

Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, companies form more than a dozen nations, including France, Russia, China, India, Italy, Vietnam and Algeria, have either reached or sought to reach agreements in principle to develop Iraqi oil fields, refurbish existing facilities or explore undeveloped tracts. Most of the deals are on hold until the lifting of U.N. sanctions.

But Iraqi opposition officials made clear in interviews last week that they will not be bound by any of the deals.

"We will review all these agreements, definitely," said Faisal Qaragholi, a petroleum engineer who directs the London office of the Iraqi National Congress (INC), an umbrella organization of opposition groups that is backed by the United States. "Our oil policies should be decided by a government in Iraq elected by the people."

Ahmed Chalabi, the INC leader, went even further, saying he favored the creation of a U.S.-led consortium to develop Iraq's oil fields, which have deteriorated under more than a decade of sanctions. "American companies will have a big shot at Iraqi oil," Chalabi said.

The INC, however, said it has not taken a formal position on the structure of Iraq's oil industry in event of a change of leadership.

While the Bush administration's campaign against Hussein is presenting vast possibilities for multinational oil giants, it poses major risks and uncertainties for the global oil market, according to industry analysts.

Access to Iraqi oil and profits will depend on the nature and intentions of a new government. Whether Iraq remains a member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, for example, or seeks an independent role, free of the OPEC cartel's quotas, will have an impact on oil prices and the flow of investments to competitors such as Russia, Venezuela and Angola.

While Russian oil companies such as Lukoil have a major financial interest in developing Iraqi fields, the low prices that could result from a flood of Iraqi oil into world markets could set back Russian government efforts to attract foreign investment in its untapped domestic fields. That is because low world oil prices could make costly ventures to unlock Siberia's oil treasures far less appealing.

Bush and Vice President Cheney have worked in the oil business and have longstanding ties to the industry. But despite the buzz about the future of Iraqi oil among oil companies, the administration, preoccupied with military planning and making the case about Hussein's potential threat, has yet to take up the issue in a substantive way, according to U.S. officials.

The Future of Iraq Group, a task force set up at the State Department, does not have oil on its list of issues, a department spokesman said last week. An official with the National Security Council declined to say whether oil had been discussed during consultations on Iraq that Bush has had over the past several weeks with Russian President Vladimir Putin and Western leaders.

On Friday, a State Department delegation concluded a three-day visit to Moscow in connection with Iraq. In early October, U.S. and Russian officials are to hold an energy summit in Houston, at which more than 100 Russian and American energy companies are expected.

Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) said Bush is keenly aware of Russia's economic interests in Iraq, stemming from a \$7 billion to \$8 billion debt that Iraq ran up with Moscow before the Gulf War. Weldon, who has cultivated close ties to Putin and Russian parliamentarians, said he believed the Russian leader will support U.S. action in Iraq if he can get private assurances from Bush that Russia "will be made whole" financially.

Officials of the Iraqi National Congress said last week that the INC's Washington director, Entifadh K. Qanbar, met with Russian Embassy officials here last month and urged Moscow to begin a dialogue with opponents of Hussein's government.

But even with such groundwork, the chances of a tidy transition in the oil sector appear highly problematic. Rival ethnic groups in Iraq's north are already squabbling over the the giant Kirkuk oil field, which Arabs, Kurds and minority Turkmen tribesmen are eyeing in the event of Hussein's fall.

Although the volumes have dwindled in recent months, the United States was importing nearly 1 million barrels of Iraqi oil a day at the start of the year. Even so, American oil companies have been banished from direct involvement in Iraq since the late 1980s, when relations soured between Washington and Baghdad.

Hussein in the 1990s turned to non-American companies to repair fields damaged in the Gulf War and Iraq's earlier war against Iran, and to tap undeveloped reserves, but U.S. government studies say the results have been disappointing.

While Russia's Lukoil negotiated a \$4 billion deal in 1997 to develop the 15-billion-barrel West Qurna field in southern Iraq, Lukoil had not commenced work because of U.N. sanctions. Iraq has threatened to void the agreement unless work began immediately.

Last October, the Russian oil services company Slavneft reportedly signed a \$52 million service contract to drill at the Tuba field, also in southern Iraq. A proposed \$40 billion Iraqi-Russian economic agreement also reportedly includes opportunities for Russian companies to explore for oil in Iraq's western desert.

The French company Total Fina Elf has negotiated for rights to develop the huge Majnoon field, near the Iranian border, which may contain up to 30 billion barrels of oil. But in July 2001, Iraq announced it would no longer give French firms priority in the award of such contracts because of its decision to abide by the sanctions.

Officials of several major firms said they were taking care to avoid playing any role in the debate in Washington over how to proceed on Iraq. "There's no real upside for American oil companies to take a very aggressive stance at this stage. There'll be plenty of time in the future," said James Lucier, an oil analyst with Prudential Securities.

But with the end of sanctions that likely would come with Hussein's ouster, companies such as ExxonMobil and ChevronTexaco would almost assuredly play a role, industry officials said. "There's not an oil company out there that wouldn't be interested in Iraq," one analyst said.

Staff writer Ken Bredemeier contributed to this report.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Charleston Gazette Online, Sept. 20, 2002]

WAR FEVER: BUSH, CHENEY WON'T STOP

Although Iraq agreed to readmit U.N. weapons inspectors, President Bush and Vice President Cheney still are clamoring for U.S. military action to topple dictator Saddam Hussein.

The White House continues its mantra that war is necessary because Saddam is "evil" and he's secretly making weapons of mass destruction. But this justification may be a smoke screen. Some observers say the administration's hidden motive is to gain control of Iraq's oil.

In a front-page Sunday report subtitled "U.S. Drillers Eye Huge Petroleum Pool," The Washington Post said America's oil in-

dustry—to which Bush and Cheney are closely tied—eagerly wants a "regime change" in Iraq so U.S. firms can begin drilling into Iraq's vast, 112-billion-barrel reserve.

The White House supports the London-based Iraqi National Congress, an umbrella organization of exiled Iraqi groups seeking to remove Saddam. INC leader Ahmed Chalabi told the Post that, when a new regime is installed in Baghdad, "American companies will have a big shot at Iraqi oil."

The Washington paper quoted former CIA Director James Woolsey:

"It's pretty straightforward. France and Russia have oil companies and interests in Iraq. They should be told that if they are of assistance in moving Iraq toward decent government, we'll do the best we can to ensure that the new government and American companies work closely with them."

Amazing. This implies that Bush's war urge isn't about "evil" or weapons. It's about oil.

Atlanta Journal-Constitution columnist Cynthia Tucker said the White House war demands are "tainted with the sickening smell of gasoline."

"If the Bush administration invades Iraq," she wrote, "future scholars will look back on this period and name the period for what it was: the Petroleum Wars. . . . What but oil could possibly explain the Bush administration's stubborn insistence on attacking Saddam Hussein, who had no connection to the atrocities of Sept. 11?"

Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., has taken the lead in questioning President Bush's war plans.

We hope that he and colleagues in Congress try to learn whether the White House war cry is designed to serve America's oil industry.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Hearing no objection, the quorum call will be terminated.

The Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON.

IRAQ AND HOMELAND DEFENSE

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the President pro tempore for the recognition, and I thank the Senator from West Virginia, who just delivered a very insightful statement of why the Constitution must be protected and not shredded, why the Constitution must be adhered to in a protection of the carefully constructed separation of powers which gives us the checks and balances that have allowed this Government to endure for well over two centuries, to be the strong Government it is because, as a great British statesman once said: Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

In the 1780s, when those political geniuses gathered to construct a document upon which this new Nation could be based and the delicate checks and balances were entered, as well as the spirit of compromise in that Constitutional Convention, they set off one branch of Government from the other.

Thus, as we come to this very serious determination of what to do in Iraq, we have to be mindful of the Constitution and its separation of powers. Clearly, the Constitution gives that awesome and very weighty responsibility of declaring war to the legislative branch of Government. There was a reason for that: So that no Executive would go off on a whim or on ill advice and start war but, rather, that the representatives of the people in this body and the body at the other end of the U.S. Capitol would be involved in that decision-making and, in fact, would make that decision and then reflect the will of the people.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for a very cogent and timely statement.

There is trouble in the Middle East and central Asia. I have been to Afghanistan twice since the first of the year. I have been to Pakistan twice. I have been to India. I have been in the middle of that situation, urging the leaders of India and Pakistan to reduce the tensions on the Kashmir border because the last thing the world needs is an exchange of nuclear weapons. Particularly, that would hurt us because both of those countries are helping us in our war against terrorism.

I have been to the Middle East, and that is a troubled part of the world. As we approach this most momentous and solemn occasion about whether or not, in effect, to declare war by giving the President of the United States the authority for the expenditure of funds to conduct such a war, we must be mindful, and the questions must be answered:

What will a war in Iraq do to our war against terrorism? Will it be hurt? Will it be helped? Will our war against terrorism be set aside? Will our attempt to cut off the head of the snake that operates the al-Qaida machine be deterred in any way?

What will happen to the flow of oil out of that region of the world to the industrialized world?

What is the number of troops that is going to be required?

How likely are the casualties, and how many American lives can we expect to lose.

How many troops are we going to have to hold in reserve? Fighting door to door in downtown Baghdad is going to be a different kind of war, and I do not think we can go into Iraq assuming that the opposition is suddenly going to melt away and that the army is going to step forth and suddenly lay down its arms.

I personally believe that Saddam Hussein has chemical and biological weapons, and I personally think he is trying to develop nuclear weapons. If he, in fact, has chemical and biological weapons, will our troops be prepared if those weapons of mass destruction are utilized against our troops or utilized against any of the neighbors in the region?

Are we going to be able to approach a war in Iraq with our allies solidly be-

hind us? There is an election going on right now in Germany, and that certainly does not seem to be the political talk in Germany. Germany is one of our closest allies.

There is also an election going on right now in Turkey, our very substantial ally. That election is in November. With the talk of war, with the imminent possibility of war, how much of a possibility is there that the election would throw to a religious party the opportunity to govern Turkey instead of the secular government that has given such stability, particularly military stability, in that part of the world?

Then the question arises, which I had the opportunity to ask the Secretary of Defense yesterday in the Armed Services Committee, what about after there has been the regime change? Is it going to be a regime that would be friendly to the United States? Would Iraq be kept intact, or would it be ripped asunder?—I might say, to the chagrin of our ally Turkey. What is the plan for the United States to be involved for the long term in Iraq, militarily and economically? We saw that in the phenomenal military success we had in Afghanistan—mostly success; some not so successful, such as Tora Bora. We saw that in the midst of all of that success, in a much different situation, the hard reality, after the fact, that the United States is going to need to be a military and economic presence in Afghanistan for a very long time.

Otherwise, if we leave, it will be like when we left in the late 1980s. After the Soviets got whipped, they tucked their tail between their legs and left, and we, assisting the victors, also left; it created a vacuum, and that vacuum was filled by the terrorists.

So in any post-Saddam Hussein Iraq, it is going to take a lot of effort and time and resources by the United States, and I want to see the administration spell that out clearly, as the Secretary of Defense started to do yesterday in response to my question. There is a lot of detail to be filled in.

It brings us to another question. We have in front of the Senate this question of homeland defense, and there is not one of us in this Chamber who does not want to have a reorganization of the Government so one hand knows better what the other hand is doing, so one hand knows better how we can coordinate, and a reorganization of the Government can achieve that. In the process, let's not overdo ourselves where we take away worker protections, where we strip apart agencies such as the Coast Guard, which is a necessary part of the homeland defense. The Coast Guard has a lot of other duties to perform. Particularly, if one comes from a State such as mine that has such tremendous coastline, the Coast Guard performs innumerable functions not only of search and rescue but of drug interdiction, and of course their duties have been heightened so much now on port security.

So, as we approach homeland defense, we have a great number of decisions to make about which we had better be cautious. Otherwise, going back to my initial comments of commendation for the Senator from West Virginia and his comments about Iraq and concern about the Constitution being shredded with regard to an invasion of Iraq, so, too, we have concerns about the Constitution not being obeyed by the Congress performing its appropriate legislative role as a check and a balance, as an overseer, as an appropriator of the funds, for this new Department that is to be created.

I offer these comments today, and I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his very insightful comments. It is always a pleasure to listen and to learn from the Senator from West Virginia.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of describing some of my concerns with regard to the possible invasion of Iraq and also the knitting together of the most massive reorganization of the Federal Government over the last half century and the creation of a new Department of Homeland Defense. This is a massive undertaking. It involves some 170,000 people. It involves scores of agencies, with an annual \$38 billion budget.

Implied in my remarks is the urging of caution as we approach the creation of this agency. One of the items to be discussed in the Senate at a future time will be an amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia to take a cautious and deliberative approach in knitting together this massive agency. The directorates would be set up under the legislation right away, but their implementation would occur over the course of 13 months. It would be done on a phased-in basis, in which the Congress would be consulted as it is phased in, where there would be time to make sure in the example that I have given earlier about the Coast Guard functions other than the homeland security function that, in fact, the Coast Guard would not be deterred from its multiple service roles.

It is a wise approach the Senator from West Virginia has brought to the table in slowing down the process. I hope our colleagues will see the wisdom of protecting the separation of powers as provided in the Constitution, and the wisdom of us being sure that instead of their being such a mass of confusion in a reorganization all at once, that it would be done in a deliberative and phased-in approach.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have an additional 5 minutes, and that the previous order be extended for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his perspicacious remarks. He has not been asleep. He has been ill with a temporary ailment, but he is back on the mend. He is ready to go.

I also thank my friend for his expression of support for my amendment. That amendment will be voted on next Tuesday. It will be voted up or down. Senators will have an opportunity to go on record, if they support that amendment, an opportunity to support the creation of a Department of Homeland Defense. In voting for my amendment, they will have an opportunity to say that we are not going to hand this whole package of homeland security as it is envisioned in the House or Senate bill. I refer to the Senate bill as the Lieberman bill.

Once the Senate passes on the homeland security bill, then the Senate bill would go to the conference. The conference report eventually would come back to both Houses, and the Senate will not have an opportunity on the conference report to amend. All the Senate will be able to do is vote up or down on the conference report.

Under the House bill or under the Lieberman bill, the overall time certainly under the Lieberman bill, the overall period for the "fleshing out" of this Department of Homeland Security, this fleshing out by moving various and sundry agencies and offices into the several directorates that are established by the Lieberman bill, and the five directorates that are mentioned in my amendment thereto, that fleshing out would occur under the Lieberman bill over a period of 13 months.

But in passing the Lieberman bill, and it is light-years ahead of the House bill, it is a better bill than the House bill, but it can be improved. That is what I am attempting to do with my amendment. Under the Lieberman bill, over a period of 13 months, Congress will be putting itself on the sidelines.

The Senate will be saying: OK, Mr. President, it is all yours. You have 13 months. Congress is going fishing. You have it. It is all yours.

Now, nothing would please this President more than to have such a blank check handed to him. The Lieberman bill, in that respect, is a Tonkin Gulf resolution on homeland security. Congress will be removing itself to the sidelines for those 13 months, and the President and this administration—think about that carefully—with its penchant for secrecy, its penchant for operating out of the White House, having no limitations, will have full authority to move agencies and 170,000 employees into this new department,

with Congress relegating itself to the sidelines.

The hand of Congress ought to be there. Congress ought to conduct its constitutional responsibility of oversight in seeing that these agencies are put into the various directorates in an orderly way throughout the 13 months. The Lieberman committee and its counterpart in the House under my amendment would be front and center throughout the 13 months. That committee would still be in the driver's seat, and every 4 months there would be another shift of agencies and directorates, every 4 months, until it is completed, over a 13-month period.

All the while, Mr. LIEBERMAN's committee would take the policies and the recommendations of the Secretary of Homeland Security, look at them, debate them in the committee, amend them, and report the legislation to the Senate, and then the Senate would take the legislation, report it from the Lieberman committee, and debate it, amend it, send it to the President.

I have said we could have expedited procedure. I am not a Senator who likes expedited procedure, but in this situation I would be willing to have expedited procedures to see that the bill doesn't fall through the cracks in the committee, and that it is not filibustered or delayed in the Senate.

That is my prescription, my amendment for order: a phased filling out of the department by agencies and offices, under continuing congressional oversight, avoiding the chaos that will otherwise occur just by handing this whole thing over to the President and the administration—hook, line, and sinker. Just mark my words. I am seeking to improve the Lieberman bill. I am not adversarial to the Lieberman bill. But if we don't adopt my amendment, or something like it, there is going to be chaos, and instead of having a measure that will promote the security of our homeland and its people, we will be taking our eyes off the terrorists, off homeland security.

The federal agencies are out there, working now to provide homeland security. The passage of the Lieberman bill is not necessary in order to get these people out there guarding the ports of entry—the rivers and seaports and airports and the southern and northern borders. They are already out there working now, every day. The FBI, just a few days ago, in the State of New York, located a cell and arrested six persons. Did the FBI have to wait on this homeland security bill? There is no great outcry out there in the country; there is no great clamor for a homeland security bill. When I go to West Virginia, people don't come up to me and say: Senator, let's get that homeland security bill passed. When are you going to pass that bill? There is no great clamor out there. As a matter of fact, it is hard to get anyone to listen to a discussion of the subject.

I have been on this Senate floor time and time again, asking to be heard.

Listen. Hear me. Why, the Members of the Senate aren't that greatly interested in this bill. Facing us in less than 2 months is a big election. All of a sudden this administration, which as late as the middle of August has been saying that there were "no plans on the President's desk" to go to war with Iraq. I asked the Secretary of State that question in a committee hearing: oh, there is "no plan. The President doesn't have any plan on his desk." I asked the Secretary of Defense. Oh, the President has no plans. The President himself has been quoted time and time again saying he has no plans; "there is no plan on my desk."

All of a sudden, bam, the administration wants to go to war with Iraq. It wasn't too long ago, I can remember the Secretary's public spokesman and Ari Fleischer and some others in the administration, saying: "Why have a Department of Homeland Defense? We don't need one." That wasn't long ago. But all of a sudden, all of a sudden the President was dropping in the polls and the domestic situation was such that the administration was appearing to be much like the Emperor who had no clothes. All of a sudden, bam, all of this war talk—the war fervor, the drums of war, the bugles of war, the clouds of war—this war hysteria has blown in like a hurricane. And what has that done to the President's polls? Seventy percent.

Don't tell me that things suddenly went wrong. I sat in on some of the secret briefings and nobody from the administration in those secret briefings has been able to answer the question: Why now? Why all of a sudden, when the administration was saying back just in August the President has no plans? Let's not have all of this angst about war.

All of a sudden this country is going to war. And the President is saying, I'll do this if the U.N. doesn't do it.

Now, all of a sudden, is the Administration talking about the domestic situation in this country? Are they talking about the stock market? Are they talking about the weakness of the economy? Are they talking about the jobs that are being lost? Are they talking about the decrease in housing starts in this country? No. No.

The war clouds are there. All of a sudden this administration sends up a resolution to Congress that is a non-starter, to give this President the authority that he is asking for. Not by this Constitution will I give my vote on that resolution. That resolution is going to take some work. But all of a sudden? Why is it? Is it politics?

The Constitution is apparently irrelevant to people in this administration. What is wanted here by the administration is for Congress, in connection with war, to do the same as they want Congress to do in homeland security—hand over the whole authority and say: Take it, Mr. President. It's all yours for the next 13 months. Congress is going fishing. We are not going to be in the mix.

Congress relegates itself to the sidelines.

How foolish can we be as Members of the Senate to tuck our tails between our legs and just quit and say: "You can have it all, Mr. President. Do anything you want to do with homeland security." Well, not by my vote.

I thank the distinguished Senator for his remarks.

Madam President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded and the time for morning business be extended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection to the calling off of the quorum, further proceedings under the call are waived.

The distinguished Senator from New York, Mrs. CLINTON, is recognized.

Did the Senator have a further request?

Mrs. CLINTON. That the time for morning business be extended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. For how many minutes would the Senator suggest?

Mrs. CLINTON. Ten minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from New York is recognized.

THANKING SENATOR BYRD

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation, and I know the appreciation of many of our colleagues, for the Chair's steadfast defense of the Constitution and for his reminder to constant all of us, that the Senate, being the premier deliberative body in the world and, as he often says, one of two such great deliberative Senates ever to be seen by history, has an important role to play in ensuring that the decisions that are made today will stand the test of time and will be made in concert with our constitutional framework and our obligations as Senators.

THREE GREAT CHALLENGES FACING OUR NATION

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, in the recent colloquy and discussion that the Senator from West Virginia, our current Chair, had with the Senator from Florida, many important issues were raised about homeland security and how best to pursue the defense of our homeland.

I don't think anyone argues we now face three great challenges in our Nation. First, we have a national security

challenge. Our men and women in uniform are addressing that challenge even as we speak—all over the world from Afghanistan to the Persian Gulf to the border of North and South Korea, and many other places as well. All of us support our military and have voted to provide the largest appropriations ever in our history to give our men and women who put themselves in harm's way all of the resources, technology and compensations that our great military deserves.

We have a new challenge; that is, the challenge of homeland security. Certainly, many of us have not had to think of this issue as we are now.

On September 11 of last year when we were so grievously attacked, it became clear that we had to begin to apply the techniques of security much closer to home that we have used to defend America's interests abroad for so many generations. We have to take a very hard look at our vulnerabilities, our infrastructure, our borders, and our public health capacity to deal with biological or chemical warfare. And it requires every one of us—not just those in elective office but every citizen—to become more vigilant and to understand that we are truly facing some serious threats.

At the same time, though, there is no reason for us not to debate the best way to defend ourselves. In every generation of America, we have had great debates about how to fight wars and how to structure our national security. Now we are having a debate about how to deal with the new demands of homeland security.

I applaud the Chair for his absolutely rock-solid commitment, his totally uncynical and heartfelt commitment to make sure we do this right. It is a huge undertaking. Are we being asked to merge departments just so somebody can say we did something or are we going to do it right? It is the right of patriotism to ask hard questions. That is who we are as Americans. We are not people who are blindly led. We are not sheep who follow any leader's oratory. We are an independent, free-spirited, liberty-loving people.

When we have debates, either on the floor of the Senate or in the media, about the right way to proceed, those of us who engage in that debate do so out of a deep wellspring of love and devotion to our country. No one exemplifies that more than the senior Senator from West Virginia.

In addition to our national security challenges and our homeland security challenges, we have all of the challenges we had on September 10 of last year. We have an economy that is stalled. We have a so-called "jobless recovery." We can't seem to come together on important issues.

I am delighted to see my colleague from Arizona in the Chamber. Senator MCCAIN has been a leader and advocate for prescription drugs and for patients getting the right to have the treatment their doctors prescribe—not an HMO or some bureaucrat somewhere.

There are many important issues we should be debating that also will determine the quality of our life and the opportunities for our children.

I hope, as people tune in to see what happens on the Senate floor—when they see the Senator from West Virginia or the Senator from Arizona taking to the floor to talk about an issue—that they recognize that we believe we are acting in the great tradition, not only of the American Senate and Congress, but of America's citizenry, because there isn't any greater title than one can have than citizen of the United States of America.

I, as one Senator, appreciate the Senator's vigilance, his constant reminder to the rest of us that we are here because of our Founders, their genius, and the Constitution which they bequeathed to us. The debates we are holding on this important issue of national homeland security and other pressing domestic issues are in the tradition of those Founders.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the forbearance of the distinguished President pro tempore and ask unanimous consent that we extend morning business by about 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for her kind words about our efforts towards addressing some of the important issues of the day. I thank her.

CONDITION IN GEORGIA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, despite America's preponderant role in the world, it is not often that foreign leaders tell us that their country would not exist as an independent state were it not for U.S. support. Yet leaders across the spectrum in the former Soviet republic of Georgia, including President Eduard Shevardnadze and his political opponents, frankly and gratefully attribute their national survival to unstinting American support since their independence from Soviet rule eleven years ago. In a troubling display of how history does not always move in a positive direction, Georgia's independence is once again under threat, with repercussions that should concern all who cherish freedom.

In an opportunistic twist of President Bush's policy of pre-emption against clear and present dangers to America and the world, President Putin of Russia has appropriated American rhetoric in the war on terrorism to justify Russian subversion of the Georgian state. A free Russian hand in Georgia is apparently the price