

fund. And let me just describe something. Maybe the Senator does not understand this, but we have, for example, in North Dakota right now a highway called Highway 57. It is a link to the Spirit Lake Indian Nation. It is now under water, incidentally. That Indian nation is virtually isolated out there, and there are young kids who need doctors' attention and medical help who at this point have to go far around in order to get it. Their lives are at risk. Commerce stops. Emergency medical assistance is not available. And so we need to deal with these emergency road needs, for example, in Devils Lake which has been flooded every year.

Mr. LOTT. If I can respond to that, it is interesting the Senator would raise that. As a matter of fact, I believe that one of the things that will probably be indicated as urgent disaster need would be in the transportation area which is different from the \$694 million that is in the bill, and let me just emphasize this. The President in that area asked I think for about \$300 million, but along the way that figure grew to almost \$1 billion. I have seen this figure I believe that is there, \$694 million. I think that has to do with ISTEA and the allocation formula and that there is a separate emergency transportation item that we might consider. It may not be accurate, but that is the impression I have. That \$694 million is for funds all over the country not related to the disaster.

Mr. DORGAN. I would say to the Senator that I have visited with the Department of Transportation Secretary and others, and they are awaiting this disaster bill in order to unlock the money necessary to deal with these critical road problems in the one area I have mentioned, which is Devils Lake, where an entire Indian tribe is isolated out there because the roads are inundated with water. But let me go back to the point I originally made today to the Senator from Mississippi.

I urge you to consider this afternoon doing the following, which would very simply and quickly unlock this issue. There are two major stumbling blocks to having the President sign this disaster bill. One is the attachment of the anti-Government-shutdown provision and the second is the census issue. Let us, as the Senator from Minnesota and others have suggested, set them aside, debate them separately. We will not stand in the way of debating and voting on those issues. And let's take the other bill that has been crafted by a bipartisan majority, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and the House, and I was on the conference committee, let us take that to the floor, vote it out, send it, and get it signed and get disaster relief. We could do that this afternoon.

I just don't understand why that is not possible today. Maybe the Senator from Mississippi can tell me why that is practically impossible. I would think it would be the easiest and most imme-

diate solution to getting disaster aid to disaster victims.

Mr. LOTT. As a matter of fact, one of the things that amazes me is the President of the United States would veto a disaster bill because he doesn't want language in there that says we won't have a Government shutdown. As a matter of fact, if we can get this problem worked out now, it will avoid a problem we are surely going to have in October, where, once again, like we do almost every year, we have these fun and games where there is a threat of various departments or agencies or Government shutdowns that has been used by Democrats and Republicans—most effectively, by the Democrats. And all I am saying is, you know, we could work this out. I have suggested some language that I believe most of you could live with, and we ought to go ahead and do that and get this issue resolved and move on.

Of course, obviously, the purpose here would be to separate these things out where the President could veto them, if he wanted to, and not resolve the problem. Why move these on down the line toward another disaster—as I have already pointed out, a manmade disaster—at the end of the fiscal year?

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LOTT. Let me just say, in order to allow other Members to speak, would the minority leader be willing to allow us consent to provide for speeches by Senators DASCHLE, GRAMS, HUTCHINSON, DORGAN, SARBANES, BOND, WELLSTONE, NICKLES, or his designee, say for 10 minutes each, and following those statements that I be recognized?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, there are many other Senators who want to be recognized to speak, so I wouldn't want to exclude other Senators who would like very much to participate.

Mr. LOTT. I would not want to exclude them. I think this would just get an agreement that these Senators that are here, waiting for an opportunity to speak—I would like to amend that list to include the Senator from North Dakota—that we get a lineup of speakers, led off by the distinguished Democratic leader. Senator GRAMS has been waiting to speak; Senator HUTCHINSON, who is an original cosponsor of the Government shutdown prevention language, and Senator DORGAN and Senator SARBANES have been waiting. Senator BOND is here and wishes to speak on his birth defects bill. That has been blocked now. It is a bill we should be able to have some limited debate on and get agreement to move on.

Senator WELLSTONE, I am sure, would like to be recognized, Senator CONRAD and Senator NICKLES, or his designee, for 10 minutes each with their statements, and then I be recognized at end of that group.

Then, if others come in, we will get time for others to speak, too. There is no desire to cut Senators off. I am just trying to set up some regular order

where I don't hog all the time and I am in a position of saying to you I will yield for a question only so I do not lose control of the floor.

Let's set up an orderly process and we all get our chance to make our speeches, make our statements, without being just a question or response to the question. Would the Senator object to that?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would have two concerns. One is that some Senators may wish to speak longer than 10 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Would you like to make it 15?

Mr. DASCHLE. Second, they may wish to come back and speak again.

Mr. LOTT. We wouldn't limit that, either.

Mr. DASCHLE. I wouldn't want it to be precluded.

Mr. LOTT. I hope before the afternoon is over, we will have an opportunity to get an agreement for an extended period of time of debate which would be open, with the normal recognition of the Chair and going back and forth on both sides of the aisle, that would go on for quite some time.

Again, I want to talk to the Senator about what length of time he is talking about.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, so long as no Member is precluded a second time or speaking for a period longer than 10 minutes at a later time, and so long as no other Senator is precluded from speaking at all by this unanimous consent request—I think that is the assertion, now, of the majority leader?

Mr. LOTT. If I could suggest, again, let's start with this and then I will talk to the Democratic leader, and we will go from there. This is just to get it started.

Mr. DORGAN. I reserve the right to object, and I ask the majority leader a question. On two occasions, on the two most recent business days, we were subject to a motion to adjourn and required to vote on that, even though many of us did not feel we should adjourn. We wanted to continue to discuss this issue and attempt to see if we couldn't get the Senate to do its business and pass a clean bill providing disaster relief.

I would just like to understand what we might face later today. I certainly would object to any unanimous-consent request propounded by anyone under any circumstances unless there is some assurance we are not going to face another motion for adjournment and simply be voted down and told the disaster bill is not a subject they want us to visit about on the floor of the Senate for any extended length. Some of us feel very strongly we would like to spend some time on the Senate floor talking about the disaster relief bill and ways to solve this so we can get disaster relief to disaster victims.

So, I guess, before I would agree to a unanimous-consent request, I would like to have some understanding

whether we are going to face an adjournment request later.

Mr. LOTT. Well, could I inquire if the leader would be willing to give us consent for our committees to meet, if we could go ahead and lock in a unanimous consent-agreement, or an agreement on how long you all would like to go tonight? Would the Senator like to respond to that?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we discussed this matter in the caucus. I think it was unanimous in the caucus that committees would not meet this afternoon, because we really need to have attention focused on this issue. I am afraid I am not able to give that agreement to the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could say, then, I would like to—and I will talk to the Senators about how we do this—with their cooperation, and I am talking about not just committee meetings, because we will do what we need to do there. But when we begin the debate or comments other Senators are going to make, we will talk with you about how much time we think we need and how we will do that. It is my inclination today to try to get it worked out, where we could have an understanding, an understood period of time, and to not go with a motion to adjourn.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator would agree to the proposition that we not propose a motion to adjourn the Senate without agreement obtained with the minority leader for such a motion.

Mr. LOTT. You know, I am asking here for some process whereby the Senators from the various States would have a chance to make comments for a specified period of time. I asked for 10 minutes. Do you want me to expand that to 15?

Mr. DASCHLE. I think there are Senators who wish to speak longer than 10 minutes. Whether it is at the first opportunity or whether they have the opportunity to come back, that is a concern. But I share the concern expressed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LOTT. If I could—excuse me for interrupting you, but we are going to have an opportunity for them to speak now and speak again later. And we will have to work out the process to do that.

Mr. CONRAD. Reserving the right to object, what is the assurance that a Senator would not be precluded from giving a second speech? Because, as the majority has outlined this proposal, as I understand it, a Senator would be able to speak 10 minutes or 15 minutes, but then would be precluded from speaking again, unless the majority leader would alter his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LOTT. I believe if we get another consent, that that would not apply. Of course, the way the Senate works, if a Senator asks for a specified period of time to speak, that usually is acquiesced to.

Here is the alternative. If you like, I'll just keep talking here. We can go

right on until some other time here in the afternoon. But I would like to have a free-flowing discussion, so I would like to do it in an orderly way.

I asked unanimous consent, and then we will get an agreement, I presume later on, that we will have an extended period of time for debate during which Senators will be able to speak for extended periods of time.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DASCHLE. Would he entertain a unanimous-consent request which would say we would not adjourn without the consent of both leaders tonight? Because I think, if that were the case, then there would be no objection on this side to working through whatever schedule may accommodate speakers on both sides.

Mr. LOTT. It is my intent, Mr. President, to work with the leader and get an agreement on what time will be needed. I would like to do that. I prefer not to move for adjournment. I think we could work that out. I am indicating to you I would like for you to be able to have that time tonight. But I have been asked for three different things to agree to. I asked for one thing in return, and that's for committees to meet. I am going to have to go through a parliamentary procedure here in order for committees to be able to meet.

Let us do this. Let us talk while others are talking and we could work this out. I think there is no question we can get that done.

Mr. President, I renew my request that the Senators that I outlined be allowed to speak for 10 minutes and that I be recognized at the end of this list, at which time, if there are other Senators who wish to speak, they will be recognized or we will work out an order so the debate can continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONRAD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Leader, I say to you I would be forced to object if there is no assurance that the rights of this Senator and other Senators will be protected. Because, as the Senator has outlined, the Senator would be able to speak perhaps 10 or 15 minutes and that's it, under this formulation.

Mr. LOTT. I am saying to the Senator from North Dakota, I would like to be able to work with him to do that. I intend to do that. We will talk and we will make that agreement. We will make it in a request at a period of time after we have had some of these speeches so we can talk.

I don't know exactly what you all are thinking about or what you want, but there is no desire to cut the Senator from North Dakota off today. I want him to be able to make his case. I am going to work with you to do that, and I think the record will show I have done that sort of thing in the past. I am telling you here, now, we are going to find a way for you to be able to

make the speech you want to make. What more can you ask of me now? And then, we will talk that through while others are speaking.

Mr. CONRAD. I am constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have five unanimous consent requests for subcommittees to meet during today's session of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent these request be agreed to en bloc and that each request be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DASCHLE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, my consent request was for the Armed Services Committee to meet on S. 450, the Department of Defense authorization bill. They are the Subcommittees on Airland Forces, Strategic Forces, Seapower, Acquisition, and Technology. Also, for the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs and the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations to meet on some very important issues, with witnesses to be Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, Mr. William J. Bennett, and Michael J. Horowitz of the Hudson Institute, Father Keith Roderick of the Coalition for the Defense of Human Rights, prepared and waiting to testify before that committee.

The second panel includes Col. Sharbel Barakat, a witness from Iran, and an anonymous witness from Pakistan.

In addition to that, we asked for the Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee, Committee of Commerce, to meet with regard to NASA's international space program, which we have been working feverishly to make work, with other countries including Russia.

Those are the committees that are prepared to meet this afternoon. They have witnesses lined up of both parties and a variety of positions. That has been objected to. I thought it was appropriate we put in the RECORD that objection is heard.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued the call of the roll.

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

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