

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 be-

cause 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

below what we ought to be doing if we are going to keep people working at levels that will allow them to provide for their families.

As I mentioned a moment ago, we are watching incomes decline. This is even more true when you start talking about new entrants into the job market from people who have lost a job and then go back to work. They are making about \$9,000 less a year overall, putting all incomes together, than they were before.

While we are creating some new jobs, the wages these jobs are paying and the benefits being provided are very different than they were with the previous jobs held by these very same people. This is tough news.

Again, there are choices that will be made in the next 45 or 50 days.

I point out for the purposes of discussion—sometimes it all gets lost—that there are those who are claiming there is nothing to worry about, that in fact our economy is good and strong.

I noted the other day that there was a speech the President gave in Michigan when he talked about how well our economy was doing. I think it was in Muskegon, MI. He was speaking just 2 days ago:

This economy of ours is strong, and it's getting stronger.

That was a speech given in Muskegon and Greenwood Village, CO.

Since the President has taken office, less than 4 years ago, the State of Michigan has lost 250,000 jobs. In Colorado, there has been a loss of 80,000 jobs.

I don't know how you square a statement of saying the economy is strong and getting stronger when a quarter of a million people in one of the most industrial States in the United States have lost work, and 80,000 jobs in the State of Colorado no longer exist. How is that a strong economy or a stronger growing economy? I don't see that. I don't think most Americans would.

JOHN KERRY, our colleague, who is running for the Presidency, has promised to create 10 million new jobs during the first 4 years of his administration. We need job creation in this country. We need to be talking about creating tax cuts for middle-income families and smaller businesses. That is where real growth occurs when you provide the kind of stimulus to smaller businesses and industries. They need the relief financially to modernize, to buy new equipment, to make themselves more competitive in a global economy. We need more of that kind of economic thinking than what we have seen in the last few years which has contributed to the worsening economic program at home.

I am an optimist and believe we ought to talk about good things that can happen in our country. It is very difficult to go anywhere in this country and have that kind of a conversation when people are out there struggling every day harder and harder to make ends meet, watching their in-

comes decline and their costs rise, and wondering how they will deal with the issues.

There are an additional 1.2 million Americans who no longer have health insurance. That number is up to 45 million in our country; it was below 44 million, but in the last year or so that number has jumped by 1.2 million. Those people are working Americans who have lost their health care coverage because of the rising premium costs of smaller and midsized businesses. Their employers are not mean spirited. They just cannot afford to maintain the cost of the health care premiums and some are dropping their employees from this kind of coverage.

So now we have working Americans who have watched their health care premiums jump tremendously. The average home health care premium in 2000 was \$6,351 a year. Less than 4 years later it has jumped to well over \$9,000, almost \$10,000. That is staggering. Employers just do not have the resources to pay these bills. So we find now 1.2 million working families in the ranks of the uninsured in our country. That adds to our problems.

I mentioned a moment ago child poverty. I will share with my colleagues my deep and growing concern about these numbers because this worries me. This is not the America that I was raised to believe in.

We are talking about a generation of kids coming along who will have to be the best educated, best prepared our Nation has ever produced. We are now in a highly competitive marketplace in the world. When kids grew up a generation or two ago you worried, if you were in Connecticut, that you might end up competing with a young person from New Mexico or you might compete with a person in Oregon. That was what it was like in this country.

Today, for a child growing up in New Mexico or in Oregon or Connecticut, their competition will be in Beijing, it will be in Moscow, it will be in Sydney, in Johannesburg, London. A global economy will be the challenge. How well prepared is this generation coming along?

We may be in the most unique position of any generation of Americans in watching a succeeding generation be less well off, less well prepared than we were as a generation. Every other generation throughout the more than 200-year history of our country has left their children and grandchildren in a stronger position. That has been our legacy as a nation. We are now precariously close to setting back for the first time in our history where a generation coming along may not be as well prepared, particularly when the challenges are going to be greater than ever before.

I worry very much when we see the jump, by 4.3 million, of Americans living in poverty over the last 3 years. In the year 2000, of the 300 million Americans, there were 31.6 million Americans living in poverty. Today that number

is close to 36 million, up 4.3 million people living in poverty in the United States. Of those numbers, we have almost 13 million of that 36 million who are children.

While the overall child poverty rate is 17.6 percent, the poverty rate for children under 5 is 20 percent. That makes the fastest growing group among the poor today, families with children under the age of 5.

Those are the facts. That is the legacy of 36 months—not quite, almost 40 months of leadership here. We are finding ourselves in worse shape.

We are fighting tooth and nail to get some resources for child care, for nutrition, for WIC programs to try to do something to assist these kids and these families. It is like pulling teeth around here to get some help for the kids who, through no fault of their own, are living in poverty. Yet the children are the ones who will be asked to defend our country, to become well educated, to provide for the strength of America in the 21st century.

I am deeply alarmed about the trendlines. We are not spending enough time addressing and talking about what we might do. This is the largest annual increase in child poverty in 10 years that has occurred in our country. Overall child poverty increased by 5.4 percent in 2003 while children living in extreme poverty increased by 11.6 percent. In fact, extreme poverty for children under 5 increased by 16.2 percent.

According to the Census Bureau, over 40 percent of children under the age of 18 who are being raised by a single mom are poor. Over half of them live in extreme poverty. That is below the poverty level.

More than half of our children under the age of five who are being raised by a single mom are poor. And, 60 percent of them—three of every five poor 5 year olds being raised by a single mother—are living in extreme poverty.

I addressed the issue of the squeeze that is occurring on middle-income families, watching the incomes decline and the costs rise. They are dramatic over the last few years. I am worried about the crushing blow that is occurring to children and the level of poverty that is occurring.

I raise these issues because we are going to have to change direction. We cannot continue the path we are on and expect these numbers to change. Every indication we have is the numbers are going to get worse and not better if we do not take dramatic steps in a different direction. I raise them today, and I pointed out earlier, and these are not personal attacks, they are choices we have to make. The candidates for President have entirely different views on how we ought to address this.

I mentioned earlier our colleague, Senator KERRY, has talked directly about tax cuts and where they ought to occur—for middle-income people, for smaller businesses; a health care plan that would start taking people off the rolls of the uninsured, put people in insurance programs and relieve them of

the fear of a child or a loved one being caught with a crippling illness or accident and bankrupting a family overnight because of their absence of insurance protection; of seeing to it that people who work overtime get paid for the overtime instead of shutting them off and depriving them of the extra income they need; of raising the minimum wage instead of depriving people of the kind of increases they need to make ends meet.

The tax incentives make a difference. Those are choices. The President says the economy is strong and getting stronger. Tell that to the 250,000 people in Michigan or the 80,000 Coloradans who have lost their jobs. I think they will agree. This is hardly getting better.

We need a change. That change will be available to people in less than 50 days.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does the Senator from New Mexico have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each Senator has 10 minutes in morning business.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will use 10 and I know there is another Republican Senator who is not here but he gave me another 10. I am just kidding. We will try to get by with 10.

I say to my good friend, I am just wondering, we have a President who is in the hinterland campaigning and we have an opposition candidate from your side. I wonder, how come all of you are coming to the Senate, one after another, telling us what your candidate is going to do? Can't he tell Americans for himself? Does he need you all to come down here and give a speech every day, five or six of you, one after another, talking about what your candidate is going to do?

No, I will not yield at this point. You have been talking for a long, long time, so let me speak.

Mr. DODD. How long did the Senator from Connecticut speak?

Mr. DOMENICI. Ten minutes and I gave you 2 extra minutes.

Mr. DODD. That is a long time.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have a speech on energy, but the Senator energized me so much that I want to speak a little bit about what he spoke about and then I will talk about the people in the Senate on their side of the aisle.

First, isn't it wonderful to say, fellow Americans, we need 10 million new jobs.

Senator SMITH, you own a business; you know how people get jobs, right? Your business employs them, right? If things are bad in the economy, you cannot hire more, right? What good does it do for a politician to come up here and say we need 10 million new jobs? That is true. In fact, I would say

we probably could use 20, although the truth is, we do not have that many people to be hired, but we could say that.

Well, that is no plan. That is a statement. How are you going to do it? Who are you going to follow? Are you going to follow the Clinton model? They say that did all those things. There is a lot of question whether that plan did all that. But why don't Democrats say: We are going to follow the Clinton plan? The Clinton plan was to raise taxes. It just happened that the economy was recovering. And the Democrats will say: Yes, but the country got very confident once we put in the increase in taxes because they thought we were going to reduce the deficit. That is really their idea of where they got their great, new jobs. That may be true, but nobody is saying they are going to do that.

They stand up and say: We need 10 million jobs. Bush is not producing them. We need 10 million jobs. Elect our man. That will take care of it. Does anybody believe that? It used to be they would say something better. When I came to the Senate, and we would have a downturn, the Democrats would come to the floor and say: We are going to add jobs. How? They would say: We are going to spend money. Do you know what they used to do? They would put a public works jobs bill on the floor and say: We are going to build bridges. We are going to build roads. We are going to build all these things. And the American people, like big, fat suckers, would say: Let's pass it. We are going to get new jobs.

We stopped doing that. I say to the Presiding Officer, have you ever heard of anybody doing that since you have been here? No. Do you know why? Because it does not work. By the time those new jobs would come on, do you know how many years passed, on average? Three years before they started; 7 years before they got finished. By then, there was a whole new set of problems. Right? The downturn was gone. It did not have anything to do with it, but they passed something. Or they said: Let's double all the spending in all these programs we have. That will put everybody to work.

Maybe we could get a chart here and say: We need 10 million new jobs. Let's put them to work with Government programs. We would see what that produced. The American people would say: Are you nuts? You want to spend \$50 billion to put people to work? And then it would be invented work.

So the truth is, you have to say, when you talk about 10 million jobs: I have the secret of how to make the American economy grow—not how you wish it would, but how you are going to make it grow.

And I have not heard much. I have heard there is going to be more middle-income people getting tax cuts. Interesting. Has anybody put on a board how much that will cost? And will they really do it? And how much are they going to give the middle income back?

And what will that do to create jobs? Most interesting. I would like to see it. Enough of that.

Second issue. Health care costs are too high. Let's take a poll. I say to Senators, put up your hand as to how many of you think health care costs are too high? I imagine you would get 100 votes. Right? One hundred Senators say health care costs are too high, health care costs are going up too much. Wonderful.

Now, let's go out to America and tell them that: I am running, and health care costs are too high. That is good. But now the question is, Are you telling us you know how to reduce the health care costs? What is your plan? What is your secret? Do you have some new way to do it? Let's hear how. I do not hear that because the one thing that is being said is, maybe the Government ought to take more people and let the Government take care of them in health care. But then, when you say, what do you want to do that for, is it that you mean you want more Government-owned and operated health care?

Now, I know when you say "socialized medicine," they get very upset. But maybe you do not want socialized medicine. Maybe you only want half socialized medicine, not all of it. But, frankly, I do not see any plan. The only one I have heard about is the importation of drugs. And I am not going to argue that today. It has been argued back and forth.

I will just say, I have read everything I can about the importation of drugs and its impact on the costs of prescription drugs in America. And I guess I am prepared to say that there is very little empirical evidence that across the board, for really good kinds of medicines that are important today, and to our seniors, that in the long run, unless you physically take your body on a train or an airplane or car and drive to a foreign country and buy the prescription and bring it back, there is very little evidence that you are sure to get the right kind and that the price will be right if you ask it be shipped. Now, enough of that.

So the question is, we need 10 million more jobs. How will the Democrat Presidential candidate do it? And let's talk about it. And then we need to reduce health care costs; and let's ask, how would we do it?

Now, let me tell you, there is a lot of talk about the uninsured. Frankly, the most interesting thing is, they speak about a lot of children being uninsured. I submit that may be true. But when we were working 8 or 9 or 10 years ago on health care, I was involved. We asked some insurance companies: Well, how much does it cost to insure kids? Do you know what they said? "We don't insure kids, children. We don't have any insurance policy that insures children." "Are you kidding?" "Yes, we don't do that."