would, in fact, be made over the 7 years—although knowing the history of the House majority leader's attempts to kill farm programs, I am not so sure about the underlining intent of that body. But I must question any use of the term ''certainty'' that has been attached to these payments.

Perhaps the most egregious feature of the freedom to farm scheme is the payment of large sums of money to farmers in years when crop prices are bringing record profits and even to farmers who have no requirement to farm anything at all except the Federal Treasury. Since their inception, farm programs have been designed to allow payments to farmers only when crop prices have fallen below set levels. This provided a form of safety net that has helped stabilize the farm economy and avoid the tremendous social disruptions that we witnessed during the Great Depression. But I must warn my Republican friends who think they are protecting rural America, that providing large payments to farmers during periods of high prices or to farmers who no longer farm is an invitation to disaster, the biggest farm disaster we have ever seen.

I realize that the Freedom to Farm Act makes reference to the term ''contracts'' which suggests a guarantee of payments over the 7-year period. I also realize that many Members of Congress have been trained in the legal profession and have had more than a cursory review of the elements of a contract. But the requirements of protecting against the abrogation by a future Congress of ''contracts'' described in legislation go far beyond simple contract law. American farmers know what a contract is, or should be, and I am afraid they are being led to believe that the Freedom to Farm Act is talking about contracts in the normal sense of that term.

The abrogation of contracts executed through the authority of congressional legislation is nothing new to the Federal courts. The contracts discussed in the Freedom to Farm Act are not protected by the contracts clause of the U.S. Constitution. The contracts clause is found in section 10 of article I which states: ''No *State* shall * * * pass any * * * law impairing the obligation of contracts * * *'' (emphasis added). In fact, case law concludes that the sovereign power of Congress to subsequently amend legislation—and contracts authorized by such legislation—is implied in the absence of ''unmistakable terms'' or other strong indications that Congress clearly intended to bind the actions of a future Congress.

It has been my opinion that nothing in the freedom to farm provisions that were appropriately vetoed by President Clinton approaches the threshold of ''unmistakable terms'' necessary to limit the actions of a future Congress. My opinion is also shared by many legal experts from around the country. Because of my concerns that the American farmer was being misled by the alleged promises of 7 years of payments, I had asked for an opinion by the National Center for Agricultural Law Research and Information as well as leading law schools with strong agricultural law programs around the country and they all concur that there is nothing in the freedom to farm provisions that guarantees payments over 7 years.

Why is this fact so important? Why should farmers be concerned if Congress can change its mind in a year or two? What does all this have to do with ''Certainty''? With all due respect to farm programs enacted by Congress and administered by USDA, there are many critics of these programs who would be eager to point out the outrageous use of tax dollars to pay huge sums to farmers when market prices are high or who have opted to spend the growing seasons in the Bahamas. It would only take a few headlines and a few news magazine television programs to draw the wrath of the nonfarm public to force Congress to end, once and for all, farm programs.

It takes little imagination to conclude that media scrutiny of freedom to farm, once put into practice, would likely result in not only a loss of the remaining freedom to farm payments, but of the possibility of any Federal support for farmers in the future. If anything is certain, it is that farmers would be without farm programs a lot sooner than they expected. As I suggested earlier, such a result would not be far removed from the stated objectives we have heard expressed for years by the current House majority leadership. Earlier this week, there was an attempt on this floor to repeal by unanimous consent the underlying agricultural acts which we refer to as permanent law. Farmers may have more to worry about than they realize. Yes, farmers are asking for certainty, but I don't believe they are asking for the certainty of bankruptcy.

Mr. President, it would be truly tragic if the tactics that shut down the Federal Government for an unprecedented 27 days are now used to shut down the farm sector, possibly for all time. Clearly, the freedom-to-farm provisions are not acceptable to me, they are not acceptable to my Democratic colleagues. If passed they will once again be rejected by President Clinton, and they will be rejected by every member of the farming community once farmers are given the opportunity to see through the candy store glitter of allegedly promised payments. The task before us now is to move the process forward to give farmers some immediate guidance for the crops they need now to put in the ground and for all of us in Congress to finally work together to craft a reasonable farm bill to take American agriculture into the next century.

I know there are some reforms that we should all agree on that we can include in a farm bill extension. Farmers need flexibility to better adjust to changing markets and to give them the ability to rotate crops in a manner that best serves their conservation needs. We can do that, and we must. Republicans and Democrats have proven in farm bills past that we can work together. We ask now for a 1-year extension of current law with certain modifications. All it takes is 1 year to write, debate, and pass a farm bill. Although 1995 was not such a year, there is not reason why 1996 can't be.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement by Secretary Glickman, to which I earlier referred, be printed in the RECORD.

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

GLICKMAN IMPROVES REPAYMENT OPTIONS FOR PRODUCERS FOR ADVANCE DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS

WASHINGTON, Dec. 22, 1995—Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman today announced that wheat, feed grains, and upland cotton producers who must repay their 1995-crop advance deficiency payments will be able to repay under more equitable terms than in the past. Those producers will likely owe about $1.7 billion in the latter part of 1996.

Glickman said USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation will propose changes is current regulations to give producers expanded repayment options, including the option to repay in installments over a three-year period, with all of the interest waived, depending on a producer's circumstances. USDA has no legal authority to waive repayment of advance deficiency payment.

''I'm especially concerned about producers who did not have a 1995 crop and are still required by law to repay their advance deficiency payments,'' Glickman said. ''To ease their financial burden, my proposed action will allow them to repay over 3 years with no interest.

''These actions will affect about 90 percent of the producers of these crops,'' Glickman said. ''To ask for a repayment of this magnitude without better terms and conditions would put severe financial pressure on many producers who are trying to recover from a series of bad weather disasters.

''We're nearing the end of the year and we still have no Farm Bill,'' Glickman said. ''At a time of uncertainty—the Clinton Administration is taking this action to give producers clear direction, so they can start planning for the coming year.''

Details of the proposal are outlined in FSA Backgrounder #0864.95.

NEIGHBOR DAY IN WESTERLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the efforts of citizens of the town of Westerly, RI, and the members of its town council in promoting Neighbor Day.

In 1993, a feud between teenagers took a tragic turn at a local arcade, leaving one youth dead and another charged with murder. Since then, this community has come together to ensure that such senseless violence is not repeated there or anywhere else.

For the past 4 years, Westerly has honored the spirit of neighborliness, tolerance, and civility by designating the Sunday before Memorial Day as Neighbor Day.

Now, the Neighbor Day tradition is spreading. The Rhode Island General

Assembly has designated Neighbor Day for statewide observance, and the Westerly Town Council would like to see the tradition become nation-wide and ultimately worldwide.

I hope my colleagues will join me and keep the sentiments of the people of Westerly close to our hearts and minds always, but particularly, this year, on May 19—the day Westerly will celebrate Neighbor Day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that resolution of the Westerly Town Council, urging local recognition of Neighbor Day, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TOWN OF WESTERLY—RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Town Council of the Town of Westerly, County of Washington and State of Rhode Island, adopted a resolution to celebrate Neighbor Day in May each year on the Sunday before Memorial Day weekend in the Town of Westerly;

Whereas, the Town of Westerly proudly displays the adopted Neighbor Day logo on the Town of Westerly Calendar each year on the Sunday before Memorial Day weekend and places a proclamation in the Town's archives for posterity; and

Whereas, through the effort of our local legislators, the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations passed legislation designating this special day to be observed in communities throughout the State: Now therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Westerly Town Council with deepest respect for all our Rhode Island legislators and United States Congressmen that they unite with one heart in a collaborative effort to aid in the reintroduction of Neighbor Day as a national day and through our representative to the United Nations to introduce and pass a world-wide Neighbor Day to be celebrated the Sunday before Memorial Day weekend in May of 1996 and each year thereafter; and be it further

Resolved, That the Westerly Town Council, in an effort to help our Congressman, hereby submits petitions signed by many citizens of all ages in our community to be used solely for this purpose and presented in support of this worthwhile effort in the hopes that Neighbor Day will be recognized and celebrated throughout the world.

MAINTAINING THE MOMENTUM FOR PEACE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, earlier this week, the International Body chaired by the Honorable George Mitchell, the distinguished former Senate majority leader, issued its report regarding the Northern Ireland peace process. Specifically, the International Body was charged by the British and Irish Governments with examining the twin tracks in the peace process—namely the decommissioning of weapons and all-party talks.

As my colleagues are aware, the current sticking point in the peace process is the relationship between the decommissioning of weapons and the convening of all-party talks. The International Body has done 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. I would particularly like to commend my friend George Mitchell for the fine work he has done in this regard.

The report lays out a very balanced set of recommendations focusing on six principles. Among other things, it recommends that the parties to the conflict ''affirm their total and absolute commitment'' to democratic and exclusively peaceful means of resolving political issues, to the ''total disarmament'' of all paramilitary organizations, and that they renounce and oppose any effort to use force or threaten to use force to influence the all-party negotiations.

The report recognizes that ''there is clear commitment'' to decommission weapons as part of the process of all-party talks. It suggests that the parties consider decommissioning during, rather than before or after the process of all-party negotiations.

The report also includes a series of further confidence building measures that might be taken. On the question of elections, it suggests that ''elections held in accordance with democratic principles express and reflect the popular will'' and that ''an elective process could contribute to the building of confidence.''

The report does not suggest, however, that elections proceed all-party talks. I know there is real concern among the various parties about the British Government's subsequent proposal that elections be held prior to all-party talks as such elections might further delay the process.

Perhaps most importantly, the report reminds us that ''for nearly a year and half, the guns have been silent in Northern Ireland'' and that ''the people want that silence to continue.'' For that to happen, there must be continued momentum in the peace process. The timely release of this report has gone a long way toward keeping the process moving. Delays at this juncture could scuttle the very real progress that has been made to date.

In establishing the International Body, Prime Minister Major and Prime Minister Bruton took decisive action to break the deadlock that had beset the negotiations. Let us hope that they, as well as all parties in Northern Ireland, will continue their courageous steps for peace.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE COACH FRANK HOWARD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most famous institutions of the South is college football. For decades, southern colleges and universities have produced powerhouse teams that dominate bowl games and yield some of the most talented players that are to be found among professional football clubs. Without question, the Clemson University Tigers is one of the grand old teams of southern football, and Frank Howard was the man who became synonymous not only with Clemson football, but with Clemson athletics. It is with great sadness that I rise today to mark his passing, and to pay tribute to him as a coach, a role model, a man, and a friend.

Frank Howard dedicated his life to Clemson University and its football program. He loved that school so much, that after he retired from coaching, he remained in South Carolina and continued to be an important part of Clemson University campus life. Not only did Frank attend virtually every Tiger home game, he maintained an office in the Jervey Athletic Center and was affectionately, and appropriately, given the title of ''Legend.'' During his career, Frank amassed one of the most impressive victory records in college football, fielding winning teams year after year, and capturing several Atlantic Coast Conference championships. In addition to his skills as a coach, Frank was a gifted recruiter, and that combination ensured that Clemson always had a team of enthusiastic, talented, and well coached players. Countless individual and team records were set by Clemson players during Frank's three-decade tenure at the University, and many of his players went on to become some of the most respected individuals to take to the gridiron in the National Football League.

Frank was the first to admit that there was no secret to how he won football games: he believed in playing aggressive football. As he said time and time again, ''Blocking and tackling wins games.'' While Frank stood for little nonsense as a coach, as some thought him gruff, he was a man who truly loved his players and set an example for them to be individuals who not only truly loved his players and set an example for them to be individuals who not only had a commitment to winning, but to good sportsmanship as well. As any coach would be, Frank was proud of his players who went on to play professional football, and believe me Mr. President, there was no shortage of such individuals. Through the years, Tigers have played on probably every team in both the American and National Football Conferences. What separated Frank from many other coaches is that he was equally proud of his players who never made the roster of a pro team, but who contributed to the growth and success of South Carolina. Frank was always quick and pleased to note that many of his former players went on to become influential and respected leaders in professions as diverse as the law, medicine, business, academics, and religion. No doubt, their accomplishments are in large part attributable to the influence that Frank Howard had on them while they were young men.

Mr. President, Frank Howard was once quoted as saying,

When I die I want to be buried up there on that hill near the stadium. I want to be there