

The subcommittees will invite witnesses representing a cross-section of views and organizations to testify at the hearing. Witnesses invited to testify are requested to submit one copy of their testimony by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, August 15, 1995, to the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, House Committee on Resources, 812 Tip O'Neill House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515, facsimile (202) 226-2301. In addition, witnesses are requested to bring 75 copies of their testimony with them to the hearing.

Statements will also be accepted for inclusion in the hearing record. Those wishing to submit written testimony should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, House Committee on Resources, 812 Tip O'Neill House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515.

For further information, please call Jim O'Toole of the Senate subcommittee staff at (202) 224-5161.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, August 8, 1995, at 10 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, August 8, 1995, at 2 p.m. to hold a closed hearing on intelligence matters.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through August 5, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 218), show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by \$20.9 billion in budget author-

ity and \$2.0 billion in outlays. Current level is \$0.5 billion over the revenue floor in 1995 and below by \$9.5 billion over the 5 years 1995-1999. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is \$237.4 billion, \$3.7 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1995 of \$241.0 billion.

Since my last report, dated July 24, 1995, the President signed the 1995 Rescissions and Emergency Supplementals for Disaster Assistance Act—Public Law 104-19. This legislation changed current level of budget authority and outlays; the change was reflected in my report dated July 24, 1995.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, August 7, 1995.

Hon. PETE DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report for fiscal year 1995 shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1995 budget and is current through August 5, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1995 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 218). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements of Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated July 24, 1995, the President signed the 1995 Rescissions and Emergency Supplementals for Disaster Assistance Act (P.L. 104-19). This action did not change the current level of budget authority, outlays or revenues.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1995, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS AUGUST 5, 1995

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) ¹	Current level ²	Current level over/under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget Authority	1,238.7	1,217.8	-20.9
Outlays	1,217.6	1,215.6	-2.0
Revenues:			
1995	977.7	978.2	0.5
1995-99	5,415.2	5,405.7	-9.5
Deficit	241.0	237.4	-3.7
Debt Subject to Limit	4,965.1	4,885.4	-79.7
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security Outlays:			
1995	287.6	287.5	-0.1
1995-99	1,562.6	1,562.6	(0)
Social Security Revenues:			
1995	360.5	360.3	-0.2
1995-99	1,998.4	1,998.2	-0.2

¹Reflects revised allocation under section 9(g) of H. Con. Res. 64 for the Deficit-Neutral reserve fund.

²Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

³Less than \$50 million.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS AUGUST 5, 1995

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			978,466
Permanents and other spending legislation	750,307	706,236	
Appropriation legislation	738,096	757,783	
Offsetting receipts	-250,027	-250,027	
Total previously enacted	1,238,376	1,213,992	978,466
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
1995 Rescissions and Department of Defense Emergency Supplementals Act (P.L. 104-6)	-3,386	-1,008	
Self-Employed Health Insurance Act (P.L. 104-7)			-248
1995 Rescissions and Emergency Supplementals for Disaster Assistance Act (P.L. 104-19)	-15,286	-590	
Total enacted this session	-18,672	-1,598	-248
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	-1,896	3,180	
Total current level ¹	1,217,807	1,215,574	978,218
Total budget resolution	1,238,744	1,217,605	977,700
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	20,937	2,031	
Over budget resolution			518

¹In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$7,663 million in budget authority and \$7,958 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$741 million in budget authority and \$852 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount requested as an emergency requirement.

REMARKS OF BISHOP WILLIAM SKYLSTAD ON THE FARM BILL

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to submit for the RECORD the remarks of William Skylstad, the Roman Catholic bishop of Spokane, WA, on the subject of the 1995 farm bill. His remarks reflect the policies of the U.S. Catholic Conference, which represents the Nation's Roman Catholic bishops.

Bishop Skylstad's thoughtful remarks reflect the American bishops' desires to save the family farm, promote wise stewardship of the land, alleviate hunger here and abroad, and sustain rural economies—goal that I hope we all share. I urge each Senator to review carefully Bishop Skylstad's observations and recommendations.

The remarks follow:

TESTIMONY BY MOST REVEREND WILLIAM SKYLSTAD

I am William Skylstad, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Spokane, Washington. I serve a diocese which is mostly rural, and which has farms of all sizes and shapes. Formerly, I was Bishop of the Diocese of Yakima, Washington. The farming community there relied heavily on migrant labor for its fruit and vegetable harvests. The smaller cities in which I have served have experienced many of the same problems of hunger and poverty that many of our nation's large cities face. So I come today as a pastor with some knowledge of the rural and urban dimensions that this omnibus food and agriculture bill addresses.

My testimony also reflects the policies of the U.S. Catholic Conference, the policy agency of the U.S. Bishops. I also serve as Chairman of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference Board of Directors. The NCRLC is a national organization founded in 1923, that serves the rural church, and rural people in their communities.

Through our many national and international organizations including Catholic Charities, the Campaign for Human Development and Catholic Relief Services, we experience first hand the plight of the poor and as the farm bill covers domestic and international food programs as well as food marketing and distribution, we are in a position to bring our experience to bear on this important debate.

I submit these comments therefore, on behalf of the USCC, with the hope that Congress will produce farm policy that will be fair, equitable and resourceful. In a time of budget cutting, we urge the Agriculture Committee to pursue the common good and target scarce dollars to those most in need.

Our perspective begins with our belief in the dignity of all people as they are created in God's image. For people to live a dignified life, they must have an adequate and safe food supply. Food, for us, is not just another commodity in the grand economic scheme. We all can live without our car or our computer but cannot live without food. It is essential for life itself. How food is produced is also important since we need not only a bountiful harvest, but a safe one as well. Care for the land is as important to us as what it produces. The common good first requires a safe and affordable food supply.

These underlying principles, then, are what drives our policy analysis. The basic goal of the food system is to ensure an adequate supply of nutritious food to meet domestic and international need in an environmentally responsible way and to ensure the social health of our rural communities. To meet this goal, we believe four areas of the Farm Bill need particular attention: 1) Agriculture, 2) Hunger, 3) Rural Development and 4) Environment.

AGRICULTURE

Our bishops' Conference believes that a just farm system is one that supports the widespread ownership of farm land and the viability of the family farm. We urge you to be guided by a principle drawn from the Bishops' pastoral letter: Economic Justice for All; 1986. That:

"... moderate-sized farms operated by families on a full-time basis should be preserved and their economic viability protected. Similarly, small farms and part-time farming, particularly in areas close to cities, should be encouraged. There is genuine social and economic value in maintaining a wide distribution in the ownership of productive property. The democratization of decision making and control of the land resulting from wide distribution of farm ownership are protection against concentration of power and a consequent possible loss of responsiveness to public need in this crucial sector of the economy. Moreover, when those who work in an enterprise also share in its ownership, their active commitment to the purpose of the endeavor and their participation in it are enhanced. Ownership provides incentives for diligence and is a source of an increased sense that the work being done is one's own. This is particularly significant in a sector as vital to human well-being as agriculture."

Widespread ownership of farm land is not currently being promoted by U.S. agriculture policy. In our judgement, current policies have resulted in a concentration of farmland ownership which is detrimental to

the interests of farming and to the vitality of rural communities. Current public policy fosters an increasingly industrialized system of agriculture that requires large amounts of capital and rewards large farms far more than smaller and medium-sized farms. This is a matter of policy choice, not economic inevitability.

This concentration is a result of farm policy that rewards high production. As incentives to produce grow, the desire to use ever-increasing amounts of chemicals and petroleum for inputs, harvesting, and transportation likewise increases. Dependency on such a system could have serious results if, for example, our supply of petroleum was ever curtailed for any period of time. Another threat of the excess concentration of farmland could be manipulation of markets which can be very dangerous, especially where food is concerned.

I also believe that the low prices paid for farm commodities are in fact subsidies to the large grain traders and large hog and cattle feedlot operations. Deficiency payments and loan rates based on output create a drive to produce more and more. This favors larger farms which can afford high inputs: inputs which depend on the generous use of chemicals. This policy also creates a drive to buy up land thus accelerating concentration. In addition, the large grain traders received over \$2 billion in direct export subsidies in 1993-94 through the Export Enhancement Program. In short, our nation's "cheap food policy" is a cheap grain policy which benefits these large agribusiness corporations at the expense of family farmers and rural communities.

We recognize the definition of "family farm" has taken on many meanings. Besides a definition based on gross sales, one helpful definition may be that the goal of the family farmer is to create resources to support a way of life. Typically, a family farmer/owner devotes a good portion of his or her time to the day-to-day management and operation of the farm. The goal of a corporate farm, by way of contrast, would be to make a profit to support its investors. Day-to-day management and operation of the farm is not necessarily by the owners.

How can we change policy to address the issue of support for family farms and begin to move away from increasing concentration of farm land? Congress needs to take a serious look at targeting farm program dollars to small and moderate-sized farmers and away from the large food corporations. A clear first step would be to close the payment limitation loopholes so that the largest farms can no longer subdivide into multiple legal entities to avoid payment limitations.

Another way to ensure broad-based ownership of land and to support family farmers would be to raise the "non-recourse" loan rate. This is also a matter of economic justice. Farmers cannot stay solvent when they are currently producing at, slightly above or, in many cases, below the cost of production. We must express alarm when we read that on the whole, farm sector profitability averaged only 2% over the past five years while the food industry profits averaged 18% over that same period. Setting the loan rate higher would decrease deficiency payments (which totaled \$11 billion in 1994) and would result in more family farmers surviving to spend more of their money in rural communities.

Even if federal farm policy were changed to give farmers a fair price for their product, and to remove the disincentives to sustainable agriculture, it would do no good if farmers were not able to get loans to plant their crops. In March, bankers urged the Senate Agriculture Committee to privatize the servicing of USDA loans and replace direct lending with a guaranteed loan program. In the

face of increasing debt load and decreasing cash flow among most farmers, bankers are using guaranteed loans to promote contract livestock operations and high equity loans that inhibit the participation of family farmers. In addition, the Consolidated Farm Services Agency currently has no credit sales allocations, which means that land in inventory is not being sold to priority purchasers. These developments are detrimental to family farmers and rural communities. Farming requires credit for the purchase of inputs and equipment. We urge Congress to make credit accessible to family farmers through USDA credit programs that have been proven effective over time.

Another important concern of family farmers is the increasing use of contract farming and the vertical integration of some commodities. This phenomenon has been seen most prevalently in the poultry industry—and increasingly in the hog industry. Rarely can independent poultry producers participate in this industry. Contracts between farmers and integrators offer substantial protections for integrators and very little for the heavily-invested contract grower. These contracts are often extremely unfavorable for the farmers, who have little legal recourse to force the integrators to bargain contracts in good faith. We urge you to support efforts that would result in good faith bargaining for contract farming.

Also of concern to the bishops is the decreasing opportunities for younger people to enter into farming. Efforts such as the "Farm Link" program, sponsored by the religious and public interest community, deserve more attention and support by the federal government. Additionally, current federal programs for beginning farmers, especially those developed in 1990 and 1992, ought to be continued and enhanced. The strategy of developing partnerships between government, lenders and beginning farmers is one we call on Congress to seriously consider as vital to the interest of maintaining a family farm system.

Part of the patchwork of family farms are minority farmers. Black farmers have lost land at an accelerating rate in recent years. Since 1954, the number of African-American owned farms has declined by over 95 percent and today their average income is only 65 percent of white farm operators. While many of these farms are small, they have been viable, they provide a sense of identity for the farmer and contribute to the economic security in the community. Special public policy measures are needed in the Farm Bill to stem the loss of these farms, as well as those among Hispanics and Native Americans. We recommend new policy initiatives to assist these farmers: increase outreach and enrollment of minorities in decision making bodies such as county committees; provide increased access to credit through adequate funding and enforcement under the Agriculture Credit Act of 1987 and the 1990 Farm Bill which provide for targeting of FmHA Farm Ownership and Operating Loans and sales of land in inventory to African American and other minority farmers; and adequately fund outreach programs such as was approved in Section 2501(a) of the 1990 Farm Bill.

Farm workers must receive more attention and protection in farm policy. They continue to be among the poorest people in our land yet they harvest so much of our table food. Opening eligibility and including the work experience of farmworkers for beginning and minority farmer programs would allow some farmworkers to become self-sufficient. The enforcement of existing labor laws and linking compliance with those laws to a farmers participation in program benefits would help

ensure that farmworkers are protected. Additionally, providing information to both farmers and farmworkers on alternative pesticides and herbicides or on new health concerns for existing chemicals is a matter of fairness and decency.

HUNGER

The system of food production is unlike any other system: it produces what is essential for life. In a world where there are hundreds of millions of starving and malnourished people, our faith and our social teaching calls us to speak on their behalf and recognize food is essential to a decent and dignified human life.

DOMESTIC HUNGER

In the area of domestic hunger, USCC's primary concerns are in the continuation of the goals of existing food, nutrition and anti-hunger programs to meet the nutrition needs of many pregnant women, poor children, families and the elderly. Food, nutrition and anti-hunger programs play a vital role in ending poverty, especially among our children. Due to declining overall incomes and the breakdown of the family, the overall child poverty rate increased by 49 percent from 1973-1992. The largest growth, 76 percent, occurred in the suburbs—the areas once considered most immune from the poverty crisis. Recent reports indicate clearly that our federal food and nutrition programs do make a difference especially for poor children.

As the bishops said in "Putting Children and Families First":

"The continuing reality of hungry children in our midst is a dismaying sign of failure. We see signs of this failure in our food pantries, soup kitchens, parishes, and schools. New investment and improvements are needed in basic nutritional programs, such as food stamps, to ensure that no child goes hungry in America. An urgent priority is the Women, Infant & Children (WIC) program, that still does not reach all expectant mothers, infants, and young children in need." (1991)

The USCC strongly recommends the continuation of Food Stamps, Women, Infants and Children Supplemental Program (WIC), The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), the school lunch program and other child nutrition and elderly food programs that assist those in need. The proposed cuts appear to us to go too far and the nutritional safety net could be in jeopardy. Additionally, we believe it would be a mistake to pit farm programs against food and nutrition programs in a time of limited budget resources. Both programs are necessary and need support.

While not categorically opposed in principle to block grants, the USCC believes that block granting essential entitlement programs such as Food Stamps could be detrimental to uniform nutritional standards and create unnecessary hardship on children, families and individuals in times of economic difficulties. These programs are often the beginning point for people who wish to work themselves out of poverty. The USCC envisions policies that will move people from perpetual hunger and poverty to a more sustained system of nutritional value and self dependency.

Linkages between urban hunger and the development of urban edge agriculture should be fostered. Such linkages should be seen as a form of community development and empowerment which complements and extends the traditional approaches to addressing food and hunger issues. I encourage Congress to direct the USDA to adopt community food security as a mission of the agency and establish a community food security program. Support direct farmer-to-

consumer marketing efforts by expanding the Farmer's Market Nutrition Program and the Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program. We encourage further expansions of government purchases of local agricultural products. These and other provisions are part of the Community Food Security Empowerment Act of 1995 which I urge you to support.

INTERNATIONAL HUNGER

While hunger in our own country remains a serious problem, we cannot turn our backs on the 800 million people all over the world (and over half of them children), who do not have enough to eat. Such hunger is shameful in a world where most believe we can produce enough food for everyone.

We believe that special efforts must be made to see food as more than just another commodity to be traded on the international market and that it not be used as a bargaining chip as the United States pursues its interest in various parts of the globe. In addition, we believe that food trade should be conducted with global food security and equity as its primary goals, not with raw competition as its driving engine. Finally, patterns of overproduction and overconsumption on the part of first world countries has a devastating impact on the development and sustainability of our third world neighbors. The question is: will US food aid help poor people in food deficient nations move toward food security, or will it foster an unhealthy dependence?

The Food for Peace Program (PL-480) needs to be re-authorized and expanded. But it also needs to have a clear and primary goal alleviating hunger and only secondarily the pursuit of commercial or strategic interests.

In the 1995 Farm Bill, the United States should reinforce its commitment to help hungry people through international food aid programs. Over the past two years, the total level of international food assistance provided by the United States has decreased by nearly 50 percent. Programs to assist those who suffer from chronic hunger, as well as U.S. commitments to provide assistance for disaster relief, have been scaled back.

Food assistance is truly "Food for Peace." When there is significant hunger and poverty, a country cannot experience internal stability and economic growth. It will not develop into a U.S. trading partner until some of its food security problems are remedied. Food aid is not the only response, but it has saved millions of lives and helped to improve the quality of life for millions more. And it has provided markets for U.S. agricultural goods and built the foundation for future trade relations.

The limited funds available for food aid should be targeted to those whose need is greatest and where the food can be used most effectively to alleviate hunger now and contribute to long-term food security. More specifically, we recommend:

1. With the downsizing of government agencies, relying more heavily on the experience, recommendations and capabilities of private partners—PVOs and cooperatives—for developing and implementing title II programs.

2. Strengthening the Title II program requirements so that the minimal amount of food tonnage required for people-to-people development programs (conducted by private voluntary organizations (PVOs), cooperatives and the World Food Program) is maintained. These programs assist countries with chronic hunger. Raiding these programs to take care of emergency needs only creates additional emergency needs. A new mechanism to take care of emergency situations should be established.

3. Establishing mechanisms which assure that the U.S. can continue to play a leadership role in responding to emergency needs by providing food in a timely manner. Allow the Secretary of Agriculture to use the Commodity Credit Corporation funds to make up to 1 metric ton of commodities available each year for emergency needs abroad.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

In the area of rural development, policies should be enacted to strengthen economic development, expansion of employment opportunities, and education in rural communities. The lack of farming opportunities, few quality jobs, and poor infrastructure is forcing many of our young people out of rural communities and into the cities. This creates a drain of talent vitally needed by our rural towns.

Some modest rural empowerment and enterprise zones have been enacted to address funding for housing and community facilities, business development, water and waste systems. However, some rural residents fear that business development projects through enterprise "zones" are not long term and many rural communities are left untouched by enterprise or empowerment zones. Policy needs to be developed to ensure that stability to rural communities can be assured through permanent business development.

Much needed infrastructure improvements could generate economic development opportunities that would enhance the overall quality of many American rural communities. Far too many rural communities still lack adequate housing, water access, safe roads, and public transportation which restrict rural residents from enjoying amenities that other communities have.

But more than infrastructure improvements are necessary. While many farmers are economically better off than the national average, 20 percent remain in poverty. Part of the problem is that money is flowing out of the rural community. Dependence on one or two key employers will be lessened if assistance in market diversification and in creating value-added ventures in the local town were to become a reality.

We believe the government has a continuing role in providing for the credit needs of farmers and especially beginning and minority farmers. Direct lending (i.e., being the "lender of last resort"), and servicing loans should be part of government services to protect and promote the viability of family farms. The advantages of existing loan programs ought to be promoted including direct CFSAs loans. Additionally, we urge support for both credit sales—so more beginning and minority farmers can enter farming—and education and outreach programs to minority farmers.

ENVIRONMENT

Our traditional concern for the environment flows from our teachings about creation and stewardship. In 1991, our bishops' Conference noted that:

"Sustainable economic policies, that is, practices that reduce current stresses on natural systems and are consistent with sound environmental policy in the long term, must be put into effect. At the same time, the world economy must come to include hundreds of millions of poor families who live at the edge of survival." (Renewing the Earth, 1991)

In this area we focus primarily on sustainable agriculture but also on the support for existing environmental and conservation programs of the federal government.

We define sustainable agriculture generally as substituting renewable resources generated on the farm for nonrenewable, purchased resources. Sustainable agriculture relies on modern, evolving and highly adaptable management technology. According to

an extensive study by the Northwest Area Foundation (an organization promoting economic revitalization for eight states—including my own state of Washington) entitled, *A Better Row to Hoe*, sustainable farmers are more diversified, plant less program commodities, use less fertilizer, pesticides, and energy, rotate crops, recycle plant nutrients and manure, plant more soil-building crops, use more cover crops, strip crops, contour grass waterways and field windbreaks than do conventional farmers. All of these techniques are consistent with our principles of careful stewardship of finite natural resources. Additionally, the new techniques of sustainable agriculture will increase small town business opportunities as the local community responds to the different production and market needs of these farmers. We see this as a positive development which corresponds to our call to value and support rural and small town life.

While the Northwest Area Foundation study concludes that there is general support for the concepts of sustainable agriculture, there is a great deal of reluctance on the part of many farmers to fully enter into these farming techniques because of the lack of governmental support. This is especially true in the areas of commodity program payments, research and extension services.

Environmental performance should be a hallmark of public farm policy. We urge the removal of penalties for converting to sustainable agriculture and an end to the discrimination against sustainable farmers who plant soil-conserving crops and have fewer acres in subsidized crops. Greater emphasis on sustainable agriculture in research and educational programs will strengthen the technology base and provide both beginning farmers and farmers who want to convert to sustainable agriculture with better technical support.

We support recent conservation legislation that would consolidate current conservation programs into a single entity; keep the current level of funding; extend the Conservation and Wetlands Reserve Programs (CRP and WRP) and focusing CRP on the most environmentally sensitive lands and encourage partial field enrollments; encourage conservation practices by giving priority to sustainable practices rather than wholesale land retirements; and encourage support for sustainable livestock management practices.

In addition to these proposals we would also recommend: Providing incentive payments to encourage whole farm planning; Encouraging local participation by farmers, ranchers, nonprofit organizations as well as federal, state and local natural resources staff in the new State Conservation Committees; Considering a grant program where a portion of federal conservation funds can draw down local funds for special conservation projects.

Finally, it is critical that Conservation Compliance, Sodbuster, and Swampbuster provisions be maintained. Though they have not been perfect programs, they have significantly slowed the wetland destruction, soil erosion and have improved water quality. These provisions are conditions of enrollment in a voluntary entitlement program and should not be viewed as regulatory "takings" of private property rights, as suggested in the House-passed "Private Property Protection Act of 1995."

CONCLUSION

I encourage you to continue to promote a broad-based ownership of the land and the means of agricultural production, to foster the family farm, support minority farmers and farmworkers and uphold the place of the land as a gift from God and for all generations.●

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF AMBASSADOR JEAN KENNEDY SMITH

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, at a time when deep budget cuts have forced us to focus more on the private sector's role in maintaining and improving society, volunteerism has become ever more important. The contributions made by volunteers, whether in the President's National Service Corps, charity groups, or religious institutions, every day serve to brighten the lives of people who need help.

That is why I was so heartened to hear of the remarks of Jean Kennedy Smith, my dear friend and our Ambassador to Ireland, to the graduating class of Fairfield University. In her commencement address, Ambassador Smith lauded the graduates for their deep faith and brilliant spirit of volunteerism. Indeed, she knows service to others when she sees it. Jean Kennedy Smith not only comes from a family whose faith underlies a deep commitment to community and public service, but is herself actively involved in both public service and in improving the lives of those who are less fortunate. Her exemplary work with the "very special arts" organization brings the joy of the arts to people with disabilities.

In this day and age, when most of the news about youth is gloom and doom it was refreshing to know that Fairfield University has cultivated such an outstanding group of young men and women. A group of young adults, as Jean Kennedy Smith explained, whose faith and commitment to service will not only bring personal fulfillment, but also ultimately advance goals such as peace in Ireland and the world over.

Mr. President, I wish to share Jean Kennedy Smith's uplifting remarks with my colleagues and with the American people, and ask that they be printed, as published June 17, 1995, in *American Press*, in the *RECORD*.

The remarks follow:

FAITH ABOVE ALL

(By Jean Kennedy Smith)

Since this is a day of celebration, it is a time to talk of those who love us and those whom we love—your parents, grandparents, your brothers and sisters, your friends—all those who have given so much for you and whose sacrifices have brought you to this threshold of the future. Although I never had the good fortune to attend a Jesuit school, I am certainly familiar with the value of a Jesuit education. My late husband, Steve, graduated from Georgetown, and my son attended medical school there. In my family, a Jesuit education has always been synonymous with excellence.

A noted college president once said that the reason that universities are such storehouses of knowledge is that every entering student brings a little knowledge in and no graduating student takes knowledge out. I'm sure that is not true at Fairfield. A good education is respected and cherished throughout the world, particularly in the United States and in Ireland. Ireland, in fact, boasts one of the most educated societies in the world. The Irish youth are the best educated in all of Europe.

But this should come as no surprise. When Europe descended into the Dark Ages, Ireland earned its reputation as a land of scholars and saints by preserving the traditions of learning and faith. Men and women of religious orders in those years committed themselves to the world of ideas and knowledge, and passed on this heritage in both written and oral form. Western civilization has benefitted from their wisdom ever since.

St. Ignatius Loyola, who founded the Society of Jesus in 1540, also extolled the importance of education. But he realized that it must be more than the mere accumulation of knowledge. Ignatius understood that a true education is one that is inspired by spiritual values. The motto of Fairfield University, "Through Faith Toward the Fullness of Truth," reflects the spirit of St. Ignatius and the work of the Jesuits and lay men and women who teach at Fairfield.

My mother, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, shared this same high vision—that faith, above all things, brings fulfillment. She often said: "The most important element in human life is faith. If God were to take away all his blessings, health, physical fitness, wealth, intelligence, and leave me but one gift, I would ask for faith."

Our family was blessed with two wonderful parents. And while we were growing up, they always impressed upon us the responsibility to give something back to our country, which had been so good to us. As President Kennedy said on Inauguration Day in 1961, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." But too often in recent years, our country seems to have lost sight of that ideal. We ignore it at our peril.

Service to others takes many forms. It can be an act of kindness to a friend or neighbor, volunteering at a soup kitchen or local hospital, standing up for civil rights and against poverty and discrimination or working with others on the countless challenges that face society. Each of these acts is important—essential—to our well being. Each act expresses our morality, our commitment to the enduring values of peace, justice and truth. My brother Robert Kennedy told by students of Capetown in South Africa in the 1960's: "Each time a man stands up for an idea, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope. And crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a mighty current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance."

I know that the spirit of volunteerism is alive and well at Fairfield. You have staffed the Head Start program in Bridgeport, teaching basic skills to disadvantaged children. Nursing students staff a health promotion center that also assists the poor. Some of you are active in Project Children, which has made a tremendous impact on the children of Northern Ireland, by giving them opportunities to visit the United States. Other have worked in third world countries like Belize, Ecuador, Mexico and Jamaica. And I am particularly delighted that Fairfield will host 520 athletes next month for the Special Olympics International World Games. I commend you for the example you have set, and I hope you will continue to find such opportunities for service throughout your lives.

Much of my own work has been with an organization called Very Special Arts, which tries to bring experience with the arts to people with disabilities. It is amazing, what men and women and children can achieve no matter how great their difficulties. Patients who can barely communicate can learn to write beautiful poetry. A deaf child can learn to dance, a paraplegic to play music by using