

technology such as drought-resistant crops. Farmers buy crop insurance. In my State of Iowa, about 92 percent of the farmers have crop insurance. Livestock farmers help animals manage heat by building climate-controlled buildings. But when faced with weather conditions such as we are currently dealing with, even the best laid plans may not keep the farming operation afloat. That is where the Federal Government comes in. We help provide a safety net.

Let me say just how that drought affects crops. I just read in the newspaper something put out by some government agency that said about 55 percent of the landmass of the United States is in a drought condition right now. In my State of Iowa and many other Midwestern States, on an average of about 22 years, we face drought situations that are catastrophic for crops. Actually, the last one was in 1988, so now we are having one in my State of Iowa and that is 24 years. But, on average, it happens about that long. So we see the need for something that is beyond farmers' control. We can't do anything if it doesn't rain when it is supposed to rain, and right now is one of those most important times when crops need rain. So why do we provide the safety net? Because the American people understand how important the production of food is to our food supply and farmers doing that production.

It is a matter of national security. It has been said we are only nine meals away from a revolution. If people were without food, this argument goes, they would do whatever it takes to get food for themselves and their families. It has only been 3 years, I believe, in some places in the world where they had riots that were national problems—not just local problems but national problems—because of a shortage of rice. That is a staple in many countries; I suppose particularly of Asia. So we have to have a stable food supply if we are not going to have social upheaval.

The need for food can also be illustrated by looking at military history. In other words, a food supply is very important for our national security. It may be a joke, but Napoleon supposedly said "an army marches on its stomachs." But we also know from modern history, if we consider World War II on this very day, 60 or 70 years after World War II, why the Japanese and the Germans protect their farmers so much with safety nets of various sorts. Because they know what it was like during wartime not to have adequate food as a part of national security. A well-fed military is one ready to fight and to defend.

There is nothing more basic than making sure the Nation's food supply is secure, whether it is to prevent social upheaval or for our national security or maybe for a lot of other reasons. In order to have stability in our food system, we need to have the safety net available to assist farmers through

the tough times so they can keep producing food.

I have not always agreed with the policies set in each and every farm bill Congress has passed—of the eight I have been involved in. In fact, there have been times in which I voted against individual farm bills because I didn't agree with the policy being set. However, I support, to a large extent, what we accomplished in the Senate-passed farm bill last month. Obviously, I didn't agree with everything, particularly with the lack of savings we captured from the nutrition title. But, for the most part, we passed a bill that embraced real reform in the farm program that still provides an effective safety net.

Whether it is the Senate bill that cut back \$23 billion from the present farm program or whether it is the House bill that seems to cut back \$35 billion, I will bet this is the only piece of legislation that can possibly get to the President's desk this year that is going to save money rather than if it had just been simply extended. I would think people who want to set a record of fiscal conservatism for the upcoming election would be very anxious to take up a bill the Congressional Budget Office says saves either \$23 billion or \$35 billion.

So I say mostly to the other body, because right now that is where the action is and where we hope it will take place, we should not delay any longer. The farm bill is too important to all Americans to leave it in limbo. We need to get a farm bill to the President. The farm bill is approximately 80 percent nutrition programs. Most of the people who benefit are not farmers. Then, the other 20 percent is a safety net for farmers but also for all the programs the Department of Agriculture administers.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, before I go into the closing business, let me say I had the pleasure of presiding in this body during the remarks that were just made by the distinguished chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, the distinguished ranking member of that committee, Senator COLLINS of Maine, and the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee and, until recently, chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER of West Virginia.

I simply want, briefly, to add my voice to theirs and echo the three points they emphasized: One, we absolutely must take action on cybersecu-

urity; two, it is a genuine and undeniable matter of our American national security; and, three, we cannot claim to have done the job, we cannot claim to even have attempted the job seriously if we do not address the question of the critical infrastructure on which American life and our economy depend that is in private hands and, therefore, cannot be protected under the existing regime in place protecting our government and military networks. We have to solve that problem. Anything that does not solve that problem is a clear failure of our duty, as national security experts from Republican and Democratic administrations alike have very clearly explained.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REMEMBERING SALLY RIDE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I know that you and all of our colleagues will want to join me today in paying tribute to Dr. Sally Ride, the first American woman to fly in space, who died peacefully on Monday at her home in San Diego, CA. Sally Ride was 61 years old.

Dr. Ride was a physicist, an astronaut, a science writer, and the president and CEO of Sally Ride Science, a nonprofit company dedicated to realizing her lifelong passion for motivating young people to stick with their interests in science and to consider pursuing careers in science, technology, engineering, and math.

Sally Ride was born and grew up in Encino, CA. As a young girl, she was encouraged by her parents to pursue her two passionate interests: science and sports. At Stanford University, she studied physics, astrophysics, and English literature while becoming the school's number one women's tennis player. When asked what had made her choose science over tennis, she joked, "A bad forehand."

In 1977, as she was about to complete her Ph.D. in physics, Sally read that NASA was looking for astronauts and, for the first time, was allowing women to apply. From a group of 8,000 applicants, NASA selected 29 men and 6 women—including Sally Ride—as astronaut candidates in January 1978. The following year, she qualified for assignment on a space shuttle flight crew.

On June 18, 1983, Sally Ride made history as the first American woman in space, part of a 147-hour mission aboard the shuttle *Challenger*. She later said, "The thing that I'll remember most about the flight is that it was fun. In fact, I'm sure it was the most fun I'll ever have in my life."