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.