

transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) for such fiscal year shall include the information required by section 251(a)(2) of such Act (other than account-level detail) assuming that the deficit in such budget baseline were the amount estimated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on August 25 of the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins.

(4) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 1989 if the budget transmitted for such fiscal year provides for deficit reduction from a budget baseline deficit for such fiscal year (as defined by section 251(a)(6) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and based on laws in effect on January 1, 1988) equal to or greater than \$36,000,000,000.

(5) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply if a declaration of war by the Congress is in effect.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I submit, and my quick analysis is, that the President has complied with none of them. Again, I repeat, if the President wanted to tell the American people he sent a vision statement up here, or if he wanted to say, "I sent a sunshine brochure up here"—it is in yellow and looks like sunshine—if he wanted to say that, that is fine. But to suggest that he sent a budget up here is clearly, clearly, a statement without any ability behind the White House to prove it. There is no budget.

Why do I say this and why do I come to the floor? First, some are saying, we should have a budget hearing on the budget. I say to my friend—two are here on the Budget Committee—there is no budget to have a hearing about. We could perhaps have a hearing about the nonbudget if some would like to have that.

Second, it is very easy to submit a budget with bulk numbers if you do not have to tell the public what you are going to do, so that in all the appropriated accounts, you do not have to tell them what you will spend money on and what you will not spend money on. It is another effort on the part of the White House to make everybody feel good and to make sure you feel good about the President's proposals because he has not yet told you what he will and will not do.

I submitted the 31 requirements, and I merely ask the White House and the President to submit a budget at the earliest possible time. I think the public deserves it. I think we deserve it. Again, I say to the White House, you have not submitted one. We understand that perhaps there is a lot of pressure this year and a shortage of time, but it would have been better if you would not have told the public you submitted one when you did not. Make sure when you do submit one that it is a budget, and then we can have hearings on it and let the American people know what is in it.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to speak up to 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. BOND. I say to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, perhaps because of the fact that the President submitted

five budgets last year, the White House sent down five budgets—the last one did not even pass the smile test—they may have lost their enthusiasm.

I certainly do share the concerns expressed by the Senator from New Mexico. We had the last budget, I guess it was called No. 5, that purported to reach balance by making somewhere between 90 and 95 percent of the cuts in appropriated accounts in the 6th and 7th years. I traveled around my State the last couple of weeks and asked how many people believed the budget was honest if you said you would get to balance by making all the cuts in the 6th and 7th years. That is one of the best laugh lines around. I should have been using that in one of the roasts we had in town because that, from the commonsense folks I talk to, draws that kind of response.

A NEW FARM BILL

Mr. BOND. Let me move on to another item that was included in that Balanced Budget Act of 1995 that was vetoed by the President and that has been addressed already today on the floor. That is a new farm bill.

During the last several days, when farmers and all the rest of us came inside, I had the opportunity to talk to and hear from and answer a lot of questions from farmers in my State. They said, "Why don't we have a farm bill?"

I said, simply, the President vetoed the first one and we were unsuccessful in getting the votes to end the filibuster.

They said, "What are they filibustering?"

I said that is the difficult point. They do not have an alternative.

These people said, "We cannot go back to the old farm bills. What are we going to do?"

I said, "Well, we are going to try again to break the filibuster so the farmers of America and the people who depend on and work with the agricultural sector will know what the ground rules are."

These people who talk to me said, "We want flexibility. It is a lot better for our land. It is a lot better for the environment. It is a lot better for us if we can rotate our crops and we are not locked in to planting corn to keep our corn base," or other crops in which they have a base. They said, "We need to be able to choose what is right for our farming operation, our land, and what we think is best for the market."

I said, "Basically, that is the Freedom To Farm Act."

I think the Leahy-Craig substitute amendment represents the opportunity that the people of America, certainly the farmers in my State, have been looking for: to move forward in a bipartisan way to shape policy on behalf of our Nation's farmers and consumers. The modified freedom-to-farm legislation offers reform, opportunity, flexibility and predictability in a fiscally responsible way and with the growing

support of Members on both sides of the aisle.

I have said farmers in my State have supported the bill. We have reform groups, such as Citizens Against Government Waste, who support this because it does save money. We have the Farm Bureau, corn growers, Cotton Council, cattlemen, pork producers, and the many others who have already been named by my colleagues who have spoken before. I concede we do not have all of the fringe groups who are working to come up with something that fits their particular interest.

I know there is apprehension by some, simply because the reform measure represents change. But I will tell my colleagues, the young farmers, the men and women who are going to be providing food and fiber for the future are ready for change. They want to move away from farming for the mailbox to farming for the marketplace. They want to be able to determine what is best for their operations and get their returns from the marketplace.

We all know this reform package is the only show in town. There have been some good ideas. Others have come up with things. But there is simply no consensus alternative that has been offered by those who are filibustering. There is no constituency for these alternative ideas that spring up and disappear. Neither producers nor farmers that I know of are supporting it.

I must say, I am deeply troubled by one proposal opponents have offered, which would cut farm payments by 60 percent. Some have said on this floor that farmers have high prices, are making money, and having high income. Mr. President, my farmers are not in that situation. My farmers have been hit by flood, by drought, by frost. They have no crop to sell in some instances. They are faced with a refund of last year's advance deficiency payments.

It does not matter if the crops are bringing high prices if you do not have anything to sell. Farmers want and deserve predictability, flexibility, and simplicity associated with a 7-year contract. A known stream of payments will provide certainty to farmers, lenders, and the taxpaying public. It will promote security during difficult economic times, and I think farmers can manage a predictable income stream to mitigate economic risks better than Washington can.

I applaud Senator DOLE, Senator LUGAR, and Senator LEAHY for bringing this bipartisan approach together. We need the votes to end the filibuster. I urge my colleagues to support the cloture motion.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

A COMPROMISE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, in connection with the issue that is before

the Senate today, I hope Senators will be able to support the petition to invoke cloture so we can have a vote on the merits of amendments to and the farm bill itself, that will put in place a farm program for this and later years. This farm bill that is being presented to the Senate, and which we will reach if we are able to invoke cloture today, is a compromise that has been developed to resolve the current impasse between the Congress and the administration about the content of farm legislation.

As Senators remember, we included in the Balanced Budget Act the provisions of farm legislation that would be in effect over the 7-year period that was covered by the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. The Congress passed that and sent it to the President and he vetoed it.

Because of that veto, we are now forced to go back and reexamine those provisions relating to agriculture and to pull them out and put them together in a freestanding bill so we can pass that legislation. If we do not, laws that have been on the books since 1938—and 1949, in some cases—will govern the agriculture programs that would be in place for this crop year. These provisions are so out of date it is ludicrous. The price support for wheat farmers would go up to about \$7-something a bushel. In order to qualify, you would have had to have had allotments that were based on your planting experience prior to 1950.

It is unthinkable that this Congress is dragging its feet and making it difficult to enact farm legislation that would give producers of American agriculture products the certainty of the laws that govern the planting and the production of those crops. But that is what is happening. It is a disgrace. We need to put a stop to it, and to put a stop to it we are going to have to vote for cloture to limit debate of this issue so we can get to votes on the merits of amendments and the bill itself, and to pass the legislation, send it to the House, meet in conference, and get a bill to the President. This has to be done as soon as possible.

Farmers are confronted right now with the inevitability of a planting season that is here, whether we legislate it or not. We cannot slow down the planting season by simply not enacting farm legislation. Lenders are going to have to extend credit based on some idea of what the returns will be in this production year for wheat and corn farmers and others who are covered by these laws.

I am hopeful that the Senate will recognize our solemn responsibility to be fair with farmers and to undertake our obligation to legislate in a serious manner and stop the partisan squabbling back and forth on who has the better program, the Democrats or the Republicans. Forget it. This bill before the Senate is a bipartisan substitute for the previous provisions that were before the Senate last week when the

Senate failed to invoke cloture, when only 53 Senators voted for cloture.

Now we have another chance. We need 60 Senators to vote to permit us to reach the amendments and then the merits of this bill. I urge Senators to look at the fact that we have made some fundamental changes to attract a large majority of support here in the Senate. There is a reauthorization of food and nutrition programs in this bill. There is a reauthorization of the Conservation Reserve Program in this bill. There are revisions and a reauthorization of a wetlands reserve program that has support from many sectors of this country. And there are other provisions—an authorization for a compact of New England States to join together to provide for themselves a new dairy program. There are other items in this bill that reflect an effort to reach out and broaden the base of support for this legislation. I hope Senators will vote for cloture so we can get on with the discussion of amendments and the vote on final passage.

If Senators do not like some of these provisions, they can offer amendments to them to strike them, and we can have up-or-down votes on them. But let us get past this point in the debate and vote for cloture on this bill.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

THE MEDICARE TRUST FUND

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to continue part of the discussion that occurred earlier which was carried forward by the fine Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and to a certain extent by Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of the Budget Committee, which involves the issue of where we stand in this whole budget process, because a very important fact has been confirmed.

About 6 months ago we on the Republican side said that the Medicare trust fund was in serious trouble, that the senior citizens of this country were at risk for their health insurance because the Medicare trust fund was going broke. Now, we did not arbitrarily come up with that statement. We took that statement from the fact that the Medicare trustees, three of whom are appointed by the President and serve in his Cabinet, stated in their report of April 3, 1995, that the Medicare trust fund was going to go broke in the year 2002 if something was not done to fundamentally repair it. So we made the tough decisions of the party. We stepped forward, and we made proposals which made the Medicare trust fund solvent. Our proposals were included in the Balanced Budget Act, which gave this country for the first time in 25

years a balanced budget and which gave our senior citizens a solvent Medicare system.

What happened? The President of the United States and his legions demagogued that act, claimed that we were attacking senior citizens, and used every scare tactic they could on senior citizens. The fundraising powerhouses here in Washington who scare seniors regularly got their machines of paper cranked up and sent out letters to seniors across this country representing that the Republicans were misrepresenting what was happening with the Medicare trust fund and were trying arbitrarily and inappropriately to take on the Medicare trust fund, when, in fact, what we were proposing would bring solvency to the trust fund.

A couple of days ago, the chickens came home to roost for this administration because now, not only do their trustees have a report filed which says that the trust fund is going to go broke, we find that the track for the trust fund to go broke, to go bankrupt, has been accelerated, and that it is unfortunately ahead of schedule.

A report by the Medicare trust fund actuary states, "Things turned out a little worse than we expected. We had projected that 1997 would be the first fiscal year with a deficit when, in fact, this year becomes the first fiscal year with a deficit."

What does that mean? That means, for the first time in the history of the Medicare trust fund, since 1972, this will be the first year when more money goes out of the trust fund than comes into the trust fund. That is a bankruptcy spiral that we have begun.

I have a chart here which we have used before. It looks like a plane crash. In fact, it is called the plane crash chart, which shows what is happening with the Medicare trust fund. This chart assumed what the trustees originally told us, which was the trust fund would go broke in the year 2002, that it would start to run a deficit in the year 1997. We have to change this chart now. The trust fund now has a track that is something like this. It goes to the negative this year, and somewhere out here before the year 2002 it goes broke.

If this administration does not step up and stop demagoging the issue and scaring seniors, what they are going to deliver to seniors is a trust fund that is broke.

What right does this administration have to abuse the senior citizens in this manner? What right do they have to stand in one room at one microphone and say, "Republicans are harassing and inappropriately attacking the trust fund and Medicare," while at the same time the facts show that, if a correction does not occur, the trust fund goes broke?

A higher level of irresponsibility in managing this country and managing the finances and managing the future of our seniors probably has not been seen in recent times than what has