create economic development by creating over 1,000 new jobs during peak construction, and almost 200 new permanent jobs and about 450 spinoff jobs.

That is positive economics when you can talk in those terms, and those terms are not just talk. That is reality if we implement the Energy bill.

It would reduce net emissions of carbon dioxide by 355,000 metric tons annually and would reduce emissions of major air components targeted by the Clean Air Act.

A mature cellulose ethanol industry based on agricultural residues alone would multiply these benefits: Enhance U.S. energy security by displacing up to 10 to 12 billion gallons of gas annually, which represents 7 to 10 percent of current U.S. gas consumption; provide approximately 200 to 300 rural communities with more jobs and farmers with more income, and certainly a stronger economy for American agriculture; reduce carbon dioxide, CO2, emissions from 65 to 100 million metric tons.

We are talking about putting money into U.S. farmers' pockets instead of the pockets of the oil sheiks of the Middle East.

About 29 States currently produce ethanol, and those States clearly have the ability to produce cellulose ethanol in a tremendous way. Chart 1 shows the States that are capable of doing that. Can you imagine, instead of having only a few oil-producing States in our Nation, we would have nearly 25 States capable of producing? That is the value of this program, and adding nearly $25 million a year to the local economy. That is what we are talking about with regard to this Energy bill and what it could do.

So not only are we talking about that, but our second chart shows what is extremely important, and that is in carbon savings reported by various studies by bringing this kind of production online. Reducing demand on gasoline from foreign oil from 15 to 20 percent creates anywhere from $5 billion to $7.5 billion annually in economic growth in rural America. That is what we are talking about, and that is what I think chart 3 represents so clearly. It is tremendously important.

Here is today's gas engines, in relation to greenhouse gas emissions. Here is the diesel hybrid that we are all excited about today in hybrid production, again a decline. Here is the hydrogen fuel cell car. Our President has been leading and talking about the new hydrogen technologies for surface transportation. Then we have today's ethanol engine, today's ethanol fuel cell engine.

As a country, we are simply on hold at this moment because for 5 long years this Congress has debated but has refused to pass a comprehensive national energy policy that not only advances these technologies but incentivizes the marketplace to go after these technologies.

So when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle simply say the Energy bill will do nothing for the American consumer, I say politically and in reality, shame on them. They know better. They worked with us in trying to develop this bill over the last 5 years. It has become a bipartisan working piece in a very comprehensive way.

Today, I have taken just a small piece of that bill, the cellulose ethanol production capability of this country, and to suggest that it would reduce our dependence by 12 percent or even more, that it would improve American agriculture and put $25 million a year into the heartland of America, oh, my goodness, we cannot as a country look forward in that way, shame on us.

I hoped we could have passed a national energy bill this year. We are certainly going to in the future because the American public, I trust, is going to get fed up with paying $2.10 or more a gallon for their fuel and finding themselves increasingly dependent upon the Middle East. That is something the American consumer should not tolerate and that the American politician ought not stall out or block from happening.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

CONSERVATION ROYALTIES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I see my colleague from Tennessee is again on the Senate floor, and it is my pleasure this afternoon to spend a few minutes with him marking the 40th anniversary of the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a fund that has been extraordinarily helpful and useful to Governors, mayors, local elected officials, and advocates for conservation and for preservation for these 40 years.

When it was passed and signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson, it was a very farsighted and bold legislation that acknowledged that one of the great characteristics that separates America from the rest of the world, particularly the old world represented by the European countries. The essence of America, having such great expanses and great outdoors, separates it from an old world that was relatively small geographically and somewhat cramped. The United States of America has many special characteristics about it, but the one that really stands out that people of all political persuasions and from all geographic areas really appreciate and grasp is the value of the vastness of our land and the great open spaces. Our mighty rivers, our deep canyons, our extraordinary lush forests and green spaces, our breathtakingly beautiful deserts are all the things that make this country what it is.

Although the country was created this way and a great gift to all of us from the Creator, it is not going to stay this way unless we take some affirmative actions to preserve what we can, to give our people and our population places to grow, expand, earn livings, and create jobs. We have an obligation, as stewards, as the Senator said earlier, not just to our constituents but actually we have a moral obligation to the Creator who created this beauty to be good stewards of the land and the gift that has been given.

Looking at the 40th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, while we have done a good job, while we have made a fine effort, while we can point to many success stories of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, I stand today on the 40th anniversary with the Senator from Tennessee to say that we must do better. There are terrible gaps in funding that are leaving beautiful States such as Tennessee and magnificent States such as Louisiana and other States throughout our Nation desperate for Federal help to finish the good work that was started late in the last century.

President Roosevelt, who is even credited today with being such a great visionary conservationist, was an advocate of the preservation of special places in America. That is what we come today to talk about, how important it is to recommit ourselves, on this 40th anniversary, to setting aside the proper amount of money, not more than we need but an adequate amount of money to help our Governors and our mayors and support a new effort for wildlife preservation and support our coastal areas in light of the original vision of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

So the Senator from Tennessee and I have introduced the Americans Outdoors Act of 2004. I commend the chairman, PETE DOMENICI from New Mexico, who, in this very challenging year, has already allowed us a hearing on this bill. We look forward to working with the members of the Energy Committee, which has jurisdiction, of course, and the Department of Interior as we move this great legislation through seeking a more reliable source of funding.

We propose in our legislation to basically establish the same conservation royalty that the Federal Government now gives for onshore production of oil and natural gas. This bill will create a conservation royalty for offshore production of oil and natural gas and have it distributed in a way that complements and fulfills the promise of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is like saying the great wealth of this resource, of oil and natural gas, should be invested, as the Senator said, in the Federal Treasury to help economic development and building highways and the space program and should support our military.

A large percentage of these tax dollars should go for general uses, but a small percentage, 25 percent of these billions of dollars that are generated, should really go to a conservation royalty to acknowledge the creation that we have inherited, to acknowledge the great land and water that we have inherited, and to say on this day we believe it is wrong to take and never to give back. We believe it is our political and moral responsibility to be good stewards of the wealth that is generated and to turn back a portion of that money for conservation. It is our responsibility to give to our grandchildren and great grandchildren the great gift and the great land that was given to us by our forefathers and our Presidents, both Republican and Democrat, who have argued and established this great fund.

So it is my hope, with the Senator from Tennessee, that we will be joined by other Senate leaders as we pursue this effort to find a reliable stream of revenue to create a conservation royalty that will fully fund the State side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a robust coastal program for the States in our Nation, and a wildlife restoration fund, as well as the urban parks component of the State side of the bill.

I think we should explore and try to look for opportunities to find a reliable stream of money for the Federal side as we continue to build and expand on public lands in the United States.

Let me say there is no one in this Senate who understands the great value of private property more than do I and the Senator from Tennessee. I go all over the world doing a lot of work on economic development and lifting people out of poverty. I have been probably to more orphanages and homes for poor children than most. Many Senators do that great work. I am well aware that, in order for countries to create wealth, owning private property and building equity in a home or getting a mortgage for a farm is essential. That is the founding essence of America. This bill we intend to reinvigorate today is not a threat to private property. It complements the great commitment we have to private property, by saying that some lands, a small portion of lands, should be in public hands. The majority should be in private hands. It is an extraordinary partnership that gives value to both.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund envisions that strong partnership making all of our land more valuable, cleaner, more user friendly, open and beautiful for us to give to future generations.

I see the Senator from Tennessee, who may want to add a few additional words. But I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the distribution of money to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is not blown up, but I think the cameras at least can zoom in to see how volatile the funding has been, up and down, up and down, since 1965. Our bill attempts to equal this out by creating a conservation royalty so we can rely on these dollars and we can make good plans, spend taxpayer money well and wisely, creating beautiful bike paths and trails, helping to make more robust our park systems and our public lands for the benefit of our grandchildren in a way that complements the private sector, private property, and the economic development efforts that will continue to be underway for generations to come in this great Nation.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release that was issued by the Department of Interior, saying how proud they are to have distributed some money, royalties, for conservation to interior States.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES RECEIVE MORE THAN $1 BILLION FROM SHARE OF FEDERAL MINERAL REVENUES

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton announced today that 36 states received more than $1 billion during 2003 as part of their share of federal revenues collected by the Department's Minerals Management Service.

The $1,096,699,888 distributed to states during the year, was nearly 46 percent more than 2002 payments to states that totaled $753 million.

''Responsible energy development on public lands and offshore areas contribute greatly to states and local governments,'' Norton said. ''The money enables local governments to fund important projects for the betterment of communities and the lives of Americans.''

The nearly $1.1 billion distributed through December of last year represents the states' cumulative share of revenues collected from mineral production on federal lands located within their borders, and from federal offshore oil and gas tracts adjacent to their shores.

''In many cases states share their revenues with counties, which apply the money to meet needs like infrastructure improvements and school funding,'' MMS Director Johnnie Burton said.

During calendar year 2003, the state of Wyoming again led all states by receiving more than $503 million as its share of revenues collected from mineral production on federal lands within its borders, including oil, gas and coal production. New Mexico's share was more than $318 million, while $62.7 million was received by the state of Colorado. Other states sharing revenues included Utah with more than $54.4 million; Louisiana with $31.5 million; Montana at $26.9 million; and California with more than $25.3 million. (Complete table provided below.)

A state is entitled to a share of the mineral revenues collected from federal lands located within that state's boundaries. For the majority of onshore federal lands, states receive 50 percent of the revenues while the other 50 percent goes to various funds of the U.S. Treasury, including the DOI Reclamation Fund. Alaska receives a 90 percent share as prescribed by the Alaska Statehood Act. States may also receive appropriations from the offshore royalty-funded Land and Water Conservation Fund to help them with park and land acquisitions.

In addition, coastal states with producing federal offshore tracts adjacent to their seaward boundaries receive 27 percent of those mineral royalties. Remaining offshore revenues collected by the Minerals Management Service are deposited in various accounts of the U.S. Treasury, with the majority of those revenues going to the General Fund.

MMS is the federal agency in the U.S. Department of the Interior that manages the nation's oil, natural gas, and other mineral resources on the outer continental shelf in federal offshore waters. The agency also collects, accounts for, and disburses mineral revenues from Federal and American Indian lands. Between 1982 and 2003, MMS distributed more than $135 billion in revenues from onshore and offshore lands, an average of more than $6 billion per year, to the Nation, States and American Indians. Nearly $1 billion from those revenues goes into the Land and Water Conservation Fund annually for the development of State and Federal park and recreation lands.

Alabama	$14,601,401
Alaska	13,126,183
Arizona	128,474
Arkansas	4,379,518
California	25,336,757
Colorado	62,703,158
Florida	387,298
Georgia	54
Idaho	1,880,786
Illinois	100,822
Indiana	6,438
Kansas	1,928,091
Kentucky	55,782
Louisiana	31,561,211
Michigan	425,844
Minnesota	17,427
Mississippi	1,231,716
Missouri	169,832
Montana	26,906,699
Nebraska	15,125
Nevada	5,015,687
New Mexico	318,768,793
North Carolina	118
North Dakota	5,139,095
Ohio	301,952
Oklahoma	3,541,950
Oregon	30,608
Pennsylvania	22,312
South Carolina	20,602
South Dakota	413,977
Texas	19,069,085
Utah	54,443,508
Virginia	2,099
Washington	815,708
West Virginia	379,821
Wyoming	503,771,957
Total	1,096,699,888

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND—STATE AND FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Fiscal year	State appropriation	Federal appropriation	Total appropriation
1965	$10,375,000	$5,563,000	$16,000,000
1966	82,409,000	38,428,349	122,114,349
1967	56,531,000	36,206,591	95,006,591
1968	61,520,000	39,902,359	103,940,359
1969	44,938,000	63,991,000	111,500,000
1970	61,832,000	66,156,000	131,100,000
1971	185,239,000	168,226,000	357,400,000
1972	255,000,000	102,187,000	361,500,000
1973	181,800,000	117,721,000	300,000,000
1974	65,767,000	5,480,000	76,223,000
1975	179,880,000	121,700,000	307,492,000
1976	175,739,000	135,587,000	316,986,000
1977	175,315,000	356,286,000	537,799,000
1978	305,694,000	490,880,000	805,000,000
1979	369,602,000	360,776,000	737,025,000
1980	299,703,000	202,540,000	509,194,000
1981	173,745,000	108,282,000	288,593,000
1982	0	175,546,000	179,927,000
1983	110,819,000	220,093,000	335,093,000
1984	72,919,000	226,890,000	301,890,000
1985	71,853,000	213,130,000	286,612,000
1986	45,993,000	120,646,000	168,209,000
1987	32,700,000	175,656,000	210,626,000
1988	16,567,000	150,478,000	170,464,000
1989	16,700,000	186,233,000	206,233,000
1990	29,843,000	211,719,000	231,481,000
1991	19,748,000	308,446,000	341,671,000
1992	19,748,000	294,148,000	317,392,000
1993	24,788,000	255,437,000	283,652,000
1994	24,750,000	227,498,000	255,551,000
1995	24,703,000	188,848,000	216,795,000
1996	0	136,573,000	138,073,000
1997	0	227,498,000	159,379,000
1998	0	270,098,000	271,098,000
Title V*	0	699,000,000	699,000,000
1999	0	328,467,000	328,467,000
2000	40,000,000	419,000,000	459,000,000
2001	90,500,000	445,500,000	536,000,000
2002	144,000,000	429,000,000	573,000,000

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND—STATE AND FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

Fiscal year	State appropriation	Federal appropriation	Total appropriation
2003	97,000,000	313,000,000	410,000,000
2004	95,500,000	177,000,000	242,500,000
Total	3,663,220,000	8,819,816,499	12,498,986,299

*Title V Funds are supplemental to the FY 98 Appropriation.

Ms. LANDRIEU. We ask the same, that the same process that is in the law for onshore oil and gas drilling be in the law for off-shore oil and gas drilling. The onshore revenue provision has been in place since the early 1920s.

The record is clear. This, basically, is the essence of what our bill does to mark the 40th anniversary of the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Let's actually find a way to fund it. That is what our bill will do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I commend the Senator from Louisiana. She has worked hard for 6 years on legislation like this. I am proud to join her on the 40th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to continue its bipartisan support.

If I may ask through the Chair a question to the Senator from Louisiana. She mentions that for 50 years we have had a tradition in this country of a State royalty. In other words, if you drill for oil in Wyoming, for example, there is a royalty paid to the State of Wyoming, which is 50 cents out of every dollar of revenues.

I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana knows what amount of money that royalty produced for the State of Wyoming this year?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Yes, I do. I happen to have that document right here.

I understand the State of Wyoming, according to this document, has received over $500 million. Yes, $503,771,000 this year, which was the State royalty for Wyoming.

For the record, New Mexico received this year $318,768,000 in the same account.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

The Senator and I understand that those concerned about the appropriations process in the Senate have to deal with this issue. Today, under our budget rules, if we were to create a conservation royalty for offshore oil drilling and made it identical to what we have been doing for 50 years with onshore oil drilling, that would require us to treat it in a different way today than they did 50 years ago when they started it. We know that. But what we are trying to suggest is there is no real difference between creating a royalty on oil drillings or gas drillings onshore and oil or gas drillings offshore. In fact, there is a better argument for creating a conservation royalty than for creating just any old royalty for the State of Wyoming or the State of New Mexico or Arizona or Montana.

The logic is this. I am one who votes for more drilling for oil and gas because I don't like us relying so much on the Middle East for it, so I vote for that. But I don't know why we cannot agree that, if we have an environmental burden on the one hand, we cannot create an environmental benefit on the other hand.

This is a subject the Senator from Louisiana and I hope to talk over with our Members and say yes, this is an issue. We understand that. But for 50 years we have been taking 50 cents out of every dollar that comes from drilling on Federal lands onshore—90 cents in Alaska—and leaving it in the State where the drilling is done. What we are suggesting is we take about 25 cents of every dollar from offshore drilling and create a conservation royalty for the State to fund these programs the Senator talked about. We think that makes good sense, and that it is in the 40-year bipartisan tradition of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I am convinced there is a bipartisan conservation majority in the United States of America, and that on this legislation there will eventually be a bipartisan conservation majority in support of the Americans Outdoors Act.

I yield the floor.

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. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

SQUEEZE ON MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes this afternoon and express my concern and the concern of many of us around the country about the growing squeeze that is occurring on middle-income families in the United States. This is a very alarming trend we are seeing.

I address not only that point but also the issue of what is happening with the rising level of poverty in the country, particularly poverty among our youngest citizens in the earliest ages, and the number of children being born in the United States who are being born into extreme poverty—not just living in poverty but living below half the poverty line.

When you think of the combination of the squeeze occurring on the middle income and watching the growing numbers of children living in poverty in this country, all of us ought to be supremely alarmed about those trendlines.

Add to that the fact that there now appears to be the largest single deficit in the history of the United States, and the failure to create new jobs in the country, which is the worst performance of job creation since just prior to the beginning of the Great Depression back in the 1920s. We have lost somewhere between 1 million and 1.5 million jobs in this country in the last 4 years. When you compare that to the 20 million jobs created during the 1990s, there is a startling contrast in what is happening to America's economy.

I think it is critically important in these days that the American people be well informed factually about what is occurring as we make the difficult choices in the coming days about the leadership of this Nation.

Let me begin with the middle-income squeeze because I think it is important to know what is happening to families out there. We are watching a tremendous decline in household incomes. Household incomes have fallen about 3.4 percent during the last 4 years.

Let me put that in terms of dollars and cents.

To give you some idea of the median household income in the year 2000, the median household income was almost $45,000 a year—actually $44,853. Today, that median income is now $43,318. That is a decline of $1,500 in median household income. That is a drop in earning power.

If you have merely a decline in income and also a commensurate decline in costs, you would say that is not great, but certainly given the cost of essential items that middle-income families must acquire, those prices are going down, then the declining income would not be startling. But what is happening is quite the opposite.

We have watched median household income decline by $1,500, and simultaneously watched gas prices during the same period of time go up almost 20 percent in the United States. College tuition has gone up some 28 percent in that same 4-year period, and family health care premiums have risen 45 percent just in the last 2 years by 26 percent—11 percent in 1 year and 15 percent the next. So we are watching household median income decline by $1,500, and then we are watching college tuition, health care premiums, and gasoline prices soar. This is the squeeze. This is what is happening to average families in this country.

Also, as I mentioned at the outset, we are watching jobs not being created. We are short of well over a million jobs that we need in order to maintain a growing economy. But even these jobs are not coming back. We saw 144,000 new jobs created in the month of August. That is certainly vastly improved over the 32,000 new jobs created in July. Understand that just to keep pace with the new entries into the job market we should be creating about 220,000 jobs every month. That is what we need to do in an economy such as ours with a population of almost 300 million people: You have it produce about 220,000 new jobs every month just to stay even.

When we start talking about 32,000 jobs or 144,000 jobs, while certainly 133,000 is positive news, it still is well