

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 Marginalal; 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:

"We may have to face the reality that we will not get U.N. inspection teams back into Iraq;

"Any military action would be to just slow Saddam Hussein down;

"We have to keep going back to bomb him again;

"Our allies support of us in Iraq may be tied to our future commitment to NATO" and other such disconcerting remarks.

Senator HAGEL concluded by saying we owe it to our country and the men and women in uniform who will be called upon to fight a war to do better than just bomb Saddam Hussein.

He said:

That is not good enough. There is something surreal about all of the war talk, and war preparation played out in this 'matter of fact' tone on international TV with every talk show host panelist presenting his or her theories and options when most of them have never been to war, prepared for war or understand the first thing about the horrors of war.

There are no good options. Saddam Hussein has and is intent on building the most vile weapons in the history of man, weapons outlawed by nearly every country in the world. He cannot go unchallenged.

But, the American people and the Congress must have a more solid basis for our support. Whatever action is taken, it must meet a clear and immediate objective. We cannot continue to ricochet from crisis to crisis and call that foreign policy.

Mr. President, that is straight talk and I commend Senator HAGEL for his candor and forthrightness.

And, Senator HAGEL is right. The policy discussions regarding Iraq have indeed been unique, if not bizarre. We have seen more policy declarations, more redefined policy declarations, and more mixed signals than a coach signaling his quarterback with the time clock running out. That may well be part of diplomatic carrot and stick efforts but it certainly does not improve public understanding or provide confidence for a well defined and successful military mission.

The latest comments by Administration officials indicate the attack is now only weeks away although there has been considerable speculation that the U.S. would not attack while the Winter Olympics are being held. The United States is a signatory to a U.N. resolution that calls on all countries to honor a cease fire during the Olympic Games. International Olympic Games President, Juan Antonio Samaranch has made a public appeal to the United States.

I do not mean to be disrespectful but it occurs to me that a previous U.S. President canceled U.S. participation in the Olympics in response to one country invading another. This time we apparently will attack, but not while the Olympics are being held.

In addition, while our strongest Arab ally in the Gulf War, Saudi Arabia, has refused the use of their country from which to base an attack, they have expressed strongly that any military strike should be well over before the beginning of the annual pilgrimage to

Mecca and Medina that is the high point of the Islamic year. The Olympics are over February 23 and the pilgrimage begins March 20.

Such are the rather unique things that military planners must factor into their planning in this modern world of limited and political military strikes.

Saddam Hussein doubtlessly can pretty much figure out when the strike is coming: all he has to do is read the latest Time magazine for the latest target and battle plan information and the London Times for the Iraqi sites at risk not to mention many other press reports.

It goes without saying, this will be no surprise attack.

Nevertheless, additional time will at least afford us the opportunity to take a hard look at what is being proposed, especially as Senator HAGEL has stressed in regard to how a limited strike will fit into long term foreign policy goals and the law of unintended consequences.

First, I recommend to my colleagues and the American public the comments made by the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator Richard Russell of Georgia almost 30 years ago to the date. The Senator made his remarks in the midst of the Vietnam war and during the month in which the United States suffered over 2,000 casualties. He said this:

"I for one am not afraid of the old fashioned term, victory. We hear a great deal about limited wars, but I would point out that there is no such thing as a limit on actual combat in which our men are engaged. While it is a sound policy to have limited objectives, we should not expose our men to unnecessary hazards to life and limb in pursuing them.

The Senator went on to make the following pledge:

As for me, my fellow Americans, I shall never knowingly support a policy of sending even a single American boy overseas to risk his life in combat unless the entire civilian population and wealth of our country—all that we have and all that we are—is to bear a commensurate responsibility in giving him the fullest support and protection of which we are capable.

It is inconsistent with our history, traditions and fundamental principles to commit American boys on far-flung battlefields if we are to follow policies that deny them full support because we are afraid of increasing the risk of those who stay at home.

It is a confession of moral weakness on the part of this country not to take any steps that are necessary to fully diminish the fighting power of our enemies.

I submit, Mr. President, that is a most powerful statement of truth that has direct application to the challenges we face today in the Persian Gulf. The only thing that has changed is that today we refer to American men and American women.

The question must be asked, just where are we in regard to specific goals regarding Iraq? Last week, in a press conference with Prime Minister Blair of Great Britain, President Clinton "clarified" Administration policy. He

said the goal of the proposed attack on Iraq would be to, "substantially reduce or delay Iraq's ability to develop and use weapons of mass destruction."

The President also ruled out the removal of Saddam Hussein from power or action designed to compel him to halt obstruction of disarmament inspectors from the U.N.

The President went on to say, "I don't believe we need to get into a direct war with Iraq over the leadership of the country. Do I think the country would be better served if it had a different leader? Of course I do. That's not the issue."

In making this statement, the President has clearly narrowed the goals of the proposed air strike. In fact, in my opinion, he has narrowed them from the goals articulated in previous speeches by key administration officials and from the goals outlined in consultation with Members of Congress.

Secretary of State Albright, in a speech given last year emphasized the American strategy was to continue the sanctions until there was a successor regime. The President stated sanctions would continue "until the end of time or as long as he lasts." That strategy was changed however to one of trying to accommodate Saddam with what was described as "small carrots." It was the "small carrot" strategy that many observers now say led to the current crisis.

Just last week, members of Congress were told there were two specific goals:

First, to set back Saddam Hussein's ability to deploy and deliver weapons of mass destruction and,

Second, to preserve the ability of the U.N. Security Council to respond to the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by enforcing the disarmament resolutions that ended the 1991 Persian Gulf war, specifically in regard to unrestricted access for weapons inspectors.

Now, with all due respect to the President and his national security advisers, I am concerned the first mission may have a very limited success at considerable risk to our men and women in uniform and for all intent and purpose, end whatever possibility there is for achieving the second mission. The bombing may not destroy Saddam's capacity to deploy and deliver weapons of mass destruction but it is almost a sure bet bombing Saddam will NOT bring about open inspections.

This is especially significant in that the current resolution of support being crafted by our Senate leadership has been premised on U.N. Security Council Resolution 687 and four subsequent resolutions demanding open inspections by the U.N. inspection team. The language mirrors the statement of the distinguished Democratic Leader, Senator DASCHLE who stated last week:

The end game is simply to allow access by U.N. inspectors into all locations suspected to be the manufacturing facilities for biological weapons. I don't know what could be more clear than that.

The Democratic Leader's statement is, in fact, clear and direct. The problem, however, is that there is a follow on goal articulated in the resolution draft and it says:

We urge the President, in consultation with the Congress, and consistent with the U.S. Constitution and existing laws, to take all necessary and appropriate action to respond effectively to the threat posed by Iraq's refusal to allow inspection.

The question is will the bombing be effective? It may set back Saddam's capability to deploy and deliver biological weapons and it may not. But one thing for sure, after a week of bombing, there will be no welcome mats for U.N. inspectors.

In addition the resolution draft urges the president to work with Congress to further a long-term policy.

My colleagues it has not taken long to discover that we do not have the support of our allies, that we do not have a long-term strategy and that if we go ahead with the limited military strike we will effectively end chances for open inspection, which is precisely the original stated goal of the administration and the stated goal of the draft resolution of support.

Now, in making these remarks, I realize the current challenge posed by Saddam Hussein is both difficult and complex and that the situation in the Gulf and our relations with the members of the Gulf Coalition allies has dramatically changed.

The President stated, "I don't believe we need to re-fight the Gulf war. It's history. It happened. That's the way it is."

The President is right. The way it was is not the way it is and we have been frantically trying to play catch up in efforts to formulate a successful response to Saddam's latest threat.

Nevertheless, Administration officials state today we have Saddam in a box. To the contrary, after repeated efforts to "lead" and convince our allies in supporting the planned military action, I do not see much "following" and I wonder who has whom in a box.

It seems to me there are several obvious disconnects:

First, other than Saddam simply behaving like the international thug that he is, we are told his primary reason for closing down the inspections is to somehow force an end to the economic sanctions now in place, that the deprivation now experienced in his country is such that his continued rule is threatened.

It is true that most of his 22 million people are going through severe deprivation. But, this is the man who has a 90,000 strong security force made up of well trained, dedicated, fanatical professional units that have maintained a climate of terror. To the extent one can be, he is both bomb and assassination proof and simply gets rid of his opposition even to the extent of using weapons of mass destruction upon his own people.

The argument is also being posed that with France, Russia and China all opposing military action, and his Arab neighbors sitting on the fence, the United States might then be willing to lift the sanctions or at least increase the oil for food and medicine program. But, the United States already proposed increasing the oil for food program and Saddam refused it. And, he has used oil revenue to further construct the many palaces that now house his weapons. In any case, this explanation of his reasoning, if true, represents a good argument against a military strike.

In a paradox of enormous irony, it could be argued that by withstanding and suffering through the attack and exploiting the obvious propaganda opportunity, Saddam may actually gain sympathy and support for ending the sanctions from the very nations we are asking for help!

Second, what if Saddam's primary reason for shutting the door to U.N. inspectors was simply self preservation, not from within but from Iran? In fact, it was the attack from Iran several months ago that precipitated the crisis. Saddam, without his weapons of mass destruction and Iran with that capability and with a growing army represents a self preservation crisis for Saddam.

A military strike against Saddam further weakens Iraq in relation to their long standing enemy. Have we thought through what the Mideast will look like when Iran has the balance of power?

Third, in proposing military action, we do not have the support of the members of the Security Council whose credibility and effectiveness in enforcing open inspection we are trying to protect! We do not even have Security Council or allied support for the continuation of sanctions.

So much for a rational prospective U.N. policy with reference to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

France wants to sell Iraqi oil, China wants to buy it and Russia desperately needs the money that Iraq owes to Russia. All three do not support military action and have warned of dire consequences should military action be taken.

While trying to broker a diplomatic solution (Lets see, how about eight palaces open for inspection for 60 days with x number of inspectors from this country and y number of diplomats from that country and on and on) France is worried that American bombs plus Iraqi casualties will only consolidate domestic support for Saddam and that the bombing does not represent a long term answer. They have a point.

The Chinese foreign minister, speaking on television, said China is extremely and definitely opposed to the use of military force because it will result in a tremendous amount of human casualties and create more turmoil in the region and could even cause more conflict.

However, the winner of the Coalition Cross Current Sweepstakes has to be Russia. Foreign Minister Primakov has seized an opportunity to climb back on the world stage as the self declared pro Muslim broker while Boris Yeltsin's comment that bombing could mean "world war" could well have been made while pounding his shoe on a lectern. But, the Iraq issue did not stop there. Gennady Zyuganov, the Communist leader stated the Russian Duma should not ratify the START II treaty and said Americans "act like drunk cowboys." The ultra nationalist Vladimir Zhirinovskiy called for Yeltsin to put Russian troops in Southwest Russia on alert. Moderate members of the Russian Duma have argued the United States must get U.N. authorization before any attack. We cannot simply dismiss this sorry state of affairs as just Russian bluff and bluster.

To say that these landmark changes in policy amongst our former coalition allies will have grave consequences is an understatement to say the least.

Fourth, we do not have the support of the Arab nations whose sovereignty and freedom were allegedly trying to protect! With the exception of Kuwait, no Arab nation has endorsed American threats of military action.

Saudi Arabia, our closest Arab ally and a major regional power provided a crucial base for 500,000 American and allied troops that routed Iraqi forces back in 1991. Today, Saudi Arabia has refused to support a military strike upon Saddam Hussein and Secretary of Defense Cohen and the Commander of U.S. Forces in the Middle East, General Anthony Zinni have been forced to change battle plans.

The Saudi's stance also undercuts political support throughout the Arab world sensitive to the view that the United States has already excessively punished the Iraqi people and that the limited attack will not rid the Gulf region of Saddam and that he will remain as vengeful as ever.

In proposing limited strikes, the United States is in the position comparable to local law enforcement asking a witness to testify against the Mafia with no promise of incarceration or protection. Those chances are slim and none.

Like other staunch allies during the Gulf war, Turkey is now putting its own interests first regarding any confrontation with Saddam. Their foreign minister has also been one of the revolving door diplomats trying to broker a solution. Seen in the rest of the Muslim world as a pawn of the United States, having suffered economic losses as a result of the Gulf war, and having to fight Kurdish rebels, the Turks have also refused the use of air bases.

There is no doubt that most leaders in the Muslim world would like to be rid of Saddam Hussein. They view him as a menace. But, the political reality is that limited bombing with no plan for getting rid of the menace will lead

to the perception of the United States conducting a military exercise with innocent civilians being killed on world wide television with ominous repercussions throughout the Muslim world . . . including the trouble spots of Bosnia and in Indonesia.

Our policy has also made Israel more than a little nervous. Israeli leaders have stated they reserve the right for self protection and will act in accordance with their defense interests. Once again, we are trying to convince Israel to forgo its right to self defense and retaliation. A retaliatory attack upon Israel in response to U.S. bombing may be unlikely but it cannot be ruled out. Such a missile exchange would have devastating consequences.

Fifth, as a result of Arab denial to use our bases in their countries, the United States must now launch any attack from aircraft located in neighboring gulf states, from aircraft carriers and from an Indian ocean island. The USS *Independence* was supposed to be decommissioned this coming September but now, the oldest ship in the fleet, is in the Gulf.

This renewed buildup of sea and air forces in the Gulf and the corresponding manpower and equipment gaps in Europe and the Pacific is another example of just how stressed and stretched our U.S. military has become, all in the wake of substantial troop cuts and rising commitments to various peacemaking and nation-building missions such as Bosnia. We are already experiencing serious problems in regard to readiness, modernization, procurement and military quality of life.

If we sustain a three carrier force in the Gulf, it will mean zero presence somewhere else. Yet, Navy command has mapped out plans for two carrier presence through 1999. Our Air Force is not structured as a mobile expeditionary force. Accustomed to operating out of large bases, the new operations and personnel tempo has caused serious retention problems.

The obvious budget, military readiness, national security and foreign policy repercussions will be far reaching. Without question we cannot fund this current buildup and prospective military strike from within the current defense budget. If this is, in fact, an emergency requiring a military strike, then it should be funded by an emergency supplemental bill.

I must ask, has enough consideration been given to the collective risks that could well outweigh whatever benefit a limited military strike might bring?

Can we really ascertain the extent of Saddam's air and missile defense?

Can we, with any degree of certainty effectively target and destroy his most deadly weapons and eliminate the threat?

Do we have adequate protection for the men and women who will conduct the operation? Personnel recovery? POW recovery?

Can this strike destroy most of Saddam's deployment and delivery capability?

Will this action end all chances of further inspection? If this is true, what happens next when his capability is restored?

Will this strike hurt or improve his support within and without his country?

Will the strike prevent Saddam from counter-attacking and using weapons of mass destruction?

Will Iran attack a weakened Iraq?

What will be the response of the Muslim nations throughout the world?

How will the attack change Saddam's conduct?

Are our forces adequately equipped and protected against biological and chemical agents?

Have we considered the possibility of terrorist activities both in the Mideast and in the United States?

There is almost no end to these kind of questions and there is no question that the President's national security team and Pentagon planners have studied all of these questions and more with great care and purpose.

I can say as a member of the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees, I have great faith and a sense of personal pride and trust in our military and in our intelligence community. But, I also know that too often in the past military action has been rooted in misguided policy and our military has suffered the consequences.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shelton, has already found it necessary to refute allegations that the battle plan and targets in Iran have been drafted and selected by the executive as opposed to warfighters, a charge that harkens back to the limited and political decision making in the Vietnam war. There is no question that our military will obey their Commander in Chief and will do an exemplary job, no matter what the mission. That is how it should be and is. Nevertheless, I would be less than candid if I did not say judging from the private commentary from many within the military and public questions from those with expertise in military tactics and national security that this proposed strike may well be flawed and counterproductive.

Administration spokesmen have stated that this strike will attempt to destroy as much of Saddam Hussein's capability to deploy and deliver chemical and biological weapons as possible; not the actual material mind you, but the delivery means. But, we will not be able to destroy all of that delivery means.

So, at the end of the attack, at the end of the day, when all is said and done, with civilian and military casualties, Saddam will still be in power, his scientists will still be at work, his military and the Republican Guard still deployed, some of his weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means will still be intact. It strains

credibility that there will be any chance of inspections. In a year or two we may have to do it all over again.

In the meantime, we will have a continued erosion of faith and confidence with our allies, anti-American sentiment throughout the Muslim world, and the horrors of war on international television courtesy of Saddam Hussein. If our bombing does not kill innocent civilians, then Saddam will.

This is not some kind of impersonal therapy to correct Saddam's behavior we are contemplating. Too often we refuse to recognize the reality and horrors of war. In this regard, there is a pretty good test. Imagine what you would say to the loved one of an American service man or woman who will be put in harms way and may not return. For what did that airman, soldier, sailor or Marine die? Justify that loss. Many times in our history we have been able to do so with the knowledge and comfort in knowing that our nation and our individual freedoms were protected. Tragically, there have been other times we have not. We could not in Vietnam. We could not in Beirut. We could not in Somalia. Unleashing the horrors of war can be justified only to protect our vital national interests and to get rid of a greater evil. I am concerned the proposed military strike may not do either.

Mr. President, before we consider S. Con. Res. 71, these concerns should be answered and other policy alternatives should be considered.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:48 p.m., recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. BROWNBACK pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 73 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")