

Marshal unprecedented economic, technological, military, and political advantages to shape a twenty-first century global system that promotes freedom, peace, and prosperity for Americans, our allies, and the world.

For each of these challenges, and others, our stated hierarchy of U.S. national interests provides coordinates by which to navigate the uncertain, fast-changing international terrain in the decade ahead.

SUMMARY OF U.S. NATIONAL INTERESTS

Vital

Vital national interests are conditions that are strictly necessary to safeguard and enhance Americans' survival and well-being in a free and secure nation.

Vital U.S. national interests are to:

1. Prevent, deter, and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons attacks on the United States or its military forces abroad;
2. Ensure U.S. allies' survival and their active cooperation with the U.S. in shaping an international system in which we can thrive;
3. Prevent the emergence of hostile major powers or failed states on U.S. borders;
4. Ensure the viability and stability of major global systems (trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, and the environment); and
5. Establish productive relations, consistent with American national interests, with nations that could become strategic adversaries, China and Russia.

Instrumentally, these vital interests will be enhanced and protected by promoting singular U.S. leadership, military and intelligence capabilities, credibility (including a reputation for adherence to clear U.S. commitments and even-handedness in dealing with other states), and strengthening critical international institutions—particularly the U.S. alliance system around the world.

Extremely Important

Extremely important national interests are conditions that, if compromised, would severely prejudice but not strictly imperil the ability of the U.S. government to safeguard and enhance the well-being of Americans in a free and secure nation.

Extremely important U.S. national interests are to:

1. Prevent, deter, and reduce the threat of the use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons anywhere;
2. Prevent the regional proliferation of WMD and delivery systems;
3. Promote the acceptance of international rules of law and mechanisms for resolving or managing disputes peacefully;
4. Prevent the emergence of a regional hegemon in important regions, especially the Persian Gulf;
5. Promote the well-being of U.S. allies and friends and protect them from external aggression;
6. Promote democracy, prosperity, and stability in the Western Hemisphere;
7. Prevent, manage, and, if possible at reasonable cost, end major conflicts in important geographic regions;
8. Maintain a lead in key military-related and other strategic technologies, particularly information systems;
9. Prevent massive, uncontrolled immigration across U.S. borders;
10. Suppress terrorism (especially state-sponsored terrorism), transnational crime, and drug trafficking; and
11. Prevent genocide.

Important

Important national interests are conditions that, if compromised, would have major negative consequences for the ability of the U.S. government to safeguard and en-

hance the well-being of Americans in a free and secure nation.

Important U.S. national interests are to:

1. Discourage massive human rights violations in foreign countries;
2. Promote pluralism, freedom, and democracy in strategically important states as much as is feasible without destabilization;
3. Prevent and, if possible at low cost, end conflicts in strategically less significant geographic regions;
4. Protect the lives and well-being of American citizens who are targeted or taken hostage by terrorist organizations;
5. Reduce the economic gap between rich and poor nations;
6. Prevent the nationalization of U.S.-owned assets abroad;
7. Boost the domestic output of key strategic industries and sectors;
8. Maintain an edge in the international distribution of information to ensure that American values continue to positively influence the cultures of foreign nations;
9. Promote international environmental policies consistent with long-term ecological requirements; and
10. Maximize U.S.-GNP growth from international trade and investment.

Instrumentally, the important U.S. national interests are to maintain a strong UN and other regional and functional cooperative mechanisms.

Less Important or Secondary

Less important or secondary national interests are not unimportant. They are important and desirable conditions, but ones that have little direct impact on the ability of the U.S. government to safeguard and enhance the well-being of Americans in a free and secure nation.

Less important or secondary U.S. national interests include:

1. Balancing bilateral trade deficits;
2. Enlarging democracy everywhere for its own sake;
3. Preserving the territorial integrity or particular political constitution of other states everywhere; and
4. Enhancing exports of specific economic sectors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have been fascinated and informed by the colloquy that has been ongoing between the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Georgia. I have been honored to serve on the Armed Services Committee with the two of them. I know they take these issues seriously, and it is, indeed, appropriate we begin to think through clearly what the role of the United States is and what the role of Congress is in establishing U.S. policy.

I thank them for those observations. They are very valuable. I agree with them that we need to involve the American people in this. The great American experiment that has guided us so far has allowed the people to rule. We do not need to do it under the table without full and open debate.

I strongly believe we must not as a nation abdicate our ability to act unilaterally when our national interest is at stake, or else why have we invested so greatly to establish this magnificent military? We cannot rely on a majority vote of the U.N. We cannot rely on the fact that we may override or avoid a

veto in the Security Council. We have to be prepared to take care of our own interests. I thank my colleagues for the dialog.

ENERGY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, energy prices are going up; gasoline prices are up. I doubt there are many families who do not spend \$60 a month on gasoline. Those who commute, those who have children with vehicles, a husband and wife working may have two or three vehicles per family and not be wealthy. They may be paying \$100 a month or more for gasoline. If they were paying \$60 a month for gasoline 18 months ago, they are now paying over \$90 a month. If they were paying \$100 a month last year, they are probably paying over \$150 a month this year.

That is \$50 a month or \$30 a month, perhaps more in some families, withdrawn from the usable income of that family, money with which they no longer can buy shoes, a new set of tires for their car, to go on a vacation with their children, take the kids to a ball game, buy shoes for them to play soccer or basketball, baseball, or volleyball. That is \$50 a month extra of aftertax money that American citizens had 15, 18 months ago and no longer have today. That is because the price of energy has gone up.

In addition, businesses are facing those same increases. I traveled a couple of months ago with a full-time truck driver and his wife. I traveled from north of Birmingham to Clanton to Montgomery and discussed with them the problems they are facing. They are paying up to \$800 to \$1,000 a month extra to operate their truck. They try to pass it on, which increases the costs down the road, but they are not able to pass it all on and it is reducing their standard of living. They have, in fact, less money with which to go to the store and buy products.

What does that ultimately mean? It means there are going to be fewer widgets bought, there are going to be fewer shoes bought, there are going to be fewer new cars bought, fewer new houses bought and many other things we would like to purchase. We will not be able to purchase those items because OPEC, through its price-gouging cartel, has fixed the oil and gas prices and driven them up to an extraordinary degree. As a result, it is hurting us. We know this. We know the economy appears to have some slowing. We know that profit margins across the board have been shrinking significantly, and we know that higher energy costs are a big reason for that.

I say that because we are talking about some very big issues. If you do not have money to purchase, let's say you purchase 8 things this month instead of what you would normally purchase, 10, there is somebody who would have made those other 2 items, somebody who would have sold those other 2 items; they may not be able to continue to do that. What does that do to

the producing business? It puts stress on them. It can cool off this robust economy with which we have been blessed for quite a number of years.

Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of the U.N., wrote an editorial recently which I was pleased to read. He pointed out how it hurts poor nations more than wealthy nations, but it hurts wealthy nations, too. Wealthy nations are hurt when poor nations do not have money to buy products from us. We sell all over the world. Whatever cools off the entire world economy cools off the American economy and jeopardizes jobs.

What caused us to come to this point? I say with confidence that it is the Clinton-Gore policies, primarily Vice President AL GORE's energy policies, that have been involved here. The simple fact is that those policies are driven by and motivated at the deepest level by his adoption of a radical, no-growth agenda that is playing in his book. He set it out some years ago. People are astounded when they read that book because he is deeply revealing of a philosophy that we ought to reduce spending on energy and that will somehow drive up costs and we will use less oil, less gas, we will ride bicycles and use solar cells, and that is how we are going to meet our national energy policy.

The trouble is that solar cells cost 4, 5, 10 times as much as fossil fuels do to produce energy. Who is going to pay for that? Working Americans are going to pay for that while some elite people think it is a cool idea and for which they are not paying the price. They can afford to pay it perhaps. We are into that mood now. This radical agenda is demonstrated by the policies that have been carried out systematically since this administration took office.

It has been steady, and it has been regular. They have not said our policy is to raise prices. They are too clever for that. They are not going to allow that spin to get about. What have they done against the consistent opposition of Members in this body who have warned over and over that reducing production of American fuels was going to lead us to a crisis? What have they done? They have opposed drilling in the ANWR region of Alaska which has huge reserves equal to 30 years of the production in Saudi Arabia. This one little area amounts to the size of Dulles Airport. It is a very small area with huge reserves. They vetoed legislation that would have allowed us to produce oil and gas to help meet our needs. Over vigorous debate in this Senate and a strong majority vote, it was vetoed by the Clinton-Gore administration.

What else? They steadfastly oppose nuclear power. France has gone from 60 percent of their power nuclear to 80 percent. Industrialized nations realize it is the cleanest, safest of all sources of energy with unlimited capacity to produce electricity, with no air pollution—virtually no air pollution, and only a small amount of waste that we

can easily store in the Nevada desert. Oh, no, President Clinton and Vice President GORE vetoed the ability for us to store that waste in the Nevada desert, therefore, helping shut down our nuclear energy. We have not brought on a nuclear plant in over 20 years in this country.

We are denying ourselves that capacity to produce energy. There are huge reserves of natural gas in the Rocky Mountain areas. Natural gas is the cleanest burning of all our fossil fuels. All our electric-generating plants today are natural gas plants. We are hitting a crisis in the production of natural gas. They refuse to allow those Federal lands in the Rocky Mountain areas, almost all of it owned by the Federal Government, to produce natural gas, which isn't a dangerous fuel to produce. It doesn't pour oil all out on the ground; it is an evaporative gas. It is safe to produce. Certainly we could do that.

They are opposed to drilling offshore. In fact, Vice President GORE, during his campaigning in New Hampshire, promised not only to not approve any additional offshore drilling of natural gas but to consider rolling back existing leases that have already been issued.

How are we going to meet our energy needs for natural gas if we cannot produce it? There are many other areas where, through regulation, we basically shut off coal as a viable option for expanding our energy needs. In fact, even though we are much more efficient than we have ever been with electric energy, we need more. The projections are that we will have a substantial increase in demand even though we are improving our efficiency steadily. So that is the problem we are facing.

The problem is that when OPEC realized our demand was increasing, and the world demand was increasing, and our own domestic production was decreasing 14 percent, while demand was going up 18 to 20 percent, they were able to reduce production, force the price up to exorbitant levels, and make themselves rich. In fact, it was a political decision by governmental leaders to force up the price. It was not even a free market decision. It was a political decision by the leaders of these oil-producing nations because of our failure to produce energy and because we have become dependent on their oil. So they have been able to demand what they want to in price. Our politicians lost to their politicians. Their politicians beat our politicians.

And who is paying the price? The American citizen, when he goes to the gas pump, when he buys his heating oil, when he goes and buys a product. It is more expensive today to buy that product than it was before because of increased gasoline prices in the whole production system. That is what has happened. We have been taken to the cleaners. To me it is as if we put a tax on the gasoline, but instead of taxing gasoline 50, 60 cents a gallon extra

where the revenue comes to Washington so it at least can be spent in the United States, it is, in effect, a 50-, 60-cent tax that goes to Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and the Middle East. The OPEC cartel gets our tax. They are taxing our wealth and sending it abroad.

This has the capacity to kill the economic growth this Nation has been experiencing. It has the capacity to drain our wealth to the degree that this economy could slow down. It could even go into recession because we have done nothing to deal with it. We have done nothing. The only thing, in the long run, that we can do is to make sure we produce what we have.

We have virtually unlimited reserves of natural gas and oil in the United States—certainly for decades to come. There are myths that we do not have enough. We have large reserves. We should have been producing those more effectively. But the policies of this administration have been to reduce our production.

And as night follows day, the price is going to go up. It threatens not only the pocketbook of a mother who is trying to now get by—she was paying \$100 a month for the family's gasoline; now she is paying \$150 a month for the family's gasoline. She cannot buy things at the store she used to buy. And the producers of those products are now going to have to lay off workers because people are not buying those products at the rate they were previously buying them.

This is not an itty-bitty issue. This is a tremendous issue for our country. I hope it will be discussed tonight in the debate. I hope it will be made a part of this campaign. I believe, with an absolute conviction, that if we allow these international greedy producing nations to jerk us around, to take money from the average mother and father and working American when they go to the gas pump, having their money sent to those nations, they can hurt us badly. It hurts a lot of people.

I pumped gas a few months ago and washed people's windshields. I talked to them about the costs they were facing. I talked to a young lady in her early twenties. She was going to college 3 days a week. The college she attended was 30 miles up the road. She talked about how much her gas bill was. She was trying to save money for tuition. Her car was not a new car. She said she would like to have a new car, but she could not afford it. That extra cost was coming out of her pocket.

This is a real issue. It hurts our families. They have less money in their pocket and in the family budget because it has to be spent on gasoline. It is hurting businesses. Their profits are down. Home building is down.

What will happen in the future? I don't know. But if we do not get in this ballgame, if we do not challenge OPEC and figure out a way to break that cartel, and if we do not increase our own production of energy, we will have

what we have had numerous times before; and that is, a recession driven by increased energy costs. What a tragedy that will be. It should not happen.

Our projections are and our needs as a nation are to continue this prosperity, to continue the surplus we have been able to generate in this Government, and to pay down our debt and to be able to do some things we wish we could have done before. This is a glorious time for us.

I believe we have to take strong action. I have been frustrated that this administration remains steadfast in blocking, time and again, any step to increase our production of energy. And that has no more consequence but one: When you reduce production, it will drive up costs.

I thank the Chair and, again, express my appreciation for his fine remarks on national defense.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

—
ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
OCTOBER 4, 2000

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 4. I further ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to

date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4578, the Interior appropriations bill.

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

—
PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will immediately resume the Interior appropriations conference report at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning. The Senate will remain on the conference report until it is disposed of. It is hoped that a final vote will occur no later than tomorrow afternoon. The Senate could consider any other appropriations conference reports as well as the continuing resolution providing for the continued operations of the Federal Government until October 14, 2000.

—
RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:49 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, October 4, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 3, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RICHARD A. MESERVE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATIVE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FORTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND
INFORMATION SCIENCE

PHILLIP N. BREDESEN, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 19, 2005, VICE WALTER ANDERSON, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

MELVIN C. HALL, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA VICE RALPH G. THOMPSON, RETIRED.

—
CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 3, 2000:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL J. REAGAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

SUSAN RITCHIE BOLTON, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.

MARY H. MURGUIA, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.

JAMES A. TEILBORG, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.