

chief cosponsors. There are 54 Members of the Senate who are cosponsoring the Byrd-Gramm-Baucus-Warner amendment, and they are from both sides of the aisle. They are Republicans and Democrats, about evenly divided, I would say, among those names that are on that amendment.

There is no partisanship here. There is no partisanship in my urging the majority leader to call up ISTEA—no partisanship. I know he is under great pressure from some of the Senators on the Budget Committee, including, I am sure, the distinguished chairman, Mr. DOMENICI, a man who has one of the finest brains in this Senate. He does not want the ISTEA bill brought up, he and Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. CHAFEE has said so. So I am not saying anything behind their backs that I would not say anywhere. They prefer to wait until the budget resolution is called up.

Mr. President, the country needs a 6-year highway authorization bill, and the time is ticking. Failure to call it up will only undermine the very necessary progress that this bill is designed to make.

I believe that if the majority leader were left to his own pursuits—he has not told me this—he would call this bill up. But my good friend, Senator DOMENICI, is a very powerful Senator. He was here a moment ago. He will be back later today. And I am not saying anything to make him feel that I am taking any advantage of him. But if he would just leave it to the majority leader, I think we would get this bill up. That is my own opinion.

Mr. President, failure to take up the bill, as I say, will undermine the very necessary progress that that bill is trying to make, and it deprives me and other Senators from calling up amendments to that bill. Our transportation system, our people's safety, and the country's economy all await action by the Congress on the 6-year highway authorization bill. What are we waiting for? How long, Mr. President, how long will we have to wait? How long?

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. How many minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-five minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. I reserve that time until later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor. 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. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Chair.

THE LINCOLN LEGACY

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today, on the 189th anniversary of his birth, to pay tribute to an American of commonsense ways and uncommon character.

Let me read to you from the autobiography of Abraham Lincoln, which he penned in December of 1859.

I was born February 12, 1809, in Hardin County, Kentucky. My parents were both born in Virginia, of undistinguished families. . .

There was absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education. Of course, when I came of age I did not know much. Still somehow, I could read, write, and cipher to the Rule of Three; but that was all. I have not been to school since.

The little advance I now have upon this store of education, I have picked up from time to time under the pressure of necessity.

Lincoln concluded his autobiography just four paragraphs later with these words: "There is not much of it, for the reason, I suppose, that there is not much of me."

That was in 1859, one year before the election that thrust Abraham Lincoln into the Presidency—before the Civil War broke out and helped crystallize all that he believed about his nation—before everything he believed about himself was tested.

Never again could Abraham Lincoln truthfully make the claim that "there is not much of me."

Mr. President, on the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, poet and biographer Carl Sandburg traveled here to the Capitol in 1959 to address a joint session of both Houses of Congress.

The description he painted that day of the man born in Hardin County, Kentucky, was delivered in words far more eloquent than any I could offer up:

He said,

Not often does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm and peace unspeakable and perfect. . .

The people of many other countries take Lincoln now for their own. He belongs to them. He stands for decency, honest dealing, plain talk, and funny stories. . . Millions there are who take him as a personal treasure. He had something they would like to see spread everywhere over the world.

Democracy? We cannot say exactly what it is, but he had it. In his blood and bones, he carried it. In the breath of his speeches and writings, it is there. Popular government? Republican institutions?

Government where the people have the say-so, one way or another telling their elected leaders what they want? He had the idea. It is there in the lights and shadows of his personality, a mystery that can be lived but never fully spoken in words.

Mr. President, there are many American leaders I admire—for their convictions, their passion, and their pursuit of truth—but Abraham Lincoln towers above most all of them.

At a troubled moment in our nation's history, he gave a voice to the growing number of Americans who felt out of place with the politics of the time. America is a place of inclusion, they argued, not exclusion. A place of freedom, not of slavery. The United States must stay united, they said, not severed into disparate parts. Abraham Lincoln spoke for what America was meant to be when he spoke of inclusion, unity, and equality, and by the sheer force of his single-minded dedication, his voice kept the Union from splintering forever apart.

If any one man is responsible for preserving the nation during the Civil War, that man is Abraham Lincoln.

"Important principles may and must be inflexible," said President Lincoln in his last public address, delivered in Washington, and for that unflinching commitment, his detractors hated him.

Lincoln was unfit, they said, "shattered, dazed, utterly foolish" . . . "a political coward" . . . "timid and arrogant." And those were the words of his fellow Republicans. Outside his party, they labeled him "a mole-eyed monster with a soul of leather" and "the present turtle at the head of the government."

But his simple words and powerful resolve endeared him to the people, who looked on him as "Honest Abe," a straightforward and sympathetic leader. He was their president, but he was also one of them. So, it was a brutal shock to the country when he was shot to death just ten blocks from here, during an evening performance at FORD's Theater.

Mr. President, poised on the edge of the Reflecting Pool on the National Mall, overlooking Washington from its place of honor, rests a graceful tribute to our sixteenth president. Outside, the Lincoln Memorial possesses the lines of a classic Greek temple—inside, you will find the soul of an American patriot. Lincoln himself rises 19 feet toward the sky, sculpted in Georgia White marble, larger than life, his eyes forever focused forward. He cannot speak, but the walls speak for him. Etched into the stone around him are his words, and each time I visit I am struck by the visual marriage of man and message. One phrase in particular always makes me pause, a quotation from Abraham Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address, spoken just 28 days before his assassination:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in.

We have come so far as a nation since those words were first spoken. More than one hundred years have passed since brother last took up arms against brother, and we are no longer divided by allegiance to a Confederate or Union flag. By heritage, we are black Americans, white Americans, Italian Americans, Polish Americans, Norwegian Americans—and united under the Constitution, we are simply Americans.

Abraham Lincoln did not live to finish the work he began, but the pursuit of liberty and inclusion he inspired in a nation has endured.

More than once in the million recorded words he left behind, Abraham Lincoln considered his death and the reputation that history would accord him. In keeping with everything else we know about the man, however, he sought not a legacy, but his place in humanity. "Die when I may, I want it said of me that I plucked a weed and planted a flower wherever I thought a flower would grow." Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln plucked many weeds during his too-brief life, and sowed a great garden of humanity in their place. On the anniversary of his birth, we celebrate the towering truths we have reaped from his planting.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I understand we are in morning business. I seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator may speak up to 10 minutes.

ADDRESSING IRAQ IN CONTEXT

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we as a nation are obviously wrestling with the issue of how to address the events presently occurring in the Middle East, specifically as they relate to Iraq. The Congress has considered taking up a resolution, which has been passed around and reviewed by many of us, but for a variety of reasons it does not appear that we are going to take such a resolution up during this week, and since we are adjourning, we will not be taking it up next week either. So I did want to make a few comments on this issue, because it is clearly the question of most significance that faces our country at this time.

I do not believe that we can address the question of how we deal with a dictator such as Saddam Hussein in isolation. We have to look at the question in the context of the other nations which surround Iraq and in the context of the history which has led us to this point. This is especially true when we deal with Iraq—or any nation in that region of the world—because the history of that region is so convoluted and involves so many crosscurrents, it being, quite literally, the crossing point of thousands of years, of generations of individuals, of numerous cultures both East and West, Bagdad specifically being the center, for literally centuries, of commerce from the east to the west and from the north to the south. As a result, it was a place where many cultures merged.

Therefore, when we as a nation, a new nation in the context of dealing with the Middle East, set ourselves down in the center of that part of the world, I think we have to be aware of the variety of forces which come to bear as a result of the historical events and prejudices and attitudes and cultures and religions that confront us

there. I am not sure that we have been, really, in dealing with this issue.

For example, let's begin at the outer reaches of the question from a territorial or geographic perception. Let's look at Russia. Clearly our capacity to deal with Iraq requires our capacity to encourage support amongst other nations for our position. We have had fairly limited success in that. In fact, you might almost call this administration's approach to alliance relative to Iraq as the English-speaking approach, because, as far as I can tell, it appears to be only English-speaking countries who are supporting this administration's present policies in an open manner.

There are a few of the gulf states that have supported us, which is something we should not underestimate. But as a practical matter, I have noted with a great deal of sadness, actually, that the White House was taking great pride in the fact that yesterday it had been joined by Australia in support of its position. That's what they were heralding. We greatly appreciate Australia's support and admire them as a nation. But I think we also recognize that in the issue of the Middle East, it is not Australia that is important; it is nations such as Russia and our former Arab allies. I say former Arab allies because it appears that that is no longer the case—such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, who are critical, and Turkey.

But in the area of Russia, for example, this administration appears to think that they can go to the Soviets—to Russia, my mistake—and demand that Russia follow our policies in Iraq and insist on their support on Iraq, but at the same time this administration proposes an expansion of NATO. You have to recognize, if you were a Russian leader, you would find a certain irony in a request that was coupled in that terminology. Because, of course, an expansion of NATO, especially to Poland, is an expression that can only be viewed in Russia with some concern and possibly viewed by some as an outright threat.

NATO expansion is represented to us here in the United States as simply: Well, let's ask these three nice nations in Eastern Europe to join us in our alliance. But, of course, NATO is a security issue. It is an alliance made for the purposes of defending nations from threat, military threat. It is not an economic group, as everybody has noted for many years. As a practical matter, the capacity to expand NATO means that you are essentially saying to these nations that they are joining, for the purposes of their own national security, against some threat. What is the threat in Eastern Europe? Of course, the threat in Eastern Europe has always been either Russia or Germany. Since Germany is a member of NATO and is not a threat, clearly an expansion of NATO is addressing the threat from Russia. Therefore, when we ask Poland especially to join us in NATO, we are saying to Poland that we

are giving you security against Russia, and clearly we are implying, certainly indirectly if not directly, that Russia may be the threat.

So you can understand that Russia might view a push to expand NATO at the same time as we are asking them to support us in Iraq as being inconsistent and a bit ironic. And it reflects, unfortunately, I think, this administration's failure to understand the linkage—and linkage is the right term—between working with a nation like Russia and our capacity to do things in the Middle East and moving forward with the NATO expansion at the exact same time. Yet, if you were to listen to the leadership of this administration, they will tell you that there is no relationship, they have no overlap on those two issues. Of course that is not true, and that is one of the reasons we are having problems with Russia.

It is equally a reason that we are having problems with our former Arab allies. Just yesterday or the day before yesterday—I lose track of the calendar here when we go to Egypt—but the Arab League met in Cairo, and they endorsed the French and Russian proposal, which was essentially a restatement, to a marginal degree, of the Iraqi proposal, as a league. The Arab League endorsed that as a league. Why would they do that? Because the Arab League essentially is dominated by Egypt, which has been our ally and which certainly, in many ways, is a friend of our Nation. I am a great admirer of the Egyptian people. They have certainly worked hard as a nation to try to bring about a constructive result, or progress in the Middle East in their relationship to Israel ever since President Sadat and through the present leadership in Egypt.

You wonder why the Arab League would openly endorse the French and Russian program? Essentially, they do it because of the situation that presently exists in Israel and Palestine, the fact that the peace process is, for all intents and purposes, dead. Yet, if you were again to listen to this administration, as the Senator in the chair has pointed out in a number of conferences that we have had, this administration's attitude is that there is no relationship between the peace process in Israel and Palestine and the question of Iraq. Of course, there is. They are intimately related. In fact, if we were able to make progress or to get back on line the process of peace between Israel and Palestine, we would probably relieve dramatically the tension in that part of the world and it would inevitably lead to having support from Egypt and Saudi Arabia, the key allies, on the issue of how we address Iraq.

So the failure of this administration to understand, again, the linkage between those two issues is a failure of fundamental proportions in their capacity to address the Iraq issue.

The third area that this also reflects is the issue of Turkey. Turkey is not