the tax cuts go to the wealthy; the fact that the middle-income tax cuts proposed by the Vice President are very simple and easy to use and desperately needed by the American people—the Vice President will score points.

More importantly, he will win the election on that basis, and America will finally spend our surplus on the priorities we need and return taxes to the middle class who need them more than anybody else. Our country will continue the prosperity that, praise God, we have seen in the last 8 years.

Mr. President, these are not fuzzy Washington numbers. These are facts. They are facts that show that the Vice President is far more in touch with what the average American wants and needs than is Governor Bush.

I don't believe in class warfare. I respect people who have made a lot of money. That is the American dream. I hope my children will.

But when you do deep tax cuts, who should get it when you only have a limited amount? When you have a surplus, why should it be squandered? Governor Bush, these are not fuzzy numbers but hard, cold facts that help the American people.

I yield back my time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

APPLAUDING SENATOR SCHUMER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from New York. New York is the financial capital of the world, and the Senator from New York, having long represented that State in the House of Representatives, has certainly hit the ground running here in the Senate. We depend on the Senator from New York on many occasions for financial information and advice due to the fact that he comes from the financial capital of the world. His very vivid description of the debate last night, in financial terms and what the tax situation is from both candidates, was welcome. I congratulate and applaud the Senator for his very lucid statement.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friend, who is a great leader for all of us. He is always giving us younger Members time to make our statements on the floor, in addition to all the other nice things he does.

ALASKA PRODUCTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I thought it was appropriate that we revisit what the junior Senator from Alaska said today. He has come to the floor on many occasions and said, as I have stated earlier, the same thing. He does it with great passion, and I appreciate how strongly he feels about it. I think the time has come that we don't let his statements go without giving the facts from the other side. What are some of those facts? Let's talk about production of oil in Alaska.

In 1999, the Clinton-Gore administration offered tracts on nearly 4 million acres of land in the national petroleum reserve in Alaska, to the west of Prudhoe Bay, for oil and gas leasing.

> Oil companies with winning bids will pay—

This is a staggering figure, but it is to show that we in this administration have had an energy policy, as we all know.

> Oil companies with winning bids will pay $104,635,728 for leases in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. A total of 425 tracts on approximately 3.9 million acres were offered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management in today's lease sale, the first such sale for the reserve since 1984.

It is important we recognize that there is an energy policy and, as indicated, this is the first sale for the reserve since 1984.

> Six oil companies submitted 174 bids on 133 tracts.

The oil industry should explore and develop the Alaskan Petroleum Reserve before there is any suggestion of opening the sensitive lands of the wildlife refuge to development. We acknowledge that, and that is why they are paying $105 million to do that. They should do that before there is even a suggestion of opening the sensitive lands of the ANWR to develop. ANWR doesn't need to be developed. To even suggest doing it before we fully explore the petroleum reserve in Alaska indicates that we are doing it for reasons other than petroleum production.

> In 1998, the U.S. Geological Survey released a mean estimate of 2.4 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil in the Arctic Refuge at $18 a barrel market price in 1996 dollars. Such a discovery would never meet more than a small part of our oil needs at any given time. The U.S. consumes about 19 million barrels of oil daily or almost 7 billion barrels annually . . .

So using these numbers for a couple of years, you could drill and it would be gone, and you would damage, to say the least, this beautiful part of the world.

The U.S. Geological Survey indicates that the mean estimate of economically recoverable reserves assumes an oil price of $18, as I have indicated. We know the price of oil is almost double that today. Even at $20 a barrel, the mean estimate increases to 3.2 billion barrels. This information comes from Dr. Thomas Casadevall, the Acting Director of the U.S. Geological Survey.

Production of oil in the United States peaked in 1970. You can see that on this chart. That was when the United States produced about 9.6 million barrels of oil every day. Production in Alaska has also been on a continual decline since 1988. It is very clear that the production of oil in Alaska has been going downhill since 1988, when it peaked at 2 million barrels of oil a day.

Domestic gas and oil drilling activity decreased nearly 17 percent during 1992, the last year of the Bush administration, and was at the lowest level since 1942. So I think we should understand that the Senator from Alaska—if he has to complain about energy policy—should go back to the Bush administration. That is when we bottomed out, so to speak.

Let's talk about what has gone on since 1992 when this administration began a concerted effort to increase the production of oil. Under the leadership of the Clinton-Gore administration, natural gas production on Federal lands onshore and oil production offshore is increasing. Natural gas production on Federal onshore lands has increased nearly 60 percent during this administration. Let me repeat that. Natural gas production on Federal onshore lands has increased nearly 60 percent since 1992. Oil production on Federal lands is down. But the gas statistics belie the argument that the administration has shut down the public lands to oil and gas development. This source comes from testimony given before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee in July of this year.

The Gulf of Mexico has become one of the hottest places in the world for exploration, especially since this administration supported incentives for deepwater development going into effect in 1995. Between 1992 and 1999, oil production offshore has increased 62 percent.

So it hardly seems to me that this is an administration without an energy policy, when we have determined that natural gas production during this administration on Federal onshore lands has increased about 60 percent and we have also determined that during this administration oil production offshore has increased 62 percent. Natural gas production in deep waters has increased 80 percent in just the past 2 years. These increases are in areas of the Gulf of Mexico, where the United States actively produces oil and gas.

So the point I am making is that we have my friend, the Senator from Alaska, coming to the floor and continually saying we don't have an energy policy. These figures belie that. We have an increase in Federal onshore lands by 60 percent; oil production offshore, 62 percent; and just in the last 2 years, gas production in deep waters increased 80 percent. Why? Because of actions taken by the Clinton-Gore administration.

The deep water in the Gulf of Mexico has emerged as a world-class oil and gas province in the last 4 years. That is as a result of work done by this administration. This historic change, after 53 years of production in the Gulf of Mexico, has been driven by several major factors, all coalescing during this administration. Truly, the deep water will drive the new millennium, no question about that.

I think it is important to note that we are all concerned about the fact that we are importing more oil than we should. Look at this chart. Oil importation went up in the mid 1970s, and during the gas crunch, because of policies taken by the Federal Government with tax credits and other things for developing alternative sources of energy, it went down. But with the glut of oil and the price of oil low, the consumption of oil, imported oil, went up again. Production has gone down. It is certainly indicated on this chart.

Also, I think we have to recognize that one thing has driven everything we do in this country, and that is the consumption of oil. We consume far more than we should. I think that is why the Clinton-Gore administration has stressed the fact that we need to do something to lessen the consumption of oil in this country.

The Energy Information Agency reports that the total petroleum product demand in 1999 grew by over 600,000 barrels a day, or 3.2 percent. That is the largest year increase since 1988.

The transportation-related demand accounted for more than 335,000 barrels per day.

According to the Energy Information Agency, the annual energy outlook for transportation sector energy consumption is projected to increase almost 2 percent per year.

We need to do better.

Of the projected increase in oil demand between now and 2020, 87 percent will be in the transportation sector.

In 1995, the Republican Congress shut down the administration's efforts to study higher fuel efficiency standards for light trucks and SUVs. Major automobile manufacturers fought ruthlessly convincing labor that it would cost jobs in the United States.

This summer when consumers started screaming about gasoline prices, Ford and GM realized they could increase the fuel economy of SUVs by as much as 25 percent. This should have happened many, many years ago. But, of course, the major automobile manufacturers were unwilling to sacrifice anything.

The good news is that we can have better fuel economy without costing jobs or eliminating the features that consumers seek in these vehicles. They have already committed to higher fuel emission standards in Europe and Japan. Why didn't they do it here? Because we were gullible. We in Congress would not allow legislation to go forward to do something about this.

Let me repeat. I appreciate very much the desire of the Senators from Alaska to want to drill in pristine wilderness to create jobs in Alaska, but I think we have to look at the big picture. Jobs in Alaska are not as important as maintaining the last remaining Arctic pristine wilderness we have in America.

I hope we look at what we are already doing in Alaska to increase energy production, and also look to the absolute necessity of doing something about alternative energy, such as wind, solar, and geothermal—and do something with oil shale—doing things such as that so we can become more energy efficient in America and less dependent on foreign oil.

I reserve whatever time we have. I know the Senator from Illinois has been here patiently waiting to speak.

Mr. President, I ask that Senator DORGAN be allowed to follow the Senator from Illinois with the time we have remaining in morning business.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has requested that he be allowed to speak before me beginning at about 11:10. I would like to go after Senator GORTON because he is only going to speak for about 10 minutes. I will speak for an extended period following Senator GORTON's remarks.

Mr. REID. We have no objection to that. We want to make sure that the manager of the bill on the Democrat side, Senator BYRD from West Virginia, is able to follow the statement of Senator GORTON—the two managers of the bill. I think the Senator from Illinois would not object to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no objection.

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

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4578, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A conference report to accompany H.R. 4578, an act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year sending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the conference report on the Interior and Related Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001. The conference report passed the House yesterday on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 348–69.

The bill provides $18.94 billion in total budget authority, an amount significantly above both the FY 2000 level of $15 billion and the President's FY 2001 request of $16.5 billion. This increase is primarily attributable to two items that I know to be of great interest to my colleagues.

The bulk of the increase over the budget request level is a direct result of the disastrous wildfires that plagued the West this summer. This bill includes the administration's $1.6 billion supplementary fire package, as well as $200 million in additional funds to address rehabilitation needs on the national forests, maintenance and upgrades to firefighting facilities, and for community and landowner assistance. The bill also includes the $240 million provided in the Domenici floor amendment for hazardous fuels reduction in the wildland/urban interface.

Those areas which public lands abut upon communities, towns and cities, as well as language designed to expedite this work that so desperately needs to be done. This language does not, however, overturn or bypass the National Environmental Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, or any other environmental statute. In total, the bill provides $2.9 billion for fire management.

The other element of this legislation that has garnered the most attention is title VIII, the land conservation, preservation, and infrastructure improvement title. This title does two things: First, it provides an additional $686 million in fiscal year 2001 for a wide variety of conservation programs, including Federal land acquisition, the stateside grant program, forest legacy, and urban park recreation and recovery. These amounts are in addition to the amounts agreed to in conference in the base portion of the bill. In total, funding for these Interior programs is about $1.2 billion for next year.

Second, title VIII establishes a new conservation spending category in the Budget Act for an array of conservation programs, for the maintenance of Federal land management facilities, most particularly, national parks, and for payments in lieu of taxes. Using the $1.2 billion provided in the fiscal year 2001 Interior bill as a base amount, plus a notional $400 million for coastal programs that may or may not be provided in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill, this new spending category is established using a base of $1.6 billion.

For Interior and CJS programs combined, this new budgetary category will go by $160 billion per year through fiscal year 2006. This separate allocation may only be spent on qualifying programs, and any amounts not spent will roll over and be added to the following year's allocation.

Title VIII also establishes several subcategories within the broader category conservation category. The allocation provided for each subcategory will only be available for programs within that subcategory and may not be used for other programs. And, like the structure of the broader category, any amounts not appropriated within a subcategory in a given year would be rolled over and added to the following year's suballocation.

The suballocations and associated amounts are shown on the chart. The bottom line is ''payments in lieu of taxes'' for $50 million a year—over and above the present payment in lieu of taxes. The next amount is ''Federal