

debt because of other sources of funds—such as a gift from the family—or that they do not, and therefore the reaffirmation cannot be approved by the court.

Without this amendment, we are concerned that the abuses in the reaffirmation system that we have seen will continue to occur, and the courts may continue to be left in the dark with respect to the existence of these agreements, let alone have the option to review them. This amendment is not perfect, and if given the choice, I probably would have preferred to go even further than we have in our language. With that said, I think it's still important to note that with this amendment, we have given our courts and consumers the appropriate tools that will provide them with the necessary information to make decisions that are in the individual's best interests, not the creditor's. That is a crucial point that I wanted to emphasize.

I appreciate all the efforts of those involved in the process that went into constructing this compromise amendment, and I am confident that it strengthens the hands of our courts, and more importantly, the minds of our consumers as they make decisions that will weigh upon them for the rest of their lives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota yields to the Senator from Missouri for 7 minutes.

Mr. WYDEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes after the Senator from Missouri has spoken.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am going to have to object. I am willing to let some people speak, but I have been waiting for 3 days to get this amendment up and to get this debated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could direct an inquiry, through the Chair, to the manager of the bill, it is my understanding that the majority leader has asked—and he has spoken to the Senator from Minnesota—that his amendment be set aside for purposes of the senior Senator from Connecticut to offer an amendment. The debate time on that would be—

Mr. GRASSLEY. Five minutes on our side and 5 minutes on the other side.

Mr. REID. Following the disposition and a vote on the Dodd amendment, Senator WELLSTONE, who has been waiting all week to offer his amendment, would get the floor to which he is now entitled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the present time, there is a unanimous consent agreement for the Senator from Missouri to speak for 7 minutes.

Mr. REID. Objection. I object, and I do so, Mr. President, on the basis of—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was already agreed to.

Mr. REID. No, it wasn't.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am afraid it was. Senator ASHCROFT has 7 minutes.

Mr. REID. OK, the Senator from Missouri.

Following that, is Senator DODD going to be recognized? Has the unanimous consent request been accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has not been an agreement to that effect. The Chair will entertain one.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I would object. The only thing I agreed to is Senator ASHCROFT being allowed to speak for 7 minutes; then I retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chair. And I thank my colleagues for allowing me this time.

DAKOTA WATER RESOURCES ACT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to talk about one of Missouri's most important natural resources, and that is the Missouri River. There is a bill that another Member is trying to pass by unanimous consent that would threaten the Missouri River. I am making it clear that I have an objection to this bill, and I am firm on this issue.

On Friday around 4 p.m., 52 bills were hot-lined to be passed by unanimous consent in the Senate. Most of the time, Members pass bills by unanimous consent that are noncontroversial. However, buried in this list of 52 bills was one that I am opposed to, S. 623, the Dakota Water Resources Act. I am opposed to it because it would divert a substantial amount of water out of the Missouri River. The bill that I am objecting to authorizes \$200 million to divert additional water from the Missouri River system to the Cheyenne River and the Red River systems. This is an inter-basin transfer of water which could have substantial impacts all along the Missouri River basin. I do not blame the North Dakota Senators for fighting for this, but it hurts my State and it hurts other States, and I cannot consent to its approval by unanimous consent. Apparently, this bill has broad opposition by many different parties along the Missouri River. It is a very controversial provision and should not be passed in the dead of night on a consent calendar with a lot of noncontroversial bills.

This is opposed strongly by the Governor and the Department of Natural Resources in Missouri. It is opposed by Taxpayers for Common Sense. It is opposed by a host of environmental groups—including the National Wildlife Federation, the National Audubon

Society, Friends of the Earth, and American Rivers. The Canadian Government opposes this bill and has opposed the program it authorizes for decades, claiming that it violates a 1909 United States-Canada Boundary Waters Treaty. The Governor of Minnesota opposes this measure. The Minnesota State Department of Natural Resources opposes it, and the list goes on.

It is too early in the process for me to clear this bill. There are too many questions that remain to be answered. There are too many related issues that the States are negotiating at this time. We are awaiting the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers on how much additional water they intend to reserve for Dakota purposes. The senior Senator from Missouri and I will continue to object. As a result of our objections, the sponsor of the bill is holding up 51 other unrelated bills.

Let me be clear. These 51 holds are not related to the longstanding dispute between North Dakota and Missouri and many other parties over the water allocation in the Missouri River. Therefore, Senator BOND and I will not be pressured into lifting our hold on a bill that will harm the livelihood of the people of Missouri. These types of interstate river disputes that have been going on for years simply should not be resolved without all interested parties involved and without adequate consideration given to the ecological and commercial effects.

From the farm to the factory, the Missouri River creates jobs in the Midwest. The Missouri River is a stable water supply and a source of hydro power for major cities. We must be very cautious about changing water levels along the Missouri River in order to maintain the recreational opportunities for local communities, as well as hatcheries for fish and flyways for migratory birds.

I regret that important unrelated and noncontroversial measures are being held up by the sponsors of S. 623, but I cannot consent to passage of this bill at this time. The water flow of the Missouri River is too important to the livelihood of numerous metropolitan areas and small cities, and transportation and industry not only in Missouri but all along the waterway. We must deal with this measure reasonably and in the context of real negotiations, not as a matter of consent to be undertaken without full discussion by the parties.

I thank the Senate for my opportunity to reference my position on this issue. I yield the remainder of the time.

BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1999—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from