

season, we have a statement out of the administration and the Vice President that says: We will not take down these dams now. We will not take these dams down in the short term. We will study it.

There are those who suggest that means we will wait until after the election, and then we will take down the dams. If, indeed, the dams are taken down, hydroelectric power goes away. Hydroelectric dams generate roughly 10 percent of this Nation's power.

So we can't drill for oil, we can't explore for natural gas, and we want to dismantle some of the hydroelectric power. What about nuclear power? That is where most of the power comes from in Europe and in many other countries that don't have the hydroelectric facilities we do.

On April 25 of this year, President Clinton vetoed legislation that would have allowed storage at Yucca Mountain of nuclear waste. Nuclear waste is building up at every nuclear facility in the United States. At some point we have to deal with it. The Congress thought it had dealt with it by creating Yucca Mountain. The President said, no, even though we have spent billions and billions of dollars preparing Yucca Mountain to receive this nuclear waste, we won't let it go there, thus jeopardizing the opportunity for this country to have a long-standing, long-going nuclear program.

All right. If we are not going to be able to handle nuclear power, if we can't drill for oil and oil power, if we can't explore for natural gas, and if we are trying to cut back on hydroelectric, where are we going to get the power? There are those who say, well, most of the power in this country comes from coal. Coal, of course, has a problem as far as the environment is concerned.

I am proud to report that we have in the State of Utah some of the best low-sulfur coal in the world, which, if burned, would have an enormous benefit for the environment. Just 4 years ago, President Clinton, with Vice President GORE clearly identified as the driving force behind the decision, shut down the possibility of ever using any of that coal from Utah when he created the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, using the Antiquities Act in a way it was never anticipated to be used, violating all aspects of consultation as required under NEPA, refusing to even admit to elected officials in the affected State that he was even thinking about it. The President, with a stroke of a pen, said, you can't use any of that low-sulfur, good-burning coal.

So you have to go to other kinds of coal. Fifty-five percent of our Nation's electricity is generated by coal, and 88 percent of the electricity in the Midwest comes from coal.

But now they are saying we must put controls and restrictions on coal and the activity with respect to coal—to the point we have seen the senior Sen-

ator from West Virginia, who represents a number of coal producers, demonstrate his concern with this administration.

So what is left, Mr. President? What is left to increase the supply? Well, you can't drill for oil. You can't explore for natural gas. You can't expand hydroelectric power. We hope to get that back. You can't use the coal. What is left? Prayer? I believe in prayer. But I also believe that the Lord prefers those who pray to him to do a little bit about it, to work at it. If I can go back again to the roots of my State, founded by the pioneers who came across the Plains, the story is told about a wagon train that got caught in a river. One of the leaders of the wagon train immediately dropped to his knees. The other fellow who was involved said, "What are you doing?" He said, "I am praying." And the second man said, "I said my prayers this morning. Get up and pull."

I think if we are going to pray for divine assistance to help us increase the supply for energy in this country, we better get up and pull at the same time and recognize that saying no to the expansion of every single source of energy in this country in the name of appealing to an environmental community, as the Vice President has historically done, puts us in the position where we are going to have high energy prices for as far as the eye can see.

I hope as people address the question of why gasoline is over \$2 a gallon in the Midwest today—and those high prices are spreading—and as people address the question of why fuel oil will be twice as much in the winter than it has historically been, as people address the question of why the natural gas prices are continuing to go up, they will understand that, once again, we cannot repeal the law of supply and demand. If we want to bring energy prices under control in this country, we ought to help the President and the Vice President understand that truth and say the only solution to high prices, Mr. President and Mr. Vice President, is increased supply for the demand that is built into our economy. As soon as they understand that and will work with this Congress to try to get increased supply in the various ways we have sent them legislation to do, we will then—and only then—begin to see these high prices come down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

#### ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the energy and water bill on appropriations has been held up. I understand that the distinguished minority leader has an objection to it. I share with Senators the importance of that bill. I suggest, hopefully, that the minority leader rethink this because I do have some confidence that he is not exclusively interested in partisan politics, and that

perhaps this very good bill on energy and water could be passed and sent to the President; although, my hopes are dwindling.

Essentially, one looks at the energy and water appropriations bill, and while I would devote some time to the energy crisis, which my friend spoke about eloquently, I will interrupt my comments to say this to the Senator: Incredibly, there is a position being formulated by the Vice President's campaign to claim that George W. Bush and Dick Cheney would be bad for American energy consumers. Isn't that a joke?

What is bad for American energy consumers, and the reason gasoline prices are so high, and natural gases are skyrocketing, and we are growing in dependence upon foreign countries for our very lifeblood, for without energy, we have no economy. Of late, we have decided it must be so clean that the only thing we are using in any increased abundance is natural gas. We are even shying away, in this administration, from clean coal technology. Did the Senator know that technology to clean up coal is being pushed down by this administration instead of up?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct. If I may make one other comment, the comment has been made that they want wind as the source. I have heard environmental groups have complained that they do not want windmills out on the prairies because they will damage the birds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me tell the Senator this: I asked this administration and I asked this Vice President to send to us what their great energy policy has been during the last 8 years. Every time we say there is none, they say they have got one, they have had one and we turned it down. I would love to see it. I would like to evaluate it and send it out to the energy people and ask them what would it have produced had we given more money to solar and wind than we did. How would that have had an impact on the consumers of America—paying this enormous price for gasoline, this enormous new price for natural gas?

Frankly, I say to my friend from Utah, if Americans don't know it—because we worry so much about Social Security and its future, Medicare and its future, what happens to this surplus, and what happens to the debt—probably the biggest challenge to the American way of life and our standard of living, driving automobiles and finding jobs and factories growing, is that we have no energy policy. And we are going to move slightly and slowly, because of this administration, into a position where we are not going to have enough energy to make America go, or it will be so high that Americans will wonder what in the world happened to us.

Do you know when that will be? That will be when our dependence on foreign sources of energy grows some more. Americans should know that over 50

percent of the crude oil and crude oil products this great Nation consumes comes from foreign countries, from the so-called cartel. It is not all Saudi Arabia. We have South American and Central American countries in there, too. But do you know what. They are not interested in America. They are interested in how much their oil will bring on the market to them. For a few years, they can sit back and say: America, America, when oil prices were \$10 a barrel and you were hopping along and we were broke and we could not pay our debts and could not borrow money—one of the closest things to a financial crisis for Saudi Arabia, whether or not you like the sheiks—financial jeopardy was when oil prices dropped so low. We were thrilled. What do you think they are going to think when the oil prices finally get up where they are making a lot of money and America is crying for it? They are going to say: Where were you when oil prices got down below 10 and hovered around 10 while we cried?

Frankly, I believe if the Vice President's campaign decides that our wonderful ticket for President, because one comes from a mass oil-producing State, and he is proud of it—and the other one, after serving in the highest office in this country, is the president of a 100,000-person corporation that happens to be involved in seeing to it that we continue to get oil and gas in America by working down there in oil patch—frankly, I don't think we ought to assume that this attack makes any sense or that they will do it.

I think what we should do is we should attack Vice President GORE as being the mastermind, the promoter of a no energy policy for America, unless it is wind and solar, which all of us think is marvelous but clearly cannot help America through a crisis.

I thank the Senator for his comments. I know a lot about nuclear power. I am embarrassed for America that we are doing what we are doing on nuclear power. It is so scientifically unreal and untrue, as to the attacks on nuclear power, and it is a shame. The greatest country on Earth in engineering cannot take high-level fuel rods and move them a little bit across the country and put them somewhere for safekeeping. We can't do that. But 1 out of 25 American ships sails the seas, some with one nuclear powerplant—as they have over there in Pennsylvania. Some have one, some have two. They have sailed the seas since 1954. No more in America—except one in New Zealand that denies these ships with fuel rods safely on board access to their ports. There is no risk. There has never been an accident. Here we sit because a few Americans are frightened to death of radioactivity—low, high, or indifferent; just the word "radioactive"—while they live in an radioactive environment on average. All of us are exposed to more low-level radiation than most of the things we are afraid of because there is plenty of it around. But be-

cause of them, we sit here and cannot find a way to help the State of Minnesota that has fuel rods sitting there from nuclear power which have been as safe as can be, and we can't get enough votes here to move them across the country. Yet those boats with it move all over the world. We sit here with a President—probably supported by the Vice President—who says no.

Look, if they like to talk about energy policy, I think we ought to just say: Mr. Vice President, the one thing you take into this campaign is that you have been part of an administration with as bad an energy policy as any because, as a matter of fact, you had none.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will my friend yield for a brief question?

Mr. DOMENICI. I would be delighted. I know I said something implicitly about his State, but I didn't mean to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to ask my friend from New Mexico: Would George W. Bush think he would have a different policy and would allow the nuclear waste to go to Nevada?

Mr. DOMENICI. I don't know about that. We will build a short-term nuclear waste facility within 6 to 8 months of the next President, if he is a Republican, because it is totally safe. Whether they put it in Nevada or somewhere else, I don't know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to say again, getting back to the energy and water bill, that I hope we can work something out on his issue, an issue that bothers some States on his side of the aisle, while on my side of the aisle, the Missouri Senators and the Mississippi Senators and others, have a different view. There is an amendment to this energy and water bill that attempts to solve that problem by not letting some amendments proceed with reference to a Corps of Engineers manual.

If this bill does not become law by October 1, I want to talk about a couple of things that will really be bad for some States, and certainly for my State will not be good.

In Pantex, TX, there are 2,800 employees; there are 7,300 at the Sandia National Laboratory; there are 3,000 in the Kansas City nuclear weapons plant. Moving over to water, the Army Corps of Engineers has 125,000 workers on 1,400 projects.

This is an important bill. I don't want to go up to October 1 and not have a bill and have to say to them that because somebody would not let us bring up our bill—which we could have done, which we could have gotten passed—we are now at October 1 and can't get anything passed. And we are playing a game of who did what to whom. Who keeps the Government open? Who closes it? We could have had this completed. We could have been in conference this weekend and be back from the convention with it finished. It could then go to the President and be

signed. I don't go beyond just asking that the problem be eliminated.

I take Senator DASCHLE at his word. There is nothing to this other than he is concerned about protecting a couple of States. I am concerned about a couple of other States or more. I am concerned about keeping in law what has been in the law for at least two previous years.

I again thank the distinguished Senator from Utah for his comments.

I want to respond for a moment to a very good friend of mine from the other side of the aisle. I consider him a friend. For the most part, we run into each other on dairy issues. People do not know that New Mexico is a big dairy State. But clearly, the distinguished Senator, Mr. FEINGOLD, comes from a State with a lot of dairy cows. We frequently are on each other's side, or against each other, principally because that is a farming issue. But today, in some brief remarks, Senator FEINGOLD took his farming issues, and instead of being concerned about his State, got over into my State and into an issue that involves thousands of farmers in New Mexico.

The issue is that thousands of farmers in New Mexico are on a river that runs short of water in dry years. We are growing into a confrontation as to who owns the flow of the river in a dry year, and a silver minnow, which has been declared an endangered species, which they think currently resides in the extreme southern regions of the river close to the Texas border. Thousands of farmers use it to irrigate small and medium-sized farms, and there are a few large ones.

I hope, if the Senator's constituents, as he said, are concerned about this, they are concerned about the entire problem—the problem of cities that own water in a dry river basin, and the river basin is not always totally moist and running with water. What about the thousands of farmers who under our State law own the water? I think if he clearly understood that, he would say: I choose not to interfere in a contest between the minnows and thousands of farmers and maybe two cities or more. And maybe he would say: I wouldn't like Senator DOMENICI getting involved in that if that were my State situation. Though he is entitled to and can certainly come down here and do that, I hope maybe before doing it—or maybe even now—he would talk with us about the issue, which is a very interesting issue.

For the last 2½ weeks, I have been constantly in touch with the Secretary of Interior seeing what we could do to try to work this issue out. I have put on this energy and water bill something so that water will not be governed totally by a Solicitor General's opinion.

That is the issue. I contend it shouldn't be. We might be able to work that out soon because there are some very serious problems involved that ought to be worked out.

I thank Senator FEINGOLD for his consideration of issues that might affect my State. I think I have been concerned with his. I would truly like to talk to him about this subject because I don't believe it is as simple an issue as perhaps some of his endangered species constituents indicate in their request to him that he get involved in the issue of thousands of farmers in the State of New Mexico and whether they get water.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the 3:15 p.m. vote, Senator HELMS be recognized as if in morning business for up to 20 minutes, to be followed by Senator BRYAN for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator DORGAN requested time. We would be happy to have Senator DORGAN go after Senator BRYAN. If there is a Republican who wishes to speak, we would be happy to insert that between Senators BRYAN and DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that Senator DORGAN be recognized after Senators HELMS and BRYAN, and a Republican, if the majority wishes to have a speaker in there. Senator DORGAN wishes to speak for up to 40 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I agree. I ask unanimous consent that each of the Republicans he has alluded to, if they desire to, be able to speak for up to 40 minutes. I don't think they will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report, Department of Defense appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). Is there a sufficient second?

(The yeas and nays were ordered.)

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

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

Under the previous order, the clerk will report the conference report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany H.R. 4576, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the con-

ference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 230 Leg.]

#### YEAS—91

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Akaka	Frist	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Miller
Baucus	Graham	Moynihan
Bayh	Grams	Murkowski
Bennett	Grassley	Murray
Biden	Gregg	Nickles
Bingaman	Harkin	Reed
Bond	Hatch	Reid
Breaux	Helms	Robb
Brownback	Hollings	Roberts
Bryan	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hutchison	Roth
Burns	Inhofe	Santorum
Byrd	Inouye	Sarbanes
Campbell	Jeffords	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Sessions
Cleland	Kennedy	Shelby
Cochran	Kerrey	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Craig	Kyl	Specter
Crapo	Landrieu	Stevens
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thomas
DeWine	Leahy	Thompson
Dodd	Levin	Thurmond
Domenici	Lieberman	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lincoln	Warner
Durbin	Lott	Wyden
Edwards	Lugar	
Feinstein	Mack	

#### NAYS—9

Allard	Feingold	McCain
Boxer	Gramm	Voinovich
Enzi	Hagel	Wellstone

The conference report was agreed to.

#### CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, on rollcall vote 230, I voted no. It was my intention to vote yea. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will in no way change the outcome of the vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate immediately adopt the motion to proceed to H.R. 4733 and the cloture vote regarding the China PNTR immediately occur, and if cloture is invoked, the 30 hours postcloture not begin until the Senate resumes the motion in September.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I further ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 6 p.m. on Tuesday, September

5, 2000, the Senate temporarily lay aside the China PNTR motion to proceed and begin consideration of the energy and water appropriations bill, and the consideration of these two measures continue throughout the week of September 4, 2000.

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

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that just prior to the vote, the following Senators be recognized for the following times: BAUCUS for 5 minutes, HOLLINGS for 5 minutes, MOYNIHAN for 5 minutes, and ROTH for 5 minutes.

I further ask unanimous consent that the allotted morning business times ordered earlier today commence immediately following the rollcall vote, and the yet designated Republican slot be allocated to Senator BOB SMITH for up to 40 minutes.

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

Mr. LOTT. Let me explain, if I could, what just occurred.

We will have 15 to 20 minutes of time now that will be used for Senators to speak, those I just mentioned. That will be followed by the vote on the China PNTR motion to proceed. Then there will be a period of morning business time to follow that.

When we return in September, we will go during the day to the China PNTR debate. That will be laid aside at 6 o'clock, and we will do the energy and water appropriations bill. This is classically described as a double tracking. We will be doing the appropriations bill at night. I hope it won't take but a couple nights. It may take three. During the day, we will be debating the China PNTR.

I have assured Senators on both sides of the aisle that we are not going to shove this through. Senators who need time, Senators who want to offer amendments on the China trade bill are going to have the opportunity to do that. I think that is the right way to do it. We are not going to do it in the wee hours of the night. We are going to do it in the day. This is a major international trade agreement, and it needs to be done carefully and with thought. The Senate has a long tradition of acting carefully and with dignity when it comes to important matters of this nature. That is the way we are going to treat it when we return. There will be no rush to judgment, but I do think the responsible thing to do is to begin to make progress toward an eventual judgment.

I thank my colleagues, Senator DASCHLE and Senator BYRD, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator WELLSTONE and all, for their cooperation on this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for announcing this arrangement. I thank my colleagues for their cooperation on this complicated but very understandable schedule. The majority leader has announced there will not be any cloture