

Economically, the fish, wildlife and recreational benefits of the river now constitute over \$80 million. Navigation constitutes \$7 million. In economic wherewithal, that is what the reality is today: \$7 million for navigation, over \$80 million for fish, wildlife and recreation. Yet the master manual is written in a way that only recognizes the navigational issues because that is all there was in 1960 when this was written.

The Corps is now looking for a way to provide better balance. I think there is a compromise that more and more States are becoming more comfortable with. But what this provision in this bill says is they can't even consider it. Now that all this work and effort has gone into considering ways in which to accommodate all the States, the provision says we won't even consider it.

I have to use my prerogatives as a Senator to say that we must find a compromise on that language. We are not going to be able to do it with one vote on a Friday or a Monday afternoon, so I would like to work with the leader. I told him I would like to find a way to resolve this matter. He said, we are looking at, we will take any option. I suggested one to the leader: Let's go to conference on this provision. I am willing to live with whatever the conference decides. Of course, the administration is going to weigh in. They said it will be vetoed if this provision is in there. So if we are going to get this bill done, let's be realistic.

I want to get this bill done. I have as many things in this bill as I have in any appropriations bill. I want to get it done. I would like to get it done this afternoon, and I am willing to let the conference make its decision. But to say that the bill must have that provision or there is no bill, is just not fair to this side, to this Senator.

That is my reservation. If the Senator from Nevada has not objected, I will. I think it is important to resolve this matter. I am prepared to offer a compromise. Let's resolve this in conference. I say that in full recognition that I have no idea what would happen in conference. But if they want to finish this bill and move it to the next phase, I am ready to do it. I will do it this morning. I will do it this afternoon. I will do it on Monday. But we have to deal with that provision.

Having objected, I thank the majority leader for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished minority leader and to Senator DOMENICI and Senator REID, we will continue to work. I have learned from experience working on both sides of the aisle, if everybody just hunkers down and says no, this way or no way, you don't ever get anything. I will continue to probe and

work with Senator DASCHLE, Senator REID, and Senator DOMENICI, to see if we can find a way to resolve this problem. I think perhaps we can. We will be talking further. I want to make sure we have on record that we are trying to get it done, and we will hopefully come back here in another hour or two and try again.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after conclusion of the 6:00 p.m. vote or votes, if any, on Monday, the Senate proceed to the intelligence authorization bill, S. 2507, and following the reporting by the clerk, Senator THOMPSON be recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, can the majority leader give me his latest report with regard to the hearing in the Judiciary Committee on Tuesday?

Mr. LOTT. I have been in contact through senior staff, the top staff of Senator HATCH, with a suggestion of how we could proceed on that and get that information back to Senator DASCHLE. I did that, I guess, about an hour ago. I have not gotten a response back from them yet. But if I don't get one pretty quick, I will pursue another call to see if we can work that out.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will be constrained to object at this time, with the hope and expectation that we can get a much larger and more comprehensive unanimous consent agreement later in the afternoon. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me say again, of course, judicial nominations are important to the country on both sides of the aisle. I guess in the Senate everything is related to everything else. But who the hearings are on in Judiciary doesn't directly affect this bill. We need to get the intelligence authorization bill done.

Once again, this is important to the national security of our country. There had been some objections to it, but we have worked through those, and it took a lot of give and take and cooperation on both sides because there were objections on both sides of the aisle. We have cleared that.

Regarding the amendment I pointed out of Senator THOMPSON, I have been looking for any number of ways to have this very important matter of nuclear weapon proliferation by China reviewed. Senator THOMPSON has been very helpful and willing to withhold, or to consider any number of options as to how that would be considered. It seems to me that if we can get the intelligence authorization bill up, that would be an appropriate place for this issue to be considered, so that we can move to the PNTR for China issue on

Wednesday. We are going to do that anyway. But I would like to have been able to deal with Senator THOMPSON's very meritorious amendment, either freestanding or as an amendment before we go to the China PNTR issue because I think he is going to be constrained to offer it as an amendment to the bill. That would be difficult because if it should be approved, of course, it would have to go on the bill and it would go back to conference and the House would have to consider it again. Perhaps, there will be enough votes to defeat it, but I, for one, do not feel constrained to vote against an issue of this significance. I think it is a legitimate argument that this is a national security and nuclear proliferation issue that should maybe be considered separate from the trade issue, but it is related to how we are going to deal with China in the future.

So, again, Senator DASCHLE objected with the recognition that we are working on another angle or issue. We will try to get that worked out, and then we will try again later this afternoon on this issue. Rather than me controlling the floor for the debate, I think it would be best at this point if perhaps I would yield the floor, and perhaps Senator THOMPSON and Senator HOLLINGS, who are very interested in this issue, could speak on their own time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me say this to the majority leader before he leaves the floor. He and I have spent more time than we probably care to calculate over the last couple of days trying to work through what is obviously a very complicated and difficult period. I have appreciated his good nature as we have done this, his patience, his tolerance. He is smiling now, which is encouraging to me. I am going to keep smiling, too. I hope we can accommodate this unanimous consent request for the intelligence authorization. As Senator LOTT, I recognize that it is important, and I hope we can address it.

I also hope we can address the additional appropriations bills. There is no reason we can't. We can find a compromise if there is a will, and I am sure there is. But we also want to see the list of what we expect will probably be the final list of judicial nominees to be considered for hearings in the Judiciary Committee this year. I am anxious to talk with him and work with him on that issue. All of this is interrelated, as he said, and because of that, we take it slowly. So far, we have been able to take it successfully.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.