

(d) administration plans to use existing military drawdown authority, and other assistance authorities pursuant to section 2(b)(3); and

(e) specific or anticipated commitments by third countries to provide arms, equipment or training to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON MILITARY ASPECTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENERAL FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT.

(a) Thirty days after enactment, and at least once every 60 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the status of the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including a detailed description of:

(1) criteria for determining success for the deployment;

(2) the military mission and objectives;

(3) milestones for measuring progress in achieving the mission and objectives;

(4) command arrangements for United States Armed Forces;

(5) the rules of engagement for United States Armed Forces;

(6) the multilateral composition of forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(7) the status of compliance by all parties with the General Framework Agreement and associated Annexes, including Article III of Annex I-A concerning the withdrawal of foreign forces from Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(8) all incremental costs of the Department of Defense and any costs incurred by other federal agencies, for the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including support for the NATO Implementation Force;

(9) the exit strategy to provide for complete withdrawal of United States Armed Forces in the NATO Implementation Force, including an estimated date of completion; and

(10) a description of progress toward enabling the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to provide for its own defense.

(b) Such reports shall include a description of any changes in the areas listed in (a)(1) through (a)(10) since the previous report, if applicable, and shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 5. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON NON-MILITARY ASPECTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENERAL FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT.

Thirty days after enactment, and at least once every 60 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on:

(a) the status of implementation of non-military aspects of the General Framework Agreement and Associated annexes, especially Annex 10 on Civilian Implementation, and of efforts, which are separate from the Implementation Force, by the United States and other countries to support implementation of the non-military aspects. Such report shall include a detailed description of:

(1) progress toward conducting of elections;

(2) the status of return of refugees and displaced persons;

(3) humanitarian and reconstruction efforts;

(4) police training and related civilian security efforts, including the status of implementation of Annex 11 regarding an international police task force; and

(5) implementation of Article XIII of Annex 6 concerning cooperation with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and other appropriate organizations in the investigation and prosecution of war

crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law;

(b) the status of coordination between the High Representative and the Implementation Force Commander;

(c) the status of plans and preparation for the continuation of civilian activities after the withdrawal of the Implementation Force;

(d) all costs incurred by all U.S. government agencies for reconstruction, refugee, humanitarian, and all other non-military bilateral and multilateral assistance in Bosnia and Herzegovina; and

(e) U.S. and international diplomatic efforts to contain and end conflict in the former Yugoslavia, including efforts to resolve the status of Kosovo and halt violations of internationally-recognized human rights of its majority Albanian population.

Such reports shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me thank all of my colleagues, as I have indicated before.

On tomorrow, we will take up the Interior conference report, with 6 hours of debate. We will start that at 10:30 a.m. From 9:30 to 10:30, we will have a period for the transaction of morning business.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with members permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENIOR CITIZEN FREEDOM TO WORK ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act with my colleagues, Senators MCCAIN and ROTH.

This bill would provide long overdue relief for our senior citizens. It would remove a significant impediment that deters seniors from continuing to work. Under the bill, seniors could earn up to \$30,000 by the year 2002 without affecting their Social Security benefits.

I intend to work for enactment of the legislation this year to begin immediately lifting the unreasonably low earnings limit. We will phase in the increase over the next 7 years from the current level of \$11,280 to \$30,000.

This legislation is important for the economy. Continuation of the current policy, which does not utilize the experience and productivity of our seniors, is wasteful and short-sighted.

This legislation is also important for the protection of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. The bill clarifies that the Secretary of the Treasury is not authorized to under in-

vest and/or disinvest Social Security and Medicare trust fund monies in Federal securities or obligations in order to avoid the limitations on the public debt.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this effort. Specifically, I urge my colleagues on the Finance Committee to join with me to report the bill out of committee tomorrow.

THE NEW READY OR NOT PROGRAM TO COMBAT UNDERAGE DRINKING

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, every day in Congress, we tackle some of the most pressing problems facing our nation. But sometimes, the best solutions don't come from the Capitol. They come from homes and schools and community organizations that you find in every town and city, all across the country. That's what a new program called "Ready or Not: Talking with Kids About Alcohol," is all about.

If you have kids, you know that telling them to "just say no" to alcohol doesn't always work. Kids want to know why they should say no. "Ready or Not" is a new video educational program that's designed to help parents and other adult supervisors answer that question for kids between the ages of 10 and 14.

"Ready or Not" is a joint effort of the Boys & Girls Clubs of America and the Century Council, an organization funded by the alcohol industry. It was introduced just after Thanksgiving, and it's already making an impact. I want to congratulate the Boys and Girls Club and the Century Council for all the time and energy they've invested in this important program.

I also want to commend my 36 colleagues in the House and Senate who have joined me in officially endorsing this life-saving project.

A recent survey of America's pre-teens—pre-teens—shows that about four in 10 expect to have problems handling situations involving the use of alcohol. Another survey by the University of Michigan found that, in 1994, more than a quarter of America's eighth-graders reported drinking alcohol in the last month. And, more and more kids are becoming "binge drinkers."

We know from our experience in combating teen smoking that if you reach kids early and tell them the truth, they're far more likely to make good decisions about their health. "Ready or Not" will help us replicate that success, we hope, with teen drinking.

There are two reasons that "Ready or Not" targets kids between the ages of 10 and 14. First, that's when many "problem drinkers" first start experimenting with alcohol. Second, and more important, parents and other adults still have a lot of influence over kids at that age. With the help of "Ready or Not," we can reach kids who are in danger of abusing alcohol, and prevent problems before they start.

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.