

should do. It is not a case that we are not moving judges. That is, in my judgment, a false charge.

If we are talking about what are the priorities, what is the urgency today on Wednesday, first, as Senator McCain said, the urgency is an aviation security bill; second is an antiterrorism bill that has been worked on and largely agreed to; and third, we ought to finish the appropriations bills. We have a responsibility to do that.

The Senator from Idaho is not wrong about energy being a significant issue. It is an issue. I agree with that. I talked today about the commercial airlines and their component part of this economy and their important part of this economy. So, too, is energy. We will not have any economy without energy.

I do not disagree with the notion that energy is a significant issue. I would not necessarily say Senator DASCHLE has the burden of making it third. We have to do the appropriations bills before we do the energy bill. If we can get rid of a few of the objections, we can move these things quickly. There is no reason we should not pass an aviation security bill and send it to the President by tomorrow night. We can pass it today and resolve our differences with the House and move it to the President. There is no reason we cannot do that for this country. We should do that.

The antiterrorism bill I think is about completed. There is no reason we cannot do that as well. What a great signal to the American people.

The interesting thing is—and the Senator from Nevada asked me about what I heard back home—what I heard all weekend in North Dakota was how pleased people were that finally the pettiness seems to be gone from the politics in this country, and good riddance. Finally, people are working together. Finally, it is not so much that you are a Democrat or a Republican. It is not that there is a my side and a your side, it is just that there is an our side. There is only one side in this country, and that is the side that all of us choose to stand on in the fight against terrorism. There is only one side, and it is our side.

That is why I hope that at 2 o'clock this afternoon when Senator McCain comes to the floor with this bipartisan bill on aviation security, that this is something we can clear, move to the floor, offer amendments, and get it done for our side.

Again, it is not Republicans and Democrats. Senator McCain is a Republican. Senator Hollings is a Democrat. They have worked together, I have worked with them and others to put this bill together. This bill represents a response by our side, the American response to an emergency, to an urgent situation. I hope we can avoid the kind of difficulty we have been seeing in recent days.

I ask those who put us in this position of being, as I said, at parade rest

day after day when there are so many urgent things to do to rethink that. I can think of several things that make me a bit upset about this body and probably object to one thing or another. I do not intend to do that.

I had an amendment on a bill in the subcommittee I chair. When I brought my subcommittee bill to the floor, I had an amendment that was very important to me and very controversial. I was fully intending to push that amendment and have a big debate and a vote on it. Then September 11 happened, and I brought the bill to the floor after September 11 and said: I do not think it is in the country's interest for me to push this very controversial amendment.

Although it means a lot to me and it is very important to me, I am not going to do it because I do not think that is the way we ought to send signals to the American people about who we are and what we are doing at this point.

I ask others, especially those who have held up the work of the Senate for now about 2 weeks on this issue, think along the same lines and see if we cannot come to some understanding of the urgency of passing an aviation security bill.

We on the Commerce Committee spent a lot of time working on these issues. The leadership of both Senator Hollings and Senator McCain has produced excellent legislation, legislation that will provide real security to commercial airlines and to those who fly in this country, and I hope we are able to do that soon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE VALUE OF THE FAMILY FARM

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I actually came to this Chamber to talk about something else, which I want to do now for about 3 or 4 minutes. But, I was inspired by my colleague from Arizona, Senator McCain, who was talking about the urgency of the aviation security bill and wanted to comment first about that.

I want to speak for a moment about another priority. When I was talking with the Senator from Idaho about priorities, let me describe another one that ranks right near the top, in my judgment. As soon as we finish the legislation dealing with aviation security, the antiterrorism bill, and the appropriations bills, we need in this Congress to turn to the farm bill. If one does not come from farm country, they may not understand the need for a farm bill, but let me describe the ur-

gency of this Congress passing a decent bill that gives family farmers a chance to make a living.

We have been living with a farm bill called the Freedom to Farm Act, which has been a terrible failure for family farmers. It literally has pulled the rug out from under family farmers in our country.

Last Friday, the House of Representatives passed a new farm bill, and good for them. The bill that was passed by the House of Representatives is better than the current farm bill that is now in place. We can make it even better. It shortchanges wheat and barley, for example, on loan rates, and there are some things that I would change.

I say this: The bill the House of Representatives passed is better than the current farm bill. Now the Senate has an obligation to take up a farm bill and pass it before we finish our work this year. We must do that. We do not have the choice. If we do not pass a new farm bill this year and accept the challenge with the House having passed its bill, we will shortchange American farmers in a significant way. There are many families hanging on by their financial fingertips wondering whether they are going to be around to plant the crop next spring. I hope this Congress will say to them that family farmers matter to this country, they strengthen this country, and we are going to give them a farm bill that provides countercyclical help when prices collapse so they can stay around and be part of our country's future.

Now why is that important? Two reasons. One reason is one I have talked about a long time in this Chamber, and that is from both an economic and social standpoint, family farms are important to this country's character and its future. Family values have always rolled from family farms to small towns to big cities, nurturing and refreshing the value system in our country. Having a network of family farm producers producing our food in this country produces more than food. It produces communities, it produces a lifestyle, it produces character in rural America that adds to this country and who we are and what we are.

Even more than that, if one does not care about that—and I do deeply—we could have, perhaps, a country in which we farm from California to Maine with giant agrifactories in which no one lives out on the land. It is just a bunch of corporate bookkeepers. That, in my judgment, erodes and detracts from the culture that has helped make America great. So even if one does not care about family farming—and I do very deeply—even if one believes that agrifactories are the way of the future—and I really disagree with that—from a national security standpoint it makes good sense to have wide dispersal of food production in America.

There was a report the other night on a national television program talking about feedlots that feed 200,000 head of

cattle. This report talked about the real possibility of the introduction of bioterrorism through the food supply in concentrations of agriculture production of that size. It is true. How difficult would it be, however, to do that to a food production system which you have a wide network of family farms on America's land producing America's food? From a national security standpoint, it is important that we have support for family farmers.

Europe does it. Europe does it for another reason. Europe has been hungry and decided never again to be hungry and never again to be dependent on concentrations of food producers. So they, in Europe, have a network of producers, small farmers, dotting the landscape of Europe because they have been hungry once and have determined never to do that again, and the best defense against hunger is to have family farmers all across Europe producing their food supply.

The same is true in this country, in my judgment. Exactly the same is true. Add to that the national security implications of having broad distribution of food supplies in this country produced by family farms. Again, as I said when I started, I think family farms produce something very enriching and very important to who we are as a country. Much more than that, they also contribute to this country's national security.

The House of Representatives has passed its farm bill. We have a responsibility in the Senate to pass ours. The difference between the House and the Senate farm bill that would amend or change the Freedom to Farm Act will be hundreds of millions of dollars to farmers in North Dakota alone.

The Freedom to Farm bill was passed when the price of grain was quite high and it collapsed almost immediately, and family farmers have lived now for 4 or 5 years with commodity prices that are far below the cost of production. The result is a whole lot of families are struggling. Many have lost that struggle and have moved from the family farm because they went broke. Others are hanging on, just hoping.

The only thing farmers have ever been able to live on is hope; hope that somehow next spring they would be able to find somebody who would lend them the money to plant a crop; hope if they put the crop in that perhaps it would rain enough so that the crop would grow; hope that it would not rain too much and drown out that crop; hope they did not have insects; hope they did not have hail; hope that crop disease did not destroy the crop.

If beyond all of those hopes they finally raised a crop, hope when they combined or harvested that crop and put it in a truck and drove it to an elevator that there would be a price that was decent. With that kind of hope, farmers deserve our help during the tough times, and it is my hope the Senate will understand its responsibility right now in the next several weeks to

take up the challenge of the House and pass a farm bill, a good farm bill, that says to family farmers we are standing with them, we are standing behind them, and we want to provide a bridge over price valleys to try to help them through these tough times. If we do that, it also will strengthen our country. That also will strengthen our economy.

We will not have economic recovery in this country if we say it does not matter what happens to those who live on the land; it does not matter what happens to family farmers.

Economic recovery also begins by helping those who produce America's food supply, and I hope the Senate will take up this challenge in the next couple of weeks.

I conclude by saying this: I come from rural America. I was raised in a town of 300 people. We raised horses, had some cattle. When I left my home county—it was a fairly large county geographically—there were 5,000 people living there. There are now 3,000 people living there. Like most rural counties, it is shrinking. The Lutheran minister in one of the communities in my home county told me she has four funerals for every wedding at which she officiates.

There is this movie "Four Weddings and a Funeral." This is the opposite: four funerals for every wedding. Why is that the case? Because in those small towns and those rural areas, people are getting older, the population is aging. Very few new people are moving in, very few young people are taking over the farms, because they can't make a living.

As the age increases, the economies of the communities are shrinking. What used to be a plum is now a prune—my home county and thousands like it across this country.

If one just thinks this is about numbers and balance sheets, let me again describe how it is not. It is about dreams, about people's lives. There was an auction sale, which happens too often in my State. A fellow named Arlo was the auctioneer. He told me he was auctioning a tractor at the auction sale. People bid and bought the tractor. At the end of the auction sale, where he auctioned many things from the family farm because the farmers could not make it, a little boy, about 9 years old, came up to him. He was the son of the farmer who was being sold out. He grabbed the auctioneer around his leg, and he kind of shouted at him. He said: You sold my dad's tractor. Arlo kind of patted him on the shoulder to try to calm him down. This little boy had tears in his eyes. He looked up and said: I wanted to drive that tractor when I got big.

This is about dreams, about families, about kids. It is about the future. Family farming is much more than just business, it is part of our culture. Our country needs to understand that. We have a responsibility to write a new farm bill, one that works, one that works for family farmers.

In conclusion, as I have said before, if writing a farm bill is not about investing in families who farm in this country, retaining a network of families across the prairies of this country, then we don't even need a farm bill. We don't need a farm bill to help the giant agri-factories. If someone wants to buy 3,000 milk cows and milk them 3 times a day, God bless them. They don't need Uncle Sam's money. But a family with a family yard and a light that shines over where that family sleeps, where the dreams reside, cannot make it through tough times and price depressions. The only way to save family farms when the prices collapse is that the Government say: This part of our economy matters; we hope you get through the tough times—we will build a bridge over the valleys. If the Government is willing to do that, it will retain a food supply network populated on average by family farms that produce that food supply.

In a world desperately hungry, where so many people go to bed at night with an ache in their belly, when thousands die every day from hunger and hunger-related causes, it is unthinkable to me that what we produce in so great abundance somehow has no value. They take it to the elevator, and farmers are told their grain has no value. It has value to the people in the world who are starving. It has value to the 500 million people who go to bed at night hungry. But our farmers are told, that which you produced, which rested on your hope in the spring to produce a crop, has now no value in the fall when it is harvested.

There is a major disconnection in this country about the value of agriculture, its worth to family farmers, its worth to the world and what it contributes to the stability of the world. We had better think through in a more clear way how all of that fits together. Food is an enormous asset. Those families who produce it are a significant asset to this country. It is time the Congress understands that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ANWR

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have spoken several times today about energy policy. I will spend a few more minutes talking about something that has created a lot of confusion and controversy and in some respects bad feelings; that is, what we should do about ANWR.