

evidence that terrorists benefit when Americans speak their mind.

In our American tradition, it is the responsibility of leaders to promote the free exchange of ideas, not stifle them. That responsibility carries over from peacetime to wartime. We don't encourage different ideas because we owe it to critics. We encourage different ideas because we owe it to ourselves. Robust debate has made America stronger for more than 200 years.

It is only because of open debate that we have a legal right to speak our minds at all. The way the Constitution was initially drafted back in 1787, there was no guarantee for free speech. There was no protection for religious freedom, for privacy, for individual liberty, for so many rights all Americans now take for granted. The original Constitution contained no Bill of Rights.

Without a Bill of Rights, many veterans of the American Revolution furiously opposed the original Constitution. My State of North Carolina flatly rejected it. The first Congress approved the Bill of Rights only after those patriots spoke their minds, spoke up and demanded it. Today, we are all grateful for their speaking their minds, for their patriotism that has meant so much to many Americans who followed.

A few years later, in the late 1790s, our Nation was on the brink of war. The French Government was torturing American soldiers and seizing American ships. At that point, an enraged Congress passed a seditious act criminalizing "scandalous" writing "against the Government." Chief among the opponents of that legislation was Vice President Thomas Jefferson. As he put it, the country's critics should be allowed to "stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

Closer to today, President Richard Nixon moved to expand the Subversive Activities Control Board's oversight of political protests during the Vietnam war. Sam Ervin, whose seat in the Senate I now hold, supported that war. But he challenged President Nixon's proposal. What he said on the floor echoed Jefferson:

Our country has nothing to fear from the exercise of its freedoms as long as it leaves truth free to combat error.

I believe that is still true today. Like the vast majority of Americans, I strongly support America's war on terrorism overseas. Unlike some, I also support much of the administration's law enforcement effort here at home. We live in a new world after September 11. We simply must take steps that we would not have accepted 3 months ago.

I also believe that vigorously discussing each of those steps strengthens our war effort. Thanks to the courage and skill of our soldiers, we will win this war against al-Qaida. But there is a totally different question whether we will win the war for the minds and hearts of those around the world.

I believe we will do that if we hold true to our values—values such as justice, fairness, and the rule of law. Those are the values that make America the beacon of freedom for the rest of the world. And nothing reminds us of our values like open discussion.

The debate over military tribunals is a perfect example. The order of November 30 that authorized tribunals came with very little explanation. Many Americans, including many past Federal prosecutors, asked why our ordinary criminal justice system was not adequate. The administration responded with a much more detailed explanation for their action. That explanation built broad support for the use of tribunals in very narrow circumstances. In fact, I support the use of military tribunals under the right circumstances.

But even since that exchange, serious questions remained about the gap between the specific terms of the order and basic norms of fairness that Americans share and believe in deeply.

In answer to some of the questions last Thursday, Attorney General Ashcroft was able to clarify that many things apparently allowed on the face of the order will not happen. For example, secret trials, indefinite detentions, executive reversal of acquittals by the military tribunals.

Mr. Ashcroft could not rule out other disturbing possibilities. Could a lawful resident in this country be convicted and sentenced to death by a tribunal on a 2-to-1 vote? Could it happen under a burden of proof requiring only a 51-percent likelihood of guilt; that is, a lawful resident of this country being convicted and receiving the death penalty on 51 percent of the evidence? And could it happen without an independent review to see whether there was evidence that should have been admitted that was not admitted, evidence that would have shown that this particular defendant did not commit the crime?

Members of Congress and members of the general public have much more than a right to raise those questions. We have a responsibility to raise those questions.

The give and take over military tribunals hardly helps terrorists. I believe that it undercuts America's enemies, for open exchange ensures that our actions reflect our commitments. It signals that a great nation fears nothing from peaceful debate. We should welcome that debate. It is a proud, necessary tradition, both in peace and in war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

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

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

RECESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is presently in effect an order that we would go into recess for the party conferences at 12:30. I ask unanimous consent that we expedite that by 3 minutes and start the recess for our conferences now.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:27 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MILLER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION, AND RURAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I start by thanking Senator HARKIN for his hard work on this farm bill. I know he has a difficult task pulling people together to craft a bill. As chairman of the committee, he and his staff need to be complimented for the fine work they have done on the bill. It is important legislation for farmers in New Mexico, and I hope the Senate can move ahead to complete action on the farm bill.

The bill has several provisions important to my State. I thank the chairman for working with me on those. I also thank Senator HARKIN for the strong efforts he has made to improve the conservation programs in the bill which are particularly important to my State.

However, all that being true, I wish to express a serious concern about the dairy provisions in the bill. As I understand it, the substitute bill creates a totally new dairy program. I believe the new dairy scheme in the bill is wrong for the Nation's dairy farmers and wrong for consumers as well. That is why I support Senator CRAPO's amendment to strike this provision and to instead have a study to determine which, if any, of the proposals that are currently floating in the Senate ought to be considered in the future.

I do appreciate the effort that Senator HARKIN and Senator DASCHLE and others, as well as our staffs, have made to come up with a balanced dairy policy. The latest version I have seen is a dramatic improvement over previous versions, and I appreciate that.

My State of New Mexico is the 10th largest dairy producing State and one of the fastest growing dairy producing