The last thing a developing mind and body needs is to be stunted with alcohol. ''Ready or Not'' will help parents and teachers and other adults make that case convincingly to America's young people. It fills a critical need, and I'm proud to lend my name to help support it.

SHOULD THERE BE FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for the past decade most of the debate on farm programs has centered around only one question:

''How much should we spend on farm programs?''

Four months ago, I took to the floor to address this issue and noted that the debate has shifted to whether there should be any programs that provide benefits to farmers.

Now, the Republican majority has reported a bill that again only answers the ''how much'' question. It will give $55 billion of the taxpayers funds to farmers over the next 7 years.

The fundamental question is not answered. Should there be farm programs at all?

Farm programs have never been welfare programs.

They have been a contract with the American people.

Here is a copy of the contract that the farmers signs each year with the American taxpayer.

No farmer is required to sign this contract. Each farmer signs voluntarily.

HISTORICAL RATIONALE FOR FARM PROGRAMS

Historically, the contract was a ''price and production stabilization'' contract—as it says here at the top of this document. The taxpayers paid farmers to set land aside in order to stabilize consumer prices as well as stabilizing farm income.

In 1985, the Republican Senate added a new term to that contract. Farmers were also paid to be stewards of the land. Again, no farmer was required to become a land steward—to be a good neighbor. Each farmer made that decision voluntarily.

Now, the Republican budget farm bill changes the terms of the farm contract. It no longer offers American farmers a ''price and production stabilization'' contract. Thus, for the $35 billion the taxpayers give farmers over the next 7 years, consumers get no price stability benefit.

Do I mourn the loss of a farmer-taxpayer contract based on a price stabilization rationale?

No, I do not. At one time regulations that required farmers to manage supplies also helped stabilize some food prices. By and large, there is no longer much, if any, consumer benefit from the supply management aspects of farm programs. Today, supply management programs function only to control the budgetary costs of the program.

This history brings us back to the basic question. Should there be any Federal farm programs?

UNIQUE NATURAL RESOURCE CHALLENGES

The answer is yes. For one overriding reason. It is this. Only farmers can give the American people what they want from private lands.

Let me put it very simply. Americans cannot get the environmental benefits they want unless farmers and ranchers are active willing land stewards.

Before we reviewed a little history—now a little—or should I say—a lot of geography. Farms and grazing lands make up 50 percent of the continental United States.

Let me say that again—Farmers and ranchers own or manage 50 percent of the continental United States.

It is impossible to successfully regulate such a vast area—even if one wanted to—which I do not. To successfully protect and enhance natural resource values on private lands, farmers must be a willing part of the solution.

The 1985 and the 1990 farm bills show that the taxpayers are willing to pay farmers to protect drinking water, cleanup lakes and rivers, and to be stewards of the soil.

As the executive director of the National Rifle Association states, ''Congress has had the foresight to create these unique mechanisms which wed agricultural goals with conservation goals.'' For example, no longer were farmers paid to destroy wetlands. Instead, farm programs began to protect wetlands.

Today, some farm groups favor destroying his harmony. They even go so far as to say that farm conservation should only be funded if there is any money left after farm subsidies and exports subsidies are paid for.

It does not make sense to the public. There is no reason a farmer should be richer than a machine shop owner, even though there is a rationale for farmers being protected from unexpected market shifts.

So this is the time for testing.

It comes down to this question—Is this Republican package the beginning of the end of farm programs, the last 7 years of ''market transition payments,'' or is it a new beginning for farm programs—which builds on the stewardship contract that the American farmer made with the American people beginning in 1985.

In 1990, as chairman, I confirmed and deepened the land stewardship contract between farmers and the American public. One of my proudest moments as chairman was when I stood in the White House while the President praised the 1990 farm bill as ''one of the most important environmental legislative accomplishments of his Presidency.''

But the Republican budget package leaves the basic question unanswered. The Republican proposal says that it will continue to make ''adherence to existing conservation compliance and wetland protection regulations'' a condition of receiving farm payments. It also launches a new program, the ''Livestock Environmental Assistance Program'' which provides the same kind of financial assistance to livestock farmers and ranchers that crop farmers have received. It is a great idea—of which I am the proud author. This press release seems to affirm and expand the stewardship contract of the 1985 and 1990 farm bills.

But, the Republican agricultural leaders have also called for dropping the wetlands protection contract term in the farmers contract with the American taxpayer.

So what is real?—the press release or their legislation?

The Republicans are not being straight with either the taxpayers or the farmers.

If the Republicans tear up the contract between the farmers and the American people—then the Freedom to Farm contract is a one way contract in which the taxpayers will pay $35 billion to farmers for the next 7 years and the taxpayers will get nothing in return.

It will be just a welfare payment—for a group of Americans whose income is seven times higher than a typical family on food stamps.

CONCLUSION

Wallace Stevens once wrote: ''After the final 'no' there comes a 'yes,' and on that 'yes' the future of the world depends * * *.''

Saying no to failed policies of the past makes all the sense in the world. Saying yes to a stewardship contract between the American taxpayer and the American farmer is the only future on which the farmer and the taxpayer can depend.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on rollcall No. 598 I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to change my vote. This will in no way change the outcome of the vote.

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

SIOUX FALLS, SD: ENTREPRENEURIAL HOT SPOT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I want to take a moment today to commend the hardworking people of South Dakota for making Sioux Falls—South Dakota's largest metropolitan area—the sixth most successful entrepreneurial spot in the country. I am proud to say the pioneer spirit still thrives in South Dakota.

Mr. President, it is not Fortune 500 companies alone that form our country's economic base. Rather, the hard work and dedication of self-employed entrepreneurs and small business owners are responsible for much of our Nation's economic activity. The business of South Dakota is small business, from the family farm to the corner drug store. I am proud to represent such an ambitious and successful constituency—people who are willing to work hard in order to get ahead.

Some South Dakota small businesses have grown to become regional and national success stories. A prime example of entrepreneurial spirit in action is Gateway 2000, a mail order personal computer (PC) corporation started 10 years ago in a farmhouse. Because of South Dakota's excellent business climate and a solid work ethic, Gateway 2000 has become the tri-state metropolitan area's second largest employer and the largest mail-order PC vendor in the United States. Gateway 2000 is a testimonial to what can be achieved with a vision and a strong work ethic.

When I travel home to South Dakota, I always marvel at the continued development my home State has undergone. Entrepreneurial South Dakotans have helped South Dakota evolve into a diverse industrial breadbasket. Now, with the designation of Sioux Falls, SD, as an international port-of-entry, the success of South Dakota will extend to new markets around the world. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent article from the Sioux Falls Argus Leader which details South Dakota's economic boom. I am sure all who read it will be impressed with South Dakota's recent surge of economic development.

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

ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT CITED IN CITY'S HIGH RATING

(By Brenda Wade Schmidt)

Sioux Falls' ranking as the sixth best hot spot for entrepreneurs shows that programs to help business people get started are working, two economic development experts said Wednesday.

The city moved up 26 spots among small metropolitan areas over last year's ranking done by Cognetics Inc. of Cambridge, Mass.

Las Vegas, Nev., was in the top spot of the 134 areas for the second year in a row.

''It could be an indication that the entrepreneurial-type programs are starting to take effect a little bit,'' said Dan Scott, president of the Sioux Falls Development Foundation. ''That spirit still exists here.''

There are so many entrepreneurs that agencies aren't able to help them all, Scott said. Many people come with business ideas but lack the planning and finances to implement their dream.

The Small Business Development Center, with offices across the state, assists many businesses.

''We see the entrepreneurial spirit as being alive and well because of the number of people that come to us for assistance,'' said Bob Ashley, state director. ''Starting a business is hard work. Hard work is not a stranger to the people of South Dakota.''

Scott said the increase probably is the result of two improvements.

''The entrepreneurs are getting more help, and financing has become more readily available,'' he said. ''What keeps most entrepreneurs out of business is the inability to attract financing.

Among rural areas, South Dakota ranked 61st out of 89 places, up five spots from last year.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today the Senate is holding a memorial service to remember Rev. Richard C. Halverson, our friend and our Chaplain from 1981 to March of this year, who passed away two weeks ago after a long illness. To each of us, whatever our individual religious beliefs, Reverend Halverson was someone special. To some of us, he was a confidant; to others, a counselor; and to still others, a pastor in the more traditional sense of the word. To each of us, he was a friend.

The Senate is, in many ways, a small community with many of the same dynamics inherent in small communities across our Nation. We work in close quarters and all know each other very well. Each of us have forged great friendships here, and each of us has seen great rivalries develop among colleagues. We are all public figures whose lives are all too often an open book. We come from widely different backgrounds, and each of us brings to the Senate a different set of values we hold dearly and ideals to which we are firmly and determinedly committed. And out of all of that, out of all the differing backgrounds and competing philosophies, out of the individual strengths and weaknesses, and out of the personal friendships and political rivalries, this community of one hundred men and women must produce public policy that ensures the well-being of more than two hundred and fifty million of our fellow Americans. That is an awesome responsibility.

As much as any of us, Reverend Halverson understood both the sense of community and the awesome responsibility of the Senate. Each morning, in his opening prayer, he would try to remind us that the sense of community, collegiality, and comity that has always been the trademark of this body is vitally important to carrying out the tasks that are demanded of us. He would remind us that the Senator on the other side of a heated debate is just as committed a public servant as we are. That no political party has a monopoly on compassion, or patriotism, or integrity. That the American Dream is neither conservative nor liberal. And that at the end of the day that sense of community, as Senators and as Americans, must prevail if we are to meet the responsibilities that have been entrusted to us.

Reverend Halverson understood that as Senators, our lives—official and often personal—are open to more scrutiny than most Americans would tolerate. He understood that not only our votes and our speeches, but our families and our lifestyles are often open to public review. As public officials we have accepted that. Nonetheless, Reverend Halverson understood that that scrutiny does take a human toll, reminding us that as we would like to be treated with understanding, so we must be understanding ourselves. And reminding us that for all of the public scrutiny of our lives and our conduct, for all of the public criticism that we sometimes receive for our votes and our political and philosophical beliefs, for all of the questioning of our motives that we must sometimes endure, the work that we do is so important to so many people that we must persevere.

Reverend Halverson always understood that election to public office does not take away the pressures that face every other American man and woman; work-related stress, family concerns, health concerns, or the self-questioning that every individual faces from time to time throughout their lives. Similarly, he understood that election to public office does not bestow skills or talents that we did not possess before; nor does it eradicate any personal weaknesses we possessed before our election. But Reverend Halverson was always there to remind us that deep within each of us is the ability to meet every challenge that our careers and our lives present.

A few years ago, I was quite ill. I left here one February night with a headache and did not return until late in the summer. During those months, as he was during all of his 14 years here, Reverend Halverson was there for me. I have never forgotten that, and my family has never forgotten that.

Throughout his 14 years as the Senate Chaplain Rev. Richard C. Halverson was a committed public servant and a friend to each of us. We shall miss him.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, almost 4 years ago I commenced these daily reports to the Senate to make a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of close of business the previous day.

In that report (February 27, 1992) the federal debt stood at $3,825,891,293,066.80, as of close of business the previous day. The point is, the federal debt has increased by $1,162,547,561,447.99 since February 26, 1992.

As of the close of business Tuesday, December 12, the Federal debt stood at exactly $4,988,438,854,514.79. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $18,936.20 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

THE PHOENIX PROPOSAL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Federal Communications Commission will soon rule on Sprint's partnership with Deutsche Telekom and France Telecom, or its more common name, the Phoenix Proposal. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to FCC Chairman Reed Hundt regarding this issue be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, December 12, 1995.

Hon. REED HUNDT,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wrote you almost one year ago concerning the proposed Global