

reason, if we continue the same policy of allowing this production to be unlimited in its potential. Yesterday they released the figures for the new '86 crop year. In certain markets the cash markets dropped a nickel, a nickel from where they were already down to. Why? Because they have made, through this farm program which is a disaster, it mandatory for people to sign up or they can't make any money. They say they want to get government out of agriculture and yet it's more mandatory than ever because they have to sign up in order to get a loan or make a profit of any kind. So I just want to point out the contradiction there. I'm going to support the resolution. I have supported darned near every resolution that came along in regard to agriculture because I think we have to support the farmer, we have to support the idea of getting something done. I don't think that this is going to solve it. Even if it were instituted, it's not going to solve it until we get the production down in the United States or figure out some way to allow ourselves to utilize the production through one of the proposals that Senator Schmit and I have been working on, the ethanol program, or through some miraculous increase in our exports, we have to get this production down so that we can make a profit. So I'm going to support the resolution, but I want to point out that there is a contradiction here, that they are part of the problem and I'm glad to see them propose a solution, but I would encourage them to look at the idea of the mandatory production controls and I'll close with this. There is property that is going to go into the farm program this year...

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR HARRIS: ...the conservation part of the program, where they are going to be able to approximate the cost of taking 20 percent out of production for the price it would take to get all of a quarter section out of production. In other words, the deficiency payment is set high. As the loan rates drop and all of the rates drop, the deficiency payment becomes larger. And by allowing that farmer to continue, the cost is approximately double, in some cases, what it would take to take that whole quarter section out of production and I submit to you that is the reason that we're going to have not just a \$21 billion program this year, not just a 25, but maybe even in excess of \$30 billion without solving the problem. As a matter of fact, it will be worse