolved*, That the Senate commends the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for having won the 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football Championship.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### COMMENDING THE CORNHUSKERS FOR WINNING THE 1995 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL 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. 211) to commend the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for winning the 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Volleyball Championship.

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 a great women's volleyball team, as a matter of fact, the best in the Nation—the Nebraska Cornhuskers. This is only the second time in the history of the volleyball championship tournament that a team east of California has won the title.

The Huskers had a spectacular season led by their great coach Terry Pettit. Coach Pettit has been with the Huskers for 18 years and has become a key part of their success. The season was also boosted by the help of Allison Weston who was named cowlinner of the national Player of the Year Award. And finally, the team was raised to a level above all others on the court by a team of national championship-winning players.

The Huskers have played for the title previously in the 1980's, so being in the limelight of college volleyball is nothing new for them. What it is, however,

is a feat only few have attained outside of the Pacific rim. The only other team was the Texas Longhorns.

The Huskers were incredible in a 3-1 title match versus the Texas Longhorns.

The volleyball program should be acclaimed for another great record as well and that is the success in the classroom. The University of Nebraska has 132 Academic-All-Americans, the most of any college sports, and 16 of them are on the volleyball team. Playing like champions and being champions in the classroom are two incredible accomplishments.

I am quite pleased and very impressed by the success of the Nebraska Huskers and look forward to continued excellence by our great volleyball program.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 211) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 211

Whereas the Cornhusker Volleyball team under the leadership and experience of Coach Terry Pettit has risen above all others in the volleyball arena;

Whereas Nebraska player Allison Weston was named co-winner of the national Player of the Year Award assisting her National Championship winning teammates in a spectacular season;

Whereas this year's Nebraska team was only the second east of California ever to win the Volleyball Championship Tournament by winning the title match;

*Resolved*, That the Senate commends the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for having won 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Volleyball Championship.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

#### THE AGRICULTURAL RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, in a few moments I will propound a unanimous consent request that I know the minority will want to be on the floor to respond to.

While they are coming, let me speak for a few moments to the dilemma we find ourselves in here in the Congress, having passed a Budget Reconciliation Act, and in that budget reconciliation having a substantial portion of new farm policy that is known as the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1995. Of course that went to the President and, as we know, was vetoed.

The problem has been spoken to by the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Iowa already this afternoon, with clearly differing points of view as to

how that was handled. But what is clear, in my State of Idaho, is that farmers and their bankers are now sitting down to determine which acres will go into potatoes or sugar beets or barley or wheat or alfalfa crops this coming season. That means that Idaho farmers are putting together their farm plans and determining their financial structure for the coming year. They prefer to do that in the presence of U.S. farm policy.

Of course, we know that on September 30 of this past year, the farm bill has expired. As a result of that, the Secretary of Agriculture is now at least looking at the possibility of our farm policy reverting to the Agriculture Act of 1949. All of us know that simply cannot be allowed to happen. The stalemate that has resulted from the budget considerations that we are now in simply has not produced farm policy as should be expected by American agriculture.

I serve on the Senate Agricultural Committee. Chairman Dick LUGAR and I and all Members of that committee now for over 10 months have been engaged in looking at and crafting farm policy on a title-by-title basis. But because of the necessary savings that we needed to acquire in fiscal 1996 as a result of the balanced budget process that this Congress is now in, the Budget Reconciliation Act handled a substantial portion of new farm policy. Whether you call it "Freedom to Farm" or whether you call it the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1995, all of us know that there were clear and substantial changes made. We had held extensive hearings with American agriculture and all segments of the commodity interest of agriculture to craft that farm policy. We had gone to conference with the House, the Senate and the House differing substantially on approaches toward this, but all of us coming together to agree on a policy, finally, that made its way into the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. Since that time, American agriculture has had an opportunity to review it, and I must say that the reviews have been favorable.

Early on, farmers scratched their heads and said, "How will this work," only to recognize the kind of new flexibility that we offer in farm policy which says to American agriculture, no longer will you have to farm to the program. You can now start farming to the marketplace, and you can begin to adjust your cropping patterns to move toward the market.

Farmers cannot wait now for this President. Farmers need to know what we are going to do. It is clearly time that we speak to that issue.

This past summer and fall, as I have mentioned, the Congress, the Senate and the House alike, have attempted to craft new farm policy resulting in an approach that brings us to a balanced budget. Somehow there appears to be a message on this floor this afternoon that American agriculture is not interested in a balanced budget.

Mr. President, that is not what we heard this year. We heard from every commodity group that they were willing to do their fair share in moving us toward that balanced budget, and in so recognizing, they would get greater flexibility in the marketplace to move their cropping programs toward the market with the kind of flexibility and planning, instead of being stuck, if you will, or found in lockstep to farm policy, afraid to lose and therefore afraid of stepping outside that.

We have provided a safety net, and that marketing loan will provide that. The loan will allow farmers a reasonable time period to market their crops. These loans will be stabilized in the market cycle and continue to protect consumers as well as the producer. It will avoid the kind of unnecessary market gyrations.

In crafting these sound programs, the Senate and the House committees worked hard and worked long, together, to solve this issue and to bring us to balance in a very diverse segment of America's economy. And that is American agriculture.

In my State of Idaho, in Florida, in Louisiana, in Colorado, in Montana, and in the Dakotas, sugar, sugar beet and cane raising remains a very important commodity crop. Inside the legislation that was vetoed by the President was, again, a new compromise, a new program, a reduction in the program. Listening to the consumer's side, we made the kind of changes that bring us to the marketplace in a variety of these areas, that allow the producer to say, "I am farming now to the market and not to the farm."

Planning flexibility, as I have already mentioned, could clearly be jeopardized. Traditional nonprogram crops like fruits and vegetables, in my State of Idaho, potatoes, could be thrown in jeopardy if we do not deal with this program and deal with it now.

When we saw in the Freedom to Farm Act limited flexibility, it was the Senate that spoke up and said we want flexibility so farmers can move to the marketplace in lieu of what we want to solve with a balanced budget. At the same time, we want to make sure that we protect a variety of these program crops.

Here we are, not at the 11th hour, not at the 12th hour, but well beyond that, into 1996, with a farm bill that expired on September 30, 1995, with a policy that was cautiously and carefully crafted between both the House and the Senate, put in the Budget Reconciliation Act, sent to the President, and the President vetoed it. Now, the Secretary of Agriculture—and I appreciate the Secretary's problem—is terribly frustrated by a need to conduct farm policy at the same time no law is in place as a result of that Presidential veto.

So I come to the floor tonight in behalf of our Speaker, Leader DOLE, myself, Chairman LUGAR, Chairman COCHRAN, Senator GRASSLEY, and others.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 2491

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that Title I, the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1995, of H.R. 2491, the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, as vetoed by the President, be introduced as a freestanding bill; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be advanced to the third reading and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, and I will object.

I would like to comment on the offering by the Senator from Idaho under the reservation, which, as I indicated, will result in an objection to this request.

The Senator from Idaho proposes that we strip from the budget reconciliation bill the cobbled version of the Freedom to Farm Act and bring it to the floor as a separate bill and deem it passed with this action. That is, in my judgment, not a good way to legislate farm policy. It follows last year's circumstances, rather than doing what has traditionally been done with 5-year farm bills. Instead of the development of a bipartisan approach in the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate, and a markup in which there was bipartisan participation, there was a partisan writing of a farm proposal. It was brought to the committee with this statement, "Here is the proposal. We can have a few votes if you want, but we are all going to vote the same way. This is what we are reporting out." That is what was done last year. This tends, in my judgment, to follow in the same steps.

I am not ascribing any improper motives. The Senator has every right to do this, and I understand the purpose of it. But I am constrained to object, and I intend to offer a unanimous consent request on my time.

Mr. President, at this point I object to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, before the Chair puts the consideration, I would like to explain to the Senate that this would allow the Senate to once again pass the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1995, thereby giving the House their opportunity to once again enact the farm bill. Farmers of this country, as I have already explained, need this legislation now. The President has vetoed it. It is very clear he has vetoed this policy.

I certainly do not agree with my colleague that this has been cobbled up. We have been 5 months in the making of this legislation, in creating these difference. I think we are moving toward planting in the Southern parts of

our country. As I mentioned in my earlier comments, farmers are now sitting down with their bankers to put the farm policy together, or their farming programs together, for the year. And we certainly need legislation at this time.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1523

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to propound a unanimous consent request, and I shall explain the request.

I introduced earlier today a bill that is now deemed S. 1523 which provides for a 1-year extension of the current farm program. The bill provides for enormous planting flexibility for farmers who operate under this program to allow them to plant what they want on base acres and not having the Government tell them what to plant, when to plant it or where to plant it. So there is substantial flexibility. And third, it would provide for the forgiveness of the advanced deficiency payment for those farmers that suffered crop losses last year.

I will ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this because I agree with the Senator from Idaho that farmers deserve an answer. They deserve certainty. They deserve to know under what farm program will they be planting in just a matter of weeks in some parts of the country as they begin their spring's work.

I do not believe this is necessarily the first choice. It is not necessarily the best choice. But the piece of legislation that the President vetoed was a budget reconciliation bill which included a farm bill that I described as a cobbled product. The President vetoed a reconciliation bill which took with it a bad farm bill.

Now, why did that occur? Because this is the first time in history that rather than debate a 5-year farm bill on its own merits in this Chamber and the House, the majority party decided to stick the farm bill in the reconciliation bill which by last July people knew was going to be vetoed.

Now, that does not talk about the merits of the farm bill itself. The merits of this farm bill would be to say, "Disconnect the price support programs from need. If market prices are high, ignore that. Still give the farmers the payment. And if after 7 years market prices are low, ignore that. There will be no farm program."

I do not think and did not think this was a good approach. I believe the President thinks it is not a good approach for those who care about having a network of family farms in our country in the long term. That is why we did not support this approach.

It should never have been put in the reconciliation bill in the first place. It was never done previously. Doing so produced the jeopardy that now exists for farmers in January of 1996 in not knowing what the farm program will be for spring planting.