

budget, which was put together by Republicans and Democrats in this U.S. Senate.

I had the privilege of voting for two budgets, the Democrat budget and the bipartisan budget. I did not vote for the Republican budget. Although many people's eyes glaze over when you talk about the budget, it is really a very simple document when you think about it. It is a statement of our priorities, and a statement, really, of what we think we ought to be doing as a nation, just as we and our families will determine every year what our priorities are, where we will spend our dollars. We do that here.

One would think that the cold war had not ended if you look at this budget. That is what is so terribly confusing to me, because we know we have to be lean in this budget. We know we are not doing as much for education as we would like. We are not doing as much to clean up the environment as we would like, at least most of us. We are certainly not doing enough health research as we would like.

Every dollar that we can find to make these investments is a dollar, I think, that is well spent when we make them. Yet, we have this Republican Senate and House throwing \$12 billion more at the Pentagon than they asked for in budget authority. That, to me, is nonsensical.

We need the strongest military in the world, and we have it, and we will always have it. We do not need to throw dollars that the generals and the admirals do not want. What is the point of it? It is wasting money, money that we need elsewhere, money that could even reduce the deficit further.

To me, it is not a close call as far as how I will vote. The Republican budget left the Senate, and I think the priorities were out of whack. Too many cuts in Medicare, too many cuts in Medicaid, too many cuts in education, too many cuts in the environment, and too much spending on the Pentagon—more than they asked for. It is something I hope that the American people will look at, because it is not pie-in-the-sky and it is not rhetoric. It is not politics. It is budgeting. It is hard dollars that will go to pay for what the American people need to have.

Mr. President, we do have an election coming up in November. Frankly, I think a lot of these issues will be issues in that election. I can think of no greater honor than to serve on the Budget Committee. When I was in the House, I spent 6 years there, and here in the U.S. Senate I am finishing the fourth. To me, it is one of the most important things that I do, because the hopes and dreams of American people, their aspirations, are really contained in that budget.

All you have to do is look at education, and see how the Republicans are slashing it, to understand that will translate into fewer scholarships for our young people to go to college, fewer slots that can be filled in Head

Start so our kids can get off to a good start on a level playing field, fewer ways to clean up Superfund sites. Frankly, in California, we have many that are languishing and are dangerous, with toxins seeping into water supplies, because we do not have enough resources there.

This is the greatest Nation in the world. We can do better.

The Democratic budget, the Clinton budget, the bipartisan budget, I think all of those are quite mainstream in their approach, compared to this budget that is before the Senate today. We do not have to hurt our seniors the way they will be hurt with this. We do not have to hurt our children the way they will be hurt with this.

Now we have a whole new idea. We will go back to star wars. We will build a full star wars. I think we ought to prepare, in case we have to. We should do all the research. I have always taken that position. But to get ready to deploy a star wars system—we will be facing that in the defense bill—it will cost us billions of dollars, billions of dollars, when we do not even know exactly what we need to do, and we are being told the threat is not defined yet. It just does not make sense.

I submit, Mr. President, if you went to a supermarket or shopping center in Tennessee, or I went to one in California, or my friend went to one in Nebraska, and you said to the person who was coming in to do his shopping: Out of these few things, which do you feel most threatened by, crime in the street and that you might get mugged or attacked, or somebody in your family getting breast cancer or prostate cancer, or a ballistic missile coming over and hitting you in your house? I honestly think that people would say we should have the strongest military in the world, but the threats that are facing me are absolutely that someone in my family would get such a dreadful disease or that, yes, someone could be a victim of a crime. Yet, you look at this budget and it has the opposite kind of priorities.

So I thank my friend from Nebraska for his leadership, his very down-to-earth Nebraska leadership. I will sorely miss it next year. I think he stands for mainstream America in his opposition to this budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget. It got worse when it went into conference. It has more of the NEWT GINGRICH approach to budgeting, and I frankly think we ought to vote "no."

I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to briefly thank my dear friend and colleague from California. I said earlier that she is a valuable member of the Budget Committee, and her earlier training over on the House side has served her and us well. She is very consistent and tender, one who becomes involved in the details of the budget process. It has been a great pleasure for me to see this relatively new Senator

come in and take her place as a very influential member of the Budget Committee. I thank her for her kind remarks.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now move off of the budget temporarily and return to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

A NEW CHANCE FOR PEACE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I welcome the news that negotiations on Northern Ireland are back on course. Fractious though they might be, the talks involving the British and Irish Governments, as well as representatives of Northern Ireland's political parties, offer hope to all of us who long for a permanent peace in Northern Ireland.

The talks, which opened Monday, had hit a significant impasse over the role of our former colleague George Mitchell, who was chosen by the British and Irish Governments to chair the negotiating sessions. Due to the courage shown by all those involved, but particularly Prime Minister Major and Unionist leader David Trimble, the impasse has been resolved and a possible deadlock has been averted. The talks will proceed with Senator Mitchell at the helm.

I regret that there are still some Unionists, however, who object to Senator Mitchell's chairmanship, for the sole purpose, I suspect, of obstructing the peace process. Having served with George Mitchell for many years in the Senate, I can personally attest to his even-handed and judicious approach to the issues. Here in the Senate, he was admired by members of both parties for his ability to build bridges and cut across partisan lines. George Mitchell is quite frankly, one of the most fair-minded individuals with whom I have had the pleasure of working.

Senator Mitchell has already demonstrated great wisdom and balance with regard to the peace process in Northern Ireland. In January, Senator Mitchell issued an excellent report examining the link between the decommissioning of weapons and all-party talks. As head of the international body charged with studying this issue, Senator Mitchell drew upon his background as a judge. He did an excellent

job of reaching out to the various parties to hear their views on this difficult matter, and of characterizing the opposing views on that issue. For this reason, the report was hailed across the board. It provides a solid set of principles for the negotiations. I am confident that Senator Mitchell will continue to demonstrate even-handedness and great insight as he takes up the gavel at Stormont Castle, the site of the talks.

The talks on Northern Ireland will proceed without the participation of Sinn Fein, the political wing of the Irish Republican Army. Sinn Fein is barred from the negotiating sessions because the IRA has failed to commit to a cease-fire. That is as it should be. The ground rules for the talks make clear that all parties must offer their total commitment to the principles of democracy and nonviolence.

But there is a place reserved at the table for Sinn Fein. The IRA need only recommit itself to nonviolence to take its seat at that table. Genuine all-party talks cannot take place without Sinn Fein or without the Unionist parties which have thus far eschewed the process.

A great deal of progress has been made toward achieving a lasting peace. Let us hope that the momentum can be continued.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, too many Americans have not the foggiest notion about the enormity of the Federal debt. Every so often, I ask various groups, how many millions of dollars are there in a trillion? They think about it, voice some estimates, most of them not even close.

They are stunned when they learn the facts, such as the case today. To be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, June 11, 1996, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$5,136,928,256,903.23.

Another astonishing statistic is that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,380.69.

As for how many millions of dollars there are in a trillion, there are a million in a trillion, which means that the Federal Government owes more than five million million dollars.

REFERRAL OF S. 1718

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask that bill S. 1718, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, pursuant to section 3(b) of Senate Resolution 400. This committee, which has jurisdiction over legislation pertaining to Senate committee structure, desires an opportunity to consider a provision affecting the structure of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the

text of a letter advising the Select Committee on Intelligence of this action.

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

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON
RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 12, 1996.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intel-
ligence, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR ARLEN: This is to advise that I have requested sequential referral of S. 1718, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, which was marked up by the Select Committee on Intelligence on April 30, 1996. It is my understanding that this bill contains a provision affecting the structure of the Select Committee on Intelligence, which, as you know, is an issue of significant interest to, and clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

To this end and pursuant to S. Res. 400, I have requested that S. 1718 be referred to the Committee upon its discharge from the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, to which the bill was referred on June 6, 1996.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

JOHN WARNER,
Chairman.

AMERICA'S FAMILY FARMS: A WAY OF LIFE WORTH PRESERVING

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I recently visited the farm of Doug Henderson in Beresford, SD, and discussed with Doug and his neighbors issues facing southeastern South Dakota farmers. There was much give and take on the new farm bill, the state of cattle prices and, of course, the weather. The discussion put in bold relief the frustrations and challenges South Dakota farmers and ranchers face every day, and raised legitimate questions about current agricultural policy.

I also had the opportunity to meet privately with the Henderson family in their home prior to the broader public discussion. It was an experience I will remember forever.

Keeping the family farm together for the past 4 decades has not been easy for the Hendersons. Their secret to survival has been an enduring appreciation of the land and hard work on the part of each and every member of the family, including the children.

The rewards for the Hendersons' dedication to farming have been numerous. They speak eloquently about raising their children in a tight-knit community steeped in strong values. They clearly love their chosen profession, which allows them to see the tangible results of a good day's work.

Despite their love of farming, the Hendersons' story also has a sad side—the continuous struggle to make a decent financial return on their investment of time, money and plain old hard work.

The Hendersons' story is described in a letter presented to me at our meeting. I would like to share that letter with my colleagues. It lays out in

clear, honest terms the difficult dilemma facing hard-working, dedicated farm families all across rural America: how to survive financially on a modest-sized family farm in today's agricultural environment. The Hendersons' letter presents a picture that merits more attention and reflection in Washington policymaking circles.

The bottom line, Mr. President, is that today financial survival on family farms is much tougher than it should be in a nation that enjoys the most abundant and least expensive source of food on the globe. If we are to preserve this durable source of farm commodities, our rural communities and their rock solid values, then farmers must enjoy a reasonable return on their investment. This problem must be addressed if family farms are to survive in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Doug Henderson's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

FALL, 1995.

MY STORY: 40+ YEARS OF FAMILY FARMING

My name is Doug Henderson. My wife, Joan, and 4 sons, ages 10 to 17, live on a crop/dairy farm west of Beresford, South Dakota. Our operation includes 100 mature holstein cows. 100 replacements, 50-100 extra cattle. 100 acres owned and 400 rented.

My grandfather bought this farm in the early 40's. My father came back to rent and then later buy the farm after serving nearly 5 years in the Pacific during WWII. I was the oldest of four sons and one daughter. Each of us played an important part in the daily operation of this family unit during the 50's and 60's—and we knew that because we could feel it. It felt good. I think that's why I was drawn to this place.

My wife and I earned teaching degrees in '77 after having served in the U.S. Army from '72 to '75. After teaching for two years and farming "on the side" I had the opportunity to "take over the place" and farm fulltime. We did some work on the house and moved our family in here in the spring of 1981. Financially, we have had some good years and some not so good years. Personally, we have had only good years. However, 1995 finds us at a crossroads.

Personally, I truly cannot think of a place I would have rather been or anything I'd have rather been doing for the last 14 years. My oldest son, a high school senior, is qualified to do almost anything I do out here. My sons 12 and 15 are almost as competent. All four have a good sense of self and a high regard for the traditional values that my wife and I do our best to model for them. Our involvement in community and church has provided growth and enrichment. Our lives have truly been joyfilled during these early years. This setting has made child rearing easy.

Financially, the future of this production unit is dim. Our facilities now nearly 30 years old, do not produce the volume of milk required per man hour to allow us to be as competitive as we need to be. Our balance sheet has not improved significantly during the last 4-5 years. While we claim not to have made purchasing or marketing mistakes and have always been moderate in our strategies, we acknowledge the reduced will to pour out boundless energies to try to make everything click. I know that the farm