still believe, however, that this debate has focused the Nation's attention on the need to get a balanced budget within a period of 7 years using certain criteria, namely the Congressional Budget Office figures in which the Congress of the United States places, I might say, a great deal of faith and credit. I am hopeful the final drafts, of what may be acted upon here momentarily, will make specific reference to that need, that the President should be forthcoming with such a budget using the 7-year criteria as well as CBO figures.

I hope we can resolve this tragic situation which has impacted my State, the Commonwealth of Virginia, as severely certainly as any other State, and in my judgment probably more severely than any other State in the Union, given the fact that we are privileged—and I say that—we are privileged to provide a home for so many Federal employees, a working place and an infrastructure to accommodate their needs, not only here in the northern Virginia area but, indeed, throughout the Tidewater of Virginia where we have the largest naval base in the world, one of the largest Air Force bases, several of the large Army bases, and, indeed, the industrial base which supports so much of our national defense.

As I have said here day after day on the floor, we are not only addressing the tragic plight of certain Government employees who have been furloughed, or others who are working but without pay. Also, the infrastructure that serves these Government employees—and vice versa, they serve the infrastructure, it works both ways—has been severely crippled. It has a ripple effect all throughout my State.

To compound the tragedy of the private sector, many of these employees being laid off in the private sector do not have any certainty that their loss of pay and benefits or other job security will ever be the subject of restitution.

Throughout this controversy I have worked with the distinguished majority leader. He has provided a letter to this Senator, as well as other Members of the House delegation from the greater metropolitan area of Washington, assuring us that he would fight very hard to see that all Federal pay is received eventually. As a matter of fact, S. 1508, the legislation which I cosponsored with Senator DOLE and the Presiding Officer, the senior Senator from Alaska, so provides specifically.

So, Mr. President, I really take very seriously these many communications. I myself have gone to our phones and received a number of the calls from my constituents, coming in from all over the State.

Let me mention another organization called Resource Applications, Inc. This is dated January 3, 1996.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: As the partial shutdown continues into its third week, the economic damage is spreading fast, and the situation is becoming painful. The Government shutdown is having a ripple effect on people and is devastating their lives. Yesterday, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) sent home 2,400 of its Superfund workers and stopped work at over 600 sites across the Nation, throwing tens of thousands of contract employees out of work.

The letter goes on to explain the impact on his particular firm, Resource Applications, Inc. It says:

As President of RAI, an environmental firm, I am like a father figure for our employees; they look to me for job security. With the majority of RAI's business with EPA, I am seriously concerned about the financial welfare of more than 100 people and their families. While I agree with your stand on issues that are morally and ethically good for our people, particularly the elderly, and the integrity of the environment, I want to tell you, the situation is becoming very difficult for the working people. An early resolution of the budget impasse and Government shutdown issues would be in the best interest of the country.

Yesterday, I had the head of the Environmental Protection Agency in to see me on wide range of issues, Carol Browner. I serve on the committee which has oversight for that Agency, and I had to bring to her attention, among other issues, the fact that our State very proudly has a large manufacturing plant operated by the Ford Motor Company. They are turning out a brand-new pickup truck which is eagerly being awaited all across the United States. As a matter of fact, I purchased my pickup truck from the same plant in Norfolk in 1989. It has been very useful to me on my farm, and I have enjoyed it, and I am going to keep driving it. But I must say I am quite envious of this new model. But, Mr. President, the new model cannot go into circulation for the reason that the Environmental Protection Agency has not had the staff with which to make the proper certifications as to the fact that this truck, this particular new model, can meet the environmental standards. That is an important thing to do—to have the truck meet those standards before it goes on the road.

So that is just another example of the many problems that the State of Virginia is facing.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Roanoke Times of today be printed in the RECORD, a very balanced analysis of the problem.

And, again, it concludes with the last paragraph:

Dole was right, however, in judging the shutdown a poor means of exacting concessions. The House should end it today.

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

[From the Roanoke Times, Jan. 5, 1996]

TIME TO END THE SHUTDOWN

Political fault-lines underlying the partial shutdown of government shifted and rose closer to the surface this week, as the shutdown's effects began rippling more ominously across the land.

As if to confirm his reputation as one of Washington's grown-ups, Majority Leader Bob Dole on Tuesday pushed legislation through the Senate that would have reopened the government until Jan. 12, while Congress and the White House continued their budget talks.

The Senate reasonably, overwhelmingly approved the measure. Yet, egged on by a GOP vanguard of freshman militants, the House on Wednesday turned it down.

Now there's word the GOP leadership is changing its tune, and none too soon.

Keep in mind: Federal employees who were furloughed, as well as those working without pay, in the end will be paid. In the claimed pursuit of austerity, the shutdown is costing taxpayers, on top of other costs, huge sums to pay employees for work they weren't allowed to do.

Give credit, therefore, to Reps. Rick Boucher and L.F. Payne for their vote Wednesday to end the partial shutdown. Rep. Bob Goodlatte unfortunately joined with the GOP's House majority, initially refusing to consider the Senate-passed measure.

''Bob Dole made a huge miscalculation,'' grumbled one of the GOP tough guys, John Shadegg of Arizona. The partial shutdown, he and other House Republicans argued, is their best leverage for getting the White House to accept the basics of their balanced-budget plan. Shadegg called Dole's support for ending the shutdown ''an act of betrayal.''

But if Dole betrayed his party's zealots, he hardly betrayed his country—or his chances for the presidency. On Thursday, House leaders were conceding theirs was the miscalculation.

The shutdown has gone on long enough. Indeed, it is more likely getting in the way of, than moving along, the budget talks. Clinton might have discerned a self-serving political interest in continuing the standoff rather than try to end it.

''It is wrong * * * to shut the government down while we negotiate, under the illusion that somehow that will affect the decisions that I would make on specific issues.'' Clinton said. He's right.

It is wrong to hold Americans hostage to budget bargaining and partisan charade; Meals on Wheel clients, nursing-home residents. Head Start youngsters, vendors waiting to be paid, citizens wanting to visit national parks or to travel overseas, Americans depending on unemployment assistance or water-quality monitoring—not to mention 760,000 unpaid federal workers.

Congress has proposed measures that Clinton is right to veto—mean-spirited, counterproductive measures. But House Republicans are right when they criticize the president for failing to specify how he would balance the budget in seven years, given a common set of fiscal assumptions.

To bargain in good faith—while still sticking to principles that, in most cases rightly, he says he'll stand by—Clinton needs to be more forthcoming.

Dole was right, however, in judging the shutdown a poor means of exacting concessions. The House should end it today.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let us hope that the relevant document delivered to the desk in the Senate by the Clerk of the House of Representatives contains the legislative initiatives that will enable us to resolve this.

Mr. President, seeing the distinguished majority leader, I yield the floor.

## AGRICULTURE POLICY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for the past several weeks, America has focused its attention on the budget talks

in Washington, and on the Government workers who have been hostages in this debate.

However, one of the faces not shown on the evening news as a hostage in these talks is that of the American farmer.

As I travel around rural America, farmers remind me that they are taxpayers too. And as taxpayers, farmers want a balanced budget.

Rural America realizes what this balanced budget means for them. For agriculture alone, spending on interest with a balanced budget is projected to decline by $15 billion over 7 years. And for a lot of family farmers who struggle to make ends meet, the money saved by reduced interest payments could make the difference between success and failure.

In addition, the Balanced Budget Act would provide much needed tax relief to millions of rural Americans; including an increase in expensing limits, death tax relief, an increased deductibility for the health insurance cost of the self employed, a capital gains tax cut, and operation of a medical savings account.

Mr. President, along with putting America on course to a balanced budget, there is something else that Congress must do to be fair to America's farmers.

I believe we have an obligation to announce by the end of February, if not sooner, the details of a farm bill so farmers can prepare this year's crop. Kansas farmers have already planted their winter wheat without knowing any program details.

In my view, Mr. President, Congress has three options from which we can choose.

Option No. 1 is to do nothing, and to simply let the 1990 farm bill expire, which would mean that permanent law would be in effect.

Anyone who knows anything about permanent law realizes such action would be bad for farmers and bad for America. Farm prices would reach parity levels which to many may sound attractive. However, the long-term ramifications to the marketplace and U.S. Treasury would be significant. Farmers would produce for the Government and not the marketplace.

Option No. 2 is to pass an extension of the 1990 farm bill. This in my view, would also be the wrong road to take.

Those who are advocating this choice are unwilling to modernize American agricultural policy as we prepare to move into the next century. The world population will grow by 50 percent by 2025. We must provide American agriculture with the tools to unleash our Nation's productive capacity to meet a growing world demand. An extension of current farm policy without addressing changes that have occurred and continue to occur, is unacceptable to a majority of farmers in this country.

If we are going to have an extension, it has to be at least for a couple of years. You have to give farmers flexibility, and you have to remove production controls.

Option No. 3—which is the correct choice—is to adopt the farm bill proposals contained in the Balanced Budget Act.

One year ago, I spoke to the American Farm Bureau Federation's annual meeting in St. Louis. While there, I outlined some of my goals for the 1995 farm bill. These goals included providing farmers with full planting flexibility, elimination of set-asides, program simplicity, and a farm policy that transitions farmers into the next century without disrupting the farm economy or land values. All of these goals are reached in the language contained in the Balanced Budget Act.

Unfortunately, that act was vetoed and we must now address how to best proceed. I am hopeful that provisions contained in the Balanced Budget Act can be retained and can be passed before the end of February.

Mr. President, American agriculture does not operate in a vacuum. Rural Americans share the Republican conviction that Congress must balance the budget. Rural Americans realize that there are important policies outside the farm bill that greatly affect their bottom lines. Republicans are actively working to provide the needed relief that rural Americans are asking for. And we will not stop.

Mr. President, there are those who claim there has been no public input into the agricultural provisions included in the Balanced Budget Act.

I disagree. Last year, the Senate and House Agriculture Committees held 33 hearings on the 1995 farm bill with over 350 witnesses. In my view, the public input has been significant.

I also hear some colleagues talk about the need for a vote on the Senate democratic proposal which would reduce the agriculture savings and provide and increase in marketing loans.

I would simply point out that Senator HARKIN offered this amendment during Senate consideration of the reconciliation bill. The vote failed 31 to 68 with 15 Democrats voting with Republicans to defeat the amendment.

The fact is that we have debated farm policy. And adopting the agriculture provisions contained in the Balanced Budget Act is right for our farmers and the right path for America.

Mr. President, I point out to my colleagues that the suggestion has been made that maybe there is an alternative plan. We had a vote on that plan, offered by Senator HARKIN. We voted 68 to 31 in opposition to that proposal.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I did not have the opportunity to hear everything that the majority leader said. I understand he spoke about agriculture.

Let me just say that I do not know what the solution is, but I think the majority leader and I both agree that we have to do something. We have a lot of farmers who have already planted everything that they are going to plant for their winter wheat, for their crops. That will be ready for harvest by spring or late spring. We have to do something. If we cannot do it in 1 year, maybe a 2-year extension is something that we ought to look at. But I do not think that doing nothing ought to be an option that either party agrees to.

While there is very little support on the other side of the aisle for the so-called marketing loan concept, that marketing loan would allow farmers to be given at least the confidence that they are going to have a plan out there that is market-sensitive; that costs less for the Government; that provides us with the kind of opportunity in the farm program that many farmers feel they need. Virtually every national farm organization has said they support it.

So I hope we can work something out. I know that in working with majority leader in good faith, we can find a way to resolve what may now appear to be some very difficult challenges in agreeing on a farm policy. But we have to do it. I hope we can do it as early as next week. We cannot wait much longer.

Again, while I did not hear what the majority leader said, I am sure he shares the need to be as expeditious as possible in finding some resolution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate to my colleague that is sort of what I pointed out. There are, as I see it, three options. We talked about it to some extent today at the White House. But I appreciate that.

Of course, we need to do something because, as the minority leader indicated, our winter wheat farmers have already planted their wheat. They do not know what the program is going to be. They are taking a chance, as they do from time to time.

## HOPEFUL SIGNS BETWEEN SYRIA AND ISRAEL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to offer my strong support for the administration's recent, extraordinary efforts to broker a peace treaty between Israel and Syria.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of bringing Israel and Syria into a peaceful, normal relationship. Their conflict is virtually the last remaining obstacle to a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. If Syria and Israel are able to overcome their differences, sign an agreement, and establish diplomatic relations, it is nearly certain that other Arab states—Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia, and Gulf countries—would soon follow suit. From that point forward, the region's prospects for political, economic, and social advancement would become almost limitless.

It is a sad irony that the peace talks being held in Wye, Maryland arose out