

Mother Katharine Drexel, who on October 1, just a few weeks ago, became the fourth American ever to be canonized by the Vatican.

Katharine Drexel was born in 1859 into a very well-to-do family in Bucks County, PA. Early in life, though, she dedicated herself and her inheritance to work for social justice for African Americans and Native Americans.

Mother Drexel's legacy reflects more than simply her commitment to the Catholic faith, though her faith was the inspiration for her life's work. Her activism expanded into the area of civil rights due to her understanding of the lingering effects of racism towards African American and Native Americans.

Due to her commitment to eradicating the vestiges of racism, she founded the Blessed Sacrament for the Christian education of Native Americans and African Americans.

In addition, throughout her life, she founded over 100 educational institutions for African Americans and Native Americans.

The most famous school she founded is Xavier University in New Orleans. At the time, no Catholic university in the South accepted black students and Mother Drexel established Xavier University to fill this void.

Along with her sisters, Mother Drexel inherited close to \$14 million. Mr. President, \$14 million in 1860 was a lot of money. Through her support of civil rights organizations such as the NAACP, and her numerous foundation schools, Mother Drexel donated more than \$20 million through her charitable work, a figure that in today's value exceeds a quarter of a billion dollars.

The excellent management of her inherited estate also earned her the reputation as an accomplished businesswoman. Thus her social justice work in the late 1800s and early 1900s also made her a woman's rights activist.

Although Mother Drexel passed away in 1955, her legacy continues today through the work of the Catholic order that she founded in 1891, an order that continues to carry out her vision of ending racial injustice.

It is my hope that we will all join in acknowledging the work of those who have dedicated themselves to working for the needs and concerns of all Americans. Nevada is home to both Native Americans and African Americans. I find it, therefore, especially appropriate that I speak today in spreading across the RECORD of this Senate the tremendous contribution and legacy of this great American, Mother Katharine Drexel.

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

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

THE TWO PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last evening I watched the Presidential debate, as I am sure many other Americans did as well. I was thinking, after the debate, that those who claim there is not a difference between these candidates, and not a choice in this election, just have not been listening. There is clearly a choice and a difference between the two Presidential candidates.

I happen to believe both are pretty good people. You don't get to the point where you achieve the nomination from your party for the Presidency of the United States without having some significant experience and talent. But there are vast differences in public policy. I want to talk just a little about this, and especially about one of the significant issues in this campaign: the proposals for tax cuts.

Governor Bush has proposed tax cuts that are somewhere in the vicinity of \$1.5 trillion over the coming 10 years.

We have had a wonderful economy in recent years. This country has been blessed with economic opportunity and growth that is unprecedented. We have the strongest economy in the world. Virtually everything in our economy has been headed in the right direction. Unemployment has been down; inflation has been down; home ownership up. Virtually all of the indicators of economic health have been good. This economy has been heading in the right direction.

One factor in that health is that Congress made some choices early on; difficult choices, to be sure, but ones that helped put this economy back on track. I worry very much that, as some economists tell us there will be surpluses for the next 10 years, this rush to enact \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts even before the surpluses exist could lead us to a much different economic place. If we take that path, and if we don't get the surpluses we expect, then we will begin to experience, once again, Federal budget deficits. We will be right back in the same dark hole of budget deficits and lower economic growth and more economic trouble.

I will read a couple of quotes.

There is no cause for worry. The high tide of prosperity is going to continue.

September 1928, by Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon.

No Congress of the United States ever assembled on surveying the state of the Union has met a more pleasing prospect than that which appears at the present time.

December 4, 1928, President Calvin Coolidge.

Economic forecasting is a tricky business under the very best of circumstances. But it is particularly suspect in the political arena, when partisan agendas are at stake and when the forecasts purport to show whether someone's agenda can work or not work. We have two classes of forecasters, according to one economist:

those who don't know, and those who don't know they don't know. We might want to add a third class of economist: those who don't know but don't care because they have an agenda to justify in the political arena with their forecasts.

The problem with economic forecasting is not just uncertainty around the edges. The problem goes to the very core of the endeavor. Most forecasting is simply linear; that is, it assumes that tomorrow will be pretty much like yesterday with just a little something added on. Of course, life is not linear. There are sudden lurches and jolts which none of us can anticipate. Yet forecasters always have a model they use that anticipates tomorrow will reflect the experience of yesterday.

If we start writing tax refund checks with money we don't yet have and return to the staggering deficits of recent times—a \$290 billion deficit the year this administration took office 8 years ago—we will have a much less certain economic future. All of us should understand that.

The reason I want to talk about this is that it is at the core of the debate in the Presidential contest. The question for me is, Are we going to move forward and build on our economic success, or are we going to risk slipping back into big deficits?

How much budget surplus is there? We hear candidates talk about trillions, \$3 trillion, \$4 trillion, \$4.5 trillion. I went to a high school with 40 kids in all four grades. My class was ninth. We didn't have a lot of advanced math. We never studied trillions, I confess. I am not sure I understand what a trillion is. I know how many zeros exist in a trillion, but I am not sure I, nor anyone else in this Chamber, knows exactly what a trillion is.

So we hear the Congressional Budget Office say, you have an estimated \$4.6 trillion surplus in the coming 10 years. Then we hear candidates say, if we have all this surplus, let's propose a \$1.5 trillion tax cut, most of which will go to the upper income folks, which I will talk about in a moment. The problem here is this: We may never have this surplus.

First of all, \$2.4 trillion belongs to the Social Security trust fund. It has to go there and should not be touched by anyone for any other purpose. Another \$360 billion goes to the Medicare trust fund. It ought to be put away and not touched for any other purpose. Realistic spending adjustments will be about \$600 billion; we are making these right now to exceed the budget caps because the budget that was passed earlier this year was wildly unrealistic in terms of what is needed for education and health care and a range of other issues, just to keep pace with increased population needs. These figures, incidentally, are from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. This organization says that, if you also include amounts necessary for Social Security

and Medicare solvency, which you are going to have to do, you have probably a \$700 billion estimated surplus. That is if everything goes right—\$700 billion, not \$4.6 trillion.

Now, with this prospect, if you add a \$1.5 trillion tax cut, what do you have left? Almost a \$1 trillion deficit.

Should we be a bit cautious? Should we be concerned about talk of giving back taxes on a permanent basis based on surpluses that don't yet exist? The answer is yes. We would be, in my judgment, far better off if we decided to establish some basic principles for the use of any estimated surplus.

The priorities I think are these: First, we ought to pay down the Federal debt. Second, we ought to ensure the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare. Then we ought to address the urgent needs of this Nation, such as repairing our schools and making sure our kids are walking through classroom doors in the best schools in the world; and dealing with the prescription drug prices that are too high for many of our senior citizens to afford. Then we should provide targeted tax relief for working families.

There is a very big difference in the agenda of the candidates for President. Governor Bush says his priority is to provide a very large tax cut. The risk is that we won't have the money for a \$1.5 trillion tax cut. The risk is that we may well go into a \$1 trillion deficit because of that proposed tax cut. I hope that will not be the case, but it is certainly possible.

The problem with the tax cut itself is, even if you decided we should cut some taxes, the question is for whom and which taxes. Here is the proposed tax cut by Governor Bush. You can see the lowest 20 percent get \$42 apiece a year, and the top 1 percent get \$46,000 each.

In the debate last night, Governor Bush said: Well, of course, the wealthy, the upper income people get most of the tax cuts; they pay most of the taxes.

You can say that only if you are using a magnifying glass to suggest that the only taxes people pay are income taxes. I have a chart that shows something interesting. People pay \$612 billion in payroll taxes in this country. Go to a convenience store somewhere. Maybe you will run into a person working in that convenience store for the minimum wage, working 40 hours a week, trying to raise two or three kids. They pay more in payroll taxes than they pay in income taxes. Yet that doesn't count, according to Governor Bush. All that counts is this: Let's give money back based on income taxes.

How about proposing a tax cut to the American people based on their real tax burden? Let me show you that burden. The fact is, 99 percent of the people in the bottom fifth income bracket in this country pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes. As to the second fifth, 92 percent pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income

taxes. Those folks work hard every day. They get a check that is less than their salary because money is taken out. Why is money taken out? For taxes. Which taxes? Payroll taxes as well as income taxes. Then they are told that when it comes to tax cuts, they don't count because we are going to give tax cuts based solely on who pays income taxes.

So the wealthiest get the biggest tax cuts. Is that fair to the people at the bottom of the economic ladder who work hard every day and who pay heavier payroll taxes than they do income taxes? The answer is absolutely not. That is another difference in philosophy.

There are people in this Chamber and people who are advisers to Governor Bush and others who believe that the proper approach to taxation is to tax work and exempt investment. That is their philosophy. Why? It is a typical political debate that has gone on for decades. Do you believe this economy works best by pouring something in at the top—that is called trickle down—or by nurturing something at the bottom, called percolate up? Do you believe America's economic engine works best if you just get some cans and pour it in the top? Or do you believe that if you give everybody at the bottom a little something to work with, that this economic engine works because things percolate up? It is a difference in philosophy.

Governor Bush believes, as do those who control the Congress, in the trickle-down approach.

I received a note from a North Dakotan one day, a farmer. He said: I have been living under this trickle-down stuff for 15 years, and I ain't even got damp yet.

Of course, Hubert Humphrey used to describe the trickle-down approach in his famous quote: That is where you give the horse some hay to eat, hoping that later the birds will have something to nibble on.

So we have this debate in the country. Who is right? It seems to me that if we are going to do this in a conservative, thoughtful way, we ought to decide the following: We don't know what the future holds. Let us hope the future is as wonderful as the last 6 or 8 years have been in terms of economic performance. Things are better in the country; everyone understands things are better.

You can stand on this floor and say, like the rooster taking credit for the sunup, that this person or that person should get the credit for the success of the economy. The fact is, we were headed in the wrong direction. This economy was in deep trouble. We had run up a \$5.7 trillion in debt, and we had a \$290 billion annual deficit in 1992. We were moving in the wrong direction very rapidly.

We in this Chamber, and over in the House—by one vote in each Chamber—passed a new economic plan. It was controversial as the dickens. It was not

easy to vote for. In fact, let me read a couple of statements that were made at the time on the floor of the Senate. I will not read the authors, but we had people stand up on the floor of the Senate, and they had their own predictions regarding what this economic plan would be for our country.

On August 6, 1993, one of my colleagues stood up and said:

So we are still going to pile up some more debt, but most of all, we are going to cost jobs in this country [with this plan].

Another Senator, another colleague, said:

Make no mistake, these higher rates will cost jobs [in this plan of yours].

Another one said:

When all is said and done, people will pay more taxes, the economy will create fewer jobs, government will spend more money, and the American people will be worse off.

Another said:

It will flatten the economy.

That was at a time when we had an anemic economy, with slow growth, huge deficits, and moving in the wrong direction. And where are we in the year 1999 and the year 2000, after 8 years of that experience? We have an economy that is the envy of the world, growing faster than any other industrial economy in the world. Unemployment is down. More people are working. Welfare rolls are down. Inflation is down. Home ownership is up. Almost every indicator of economic health describes a country that is doing better. What should we do at this point? Some say give huge tax cuts, right now. Let's put them in law right now, lock them down.

If during good economic times you don't use the opportunity to pay down the Federal debt, you are never going to be able to pay down the debt. When you run up debt during tougher times, you ought to pay it down during better times. That is as conservative an ethic as you can have, it seems to me.

Why this Congress would not embrace that is beyond me. Why we would not agree together that it is our responsibility to pay down the debt during better times—what greater gift could there be to America's children than to unsaddle them from the debt, the \$4.7 trillion that was added between 1980 and the late 1990s? What better gift could we give to them than to say our first job is to pay down this Federal debt? But, no, there is some political attractiveness, I guess, to say we want to give tax cuts. Gee, that is an easy thing to say, but it is not at this point a very responsible fiscal policy—especially when the largest portion of those cuts would go to the wealthiest Americans who have done the best in this economy.

It seems to me that tax cuts ought to come after the paydown of the debt and a number of other obligations. But second, when we do them—and we should if we have surpluses—we ought to do them based upon the burden the American families have in the workplace,

which includes not just the income tax but also the payroll tax. Those are the things I think we ought to consider.

Now, the other issue in the debate last night was, whose side are you on? I know there is a difference between the two candidates. Let me say I am not here to say one candidate is bad and the other is good. That is not my role. My role is to say there is a very significant difference in what they believe and how they approach public policy. I think on the key issues the American people ought to evaluate these matters that were before this Congress.

A Patients' Bill of Rights: Who is on whose side on the Patients' Bill of Rights? Does anybody really believe that with the growth of the HMOs and managed care organizations that patients are just fine; let them fend for themselves? Or do people really understand it is time to do something to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights? And if they believe we ought to, why has this Congress not been willing to do it? I will tell you why: because too many in this Congress stand with the insurance companies and the managed care organizations, and too few have been willing to stand on the side of patients.

We have heard story after story of people who have had to fight cancer and fight their HMOs at the same time. These stories have been told on the floor of this Senate. I will state again that at one hearing I held on this issue with my colleague from Nevada, a woman stood up and held a picture of her son. She began crying as she described her son's death on his 16th birthday. Her son suffered from leukemia and desperately needed a special kind of treatment in order to have a chance to live. But he had to fight his cancer and fight his managed care organization at the same time because the managed care organization withheld that treatment. She said her son looked up at him from his bedside and said: Mom, how can they do this to a kid like me?

It is not fair to have a child or have parents fight cancer and the insurance company at the same time. That is not a fair fight. Should we pass a Patients' Bill of Rights? Yes, we should. It is what Vice President GORE said last evening. It is what we said in this Congress. Why don't we do it? Because too many stand on the side of the bigger economic interests and are unwilling to stand on the side of patients.

They say the Senate passed a Patients' Bill of Rights. No, the Senate passed a "patients' bill of goods." It was like playing charades, pulling on your ear and saying: It sounds like. Those who wrote it knew what they were doing. Republicans in the House of Representatives say it not only is not worth anything, it is a giant step backwards. The Republicans in the House who support the bipartisan Dingell-Norwood bill know what we ought to do, and this Senate has been unwilling to do it.

Minimum wage: We have people every day who are working their hearts out trying to take care of their families at the bottom of the economic ladder. Somehow, while this Congress is in a rush to help those at the top of the income ladder with tax cuts, these folks who are working at the bottom of the economic ladder, trying to get ahead, are left behind. They deserve an increase in the minimum wage. They deserve to keep pace. It ought to be a priority in this Congress to say work matters and we value you. If you are struggling to work and take care of your families—good for you. We want to do something to make sure you keep pace with that minimum wage.

Other issues include prescription drugs and Medicare. Of course we ought to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, but this Congress does not seem to want to get there.

Helping family farmers: You can't say you are pro family and not stand for family farmers.

Education: We have not even passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

We have a lot to do. There are big differences between the political parties. That doesn't mean one is good and one is bad. It simply means there are significant policy choices the American people have an opportunity to make. We have been struggling mightily on these issues. We are a minority on my side of the aisle. The debate last night highlighted some of the differences. And America needs to make a choice. Which path do they want to choose? One with more risk that might upset this economy of ours and throw us back into the same deficit ditch we were in before, or one that is more cautious, that says one of our priorities is to pay down the debt? Or will we choose a course that says we want to stand with the American people against the larger economic interests?

It is not a myth that the economic interests are getting bigger and bigger. Open the paper today and see who merged today. Yesterday it was two big oil companies. Tomorrow it will be two big banks. Every day the economic enterprises are getting bigger. And what is happening is every day the American people are finding they have less power in dealing with them, they have less power in confronting the prescription drug prices because the pharmaceutical manufacturers decide what the prices are, and they tell the American people: Pay up. If you don't like it, don't buy it. And they will charge ten times more for a cancer drug in the United States than the same drug they sell in Canada.

The American people need some help in confronting these concentrations of economic power. That is what we have been fighting for. My hope is that the next time someone says there is no difference in these campaigns, there is no difference between the two candidates for President, no difference between the Republican and Democrats, I hope

they look at the record. There is a big difference. I hope they make a choice that says that difference matters in their lives, as well.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCY PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 4461, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A conference report to accompany H.R. 4461, an act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration, and related agency programs for fiscal year ending September 30th, 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, for nearly 200 years from the founding of our Republic, capital punishment has loomed as the ultimate punishment for the violation of our laws. This reflected a belief that such a severe penalty would serve as a deterrent to those who might think they can take an innocent life or bring injury to our people.

While this Nation has always believed that capital punishment is an appropriate penalty for those who commit the most heinous of crimes, our criminal justice system has also been based on the premise that it is better—and it has been part of American lore to suggest that it is better that ten guilty men go free than an innocent man ever be put behind bars or lose his life.

This is all the more true when what is at stake is not just putting a person in prison—an act that could be rectified or proven wrong—but the irretrievable taking of a human life. As long as there has been the American Republic, this has been a founding belief: Taking of a life, if it can deter a crime, but protecting a mistake of justice.

Throughout our history, concerns have been raised about the fair application of the death penalty for exactly this concern.

Almost 30 years ago, the Supreme Court, in *Furham v. Georgia*, effectively abolished the death penalty when it decided that death penalty statutes at the time did too little to ensure the equal application of the law. In doing so, the Court held that the death penalty, while itself not necessarily unconstitutional, was often