

against the proposal to cut taxes and increase defense spending to balance the budget—11 Senators. President Reagan's popularity was unbelievable, and there was a herd instinct that swept across this body. It was absolutely unstoppable. And in 1994 when we were going to balance the budget the deficit was up to \$200 billion.

I hate to say this. But, in my opinion, Mr. President, 18 people who voted "no" today will be more than justly and aptly vindicated when the year 2002 rolls around and we will not have a balanced budget or anything even close to it.

I am chagrined and dismayed that today we are looking at a \$67 billion deficit on October 1, and next year, by our own admission and our own actions, the deficit will go to \$94 billion—almost \$30 billion higher than it is in 1997. To me that is shameful and unforgivable.

The American people have demanded a balanced budget as long as anybody can remember, and today we just forsook the opportunity to meet that nonnegotiable demand of the American people which they have laid on us for years.

Mr. President, I forsook offering an amendment that I felt very strongly about this afternoon. I did it to accommodate our own majority leader who had a plane to catch, and there were a lot of other Senators. I had no disillusion about whether my amendment would pass or not. But I wanted to debate it for 1 minute, and I am perhaps better off taking 5 minutes now to say to whoever may be watching and the Members of this body, ask yourself this question. It goes right to the heart of my amendment.

Do you think the Nation is better off providing a \$135 billion tax cut, over 50 percent of which goes to the wealthiest 5 percent of the people in America? Do you think we are better off doing that, or do you think we would be better off providing a college education for the 5 million youngsters whom the New York Times says over the next few years will be excluded from a college education because of skyrocketing costs?

I speak from experience. I spent 3 years in the Marine Corps in World War II. I came home where there was a compassionate, caring, understanding Government which provided the GI bill to my brother and me. I wouldn't be standing on the floor of the Senate today as a U.S. Senator if it had not been for that help from the U.S. Government. Some people think the Government has no obligation to help anybody.

What I am saying is if I had my first choice it would be to put the \$135 billion in savings on the deficit, and balance the budget by the year 2000, and no later than 2001. But if we are not going to do that, if we are going to take the \$115 billion we cut out of Medicare and spend it on something, I say spend it on college education for

youngsters who cannot go to college otherwise.

Mr. President, the greatness of this country has occurred when Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives had strong convictions about what we need to do as a matter of social, educational, and cultural policy—the GI bill, for example. It takes a giant leap of faith to believe that we can do this—educate every youngster in the country with a college degree.

We found that the average cost of an education in a State-supported university is \$7,000 a year. So we simply increased the Pell grant to \$7,000. The income criteria would remain as it is now. If you were wealthy or partially wealthy, you wouldn't get the full \$7,000. But if you had an income of below a certain amount, you would get the \$7,000. We left the two tax provisions that are in this bill that we just passed intact.

Mr. President, I want you to look at this chart so that you can see what I am talking about and where we are headed.

Here are the percentages of people in certain income categories. This is the highest level of income in the country—86 percent of those people go to college. In the next quintile down here, 60 percent, a little less than 60 percent, in 1983 and today, almost 68 percent of those kids go to college. And you get down here in the low-income, and look what happens. It started up—down and up. And now it is down again. If you look at the New York Times article of this past week, you will see that this figure is going to head down.

Mr. President, I am not going to take up a lot of time to say something that everybody knows that we ought to be doing. But I do want to say this. Mr. President, the high school graduates in this country in the past 20 years have lost 18 percent more of their income. When you hear people say the income gap in this country is widening, there it is. High school students lost 18 percent in the last 20 years. Dropouts have lost 25 percent. And, if it continues at the present rate, by the year 2015 high school students will have lost 38 percent of their income because they didn't go to college.

If you want to live in a civilized society, it is this simple. If you want to live in a civilized society, one that is relatively drug free and crime free, if you want to live in a society and in a technological age, we don't have any choice about it. This has to come.

It is one of those things that we need to debate and debate now, and we need to do it. We need to make sure that no child in this country is denied a college education anymore than today we would deny somebody a high school education.

So I forsook offering that amendment even though my staff and I had spent untold hours gathering statistics and information.

I want to conclude as I opened a moment ago. Once again, I ask my brethren

in the U.S. Senate and the people of America to ask yourself this one question: Do you think we are better off spending this \$135 billion on a tax cut which goes to me, upper-income people, and \$12 a year to the stiff out there making \$15,000 a year—\$12 a year for him? The guy making \$15,000 a year gets \$12 a year out of this tax bill.

The guy making over \$200,000 a year gets \$3,500 to \$3,700. It is ironic; it does not mean anything to either one of them. To the man making \$15,000, \$12 does not mean anything in his life; to a man making \$200,000, \$3,000, or \$3,500 does not mean much either. That is what we are doing instead of meeting our obligation. Ask yourself which is more important, that tax cut or educating the children of this country so we can live in a civilized society.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

#### INCOME AVERAGING

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I will not take long. There are some folks I would like to extend my appreciation to. In the Senate today, when we passed the income averaging for our farmers and ranchers in Montana, we fulfilled a commitment that we made to those farmers and ranchers when we passed Freedom to Farm. We are in a transition; subsidies are going away, and now we are providing a vehicle, a tool with which we can maybe ride out the good years and prepare for the bad years without too much trouble.

I express my appreciation to the chairman and the ranking member of the Finance Committee for their help, also the efforts made by Senator ROBERTS of Kansas and Senator BUMPERS of Arkansas, Senator CONRAD of North Dakota and Senator BOND of Missouri and Senator HAGEL of Nebraska and my friend and colleague, Senator BAUCUS from Montana.

Without help from those Senators on this issue, I am afraid we would not have been as successful as we were in justifying and trying to pass income averaging. It is very important. Who is it important to? It is important to the young farmers and ranchers just starting. We know they will have good years and we know they will have bad years right behind them due to the elements of Mother Nature, to prices of commodities raised on our farms and ranches. This allows a way to hang on and spread that income out and survive in agriculture. After all, we produce the best food, the most of it, the cheapest of any country in the world. So this is a winner for all of America, not just American agriculture.

I thank you and I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut.

CHRISTOPHER F. PATTEN,  
GOVERNOR OF HONG KONG

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to say a thank you on behalf of myself and I feel a thank you as well on behalf of my 99 colleagues to his Excellency, Christopher F. Patten, the outgoing Governor of Hong Kong. Governor Patten has the particular distinction of being the last of 28 British Governors to preside over Hong Kong before this territory reverts back to the People's Republic of China on July 1—in just a few days.

Chris Patten, as those of us in this body have come to know him over the years, is a truly remarkable individual. He has been a superb administrator and an inspiration to the people who he has sought to govern in Hong Kong.

During his 5 years there, Chris Patten has watched the economy flourish under his stewardship. It grew by more than 30 percent in real terms over that period—a truly impressive performance. He has presided over a capable and honest civil service. Crime has fallen. The political situation has been stable and further democratized.

These are all important achievements, but, in my view, the most important legacy of the Patten administration is that it leaves behind the seeds of democracy firmly planted in the minds and hearts of the people of Hong Kong.

Thanks to Governor Patten and the people of Hong Kong, they were able to experience democracy firsthand by electing members of their local legislature, thereby making good on the British commitment to put in place a solidly based democratic administration.

Sadly, Mr. President, the Chinese have already made the decision to dismantle the elected legislature and to replace it with an appointed council, hand-picked by Beijing. That may work for the moment. In time we will know whether the "provisional legislature" installed by Beijing is only a temporary setback to democracy or the first step down a very dark, dark road, indeed. I hope it is not the latter.

Hopefully, Beijing will come to appreciate that it is virtually impossible to totally destroy democratic aspirations. As Governor Patten recently so eloquently put it, "You can dismantle institutions but you can't dismantle benchmarks. People now know what a fair election is like, and they will surely know what an unfair election is like if one takes place."

Many political leaders leave office, Mr. President, less than popular with those that they have governed, some deservedly so and others unfairly so, because they have had to make hard choices that only history will record kindly.

Not in the case of Chris Patten, in my view. Although few have had to make tougher decisions than he has, he leaves Hong Kong enormously popular, with 79 percent of the people of Hong Kong viewing him as having done a very good job, indeed.

On Monday, June 30, Governor Patten and his wife, Lavender, and his daughters, Kate, Laura, and Alice, will depart Hong Kong. I am confident that the people of that place will hold Chris Patten in their hearts for years and years to come. As one who considers him a personal friend, I would like to add my personal congratulations and thanks to him for all that he has endeavored to do, and I know that his many, many friends here in this body and the other and across this country, and particularly in Hong Kong, will not forget the challenges he has placed before the Government of the People's Republic of China.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD pertaining to the introduction of S. 983 and Senate Joint Resolution 34 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the indulgence of my colleagues, Senator BYRD of West Virginia, Senator GRAHAM of Florida, and Senator BAUCUS of Montana, for their time here this afternoon. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I note two other Senators on the floor who will be seeking recognition. May I ask, does either of them have to catch a plane?

Mr. BAUCUS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. How soon?

Mr. BAUCUS. Tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. I have to go somewhere tomorrow, too. I thought if the Senator wanted to catch a plane today, I would take my chair again.

Mr. BAUCUS. Thank you.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may use as much time as I may consume. I can assure my colleagues it will not be long, but I do not want to be interrupted in the midst of this speech.

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

#### CELEBRATING THE 4TH OF JULY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last week I was proud to celebrate West Virginia Day, marking the 134th anniversary of the birth of my great State. Born in the midst of a terrible war, the mountain State still bears witness to that difficult four years of struggle, from Harper's Ferry to battle sites across her hills and farmlands. But she also still stands fast, and holds onto the traces of earlier history in her sturdy log barns and cabins and the winding rows of moss-covered stones bounding fields and cemeteries. Crumbling now, these long stone walls are losing their battles to the honeysuckle vines and the frosty upheavals of the centuries, but they remind us still of our forebears who settled this rugged and beautiful country and who bequeathed to us a legacy both tangible and intangible. For just as these early settlers left us these stacked stones, they also left us an even greater gift, a gift no one else

on Earth has ever truly shared—our American freedom and the remarkable form of government that keeps Americans free.

Next Friday, on the Fourth of July, we in the United States will celebrate the declaration of our freedom and the announcement of our intent to form a new government, not bound by happenstance of birth or caste, but one that gives each man an equal opportunity to rise above the circumstances of his own beginning and to make of his life whatever his ability and ambition would allow. The government that was painstakingly crafted in the years following this turning point in history combines the best of many forms of government, while avoiding their excesses. I never cease to wonder at our great and lasting fortune in having been blessed with a collection of Founding Fathers who were able to blend so many differing viewpoints and draft a Constitution that is so well thought out, and so finely balanced, that it has survived over the last two centuries with remarkably little change—remarkably little change. It demonstrates an ability to cooperate that has been in rather short supply around here in recent years.

The drafting of the American Constitution was the work of many minds. The Declaration of Independence, though conceived by a committee of five, was penned by a single versatile, very remarkable man. The group formed for this work was comprised of notables including John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, Thomas Jefferson, and Robert Livingston—whose namesake graces our Government today with his presence in the other body, Representative and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives, BOB LIVINGSTON. These were brave men to undertake what was then an act of treason against the British monarch, King George III. They decided unanimously to select Thomas Jefferson for the delicate job of putting into words the message they wanted to send to George III, and to the world. And of all the powerful and lyrical speeches that have ever been captured on the page, surely the grace, courage, and idealism of the Declaration of Independence ranks high. Thomas Jefferson's legacy to this Nation is a rich one, including the nucleus of our Library of Congress formed from his own collection after the destruction of the War of 1812, his contributions to the Continental Congress, and his service as President. But the soaring majesty of his words—beginning with "When in the course of human events \* \* \*"—would stand alone as a monument to the man. Even as he lay dying at his mountaintop home in Monticello in 1826, Jefferson struggled to last until the fourth of July before succumbing to the call of the angels. John Adams, who died that same day—what a coincidence, what a coincidence—50 years after the Declaration of Independence was adopted, observed with his last breath that the