

## AMENDMENT NO. 3372

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the total amount appropriated by title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY" for the Navy technical information presentation system, \$5,200,000 shall be available for Synesis 7 in Montana for preparation and training for the digitization of FA-18 aircraft technical manuals.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3373

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the total amount appropriated by title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY" for the Navy technical information presentation system, \$5,200,000 shall be available for Synesis 7 in Montana for preparation and training for the digitization of FA-18 aircraft technical manuals.

## NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY RESEARCH,  
DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTION AND REGULATION

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production, and Regulation.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, June 27, 2000 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on the April 2000 GAO Report entitled "Nuclear Waste Cleanup—DOE's Paducah Plan Faces Uncertainties and Excludes Costly Cleanup Activities."

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger, Staff Assistant, or Colleen Deegan, Counsel, at (202) 224-8115.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND  
MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that the hearing scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will begin at 9:30 a.m. instead of 9 a.m. as previously announced.

The purpose of this hearing is to conduct oversight on the proposed expansion of the Craters of the Moon National Monument.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

20510. For further information, please call Mike Menge (202) 224-6170.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a legislative hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, June 21, 2000 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 1848, To amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project; S. 1761, the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 1999; S. 2301, To amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Lakehaven water reclamation project for the reclamation and reuse of water; S. 2400, To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution facilities to the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District; S. 2499, To extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Pennsylvania; and S. 2594, To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with Mancos Water Conservancy District to use the Mancos Project facilities for impounding, storage, diverting, and carriage of nonproject water for the purpose of irrigation, domestic, municipal, industrial, and any other beneficial purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger, Staff Assistant, or Colleen Deegan, Counsel, at (202) 224-8115.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, as I understand it, the Senate is in a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). That is correct, with Senators to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I consume.

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

## GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, this afternoon, according to the news accounts released earlier today, the Environmental Protection Agency is calling on major oil refiners to meet in Washington, DC, to explain the price hike phenomenon, as it is called. This is not a phenomenon. It is a pain in the wallet what is happening with respect to the price of gasoline.

I want to talk a little about that, and talk a little about the problems that may be causing it.

It is not lost on the American people that when they drive to the gas pumps these days they are discovering, once again, another price spike in the cost of gasoline.

In North Dakota, for example, the North Dakota Petroleum Marketers Association provided me with current gasoline prices in North Dakota: Minot, \$1.79 a gallon today; Fargo, \$1.64 a gallon; Devil's Lake, \$1.69; Bismarck, \$1.68 a gallon. Interestingly enough, the current price in Bismarck of \$1.68 is nearly a 30-cent-per-gallon increase in just the last couple of weeks since the previous price spike. Earlier this year, the price of petroleum spiked up and came back down. Now it has spiked up again, a nearly 30-cent-per-gallon increase in a very short period.

The EPA is asking for a meeting with the major oil refiners to evaluate what is happening with respect to the price of gasoline. Some indicate an EPA rule that describes the base fuel that must be used in certain cities in the country with respect to oxygenated fuel or ethanol as a circumstance where certain base fuels are kind of a narrow commodity and are not readily available and so it is pricing gasoline very high. That may be one case. I don't know the answer to that. I assume the EPA and the refiners will have that discussion. It is quite clear there are other things at work.

No. 1, this country gets a substantial amount of its energy from the OPEC countries. In a global economy, the OPEC countries are producing an ever-increasing amount of the energy the United States needs. Does this put us at the mercy of the supply coming from the OPEC countries? Of course it does. When the OPEC countries cut supply, as they did, and then increase it marginally, but not increase it to the level where they had previously been producing, that is going to have some dislocation in this country. The result is an increase in gasoline prices.

It is probably also the case, from hearings I have been involved with, that the refiners in this country were refining heating fuel for much longer than they normally would have and probably didn't switch over to gasoline quite quickly enough. Therefore, we are going to continue to see these price spikes. The news reports talk about volatility. Well, volatility is a euphemism for the price spikes that are jumping up and around with respect to the price of gasoline when we don't

have sufficient supply of crude stock coming into this country which refiners need to produce and turn into gasoline.

What we have are three possibilities. The most obvious is, we are seeing an ever-increasing dependence on the OPEC countries. They cut back supply, then increased it some, but not nearly enough. The result is increased prices for petroleum products in this country.

It ought to be a wake-up call for all of us. We are too dependent on foreign source energy. We ought to make certain we have a national energy policy that includes incentives for producers here at home, includes additional incentives for renewable energy. There isn't any reason we ought not be doing much better with respect to renewable energy in this country. The other possibility, aside from the OPEC industry, as I mentioned, is the potential of EPA recommendations or requirements that have created dislocation in certain markets in terms of the base supply that can be used with respect to ethanol.

I don't know what the outcome of this meeting will be, but I will be very interested to see what the EPA has done, whether that has caused some dislocation and some price spikes as well.

Third, it is not unlikely and certainly wouldn't be without precedent to have had the petroleum industry play some of their own games with respect to supply, the movement of supply and the pricing of supply. Some would say: Gosh, how could you think that? Well, history would bear out how I might be able to think that would be the case. We ought to look at all of these issues and evaluate exactly what is causing this price spike and what impact it is having and what we can do about it.

I come from a State that is 10 times the size of Massachusetts. North Dakota is a big old State. It takes a lot of driving to get around my State; 640,000 people live in a land mass that is equivalent to 10 times the State of Massachusetts. Our predominant industry is farming. In order to seed a crop in the spring, it takes a lot of fuel. In order to get the crop off the fields in the fall, it takes a lot of fuel. Those family farmers, with the kind of depressed grain prices we have seen in this country, don't need further increases in input costs placed upon them by these increases in gas prices.

We have to get some answers from the EPA, the petroleum refiners, the major oil companies, and from those who are supposed to be involved in the development of an energy plan for this country to answer what kind of dependence do we have on the OPEC countries and what could the consequences be in the longer term, if those countries decided to have a much tighter supply of petroleum going to Western nations, including the United States.

I was reading a briefing memo this morning about this issue. I thought a

couple of pieces of information were interesting. OPEC officials contend that prices are only marginally above the stated ban and "the price rise is more due to a tight gasoline market in the United States where new environmental regulations are reducing volume." That is according to OPEC. OPEC is saying: It's not us.

The fact is, OPEC cut supply, increased it some but not nearly back to where they had originally been producing.

The Saudi Arabia oil minister also pegged the recent price movement on tight oil products markets; that is, oil products markets, not a shortage of crude oil itself. One source indicated that the increase in prices on certain world oil markets, notably in the U.S., has no relation to the volume of international crude output. That is an interesting theory. That would stand all logic on its head. Prices in the United States with respect to crude oil have no relationship to international crude oil production. I think that is not likely to be something that would be believed by anyone who is thinking.

The point is this: This is a significant and important issue to many areas of our country. We need to understand the consequences of it, what is causing it, and what we can do about it. I hope all of us working together can rely on not only the Energy Department, the EPA, but the Congress itself to evaluate all three of the suggestions I have just made.

#### SANCTIONS ON FOOD AND MEDICINE

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I rise to talk about the issue of sanctions on food and medicine shipments to other countries in the world. I know I have talked about this on the floor many times. At the risk of being repetitive, which I think is important in this body, I say again, it is immoral for this country to have a policy of imposing sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine to any other country in the world.

We have decided to impose economic sanctions on countries whose behavior we don't like. We have decided that economic sanctions is the way to punish certain countries. We don't like what Saddam Hussein in Iraq has been doing. He is an international outlaw, according to our country's view. Therefore, we want to punish him. So we impose economic sanctions.

We don't like Fidel Castro in Cuba, according to our public policy. So we want to impose an embargo that, by the way, has been existing for 40 years. We have sanctions against Iran, against North Korea. When we impose these sanctions, it is also included in those sanctions that we will not allow shipments of food and medicine to these same countries.

As I said, I think it is fundamentally immoral for our country to decide what they will withhold and prohibit

the shipment of food and medicine to any country in the world. It doesn't make any sense.

I come at this from more than one standpoint. One, I represent a farm State. Yes, it bothers me that 11 percent of the international wheat market is off limits to our family farmers. We have folks that stand up here in the Senate and say: Well, we support the Freedom to Farm bill for family farmers. What about the freedom to sell bill? Why shouldn't farmers be free to sell into the marketplace where people are hungry and need food? What on Earth would persuade this country to have sanctions with respect to the shipment of food and medicine anywhere in the world? If my proposition is these sanctions are fundamentally wrong with respect to food and medicine sanctions, then let's change it.

We have tried to change it. Last year, we had a bill on the floor of the Senate. Seventy Senators voted to get rid of sanctions on food and medicine shipments everywhere in the world. Seventy Senators said: Let's get rid of them. We got the bill to conference and it got hijacked because some people want to continue sanctions, especially on the country of Cuba.

This year in the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Agriculture bill, I included an amendment that says: Get rid of all sanctions on food and medicine; get rid of them all with respect to Cuba and Iraq and North Korea. Get rid of all sanctions on food and medicine. That passed. It is in the Appropriations Committee. It will come to the floor on the Agriculture appropriations bill. Already we have some people in the Congress who are saying we are going to dump that. That is not going to become law. We are not going to get rid of sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine from this country to Cuba.

As I have said before, I intend to push this issue very hard this year.

It does not make sense to continue sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine to anywhere in the world. I want to read a couple of editorials that I think describe it as well. This is from the Seattle Post Intelligencer of May 28. This is an op-ed piece:

Economic sanctions against nations are long overdue for a critical appraisal. They make an appealing weapon. They are a way to hurt people without shooting at them. Done in the extreme, they inflict sickness and death. Sanctions have been used for many years—more than 40 years against Cuba and 10 years against Iraq. Lesser sanctions have been set against Libya, Iran and Burma. Threats of sanctions are annually made, but not acted upon, against China. In any case, economic sanctions have never removed a tyrant and they will never remove, for example, Saddam Hussein. In all likelihood, he will be in power until he dies. What sanctions have done is to further impoverish the Iraqi people.

Here is an excerpt from the Washington Times, an op-ed written by Steve Chapman:

Things have changed a lot since 1990. The Soviet Union no longer exists. The Federal