

his record was economic—his courageous support for the interests of ordinary Americans against the growing power of our emerging plutocracy.

In our money-dominated politics, that's a dangerous position to take. When Mr. Wellstone first ran for the Senate, his opponent outspent him seven to one. According to one of his advisers, the success of that ramshackle campaign, run from a rickety green school bus, "made politics safe for populists again."

If only. Almost every politician in modern American pretends to be a populist; indeed, it's a general rule that the more slavishly a politician supports the interests of wealthy individuals and big corporations, the folksier his manner. But being a genuine populist, someone who really tries to stand up against what Mr. Wellstone called "Robin Hood in reverse" policies, isn't easy: you must face the power not just of money, but of sustained and shameless hypocrisy.

And that's why those fliers are a perfect illustration of what Paul Wellstone was fighting.

On one side, the inclusion of estate tax repeal in last year's federal tax cut is the most striking example to date of how our political system serves the interests of the wealthy. After all, the estate tax affects only a small minority of families; the bulk of the tax is paid by a tiny elite. In fact, estate tax repeal favors the wealthy to such an extent that defenders of last year's tax cut—like Senator Charles Grassley, who published a misleading letter in Friday's Times—always carefully omit it from calculations of who benefits. (The letter talked only about the income tax; had he included the effects of estate tax repeal, he would have been forced to admit that more than 40 percent of the benefits of that tax cut go to the wealthiest 1 percent of the population.) To eliminate the estate tax in the face of budget deficits means making the rich richer even as we slash essential services for the middle class and the poor.

On the other side, the estate tax debate illustrates the pervasive hypocrisy of our politics. For repeal of the "death tax" has been cast, incredibly, as a populist issue. Thanks to sustained, lavishly financed propaganda—of which that anti-Wellstone flier was a classic example—millions of Americans imagine, wrongly, that the estate tax mainly affects small businesses and farms, and that its repeal will help ordinary people. And who pays for the propaganda? Guess. It's amazing what money can buy.

In an age of fake populists, Paul Wellstone was the real thing. Now he's gone. Will others have the courage to carry on?

[From the New York Times, Oct. 25, 2002]

A TAX CUT FOR WHOM?

TO THE EDITOR: Re "Springtime for Hitler," by Paul Krugman (column, Oct. 18): I stand by my call for unbiased tax data in policy debates. Some observers claim that 40 percent of last year's tax cuts went to the top 1 percent of taxpayers. The Joint Committee on Taxation, Congress's official, unbiased source, says the top 1 percent will receive 27 percent of the income tax cuts in 2006, the latest projection available. Taxpayers with incomes of \$200,000 and less will receive the majority of the tax-cut benefits, with 67 percent.

The real story is that despite those cuts, the top 1 percent of taxpayers will still pay 33 percent of federal income taxes. They will receive a lower share of the income tax cut, 27 percent, than their burden, 33 percent.

The joint committee says the taxpayers who will receive the greatest reduction in their tax burden have incomes between

\$10,000 and \$40,000. Those with incomes between \$10,000 and \$20,000 will enjoy a reduction of 13.6 percent. Those with incomes of more than \$200,000 will see their burden reduced by 6.1 percent. Intellectual honesty demands putting tax data in context.

— CHUCK GRASSLEY.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 2002]

(By Paul Krugman)

SPRINGTIME FOR HITLER

You may recall that George W. Bush promised, among other things, to change the tone in Washington. He made good on that promise: the tone has certainly changed.

As far as I know, in the past it wasn't considered appropriate for the occupant of the White House to declare that members of the opposition party weren't interested in the nation's security. And it certainly wasn't usual to compare anyone who wants to tax the rich—or even anyone who estimates the share of last year's tax cut that went to the wealthy—to Adolf Hitler.

O.K., maybe we should discount remarks by Senator Phil Gramm. When Mr. Gramm declared that a proposal to impose a one-time capital gains levy on people who renounce U.S. citizenship in order to avoid paying taxes was "right out of Nazi Germany," even the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance committee, Charles Grassley, objected to the comparison.

But Mr. Grassley must have thought better of his objection, since just a few weeks later he decided to use the Hitler analogy himself: "I am sure voters will get their fill of statistics claiming that the Bush tax cut hands out 40 percent of its benefits to the top 1 percent of taxpayers. This is not merely misleading, it is outright false. Some folks must be under the impression that as long as something is repeated often enough, it will become true. That was how Adolf Hitler got to the top."

For the record, Robert McIntyre of Citizens for Tax Justice—the original source of that 40 percent estimate—is no Adolf Hitler. The amazing thing is that Mr. Grassley is sometimes described as a moderate, his remarks as just one more indicator that we have entered an era of extreme partisanship—one that leaves no room for the acknowledgment of politically inconvenient facts. For the claim that Mr. Grassley describes as "outright false" is, in fact, almost certainly true; in a rational world it wouldn't even be a matter for argument.

You might imagine that Mr. Grassley has in hand an alternative answer to the question "How much of the tax cut will go to the top 1 percent?"—that the administration has, at some point, produced a number showing that the wealthy aren't getting a big share of the benefits. In fact, however, administration officials have never answered that question. When pressed, they have always insisted on answering some other question.

But last year the Treasury Department did release a table showing, somewhat inadvertently, that more than 25 percent of the income tax cut will go to people making more than \$200,000 per year. This number doesn't include the effects of estate tax repeal; in 1999 only 2 percent of estates paid any tax, and half of that tax was paid by only 0.16 percent of estates. The number also probably doesn't take account of the alternative minimum tax, which will snatch away most of the income tax cut for upper-middle-class families, but won't affect the rich.

Put all this together and it becomes clear that, such enough, something like 40 percent of the tax cut—it could be a bit less, but probably it's considerably more—will go to 1 percent of the population. And the adminis-

tration's systematic evasiveness on the question of who benefits from the tax cut amounts to a plea of *nolo contendere*.

Which brings us back to the new tone in Washington.

When Ronald Reagan cut taxes on rich people, he didn't deny that that was what he was doing. You could agree or disagree with the supply-side economic theory he used to justify his actions, but he didn't pretend that he was increasing the progressivity of the tax system.

The strategy used to sell the Bush tax cut was simply to deny the facts—and to lash out at anyone who tried to point them out. And it's a strategy that, having worked there, is now being applied across the board.

Michael Kinsley recently wrote that "The Bush campaign for was against Iraq has been insulting to American citizens, not just because it has been dishonest, but because it has been unserious. A lie is insulting; an obvious lie is doubly insulting." All I can say is, now he notices? It's been like that all along on economic policy.

You see, some folks must be under the impression that as long as something is repeated often enough, it will become true. That was how George W. Bush got to the top.

BASELINE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003 SPENDING FOR TEA-21

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as we wrap up business for the 107th Congress, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with my Environment and Public Works Committee and budget Committee colleagues regarding an issue that will set the groundwork for reauthorization of the surface transportation program next Congress. Specifically, what the baseline figure will be for the program. Will it reflect the fiscal year 2003 enacted spending level or the pending CR level.

As my colleagues know, although Section 137 of Public Law 107-240, Making Further Continuing Appropriations for fiscal year 2003, provides that the highway program be funded at the fiscal year 2002 level of \$31.8 billion, section 137 limits total annual obligations for the program to not more than \$27.7 billion. Given that the fiscal year 2003 enacted level for surface transportation may not be known until after the President's fiscal year 2004 budget proposal is submitted, I have a concern that we could be faced with an artificially low baseline figure. I hope we can reach agreement now that it would be the intention of the Budget Committee to use the highest possible figure as the baseline for fiscal year 2003 when developing their fiscal year 2004 resolution. Ideally I would like to see a baseline of \$31.8 billion.

At a minimum I hope that next year's Budget Resolution will ensure that all revenues into the highway account of the Highway Trust Fund will be available to the EPW Committee for authorization with the existing budgetary protections.

I know we can all agree that a strong surface transportation program creates and preserves jobs, and thereby boosts the economy. Beginning reauthorization discussions with a low baseline figure stunts the value of the economic

activity that we can realize with a robust program.

If my colleagues would care to comment, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the Senator for yielding for my comments. I agree with my colleague Senator INHOFE and I look forward to working with him on this major transportation reauthorization bill. He is correct that beginning reauthorization discussions with a low baseline will hinder our efforts in crafting a truly robust national program which will provide strong economic and transportation benefits for all regions. I would be happy to yield back to my colleague Senator REID.

Mr. REID. I agree with my colleagues. The transportation bill will be one of the most important pieces of legislation taken up by the next Congress. The series of reauthorization hearings we held this past year made clear the importance of a well-functioning transportation system to our nation's economy and quality of life. These hearings also laid out the challenges our transportation system faces due to increasing congestion, safety concerns, the deterioration of our infrastructure, and the rapid projected growth in freight movements. Finding the necessary funds to address these problems will be our toughest reauthorization challenge and I hope that we can work closely with the Budget Committee to ensure that we devote the maximum resources possible to maintaining and improving our transportation infrastructure.

Mr. BOND. Senator INHOFE accurately states that transportation dollars have a direct effect on jobs and the economy in this country. For example, earlier this year there was a proposed \$8.6 billion reduction in fiscal year 2003 proposed spending from fiscal year 2002 enacted level for highways. This would cost an estimated 6,600 jobs in Missouri alone. Fortunately, the Environment and Public Works Committee in working with our colleagues on the Senate Transportation Appropriation Subcommittee have proposed full funding for fiscal year 2003.

More importantly, we need to recognize that our nation's transportation infrastructure is also an issue of safety. There is no question that increased investment in our nation's transportation system saves lives. For these reasons and more, I stand with my colleagues on Environment and Public Works in doing everything in our power to maintain a robust highway program as we go into reauthorization.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate my colleagues comments and agree with them that the revenues collected through the federal gas tax should be used to maintain and improve our transportation infrastructure. I will work with my colleagues to ensure this is the case.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JUDGE SERGIO GUTIERREZ

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, today I congratulate and honor a man whose contributions are an example to all of us. Idaho's Judge Sergio Gutierrez was recently recognized by Hispanic Business magazine as one the 100 most influential Hispanics.

Judge Gutierrez holds the distinction of being the first Hispanic judge in Idaho. A judge since 1993, he was appointed to the Idaho Court of Appeals in January of this year by Gov. Dirk Kempthorne. Sergio Gutierrez does a tremendous job as a judge, but his contributions go far beyond those he has made in his official capacity. Judge Gutierrez has worked to fight drugs, register voters, curb gang violence, and promote education, and he sits on the Governor's Coordinating Council for Families and Children. I am also honored that he serves as a member of my Hispanic advisory group in Idaho. His wisdom and advice have been invaluable assets as we have worked together to meet the needs of Idaho's Hispanic population.

It is hard to believe Judge Gutierrez was once a ninth grade dropout. However, with perseverance, he attained his GED, worked his way through college, and went on to graduate cum laude from Boise State University, later earning a law degree from Hastings Law School.

Judge Gutierrez believes in people, and he goes out of his way to help others overcome unfortunate circumstances that otherwise would limit their success. As a judge, he takes the opportunity to counsel with those who come into his court room. He often invites defendants into his chambers to discuss their futures, including drug rehabilitation, job training, and education. This is not a common practice among judges, but it has proven to be effective in the lives of the individuals whom Judge Gutierrez has touched.

I am proud to know Judge Sergio Gutierrez, and I would like to thank Hispanic Business magazine and its readers for recognizing this talented man. I would also like to thank Judge Gutierrez on behalf of the people of Idaho for the contributions he has made to our State and its people. He is truly an inspiring example for all of us.

A REMARKABLE AMERICAN: ROBERT INGRAM

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as my father always said, there are two types of people, talkers and doers. Anyone who knows Robert Ingram will agree with me that he is a "doer extraordinaire." Bob, of course, is the distinguished Chief Operating Officer and President, Pharmaceutical Operations of GlaxoSmithKline, GSK.

A few weeks ago, October 15, Bob announced his intention to retire at year's end from his daily responsibilities as the second-highest executive

officer at GSK, the world's premier pharmaceutical company. Through the years, GSK and more importantly, countless people around the world have benefitted immeasurably from Bob Ingram's compassion, energy, vision and intelligence.

In recent years, many politicians have engaged in a virtual sport, unjustifiably criticizing pharmaceutical companies and the senior executives who lead them. Thankfully, the American people have seen though many of these attacks for what they are, political expediency.

Americans are sophisticated enough to know that politicians do not develop life-saving and life-improving medications. Rather, it is the research-based pharmaceutical and biotech industries that invest billions of dollars each year to develop products that both extend our lives and improve the quality of life for billions of citizens around the world.

Bob Ingram has served as a beacon, consistently, respectfully and thoughtfully explaining the public health tradeoffs involved in implementing proposed new pharmaceutical regulations. It would be impossible to overstate his enormous contribution to reasoned discourse on this critical subject.

Bob Ingram has long understood that the ultimate victims of an inefficient and unproductive industry are the patients who will lack a safe and effective pharmaceutical therapy for the ailment that afflicts them not the pharmaceutical companies or their stockholders as some would have you believe.

Compassion requires that one stand up in support of what is proper. The measure of a leader is that he is willing to do so when that view is not popular. Bob Ingram has worked tirelessly as such a leader.

Fortunately, Bob's retirement from his day to day responsibilities at GSK will not mean that he is retiring from his role as an effective and outspoken advocate for the industry. Softening the blow somewhat is the knowledge that Bob will continue to fight for the well-being of patients as GSK's representative to the board of the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturer's Association.

Bob, his dear wife Jeannie, and GSK employees have long been involved in promoting service to others. Together with GSK's Chief Executive Officer, JP Garnier, Bob Ingram has done much to ensure that GSK serves as a global leader, launching effective medical programs that benefit millions of people throughout the world. The Orange Card discount program is a prime example of GSK's responsiveness and industry leadership in the United States.

Through GSK's Global Community Partnership programs, the Global Alliance to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis, a 20-year initiative to contribute hundreds of millions of doses of medication to rid the world of LF, the world's most disfiguring and disabling