

and do it with him. We will just come out here and have a debate, I suppose, if Senators are opposed to the resolution of support. Above and beyond that, we are talking about a lot of Capitol Police. They are working 6 days a week, 12 hours a day. Frankly, the whip discussed this with me. Above and beyond just the resolution saying "thank you for your support," the other point is the additional resources. With all due respect, there will have to be additional resources to go to them for them to be able to do this job.

I thought when I came back that this resolution would have been passed. I wouldn't have thought there would have been any controversy. I thought we then could notify the police.

Now what we will do is talk about it for a day or so. We will keep asking who is holding it up. We will keep asking why. It is hardly a way to say thank you to the police. And if necessary, we will have an amendment on it.

Mr. REID. I say to the Senator, I am hopeful and confident that it is just a misunderstanding. Otherwise, we will have to move forward as the Senator from Minnesota has indicated.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in a period of morning business until the hour of 4 o'clock today with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period of up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. REID. And that the time continue to be charged against the underlying matter before the Senate; that is, on the motion that is postcloture.

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

AVIATION SECURITY AND THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I was actually thinking about reading some of the descriptions and testimony of some of the people who spoke yesterday.

Let me just say one more time that on this one, we don't budge until we get the help for the employees. That is all there is to it. If that is the difference between Democrats and Republicans, so be it. That would make me proud to be a Democrat. If it does not end up being the difference between Democrats and Republicans and we do it in a bipartisan way, all the better. But we are not waiting any longer. I am not going back home again this weekend trying to explain to people how in the world the Senate could not provide them some support.

My final point is, the truth is, we need to be doing this business and more because, frankly, we have something else that is ahead of us, which is all the other people in Minnesota and in the

country who have been affected, all of the other people who are losing their jobs, whether it be in the tourism industry, hotel/restaurant, related to tourism, whatnot, whether it be small businesses, or whether it be people in high-tech. There are a lot of people right now who are out of work. A lot of small businesses lost some of their business, and they never had a lot of capital to rely on in the first place.

So I just say to colleagues that we are in a serious recession in our country. These are hard economic times. We need to put a stimulus package together next week. We need to have the stimulus package large enough to make a difference. It has to be something that focuses on getting money into the hands of consumers—those who will make purchases right away. It has to take effect within the next couple of months, frankly, to really make a difference. There are a lot of people who, A, could use the help and, B, this would put purchasing power back into the economy. Unemployment benefits need to be extended and improved. There is the health care coverage for people and child care expenses, and there is the workforce development and work training that is so important. There are ways in which we can invest in rebuilding crumbling schools and affordable housing and creating jobs at the same time. There is a whole lot we need to do, and we need to do it now. That is part of the crisis that is staring us in the face. Yet we are in morning business for another 2 hours this afternoon.

I just wanted to make it clear that—and I think I am speaking for other Democrats—we are not giving any ground on getting help to the aviation employees and others, and we are going to do it this week on this bill. We are not going to give any ground on safety, and we are going to pass this bill this week. We are also going to move on and get serious about an economic stimulus package as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Because of the unanimous consent agreement, I ask that the time continue to run on the motion to proceed because it is the same morning business we asked it to run against; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

RECESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 4:30 p.m. today with the time charged against the postcloture proceedings.

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 2:54 p.m., recessed until 4:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. JOHNSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from South Dakota, notes the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, about a half hour ago, President Bush was in the Rose Garden for a ceremony. During the question-and-answer period, the President expressed some great concern—in my judgment, justifiable concern—about the leaking of classified information that was given to some Members of Congress. Apparently, at least a couple Members of Congress, on a couple of occasions, have leaked that information to the press.

In my judgment, the President has every right to be very upset about that. This country has asked its young men and women in military service to risk their lives in this time of national emergency. As they undertake military operations in parts of the world that are thousands and thousands of miles from here, it ill-serves our country's interests to have any Member of Congress, under any circumstance, at any time, going to a classified briefing and then disclosing the information from that classified briefing to a member of the press.

The solution, I might say, is not, however, for the administration to stop briefing the Congress about classified material. The solution, I would urge the President, would be for us to find out which Member of Congress has leaked classified information and then make certain that this Member of Congress—House or Senate—is not given classified information in the future.

I know this is a difficult area and a difficult set of circumstances, but this country faces some very difficult days ahead.

The September 11 terrorist attacks that were committed against this country changed almost everything. The need for security is quite evident to almost everyone in this country.

The terrorist attacks require this country to respond. The President had no choice. We cannot ignore those attacks. We had to respond to those attacks. And the President has the full support of the American people in his response, in my judgment, and certainly the full support of the Congress.

But I just want to say that the President was dead right this afternoon in

expressing anger about the disclosure—the unlawful disclosure and unauthorized disclosure—of classified information. Members of the House or the Senate who would disclose classified information to the press that they received in classified briefings do no service to this country.

I would hope the administration and the President, rather than deciding they will not share that information with Congress, would decide that they would sanction those who have misused that classified information.

In order for Congress to do its work, and in order for the committees in Congress to do their work, information must be made available, even classified information. But the President is correct that information must be treated as classified, treated as top secret, and cannot be given to the press. An unauthorized disclosure, in my judgment, undercuts this country's interests.

I hope the President's admonition today, and I hope the discussion by other Members of Congress about this, will convince the administration they ought to continue the briefings. They are helpful and important as a part of this process. But some of us in Congress full well understand the President's concern about the unauthorized leaks that have occurred.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last week the House of Representatives passed a new farm bill. That piece of legislation is an important step forward because most of us believe the current farm bill does not work. The so-called Freedom to Farm bill, in fact, has been a disaster for family farmers now for many years. It had no ability to help farmers during tough times to provide for disasters and collapses in commodity prices. Because of this, each year Congress has had to come up with emergency funding at the end of the year.

We did that. We did not do enough, but we did some each year to try to repair the hole in the so-called Freedom to Farm bill. That bill now expires at the end of next year and needs to be replaced.

The House of Representatives, God bless them, said: No. We should not wait until next year. We should write a new farm bill now. And it ought to be in place for the next crop-year when people go into the fields next spring. We in the Senate now have the obligation to do the same, and I believe we will do the same.

With respect to the bill that the House of Representatives enacted last week, let me say this: I think it is better than the Freedom to Farm bill. They have made progress. Good for them. I commend them.

There are some things we need to do better than they did in the House bill. For example, in my part of the country we raise a great deal of wheat and barley. The loan rates, for example, for

wheat and barley are not significant enough, when compared to other crops. They are far too low in the House bill. So we need to make some adjustments to that piece of legislation.

Farm benefits ought to be better targeted to family farmers, in my judgment, as well. We have had the development in this country of these giant agrifactories. Well, that is not what we are trying to preserve. If this isn't about preserving family farms, families that are trying to live out their lives in the country and make a living on the family farm, if that is not what this is about, then, in my judgment, we do not need a farm bill.

Abraham Lincoln started the Department of Agriculture with nine employees in the 1860s. As you know, a century and a half later, it is a behemoth organization. If a farm bill is only to support the giant agrifactories of the world, then count me out. But if it is to support family farms, I say: Good; it is important. And it is important to this country's future that we maintain a network of family farm food producers.

There is a national security interest as well for the Senate to do a farm bill. The House has done the bill, so we also ought to do it before we adjourn, in the interest of national security.

What is the national security interest? The other evening on national television, they described a feedlot with nearly 200,000 cattle in it over the year. This is a giant agricultural enterprise that brings large numbers of cattle together and feeds them in a huge series of feedlots. They talked about the potential of bioterrorism entering the food supply, and how convenient it would be for those giant agrifactories to be a target for efforts in bioterrorism.

It seems to me a broad network of family producers across this country tends to thwart that.

Security of America's food supply is best achieved by a network of family farms producing America's food. That is why a farm bill is so important.

We have the obligation and the opportunity in the Senate to do the right thing. Between now and when we leave at the end of this session of Congress, we should pass a farm bill, go to conference, reach agreement with the House, and then send a farm bill to the President that he will sign. I understand the President says he doesn't support the bill passed by the House of Representatives. The fact is, however, if it is not his priority, it is ours. We ought to write a good farm bill and send it to him.

I believe at the end of the day he will support it because the House passed it with a veto-proof majority. I would expect a good farm bill will pass the Senate with a similar majority.

I believe we ought to waste no time. I have talked to the majority leader and others about it. He agrees. Let's try to do what we can do to pass a farm bill in the Senate, then go to conference and see if we can't get a farm

bill signed into law before the end of this year. That way, family farmers who go into the fields next spring will understand what the new farm bill will be and will be able to plan accordingly.

It will certainly be better than the Freedom to Farm bill, a bill that has undercut the interests of families trying to make a living on a family farm.

Very few people in this country have seen their income cut as dramatically as the average family farm income has been cut over the years. This loss of income, then, is somewhat ironic. We are dropping food into Afghanistan because people are on the abyss of starvation; we hear reports of old women climbing trees in Sudan to forage for leaves to eat; and one-half a billion people go to bed every night with an ache in their belly because it hurts to be hungry. All told, thousands of children die every day from hunger and hunger-related causes. Yet the farmers of South Dakota and North Dakota and Kansas and Montana and Nebraska are told, when they load their truck with wheat or barley and take it to the country elevator, that which they produce has no value. They are told the food somehow has no value, that the price is collapsed because it is not worth very much. It seems to me that much of the world is placing great worth on that which we produce in great abundance on America's farms.

If we can't find a way to connect that which we produce to those who need it, then we are not thinking hard. The surest road to stability and peace in the world is to try to help people who are hungry. We must place a value on the food our family farmers produce. Again, there is a disconnection there somewhere. We need to find it and reconnect it.

Let me again say, I hope in the coming couple of weeks we will, in the Senate, make it a priority to write a farm bill, bring it to the floor, and go to conference with the House. We have that obligation to our family farmers. That ought to be our responsibility now. It is not only good for family farmers; it is good for American security interests, for food security interests to do that. I hope we will do it soon.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AVIATION SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1447.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me correct a statement I made sometime last week when we were checking