

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David Satcher to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, Medical Director of the Public Health Service, and Surgeon General of the Public Health Service? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 63, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Akaka	Durbin	Lieberman
Baucus	Feingold	Mack
Bennett	Feinstein	McCain
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Frist	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Gorton	Murray
Breaux	Graham	Reed
Bryan	Harkin	Reid
Bumpers	Hatch	Robb
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Inouye	Roth
Cleland	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnson	Snowe
Collins	Kennedy	Specter
Conrad	Kerrey	Stevens
Coverdell	Kerry	Thompson
Daschle	Kohl	Thurmond
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Domenici	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—35

Abraham	Gramm	Lugar
Allard	Grams	McConnell
Ashcroft	Grassley	Murkowski
Brownback	Gregg	Nickles
Burns	Hagel	Roberts
Campbell	Helms	Santorum
Coats	Hutchinson	Sessions
Craig	Hutchison	Shelby
D'Amato	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
DeWine	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Enzi	Kyl	Thomas
Faircloth	Lott	

NOT VOTING—2

Levin	Warner
-------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to exceed 1 hour, with the first 30 minutes under the control of Senator BYRD and the remaining 30 minutes under the control of Senator ROBERTS.

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

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for arranging the time for me to speak.

HIGHWAY FUNDING

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, since the convening of this session of Congress 2 weeks ago today, I have spoken on the Senate Floor numerous times to convey the urgency of prompt action on the highway bill. We were told that it would be among the first pieces of legislation considered this year, and yet the bill is still not before us. This inactivity is unjustified and, I think, it is inexcusable. The deadline for passing highway reauthorization legislation is May 1—May 1 of this year.

That deadline is set forth in the short-term highway bill that was passed last November before the Congress adjourned sine die. It is very clearly set forth in that legislation. After May 1, States will be prohibited from obligating any Federal highway or transit funds.

After that date, states will be prohibited from obligating any Federal highway or transit funds. As a result, many states will be forced to delay road and bridge projects and thousands of highway construction workers, as well as those in related industries, such as gravel and asphalt manufacturers, highway equipment manufacturers, and steel suppliers, may begin to be laid off. At the height of the highway construction season, thousands of highway, bridge, and safety projects will be stopped cold—dead in their tracks—and those who are employed in relation to these projects could begin to be sent home and lose their paychecks, while they await further action by Congress to enact highway reauthorization legislation.

So the Senate has just 44 session days remaining, including today. Those are days we have been told that the Senate will be in session. So there are just 44 session days, including today, remaining in which to avert this impending crisis. When the hour strikes midnight on May 1, the time is up.

I want to take a few minutes to explain exactly what this May 1 deadline means to a number of the States.

The Road Information Program, TRIP, recently surveyed the State transportation departments throughout the country to ascertain what will happen after May 1 if a new highway bill has not been signed into law by the President by that time. To date, TRIP has received responses from 15 State transportation departments, and additional responses are expected soon. Even with preliminary results, however, it is clear that billions of dollars worth of highway projects and transit projects are in danger of being postponed, and will be postponed until new Federal funding is available. These are critical transportation projects—critical transportation projects—projects designed to improve road safety and reduce the number and severity of highway crashes, to smooth the flow of traffic so we can improve air quality and lower the pollution that Americans breathe every day and every hour and every minute, and to reduce congestion so that Americans can spend more time at work and more time at home caring for their children, more time with their families and less time trapped in gridlock.

It may be edifying to my colleagues to hear some of the specific projects in their States that will be delayed, according to their own State transportation departments, if new Federal highway funding is not available beyond May 1. Remember, these are just the 15 States that have responded already to the TRIP survey.

The Road Information Program asked each State to list some of the most critical transportation projects that would have to be postponed during the 12-month period beginning May 1, 1998, if no new Federal funding is available.

And so let us go down the list. The very first State that is on the list is the State of Georgia.

In Georgia, the State transportation department will have to delay: Improvements to I-475 from I-75 in Bibb County to I-75 in Monroe County; improvements to the Harry S. Truman Parkway in Chatham County; work on the Jefferson Bypass in Jefferson County; and improvements to Peachtree Industrial Boulevard in Gwinnett County.

The Indiana transportation department will have to postpone: rehabilitating I-69 in Dekalb County; road and bridge rehabilitation on I-465 in Marion County; and bridge rehabilitation on US 20 in St. Joseph County.

In Kentucky, funds will dry up after May 1 for projects to: widen US 27 to four lanes from Lexington to Paris; reconstruct the Donaldson Road interchange on I-75 in Boone County; and replace the Cumberland River Bridge in Somerset.

Now, the Senators from these respective States, I am sure, are talking with their highway departments. Those Senators will probably have more complete lists than these that I am reading. But these are just the first 15 that have been supplied to me by TRIP.

In Maine, delays will occur on: The rehabilitation of the Carlton Bridge on US Route 1 in Bath; the reconstruction of 4 miles of Route 9 in Devereaux; and the replacement of the Penobscot River Bridge on Route 11 in Medway.

The Missouri transportation department will have to postpone, I am told: the replacement or rehabilitation of seven bridges on I-70 in the St. Louis area; plans to add left turn lanes on Route 61 at Lemay Woods in St. Louis to improve traffic safety; the widening and resurfacing of Route 39 in Barry County; and the replacement of two bridges over the North Fabius River on Route 136 in Scotland County.

In Nevada, they will have to delay plans to: widen I-15 from two to three lanes in West Las Vegas; remove and replace pavement on I-80 in Reno; and widen US 95 to four lanes in Las Vegas.

In New Hampshire, our failure to enact a highway bill by May 1 will mean the transportation department has to postpone: reconstructing exit 20 on I-93 in Tilton; safety improvements planned for I-93 in Manchester; and replacing a bridge over North Branch River in Stoddard.

In North Dakota, congressional inaction will mean the postponement of plans to: reconstruct South Washington Street in Grand Forks; improve I-94 from Eagles Nest to Geck; and widen US 52 from Drake to Harvey.

The Oklahoma transportation department will have to shelve plans for: interchange reconstruction and resurfacing on I-35 in Oklahoma City, a project designed to relieve congestion; widening 50 miles of US 183 from Cordell to Snyder in western Oklahoma to provide four lane access to I-40, designed to foster economic development in the region; and building shoulders and a passing lane on US 283 in Beckham County to improve highway safety.

In South Dakota, failure to meet the May 1 funding deadline will mean the delay of plans to: reconstruct I-29 in Minnehaha and Moody Counties; improve Benson Road in Sioux Falls to provide access to the Joe Ross Field Airport; and improve the interchange at the Haines Avenue exit on I-90 in Rapid City.

The Texas Department of Transportation reports that the following projects scheduled for Spring 1999—all designed to relieve congestion—would be delayed without new Federal funding beyond May 1: widening to eight lanes a 4.3 mile section of Route 1960 in Harris County; widening to eight lanes a 3.9 mile section in Fort Bend County; and widening to four lanes a 6 mile section of US 67 in Johnson County.

In Utah, the following projects—all related to preparations for the 2002 Winter Olympic Games—would be delayed: The reconstruction of the Kimball and Silver Creek Junctions on I-80; the construction of the 1.5 mile Winter Sports Road; and the reconstruction of the interchange at I-84 and US 89.

In Vermont, our inaction will mean delay in the planned resurfacing of 200 miles of State highways; the rehabilitation or replacement of three State highway system bridges and five local highway system bridges; as well as the reconstruction of four miles of US 7 in Shelburne and South Burlington to increase capacity and improve traffic flow.

In my State of West Virginia, the lack of new Federal highway funds after May 1 would mean postponement of the renovation of the Shepherdstown Bridge on West Virginia 480 in Jefferson County; the widening of a segment of West Virginia 2 in Ohio County to improve traffic flow—by the way, it was on Route 2 that my former colleague in the Senate, Senator Jennings Randolph, and I had an accident in 1957—1957 or 1958. We had an accident in that county. We ran head on into another automobile, killing the driver of the other automobile. That was Route 2. So we are talking here about the widening of the segment of West Virginia 2 in Ohio County to improve traffic flow, and the replacement of the Easley Bridge in Princeton, Mercer County. Mercer County, that is where I first started school in a little two-room schoolhouse over 70 years ago.

And finally, in Wyoming, the Senate's failure to act by May 1 would mean delaying reconstruction and bridge work on I-80 in Rock Springs, Rawlins, and Laramie Marginalia; as well as widening and rehabilitation projects on I-90 from Buffalo to Gillette and from Moorcroft to Sundance.

So, Mr. President, I urge Senators to call their transportation departments, if they have not already, and find out what a prolonged delay in Federal highway funds would mean for their States. The list I have just read is, obviously, not exhaustive; but it is indicative of the serious problems every State, or almost every State certainly will face if Congress does not act before midnight May 1. When Senators start to realize what this May 1 deadline means for their States, and how few days we have left to move a highway bill through the Senate, it should become obvious that we will have no choice but to bring up the highway reauthorization bill.

We have just 44 days, 44 session days. That does not count days like Saturdays and Sundays or other days when the Senate is not expected to be in session. Only 44 session days, including today, remain through the hour of midnight May 1. After that hour of midnight, then those States can obligate Federal aid highway program funds for any Federal highway project, after the hour of midnight on May 1. Now, that is by law. That was a part of the law that Congress passed last November when it enacted the short-term highway bill. It is in there. Bridge replacements, traffic decongestion projects, and road widening efforts all mean safety, time, money and jobs to our people. Further delay makes no sense.

A commitment was made to bring up the highway bill after the President's State of the Union speech. The State of the Union speech has come and gone and there is still no highway bill here in the Senate. Further delay makes no sense and the Senate should consider the highway bill promptly.

How much time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I yield that remaining time to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Chair, I thank all Senators, and again thank the leader for making possible the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the previous order for the Senate to stand in recess at the hour of 12:30, that I may be permitted to speak for up to 40 minutes.

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

CURRENT SITUATION IN IRAQ

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concerns about United States policy with regard to Iraq. Through the national and international news media and in consultations with members of Congress, we have been told time and again in the past several weeks that the United States is on the brink of waging a limited but significant military strike against Iraq and Saddam Hussein.

At the same time, Administration officials and President Clinton have also repeatedly stated they are hopeful for a diplomatic solution.

It would appear, however, that Saddam Hussein despite almost frantic revolving-door diplomatic efforts from Russia, China, France, Turkey and others, will not agree to the resumption of full and open U.N. inspections. So, we have a standoff.

Mr. President, in regard to this latest crisis in the Gulf, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL. His remarks are both thoughtful and thought provoking and they come from a man who is a veteran with a most distinguished record.

Senator HAGEL said this:

This dilemma must be approached from the framework of both our short-term and long-term foreign policy objectives. We cannot allow Saddam Hussein to stampede us into precipitous action.

What chain of events will we unleash with any action we take? What is the Administration's long-term objective in Iraq? Do we have one? Or, are we crafting a long term policy to justify short-term actions?

Senator HAGEL went on to say he was disturbed about reports over the weekend quoting high ranking Administration officials and Congressional leaders saying such things as: