

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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded and the time for morning business be extended.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

President Putin believes the United States is willing to pay for Russia's support for military action against Iraq. President Bush and the Congress of the United States should disabuse our friends in Moscow of this illusion, immediately.

President Putin rode to power on promises to defeat Chechen separatists in Russia's south. Reports indicate that members of Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups operate in Chechnya. Russia has a right and an obligation to bring these legitimate terrorists to justice. But rather than targeting them and their Chechen comrades in arms, Russian forces have conducted a military campaign of astonishing brutality against Chechnya's civilian population as leaders in the West have looked the other way.

At the same time, Presidents Bush and Putin have brought about a historic change in U.S.-Russia relations that is moving our two nations from rivalry to strategic partnership. We in the United States welcome this development. But there can be no true partnership absent Russian commitment to the fundamental values that guide American policy in these areas.

I believe President Putin has indeed made a historic decision to align his country with the West as Russia moves away from its imperial past and towards a democratic, prosperous future. Yet Russia's threat to Georgia, like Russia's brutality in Chechnya, calls to mind a discredited, imperial past whose resurgence threatens the transformation in U.S.-Russian relations and, in particular, our joint commitment to eradicating the networks of global terror that threaten both our peoples.

Seized by the domestic political costs of a grinding war in Chechnya that Russia cannot win militarily, and calculating that President Bush's doctrine of pre-emption somehow applies to both a megalomaniacal tyrant like Saddam Hussein and a democratically oriented, pro-Western leader like Eduard Shevardnadze, President Putin has sent Russian jets to bomb targets in Georgia. Putin openly outlines his plans for a Russian invasion of Georgia to wipe out terrorism there. Motivated by a deep dislike of President Shevardnadze, whom they blame for the Soviet Union's disintegration and who has been targeted for assassination by figures linked to Moscow, and tempted by visions of Russian control over Russia's oil-rich Near Abroad, some Russian leaders seem to believe the impunity Russia has enjoyed in Chechnya would carry over to Russian military operations against its sovereign neighbor. They are wrong.

Russia's civilian and military leadership must know that our growing, and welcome, strategic partnership in the war on terror does not sanction unilateral Russian military adventurism for purposes whose relation to the war on terror is incidental. Moscow, and Washington, and Tbilisi are right to be

alarmed by continuing reports that Chechen militants and members of al-Qaida have taken refuge in Georgia's lawless Pankisi Gorge. America's proper response was to deploy American Special Forces teams to Georgia to train and equip Georgian security forces to take control of the gorge and enforce Georgian control over its territory.

President Shevardnadze has announced a major Georgian military operation, with U.S. military advisors, to root out terrorists in Pankisi. International monitors are already stationed along Georgia's border with Chechnya, and President Shevardnadze has proposed expanding this monitoring force to prevent militants from finding refuge in Georgia in the future. Shevardnadze yesterday pledged to extradite 13 men that Russia says are Chechen guerrillas captured by Georgian security officials.

The United States and Russia, in the spirit of strategic partnership both countries profess, have a willing partner in President Shevardnadze to eliminate any terrorist presence in Georgia that Moscow correctly perceives to threaten its interests. But Russia has rejected Georgia's candid, and unprecedented, proposals to cooperate in eradicating terrorism. Instead, Russia seems to want to use the terrorist problem as a means of reasserting Russian control in Georgia, which already suffers the presence of three Russian military bases and separatist conflicts supported by Moscow.

Some in Moscow do not understand that unilateral and preemptive Russian military operations in Georgia make the situation worse, not better. These operations threaten to turn Russia's desire to root out a small group of terrorists into an international crisis that threatens what President Putin cherishes—a robust partnership with the West that he has defined as Russia's future.

It is unacceptable and immoral for any American leader to countenance Russia's increasingly open campaign for control of its neighbor to the south—which is why no American leader will do so. But pressure from Moscow works in insidious ways. One "senior Administration official" recently told the New York Times, "Looking now at the new strategic circumstances, I think there may be some rethinking about how we handle the Georgian situation. I think there's a recognition the Russian government has a legitimate security concern."

The United States properly shares Russia's concern about foreign terrorists seeking refuge in Georgia, and can surely find a way to advance our mutual interest in helping Georgia end incursions by these people. But giving Russia carte blanche to impose its own solution—as it has, brutally, in Chechnya—would be a repudiation of the values we are fighting the war on terror to defend and the celebration of freedom that took place in Georgia and

across the former Soviet Union when imperial rule crumbled.

Strengthening the Georgian Government's capacity to control parts of its own country and working with American and Georgian officials to eliminate terrorists from Georgian territory, on terms acceptable to the Georgian Government, is an interest Moscow shares with Washington and Tbilisi. It is one we can advance together, in the spirit of partnership that characterizes our cooperation in the war on terrorism—not in the spirit of rivalry and spheres of influence that recall an unpleasant past.

Leaders in Moscow must know that no nation has a greater stake in wiping out al-Qaida's global terror network than the United States. We would never countenance any Georgian actions to wink at terrorism within its borders; indeed, our deployment of American Special Forces to Georgia is a measure of the seriousness with which we take the threat terrorists pose to Georgia and the region. In the same way, President Putin and those around him must know that we cannot countenance unilateral Russian military action that puts Georgia's independence at risk. I hope President Putin will make the choice that befits his role as an enlightened leader of the Russian people, and does not cast his lot with the officers and civilians around him who believe Russian can assert imperial control over a sovereign neighbor without consequence. There will be consequences—and no friend of Russia or Georgia should suggest otherwise.

(Mrs. CLINTON assumed the Chair.)

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a Wall Street Journal editorial of September 16, 2002, entitled "Putin's Iraq Price" a September 19, 2002, editorial in the Washington Post, entitled "A Parody Of Partnership" and an editorial from the Economist magazine of September 21, 2002, entitled "Putin's folly" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 16, 2002]

PUTIN'S IRAQ PRICE

One danger of President's Bush's otherwise successful overture to the United Nations on Iraq is the price the U.S. will have to pay to win Security Council approval. Russian President Vladimir Putin has already submitted his bill, requesting a global wink at military intervention in what used to be Soviet Georgia.

Even as the U.N. was still digesting Mr. Bush's speech last Friday, Mr. Putin appropriated the language of U.S. policy to justify his Georgian meddling. He accuses his southern neighbor of harboring Chechen rebels and others he calls terrorists, and the bold Russian hopes Mr. Bush will give him a pass in return for approving action against Iraq. This is an offer we hope the U.S. refuses, not least so it can begin better defining just what the new Bush "pre-emption" doctrine means.

For starters Mr. Putin's analogy is preposterous. Georgian President Eduard

Shevardnadze is not only not another Saddam Hussein, he is one of the more enlightened leaders of the new countries that were once part of the former Soviet Union. He hasn't tried to acquire nuclear weapons or plotted to assassinate a U.S. President, much less invaded a neighbor, gassed his own people or ignored 16 U.N. resolutions.

On the contrary, Mr. Shevardnadze's main problem is that he has charted a pro-Western foreign policy that irritates some of his former Soviet colleagues in Moscow. He has already survived several assassination attempts, with the chief suspect in one case finding safe haven in Russia. He has fought a separatist war against Abkhaz rebels trained and funded by Russia. Russia still has three military bases in Georgia and has defied orders from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe to vacate its base in Abkhazia and negotiate withdrawal from the others.

Mr. Shevardnadze is understandably keen not to give his big neighbor any excuse to intervene militarily. In response to Russia's latest saber-rattling, he has beefed up border security and invited monitors into Georgia to testify to his country's anti-terror efforts. U.S. special forces are already helping train and equip the Georgian military to root out rebels from Chechnya, a Russian republic on its northern border.

All of which suggests the need for Mr. Bush to elaborate on his pre-emption doctrine. We support this policy as necessary in a world in which madmen who control countries can get nuclear weapons; "non intervention" in the internal affairs of such countries is no longer a safe strategy. But the critics have a point that without some clarifying distinctions, the doctrine of preventive action can be abused by countries looking to settle old scores or grab new territory. Drawing a line between peaceful Georgia and Iraq—ruled by a lunatic dictator who traffics with terrorists and seeks nuclear weapons—would be a useful first step.

On Friday U.S. Undersecretary of State John Bolton began to take that step by saying the U.S. "opposes any unilateral military action by Russia" inside Georgia. He added that "I don't see that there are really any quid pro quos to be had" over Iraq, "whether with Russia or others."

We hope that view holds inside the Bush Administration, even as Russian pressure inevitably increases. Agreeing to Mr. Putin's Georgian price would be damaging to U.S. interests, and isn't necessary in any case. It would set a precedent for Russian action in oil-rich Central Asia, emboldening Russian nationalists to meddle next in Azerbaijan and elsewhere. It would also be dishonorable, abandoning a man in Mr. Shevardnadze who helped bring the Cold War to a peaceful end as the Soviet foreign minister under Mikhail Gorbachev.

It's doubtful that Mr. Putin will want to block U.S. action against Iraq in any event. Siding with Saddam would only undermine the worthy efforts he has made so far to build confidence in Russia as a political and business partner of the West. His overstretched military is already bleeding in Chechnya, and the last thing he needs is a ground war in neighboring Georgia. Using Iraq as cover for more meddling in impoverished Caucasus would only recall memories of Soviet imperialism.

Mr. Bush began to turn would opinion on Iraq last week not merely because he went to the U.N. but mainly because of the rightness of his cause. The U.S. can carry the day in Iraq without sacrificing its principles by catering to Mr. Putin's nationalist opportunism.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 2002]

A PARODY OF PARTNERSHIP

Vladimir Putin, the soul-baring friend of President Bush, is offering another demonstration of why the administration's flighty rhetoric about the "transformation" of U.S.-Russian relations has been premature. Mr. Putin's government is doing its best to hamstring Mr. Bush's campaign against Iraq; the Russian ambassador at the United Nations rushed to embrace Saddam Hussein's transparently tactical acceptance of weapons inspectors and declared that no further action by the Security Council was needed. Meanwhile, Mr. Putin himself is peddling a grotesque parody of Mr. Bush's principled stand on both Iraq and Afghanistan: Last week he informed the Security Council, in terms that deliberately echoed Mr. Bush, that the war on terrorism may require a unilateral Russian attack on the small neighboring nation of Georgia, a former republic of the Soviet Union that infuriates Moscow merely by existing as an independent, democratic and pro-Western state. This stunningly brazen attempt to cloak an old-fashioned threat of military aggression in Mr. Bush's new doctrine of preemption has been accompanied by an even more cynical suggestion of quid pro quo: Allow Russian to crush Georgian sovereignty, Mr. Putin hints, and he just might acquiesce in the enforcement of the U.N.-ordered disarmament of Iraq. Bush administration officials are saying they won't play Mr. Putin's game; the White House needs to make that point unambiguously this week to Mr. Putin's visiting defense and foreign ministers.

The nominal basis for Mr. Putin's threat to Georgia, a country the size of South Carolina with a mostly Christian population of 5 million, is that it is tolerating the presence of Muslim rebel fighters from the neighboring Russian province of Chechnya. Mr. Putin insists that these are terrorists, indistinguishable from al Qaeda, and that Georgia is allowing them to operate training camps and pass freely across the border. In fact the insurgents are almost all ethnic Chechens fighting for self-rule who take refuge during summer in the Pankisi Gorge, a wild, 11-mile-long strip that has long been lawless. The Bush administration contends that some al Qaeda operatives may be present in the Pankisi, but evidence is scant. In any case, the Georgian government clearly has no interest in backing al Qaeda terrorists, or even the Chechens; it has readily accepted an ongoing U.S. training program for its army, and it recently dispatched 1,000 troops to clear out the Pankisi. President Eduard Shevardnadze has asked to meet with Mr. Putin and invited international monitoring of the border area; this week his administration agreed to extradite 13 suspects Russia says are Chechen guerrillas.

These initiatives are not enough for Mr. Putin: His generals say they are readying a cross-border invasion, following up on airstrikes carried out last month. It's not likely that Russian forces, which have failed to control Chechen movements across their own border, could eliminate or even locate any militants in the Pankisi. But that's not Mr. Putin's real aim. His goals are to distract attention from a recent series of military disasters in Chechnya—incidents that have revived discussion in Russia about the futility of Mr. Putin's campaign to suppress the rebellion by force—and to use the leverage of Russia's U.N. Security Council vote on Iraq to achieve suzerainty over Georgia, which Moscow has been seeking since long before the war on terrorism. This is not the behavior of a soul mate, or even a "strategic partner"; and a U.S.-Russian relationship afflicted by such tactics has not been transformed.

[From the Economist, Sept. 21, 2002]

PUTIN'S FOLLY

Those who write speeches for Russia's president, Vladimir Putin, no doubt imagine they are good students of American foreign policy. They seem determined to copy, or rather caricature, every new American idea. They no doubt had a hand, too, in drafting the stern letter that Mr. Putin sent to the United Nations, laying out his case for intervention in neighbouring Georgia unless its government clears its territory of a group of Chechen terrorists who have holed up there.

Like America in Iraq, his officials claim, Russia is insisting on its right to take military action, alone if necessary, against a nation which it deems to be in breach of international law; like America in Afghanistan, Russia justifies itself by recalling that failed states can be a source of festering security threats. Like George Bush, Mr. Putin is merely proposing to act pre-emptively, in extremis, against a state that poses a deadly and increasing danger. Indeed, regime change cannot be ruled out.

A mixture of all these arguments has been used by Mr. Putin and his lieutenants to justify their recent and repeated threats of military action against Georgia—some air raids have already taken place, say the Georgians, and Russians have been hinting darkly that a land attack may follow. The Georgians stand accused of posing a threat to Russian security because they cannot or will not take effective action against the Chechen fighters, possibly allied with Islamist extremists from elsewhere, who have set up camp in the remote Pankisi gorge. If you cannot solve the problem—and guarantee that no attacks on Russian territory will be launched from Georgian territory—then we will, is the Kremlin's message. The Russian media, meanwhile, have mounted an escalating series of personal attacks on Georgia's president, Eduard Shevardnadze. The clear implication is that nobody in Moscow would shed a tear if, in the turmoil caused by a Russian attack, the leadership of Georgia were to change hands.

If there is not grain of truth in Russia's arguments, it lies in the fact that Georgia, while not a failed state, is one that has had difficulty asserting its authority in its border areas. Indeed in two of its regions—Abkhazia and South Ossetia—the writ of the Tbilisi government does not run at all. Even in other places, it struggles to collect taxes and enforce the law. This is a dangerous state of affairs; where the rule of law is absent, smugglers in drugs, guns and even deadlier things fill the void.

THE MOTE IN RUSSIA'S EYE

But there is also a huge flaw in Russia's argument. If the Georgian state functions less than perfectly—in Pankisi and elsewhere—that is in large part because Russia itself has consistently undermined it. The restive mini-states within Georgia's legal boundaries (Abkhazia, South Ossetia and, to some extent, Ajaria in the south-west) defy the government with the help of powerful friends in Moscow.

By sending 150 or so military advisers to Georgia, America is attempting to bolster the country's security forces. But even that programme has been undermined by Georgian officers with connections in Russia. If Russians are concerned about the security of their southern frontier, they would do better to reinforce Georgia's statehood rather than chip away at it. Georgia is neither a rogue state, nor (as yet) a failed one. Nor do Georgians need outsiders to orchestrate regime change for them. Imitation is a form of flattery, but other should not be duped into seeing parallels where none exist.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, all three of these editorials I have asked

to be printed in the RECORD talk about the danger we are now experiencing concerning Mr. Putin's actions, or possible actions, in Georgia.

The Economist magazine editorial says:

Russia would do better to bolster Georgia's stability, not undermine it.

It says:

If there is one grain of truth in Russia's arguments, it lies in the fact that Georgia, while not a failed state, is one that has had difficulty asserting its authority in its border areas. . . .

But there is also a huge flaw in Russia's argument. If the Georgian state functions less than perfectly—in Pankisi and elsewhere—that is in large part because Russia itself has consistently undermined it. The restive mini-states within Georgia's legal boundaries . . . defy the government with the help of powerful friends in Moscow. . . .

If Russians are concerned about the security of their southern frontier, they would do better to reinforce Georgia's statehood rather than chip away at it. Georgia is neither a rogue state, nor (as yet) a failed one. Nor do Georgians need outsiders to orchestrate regime change for them. Imitation is a form of flattery, but others should not be duped into seeing parallels where none exist.

In the Washington Post it goes on to say, referring to Mr. Putin:

His goals are to distract attention from a recent series of military disasters in Chechnya—incidents that have revived discussion in Russia about the futility of Mr. Putin's campaign to suppress the rebellion by force—and to use the leverage of Russia's U.N. Security Council vote on Iraq to achieve suzerainty over Georgia, which Moscow has been seeking since long before the war on terrorism. This is not the behavior of a soul mate, or even a "strategic partner"; and a U.S.-Russian relationship afflicted by such tactics has not been transformed.

Madam President, I thank the Presiding Officer for her patience. I do believe this is an important issue. I hope our Russian friends, with whom we have a very strong relationship, will not embark on an adventure which could have serious repercussions not only in the region but in the world.

I thank you, Madam President, and yield the floor.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I have had a discussion with Senator LOTT with regard to next week's schedule. I have indicated privately to a number of Senators my concern for the legislative agenda we must confront prior to the time we leave. That agenda includes a number of issues that have support on both sides of the aisle. It recognizes that we have been on the homeland security bill now for 3 full weeks and the Interior appropriations

bill for an equal amount of time. I am increasingly concerned that the longer we stay on those bills, the less likely it is that we will be able to adjourn on time.

Given that realization, my expectation is that we will require colleagues to be here at least possibly as early as next weekend to confront this agenda and to complete our work. I am not announcing necessarily that next weekend will be a work period, but I am suggesting to all colleagues that they not make any firm commitments next weekend.

We have to finish the homeland security bill next week. We have to deal with perhaps a continuing resolution, short-term, because of the pending end of this fiscal year. We have a number of other matters that have to be taken up prior to the completion of our work at the end of this session.

As I look at that schedule, I conclude that there is virtually no way we will be able to do this, and do it successfully, without longer hours and more days. The only days available to us, of course, are the Mondays and Fridays that have oftentimes been travel days for our Members but also Saturdays and Sundays.

It is my expectation that we will be using weekend days between now and the end of session, that we will require Senators to be here at least on Saturday and possibly on Sunday in an effort to complete our work. That may occur as early as next weekend.

This is not meant to be a threat or in any way a signal that we are not prepared to take whatever action necessary to preclude that, but I also want Senators to know that that is a very likely possibility.

I come to the floor with a recognition that we do need to make Senators aware of the importance of the schedule and the significant amount of work that needs to be done before we leave.

I appreciate everyone's cooperation and will appreciate the opportunity to speak more specifically to the schedule early next week.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

• Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I regret that I was necessarily absent for the vote on the confirmation of Reena Raggi to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. I would like to include in the RECORD that I would have voted "yes" on this nomination. •

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. We are now in morning business; is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

TRIBUTE TO DR. KELLY S. SEGARS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the professional achievements and public service of a truly extraordinary man, Dr. Kelly S. Segars, and to congratulate him on his selection as the 2002 Mississippi Family Physician of the Year.

The son of the late "Doc" and Ora Segars of Red Bay, Alabama, Dr. Segars displayed a penchant for helping and healing the sick from a very early age. He graduated with honors from high school, pharmacy school, and medical school despite an interruption while serving one tour in the Army during the Korean War. His military decorations include the American Defense Medal, the United Nations Medal, and the Army Commendation Medal.

Upon graduation from medical school in 1959, Dr. Segars entered the practice of Family Medicine in Iuka, Mississippi, not far from his birthplace, where he continues to practice today. Dr. Segars delivered some 500 babies before obtaining his board certification in geriatrics. He has been seeing some of the same patients for over 40 years and considers his many patients simply his "friends who have a medical problem occasionally." Dr. Segars' son joined his practice about 15 years ago, and the clinic, which is vital to the health of so many in the rural community of Iuka, has grown to include 31 employees.

Despite his resounding success as Iuka's resident physician—as if that accomplishment was not already enough for one man—Dr. Segars' has consistently worked for the betterment of his community in many other ways. He established the First American National Bank just four years after opening his medical practice. It was the first bank established in the Great State of Mississippi since the bank holiday in 1929 when all of the banks were closed. He also chaired his town's municipal library committee where he initiated the project, obtained the funds, and oversaw construction of the library. His most recent civic project is the re-designation of highway US 72 to Interstate Highway 72, acknowledging the advantage of an Interstate Highway to draw bigger, more lucrative industries to Tishomingo County. It takes a special individual like Dr. Segars, with a clear vision of the future, to recognize the need for a public institution or additional infrastructure, and then to take it upon himself to see to it that the need is fulfilled.

As a charter member of the Board of Directors of the Tishomingo County Development Foundation and Industrial Park, he was instrumental in the acquisition of the Lockheed-Aerojet office and the recent establishment of the AlliantTech Systems facility. He was named as 1992 Citizen of the Year and the Aerospace Business Center was most appropriately named in his honor.