

They will say: Look, we cannot control Mr. Iverson's conduct. That may be true. But they have an obligation, a responsibility to speak out and to condemn such conduct, even if they are unable to control it. So far, either they have, by silence, acquiesced, or they have to acknowledge that they find nothing wrong with the CD.

I find that both troubling and tragic if that is the standard we are to follow.

Again, the NBA, the Philadelphia 76ers, and their coach ought to speak out loud and clear and indicate this is not the kind of conduct they expect from one of their star athletes and to be as critical of it as I know Americans are in general.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I believe some of our other colleagues have reserved time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for sharing those serious concerns. It was not long ago that a group of us wrote the major department stores in the country asking them not to sell this violent material to minors, and they responded as good corporate citizens.

They said: We have a constitutional right to sell it, but we are not going to do it. Either we are not going to sell it at all, or we are going to make sure children produce an ID so we know they are old enough to buy the material. I thought that was a good corporate response.

Yes, the NBA may not legally be able to stop this stuff, but they ought to express their concern about it. The Senator makes a valid point, and I salute him for it.

(The remarks of Mr. SESSIONS pertaining to the introduction of S. 3169 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

ORGAN DONATION IN AMERICA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before I address the issue that I would like to speak to this evening, I would first like to acknowledge a press conference which was held today, and one which I believe could have some significance across the United States. It was a press conference here on the lawn of the U.S. Capitol. In attendance were Senators BILL FRIST of Tennessee and Senator DEWINE of Ohio—both Republican Senators—as well as my Democratic colleague, Senator CARL LEVIN and I.

What would bring together two Democrats and two Republicans in rare agreement here in the close of a session? It is an issue which, frankly, transcends party and transcends region. It is the issue of organ donation in America.

Mr. President, 72,000 of our friends and neighbors are sitting by a telephone across America at this very mo-

ment waiting for the phone to ring to be told that there is an organ available to be donated to them which could save their lives—72,000. In my home State of Illinois, there are 4,500 such people. Sadly, 300 of them will die before they receive the phone call that an organ is available.

So last year I joined with Senators FRIST, DEWINE, LEVIN, and KENNEDY, and half a dozen other Senators from both sides of the aisle, to try to address this on a national basis. We came up with the concept that this Thanksgiving in the year 2000 will be designated "Give Thanks, Give Life Week," where we will try to alert families across America, as they come together for Thanksgiving, that they should take a few moments of time in that festivity and just perhaps talk to one another privately about their feelings about organ donation.

We were lucky to have the endorsement of this effort by the National Football League. At 17 different NFL games on Thanksgiving Week, they will have "Give Thanks, Give Life" activities.

Today, we had at this gathering on the Capitol lawn, Connie Payton, who is the widow of the great Chicago Bear running back Walter Payton. Of course, he died in November of last year from liver disease. He might have been saved by a liver transplant. She has really dedicated her life since trying to work for children and for organ donation in his memory.

Connie is a wonderful lady who has been on television in public service spots across Illinois with our Secretary of State, Jesse White, for the past 6 or 7 months. She really is well respected for her efforts.

Joining her were representatives of the National Football League from the Washington Redskins and from the Tennessee Titans. It is going to be a great opportunity across America to use what is a great family get-together to remember the very basic: If you want to give thanks, you can give life with an organ donation.

So I hope a lot of my colleagues in the other NFL cities will be part of this and will participate. In Chicago, we are going to set up tables in Soldier Field for those who want organ donation cards and to encourage people to sign their driver's licenses. At half time we are going to bring out a bunch of kids and older folks who successfully received organ transplants.

At this meeting, we had Jon Hochstein, a 5-year-old boy from Virginia. He had a heart transplant a year and a half ago, and he looks like he will play in the NFL some day.

It is a great miracle, but it can't happen without organ donors. Those of us who made that commitment, and have made it known to our families, stand at least the possibility to bring a lot of joy to families.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Illinois and I came to the House of Representa-

tives together 18 years ago. I was placed on the Science and Technology Committee, and the first subcommittee I was on was chaired by Representative ALBERT GORE. One of the first hearings that he put together as chairman of that subcommittee dealt with organ transplants. That was 18 years ago. Maybe the Senator can remember the very noted hearing that he held, beginning a discussion on organ transplants.

Mr. DURBIN. I was at the same hearing.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Illinois, do you remember little Jamie Fisk whom he brought in?

Mr. DURBIN. I do.

Mr. REID. He was yellow.

Mr. DURBIN. Jaundiced.

Mr. REID. He needed a liver transplant. As a result of that hearing, Jamie Fisk got a liver transplant. It began a discussion in our country that the Senator from Illinois has carried on all these years about why we should be aware of the need for organ transplants.

I was not aware the Senator was coming to the floor today to speak about this subject. But my mind returns to that very dramatic hearing that went on for many hours. It was the first of its kind.

I would say, in passing, and ask the Senator if he agrees with me, that this is like AL GORE to begin something like this. He is a visionary. And this goes back long before anyone ever anticipated or thought that AL GORE would be a Member of the Senate, certainly not Vice President, and not running for the Presidency.

Mr. DURBIN. I agree with you.

But I remember it well because I was lucky enough to serve on that same subcommittee. I remember that testimony as if it were yesterday. It was amazing that this issue was brought forward. We have done so much.

Our Republican colleague, who is a medical doctor, Senator BILL FRIST, was a former heart and lung transplant surgeon. He came down here. He talked about how he used to carry around in his pocket the names of 10 or 12 people who needed an organ donation. He would go through the hospital to see if there were any families with a loved one who was about to pass away who would even consider that. He said since he stopped that practice a few years ago, the number of organ transplants has been increasing each and every year. But it can't continue unless there are more donors.

I hope this "Give Thanks, Give Life Week" around Thanksgiving will become an annual event. I want to really salute the National Football League and Paul Tagliabue, the Commissioner, for all the support they have given us. They have at least given it the kind of sendoff we hoped to achieve. Connie Payton, who was here the other day; Mark Moseley, who is a former most valuable player in the NFL; Bill Brundage, who was also a lineman for the Washington Redskins—they all came out here to endorse the concept.

Many times, people in sports can come forward and spur a lot of folks to take seriously what politicians, such as ourselves, may not be able to impress upon them. So this meeting today was a good one.

TAX CUTS AND THE PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I also come to the floor today to talk about an issue that came up the other night during the course of the Presidential debate. I did a television show last night called "Crossfire." Some people probably have seen it. It was typical. It was kind of a controlled shouting match, you might say, on "Crossfire," with Republicans on one side and Democrats on the other. Mary Matalin, who is from Illinois, and has been quite well known for her chairmanship of the campaign for George Bush's election as President, was there representing the Republican side. Of course, we had Bill Press on the Democratic side. We talked about the debate.

The interesting thing to me was, the analysis of the debate by these commentators kind of came down to what I consider to be fairly superficial questions: Did George Bush show disrespect for AL GORE when he brought up the whole question about fundraising? Did AL GORE show disrespect for George Bush when he shrugged or was guilty of audible breathing?

I thought to myself at one point, is that as good as it gets in a Presidential campaign in America? We can listen to 90 minutes of debate and wonder if someone perhaps cleared their throat at the wrong time, or shrugged their shoulders, or someone else brought up a word or two that might have crossed the line.

I think it is worth a lot more for us to have these debates. I think it is important that all of us who are in this business—Republicans and Democrats—take it as seriously as the American people want to take it.

What I hear from people across the country is, we are looking for political candidates who speak candidly, honestly, openly, and truthfully. Tell us what you believe, even if we might disagree with it, so we can draw a conclusion about you, not just our ideas about you.

The issue that AL GORE came to the debate to talk about is one which was addressed a few moments ago by our colleague, Senator PETE DOMENICI of New Mexico. I listened carefully because I really respect this man. For years, when I served in the House of Representatives on the Budget Committee, and now on the Senate Budget Committee, I have watched PETE DOMENICI. He has gone after the deficit like a tiger and for years and years was admonishing Congress to cut spending, trying to bring down our deficit. He continues in that effort.

As a consequence, I wish he were here on the floor. I told him I was going to

bring up this issue. I wish he were here on the floor so we could have a little debate about the proposed tax cuts of the two candidates, AL GORE and George Bush, and the impact it would have on America.

I think that is the point that AL GORE was trying to make the other night in the debate. There really are two clear choices. Both parties are for tax cuts, but they are entirely different approaches. The American people get to take their pick whichever they think is best for the future of this country and fairest for the taxpayers.

Frankly, I think the choice is very stark and very clear.

Let me show you, as an example, this chart, which demonstrates George Bush's proposal. It is true, we are at the point in our history where we are going to have a surplus; more money coming into the Federal Treasury than going out for the next 10 years.

The amount of that surplus will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$4.8 trillion—a huge amount of money. It sure is a far cry from just a few years back when we had, year after year, deficit after deficit. But, thank goodness, we are now living in an era of projected surpluses. We can start thinking about doing things with that money that will be good for the Nation.

The first thing you have to notice out of the \$4.8 trillion surplus over the next 10 years is we have all agreed—Democrats and Republicans—that \$2.6 trillion of the \$4.8 trillion will not be touched. That is a surplus in the Social Security funds. We have said that is off limits. Nobody gets to touch the Social Security fund. So you start off with a 10-year surplus of \$2.2 trillion, which I have indicated on this graph.

Then we take a look at the projection, first from George Bush, as to what you might do with that. Well, there will be a surplus as well in the Medicare trust fund, the hospitalization plan for the elderly and disabled, of about \$360 billion. We think that should also be off the table. We should not touch it. We know Medicare won't last forever, and we want it to be solvent. So if you take away that amount, you are down to \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years.

Then, of course, you take the proposal of George Bush for tax breaks of \$1.3 trillion, and you find that you have \$500 billion left over the next 10 years.

Then George Bush has also endorsed other Republican tax breaks, such as the estate tax, the marriage penalty tax, the telephone tax, a whole variety of tax breaks which total \$940 billion. Now we find ourselves in short order in the deficit category again. If you do all these things, you are back in the deficit world.

Then take a look at proposals by Governor Bush for additional spending on a variety of things—the military, education, whatever it happens to be—\$625 billion, and that brings the deficit to a total of \$1 trillion over the next 10 years. Then there is the proposal by

Governor Bush that suggests we should privatize Social Security. That would cost \$1.1 trillion. So add that to the \$1 trillion, and now you have \$2.1 trillion. With added interest costs of these additional debts of \$400 billion at the end of 10 years, you started off with a \$4.8 trillion surplus and now, at the end of it, under the George Bush plan, you have a \$2.5 trillion deficit.

None of us wants to see a return to those deficits. So the alternative which has been proposed on the Democratic side by Vice President GORE suggests a much more reasonable approach: Start with the same \$2.2 trillion, the non-Social Security surplus; protect the Medicare trust fund, \$1.8 trillion; targeted investments, \$530 billion. What is that for? Additional medical research at the National Institutes of Health, more money for our schools, environmental protection, cleaning up some of the environmental waste sites across America. Now add in the prescription drug benefit under Medicare, which we support on the Democratic side. You are now down to \$943 billion.

Then we bring in our tax cuts, \$480 billion worth of tax cuts, which I will describe in a few minutes. Then after you have reduced interest, you have a net of \$310 billion on the plus side. You are not back in deficit land again. You don't see the red ink on this chart. You are still above the line. You still have a surplus.

The Vice President has suggested that we should put this in a rainy day fund because, frankly, all of these economic projections are just guesses about the future. If we guess wrong, we should have a rainy day fund for emergencies. The good news is, as we address this approach, by the year 2012, we will have eliminated, under Vice President GORE's proposal, the publicly held national debt in America.

What does that mean? It means that the debt being held by folks who own treasuries and securities in the Federal Government will have been retired. And if that is retired, then it means less competition for capital, lower interest rates, more opportunity for businesses to expand and families to borrow money for mortgages. It also means that our kids will not be carrying the burden of the national debt on their shoulders. I don't think we can leave our children a better gift. Those who would suggest that a tax cut is a much better deal miss the point.

The best deal is for us to eliminate the publicly held national debt, have targeted tax cuts, and end up with a surplus at the end. To find ourselves, as Governor Bush has proposed, running into all of this red ink from his proposals would be a recipe for disaster. We would not only still have our national debt, we would be adding to it. I don't think that does our kids and grandchildren any good whatsoever.

When AL GORE said repeatedly the other night that the Bush tax cut spends more for the wealthiest 1 percent than the total that he wants to