

I then became his ranking member, as my friends on the Republican side ended up in the majority, and Paul and I worked together. In fact, just recently, we were able to actually increase the funding for the Peace Corps. I do not think we would have won the decision here about whether or not to provide additional support to the Peace Corps and those additional funds would not have been forthcoming, had it not been for Paul Coverdell.

We also worked together on the narcotics issue. We had a passionate interest in trying to do something to stem the tide of narcotics, the use of drugs in this country, and worked tirelessly on that effort internationally, through the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, to fashion a formula that would reduce the consumption of drugs in this country and reduce the production and the transmission of drugs and the money laundering that went on all over the world.

In fact, he came up with a very creative idea of trying to involve all of the countries that were involved in this issue, either as sources of production, transition, money laundering, or consumption—as is the case in the United States. I used to tease him a bit because I think I was a more public advocate of the Coverdell idea on narcotics than he was.

Paul Coverdell was one of the most self-effacing Members I have known in this body. George Marshall used to have a saying: There was no limit to what you could accomplish in Washington, DC, as long as you were willing to give someone else credit for it.

Paul Coverdell understood that, I think, as well as any Member who has served in this body. He came up with ideas, such as he did, in the area of drugs and narcotics, and then was more interested in the idea being advanced than he was having his name associated with it.

I wanted to mention those two particular areas: The Peace Corps and the drugs and narcotics effort. There were others he was involved in substantively: Education and the like. These were two areas where we worked most closely together.

Paul Coverdell was a partisan, a strong Republican, with strong views, strong convictions. But he also was a gentleman, thoroughly a Senate person. I say that because I do not think this institution functions terribly well without both of those elements.

People who come here with convictions and beliefs, who try to advance the causes that they think will strengthen our country, are in the position to make a contribution to this body and to the United States; but you also have to be a person who understands that you do not win every battle. This is a legislative body, a body where you must convince at least 50 other people of your ideas, and in some cases more than 60. If you just have strong convictions and strong beliefs, and are unable to work with this small

body, then those ideas are nothing more than that—ideas.

Paul Coverdell had a wonderful ability to reach across this aisle—that is only a seat away from me—and build relationships on ideas he cared about. That, in my view, is the essence of what makes this institution work.

Usually it takes someone a longer period of time to get the rhythms, if you will, the sensibilities of this institution, that are not written in any rule book, that you are not going to find in any procedural volume. You need to know the rules—which he did—and understand the procedures. But the unwritten rules of how this institution functions are something that people take a time to acquire. What somewhat amazed me was that Paul Coverdell, in very short order, understood the rhythms of this room, understood the rhythms of this institution, and was able to build relationships and coalitions.

He could be your adversary one day—and a tough adversary he was; a tough, tough adversary—and, without any exaggeration, on the very next day he could be your strongest ally on an issue. Those are qualities that inherently and historically have made some moments in the Senate their greatest—when leaders have been able to achieve that ability of being strong in their convictions but also have the ability to reach across the aisle and develop those relationships that are essential if you are going to advance the ideas that improve the quality of life in this country.

I suspect he acquired some of those skills in his years with the Georgia Legislature. It has been said—and I can understand it—when he was the Republican leader in Georgia, there were not a lot of Republicans in Georgia. And even though we have our disagreements, there is a respect for those who help build something. It is not an exaggeration to say that Paul Coverdell, in no small way, was responsible for building the Republican Party in Georgia. I do not say that with any great glee, but it is a mark of his tenacity, his convictions, his ability to be responsible for building a strong two-party system in that State.

So from the perspective of this Connecticut Yankee, to the people of Georgia, we thank you for helping this man find a space in the political life of Georgia and for sending him here to the Senate on two occasions.

I send my deepest sympathies to his wife Nancy, to his friends, to his staff in Georgia and those here in Washington. Paul Coverdell will be missed. He was a fine Member of this institution. He was a good and decent human being. He will be missed deeply by all of us here. So my sympathies are extended to all whose lives he touched so deeply.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—  
H.R. 4733

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4733, the energy and water appropriations bill. I further ask that the committee substitute be agreed to and the substitute be considered original text for the purpose of further amendment, with no points of order waived.

I further ask consent that if a motion to strike section 103 is offered, the motion to strike be limited to 3 hours to be equally divided in the usual form, and a vote occur on the motion to strike following the use or yielding back of time, without any intervening action, motion, or debate.

I further ask consent that any votes ordered with respect to this bill, either on amendments or final passage, be stacked to occur at 6 p.m. on Monday, July 24.

I observe that both managers of the appropriations bill for energy and water are present and ready to proceed, and therefore I submit that unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, as has been stated here—and there has been a conversation between Senator BOND from Missouri and the Senator from Nevada—we are willing to move forward on this legislation. There is one provision in it that is offensive to a significant number of Senators. If that were taken out, and there were no amendment offered on the floor, we would be ready to move forward with that. I have spoken to Senator DOMENICI on many occasions. I think we could finish this bill quite rapidly.

Based on that, Mr. President, unless my friend from New Mexico has a statement, I object.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I make a statement?

Mr. REID. I extend my reservation for the Senator from New Mexico to speak.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President and fellow Senators, first, I thank the distinguished majority leader for the effort he has just made. This is a very good bill and very important to America. It contains all of the nuclear weapons funding, some very important money for the enhanced security apparatus for the National Laboratories that we have all been concerned about. It contains about \$100 million to build some of our old, decrepit nuclear manufacturing facilities which are still being used for parts in other things and are held in abeyance in case they are needed.

We have a report saying they are in desperate shape. We have a report that some of the facilities we are trying to maintain in the State of Nevada—that are still there from the underground testing—need to be fixed up because they will not be in a position of readiness.

We have hundreds of water projects in this bill for Senators. And we wait

to go to conference to even fill in some more.

Oh, let me talk about the Missouri conflict. I am not aware of the substance of it, but when the distinguished Senator from Nevada says there are quite a few Senators who are concerned on your side, let me suggest that there are more than quite a few Senators who are worried on the other side—and they are here, and they are there—as to who is being impacted.

I hope at some point they would let us fight that issue out. We would be willing to have a full debate on it, if the minority leader will let us. He is a wonderful and hard-working minority leader who tries to put things together. We all agree with that. But in this instance, these provisions have been in three previous bills that I have brought to the floor with my good friend, Senator REID. They have been in there and signed by the President of the United States.

To take a bill we worked on diligently, that contains all of these important issues I have just discussed, and say we can't get it done—I see the minority leader. I just said I have great respect for everything he does in the Senate. I just want to make sure that everybody understands, this is a very important bill. We ought to get it done and go to conference. We need some additional resources to get the job done on the water side and other aspects, but we will get a good bill completed. I hope we are not in a position where we will never get this bill.

If the Senator insists that it go his way, I think we won't get a bill. I hope at some point he will let us vote, I say to the minority leader. I have told him before and I confirm, I put the language in three times that is in this bill. The President signed it. I would very much like to move ahead. I am not trying to put any untoward pressure on anyone, just to state the problem that I see in not moving ahead.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if the distinguished assistant minority leader will yield to me under his reservation, I will be brief. Then under his reservation or on his own, Senator DASCHLE may want to comment.

What I have asked is consent that we go to the energy and water bill, and I asked consent that if a motion to strike section 103 is offered, the motion to strike be limited to 3 hours to be equally divided in the usual form, and we would go to a vote.

Under Senator REID's reservation, if I could respond to two points: One, in addition to the very important energy aspects of this legislation that have been mentioned, I will focus on the water side. So much of America benefits from our water and our water projects, whether it is navigation or recreation, flood control. These are not just projects that individual Members want to get for their particular district for political benefit. They have a lot to do with the economy of this country, the creation of jobs and the lifestyle in America.

This is an important bill both on the energy and water side. I know both sides want to get it done. I have absolutely no doubt about that. I know the managers of this legislation, Senator DOMENICI and Senator REID, are probably two of the best we have in the Senate. It would probably look as though magic had been performed, how quickly this bill could be completed.

The issue we are talking about is a very difficult one with which to cope. It has been in the mill a long time. I know there are very strong beliefs on both sides of the issue, probably on both sides of the aisle. I hope we will continue to work to see if we can't find a way to deal with this issue in a way that is fair. My thinking is under an agreement to try to take it out with a time limit; that is fine, or an agreement to try to take it out and then put it back in with a time agreement; that is fine. We are looking for any possible solution. I hope we will find a solution in the next few minutes or next couple hours today.

If we can't, then I am already looking, I say to Senator DASCHLE, to see if we can get managers available and try to proceed to the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill Monday afternoon, see if we can make progress on that. I don't know of any big controversy on that one. Of course, it funds the Treasury. It also funds the Postal Service, and it funds White House operations. Hopefully, we could look to that as an alternative. I would rather do energy and water. I would like to do them both so we can get them into conference and so progress can be made next week and they will be hopefully ready to go to the President soon after that.

I thank Senator REID for allowing me to speak under his reservation. I will withhold if Senator DASCHLE wants to respond or comment under reservation, too.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has the floor. There has not been an objection filed yet.

Mr. LOTT. I have the floor and I propounded a unanimous consent request, if the Senator would like to respond under a reservation.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me respond to the distinguished majority leader. I thank my colleague, as I always must, the assistant Democratic leader, for being on the floor. I was not aware that a unanimous consent request was going to be propounded. I was downstairs. I am disappointed I was not able to be here at the time.

Let me very succinctly explain the circumstances. In the past, there has not been any real concern about revising the master manual. The master manual was written by the Corps of Engineers in 1960. It has been the law of the land with regard to the operation of the river since that time, now 40 years. There has been an effort under-

way in earnest over the course of this last year to look for ways that more accurately reflect how the Missouri River ought to be managed, taking into account, now, the extraordinary relevance of fish and wildlife issues.

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.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the mi-

nority leader for trying to work out these complicated matters. There is, understandably, some interrelationship. I think it is well known that we are looking for a way to get a vote on the important issue of proliferation. It should not be considered to be a trade issue. It is an issue separate and apart. Many of us believe it is extremely timely because of the trade issue, and that while we need to extend our trade relationship with China, at the same time, we need to demonstrate to them and to the world that they must do something to improve their habits in terms of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Every day, we see in some media outlet a further indication that the Chinese are intent upon continuing their proliferation habits, as long as we support Taiwan and as long as we perceive a national defense system.

I hope the objection is not based upon the desire by the Democratic leader to prevent a vote from happening on the issue of China's proliferation. Just as the majority leader and the Democratic leader have been working together, so have the staffs been working together across the aisle to try to bridge some of the differences on this bill. We have made changes to the bill to accommodate some of the concerns. This bill will not affect agriculture; this bill will not affect business, except in those narrow circumstances when a business may be dealing directly with a known and determined foreign proliferator. At that point, it is not too high a price to ask our American businesses not to deal with those kinds of companies. That is what this is about.

So now that the majority leader has set a date for a vote on PNTR, I certainly hope we will be able to rapidly reach a date prior to that when we can vote on the important issue of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Although trade, being as important as it is, it pales in comparison with the national security of this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

#### CHINA PROLIFERATION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I speak to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. There is no question that China proliferates. The very interesting feature to the entire picture here is that they object, of course, to us defending ourselves. As I see it, in essence, they are saying: Wait a minute. If you get a strategic defense initiative, if you get an antiballistic missile defense, that is going to deter or retard our proliferation, our sales to Pakistan, our sales to Iran.

A nation's defense should never be negotiable. It is totally out of the question. We should not be running around talking to the Europeans or those in the Pacific rim when it comes to what