

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 into the practice of other countries with respect to airport security. We were told that of the countries in Europe, all were Government employed.

That should be corrected. That is not the case. In fact, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and England, those four countries, have contracts, but they have the health benefits and the guaranteed vacation and other benefits guaranteed by the Government. It is a sort of hybrid situation.

Of 102 countries around the world with significant air travel systems, only 23 use contract screeners. I think that is not the point I want to make this afternoon.

No one would suggest that we take the security for the President of the United States; namely, the Secret Service, and privatize it, contract it out. Nor would anyone recommend privatizing the security that the distinguished Chair, myself, and other Senators receive, the Capitol Police, who incidentally have been working around the clock, doing an outstanding job. You can go on down the list, whether it is Customs, whether it is the Border Patrol, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service that has some 33,000 personnel, no one in the House or Senate has suggested that we contract that out.

No one has suggested we contract out the Federal Bureau of Investigation with the thousands of professionals conducting the investigation right now. No one suggests that they take some 669,000 civilian workers in national defense and contract them out. In fact, there was a suggestion by the OMB earlier this year to do just that. The OMB folks called over to the Pentagon and said: We are looking at downsizing and we want to get some contracting out of 5 to 10 percent of your civilian workers. And the Department of Defense said: That will never happen. We are in the security business.

Yet the big hangup is federalization, the Government taking over the responsibility of security for air travel in America.

Now, we have tried after Pan Am 103 back in 1988, with more training, more hours, more supervision, extra this and extra that, to no avail; we had TWA 800 in 1996 and again the Gore commission with more training, more supervision, and what have you. And now we have 6,000 killed and 13,000 casualties. To me, it will take unmitigated gall, with the recent experiences in mind, to come forth with a contracting out proposal.

Only a while ago did I learn why we are having to put up with this nonsense. All you have to do is read Roll Call, "Airport Firms Form Alliance." The airport firms formed an alliance with a Swedish company and call themselves the Aviation Security Association. And who do they have as members? The contractors that want to keep continuing their misdeeds. For instance, one of the association members, Argenbright had the contract for the Dulles and Newark airports.

Now, let's read about Argenbright. I find in an article on September 13 in the Miami Herald:

The security company that provides the checkpoint workers at the airports breached by Tuesday's hijackers has been cited at least twice for security lapses.

In its worst infraction, Atlanta-based Argenbright Security pleaded guilty last year to allowing untrained employees, some with criminal backgrounds, to operate checkpoints at Philadelphia National Airport.

In settling the charges, Argenbright agreed to pay \$1.2 million in fines and investigative costs.

... Argenbright was also found to have committed dozens of violations of Federal labor laws against its employees at Los Angeles International Airport, an administrative law judge ruled in February 2000.

Here we are trying to do the work of the people of America, and we don't have any Senators listening. They are listening to the lobbyists, the K Street crowd, who are down here working the different Senators, and I can't explain to them the problem of security at the airports. Mind you me, those who are falsifying records, if you please, are now saying what we have to do is have contracting out; we can't federalize.

Of course, that appeals to the crowd that comes into public service by promising to get rid of the Government. "The Government is not the solution, the Government is the problem." That is all they all talk about. They are thinking of what? Of next year's reelection. They are not thinking of security. They are thinking: Wait a minute now, I was going to downsize and get rid of the Government, and now I supported 18,000 screeners and some 10,000 other airport personnel—some 28,000 I am going to put on the Government payroll, and my opponent is going to say: He promised to get rid of the Government, and he went and voted to add 28,000 more Government jobs.

That is the problem—along with the blooming lobbyists. They are trying to carry out their political commitments. They are not looking out for the safety of the traveling public in America. The worst thing we have ever done is give the money to the airlines. They didn't take care of the employees. I had Herb Kelleher, of Southwest Airlines, tell me he did not furlough a single employee and maintained 100 percent service. But they were all going broke. Why? Because the lobbyists took over—the same crowd that came running around hollering they were all going to go broke. Here I am fighting to do the people's work, and Senators are gathered together in their offices with all of these airline lobbyists. This is the fifth week since September 11, and we can't pass airline security.

All of America wants this responsibility fixed within the Government. No one for a second, as I say, would suggest that the FBI and the Secret Service, the Border Patrol, and Customs, or