

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

would not break even without the input of the family. We have estimated an annual family labor input of 6000 to 6500 hours/year. In return my family draws \$14,400/yr and housing, milk and meat. Our gross revenues in each of the past two years have approached 300,000 dollars. Milk is the primary product produced and that production in 1994 was 1.6 million pounds (160,000 cwt). That 1994 production represents almost three times the production of this same facility in 1978-80 when my father, brother and I worked as partners and each drew a salary. Together my father and I have been making payments to the FHA for over 40 years and I have 25 years and \$110,000 to go on my farm ownership loan. We would probably not have maintained this operation without the security of the FHA loan.

We have added some buildings and prepared for a less labor-intensive livestock production enterprise and do of course have the option to update and sign the dotted line for another lifetime of debt if we want to take on a partner and continue producing milk. The fact of the matter is however that after nearly 20 years of working 3500-4000 hours per year, my body is saying "enough"! My brain is saying "there must be a better way"! And my heart is saying "thou shalt not offer a son"! I never thought I'd feel this way, let alone admit it.

In a nutshell, I know agriculture. I know crops. I know livestock. I can produce. I love to work. My family works for free. I love this life. My family does too. We plan to quit (as soon as we can figure a way to pull it off financially. . . but maybe sooner). I hope I can find work that allows us to maintain the high cost of country living.

EPILOGUE—MAY 1996

As it turns out, 1995 was a year of major marketing mistakes—at least wrong choices. Instead of selling 55 surplus steers at depressed prices in the fall to pay off bills, we were duped into selling 10,000 bushels of corn. The price seemed relatively good; and after all, how much worse could the cattle market get? This single decision will ultimately represent a turn around of nearly 30,000 dollars. When combined with a poor crop year, severe weather stresses to herd health and dairy production and additional budget pressures that happen from time to time, we simply were not in a strong enough financial position to handle this much adversity.

As a result, we had to either seek a guaranteed loan or sell out secured chattel which at depressed prices would have left us very little on which to operate. Fortunately the timing was right and the loan was approved. We honestly would not be operating this year without the help of the FHA. These people (Ron Walker and his loan officers) have always been cordial, understanding and very helpful. I salute them and the general mission of the Farmer's Home Administration.

SHOCK is the best way to describe what happened to us financially. It occurs to me that I can distinctly recognize the seven stages of grief in this process. There is for a man who has known tremendous happiness and satisfaction in his personal life as well as his business, no greater stress and loss than financial failure. The MOURNING and BLAME part of this process is very, very disturbing. Our Extension Service here in South Dakota responded to the flooding in 1993 with Project Rebound. I hope the cattle ranchers and feeders will be offered at least the emotional support they need during this cattle crisis. We have a plan and with decent crops should HEAL. I have a hunch that milk prices are going to respond fairly quickly to current market pressures. The REBUILDING part of this process for me will likely include a career change. I've always managed a high-

er level of energy for new challenges. I'm hoping again to see one of my sons have a life here—a clear sign we are rebuilding.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BOB DOLE

Mr. KYL. Bob Dole's statement upon announcing he would give up his Senate seat to run for the Presidency—that he is "just a man"—packs a lot in a simple string of words, as is his habit. This phrase captures the modesty, the simplicity, and above all the straightforwardness and honesty of the Senator from Kansas. Men like Bob Dole achieve great things because they go at them directly, with no ifs, ands, or buts asking a lot of themselves and taking responsibility for the bottom line.

Senator Dole's more than 35 years of service to the Congress of the United States have been filled with great accomplishments because he never let up, he brought people of different views together to hammer out legislation, and he was an honest broker trusted by everyone. My father, Congressman John Kyl of Iowa, served with then-Congressman Dole in the House of Representatives in the 1960's and knew him to be a man of leadership and utter integrity. As Congressman Dole, and later Senator Dole, learned his job as a legislator, he never lost that sense of being "just a man" from Russell, KS. He is not one to be dazzled by the bright lights, the pomp, and the power of Washington. He came armed with the simple virtues of his Kansas constituents, and those same virtues are evident in him today. He remains the embodiment of the heartland of America—a place much maligned by sophisticates, perhaps, but a place that still has the moral strengths that we Americans define ourselves by: dedication to duty, plain but honest speech, and an awareness that limited government requires of office holders that they never take their power for granted. When Bob Dole says that he is grateful to have served his fellow citizens, those are not empty words. We believe him.

In his parting statement today, he hold us that "there are some issues that transcend politics * * * and result in legislation that makes a real and lasting difference." Whether it is a matter of supporting civil rights, doggedly backing our military troops in an unpopular conflict in Indochina during the 1960's and 1970's, or ensuring access to public places for disabled Americans in the 1990's, he has often put aside partisanship and laid it on the line for the things he believes in. His statesmanship, his ability to come to closure for the sake of the common good, is well known to those of us who have worked with him inside this institution. But perhaps few outside of the Congress are aware of it. If everyone could know him as we do, they would see a man with an extraordinary capacity to see beyond the heated conflicts of the moment, to keep the big picture in mind, and to reach a consensus that yields

practical results. If everyone knew him as well as his colleagues do, they would see that Bob Dole has everything it takes to be President of this country.

Of the Senate he now says, on the day of his departure, "It is a place that I have loved." Again, no rhetorical flourishes, just simple words of emotion, and all the more powerful for being unadorned. He reached the pinnacle of leadership among Senate Republicans, and for all too short a time has been leader of the Chamber itself. But he has walked away, and in characteristic style. Bob Dole is at the peak of his powers. But he moves on, ready to take on the biggest challenge in a life full of challenges. He has demonstrated—and in a remarkably dramatic way—that he is not one to rest on his laurels; instead, he is the kind of man who does honor to every contest he enters.

CHINESE NUCLEAR MISSILES IN PAKISTAN

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, last year the Clinton administration asked Congress for the authority to allow United States military equipment to be delivered to Pakistan. Since 1990, such deliveries were not allowed because of a 1985 law known as the Pressler amendment, which prohibited any United States Assistance to Pakistan if the President failed to certify Pakistan was not in possession of a nuclear explosive device. My colleagues may recall that we debated this issue quite extensively. It was very controversial. In the end, despite strong opposition from this Senator and many of my colleagues, the Senate approved the so-called Brown amendment, which authorized the transfer of military equipment and repealed the Pressler amendment's prohibitions on nonmilitary aid to Pakistan. The Brown amendment became law earlier this year.

To bolster the Clinton administration's request, Under Secretary of State Peter Tarnoff sent a letter to Members of Congress on August 3, 1995, when the Senate first debated the Brown amendment. Secretary Tarnoff attempted to assure Senators that the administration's support of the Brown amendment would be conditional on "no significant change on nuclear and missile non-proliferation issues of concern to the United States."

Mr. President, that was then.

On February 22, 1996, Dr. John Deutch, the Director of Central Intelligence, testified before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. Director Deutch confirmed earlier reports that Pakistan had taken delivery of sensitive nuclear technology used to develop weapons-grade uranium. He also confirmed that Pakistan had received M-11 ballistic missiles from China. My colleagues will recall that when we debated the Brown amendment, there was some dispute over whether Pakistan had in fact taken delivery of the M-11 missiles. Director