

The clientele did not rush to him, frankly, but he also discovered that he had a knack for politics. He ran as a State representative in the thirties. He was elected twice and, at that point, he began to create a name for himself as an articulate advocate, someone who was a hard-working, determined champion, not only for his people but for all people.

He was made an assistant attorney general for the State, and then he was selected to run as lieutenant governor. He served as lieutenant governor for the State of Rhode Island. And then, fortuitously—because the Governor accepted a position in the Democratic administration—he became the first Italian American Governor in this great country. Then, he moved on to the U.S. Senate to become the first Italian American Senator in the history of this country. An extraordinary individual. He came here and worked on so many different issues. He was the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy at the time when atomic energy was becoming a powerful force in all of our lives.

He committed himself to the peaceful use of atomic energy to try to develop its potential to help rather than to destroy. He worked ceaselessly to ensure that we were controlling atomic energy throughout the world. He worked very hard on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. He worked with many colleagues—some colleagues who are here today—on that landmark legislation.

He also served on the Commerce Committee where he was the chairman of the telecommunications subcommittee. I daresay many of the fundamental foundations and principles that have guided this huge explosion of telecommunications that have opened up the cyberspace of the world began years ago under his deliberations on that committee.

Also, in 1974 at the end of his career, he was very active in campaign finance reform in the wake of the Watergate affair.

Those are accomplishments, but what is so compelling and so emblematic of the man is that his whole life represented something so fundamentally American. He was modest and humble. He seized the opportunity that is America—the chance to succeed. Then he committed himself in his public life, day in and day out, to ensure that every American had those types of opportunities.

That is why he and his colleagues in the 1960s embraced the idea of providing educational support to the talented but poor Americans who could get into college but couldn't afford to go to college. That was not some theoretical flourish he discovered in a lecture hall at a great university; that was from his heart, from having lived it, from having seen so many of his contemporaries with the talent, the

skills, and the ambition frustrated and thwarted because they didn't have the money to go to college. In so many other ways, he tried to ensure that "opportunity" was the watchword of America.

His greatest contribution perhaps is the fact that he lived what we all think America should be and is—that someone can rise up from an immigrant household, from a place where English is not the first language, to the highest positions in this country through hard work, dedication, and commitment. That example alone, that inspiration alone, is extraordinarily important to all of us.

We in Rhode Island are very lucky because we have a chance to see our public officials close up. All of us have stories about our leaders. In Rhode Island, Senator Pastore was no exception. We all understood early on that he was one of the most extraordinary debaters and oral advocates this body has seen in a very long time.

In 1964, President Johnson asked Senator Pastore to be the keynote speaker at the Democratic National Convention. I was 14 years old then. I, as every other Rhode Islander, was crowded around the television set on a hot summer's night waiting for our Senator to speak to the Nation. He spoke in his typical powerful and forceful way. He spoke about justice and opportunity. He spoke about the Democratic Party, and he spoke about our commitment to help everyone. He spoke with both passion and precision. He moved that convention, and he moved the Nation. We will never forget those words.

Also, again because of the proximity of everyone to everyone else in Rhode Island, I had the chance to see him when I was a younger person in my early teens because my parents would summer down at Narragansett, RI, and his family would summer there also. It was a very modest summer resort. My father was a school custodian. So this was not exactly the Riviera. But he was there because that is where the people were. That is where he went for his summer vacation.

I can remember going to mass on a hot summer's day. We were all lucky just to be in long pants because it was summertime. However, he would be there in his suit and tie looking every inch the sartorial master that he was, with a bearing and a dignity that was beyond senatorial, it was regal, but also with a kindness and a humility that came through equally well.

Finally, with a great deal of appreciation and gratitude, Senator Pastore was the individual who appointed me to the military academy at West Point. He gave me the greatest opportunity of my life. He did it in a nonpartisan, nonpolitical way. I had never really met the Senator. I had asked for the appointment. I sent him a letter. He had his staff direct me to take a test.

I took a test. I took a physical. I took a physical aptitude test. I still remember the moment when his executive assistant called me and told me I was going to West Point.

In my office in Washington I have both his picture and the letter he sent me on that day. In my office in Rhode Island I have his picture and the telegram he sent to follow up. He gave me a great opportunity. I like to think that the good things I have done in a way have been a response to that confidence he showed in me as a very young man.

He also was someone who had a great sense of humor about himself and about many things. He once quipped that he was very grateful his parents named him John O. Pastore rather than Giovanni Orlando Pastore because in the latter case his initials would have been "GOP," which is something he would have been hard pressed to deal with because of his very strong Democratic life and career.

I can remember also that Senator Mansfield spoke to me one time. He said: You know, every St. Patrick's Day, Senator Pastore insisted that he be the President pro tempore. It was his birthday. He wanted to preside. He also reminded everyone that his name was really John O. Pastore with the accent one would have if one were John O'Rourke, or John O'Neill, or John O'Donnell.

He was an extraordinary man. He graced us with a life of service. He graced us with a life that is an example to all of us. He has honored us by doing his best every day, by taking his work much more seriously than himself, and by doing this great work and then quietly and gracefully returning home, back to Rhode Island, to his beloved wife and his family—to his simple life with the people he respected and admired. He is beloved in my State of Rhode Island. He is well deserving of that great love.

To his wife, Mrs. Pastore, to his son John, to his daughters Francesca and Louise, to his sisters Elena and Michelina, our sincere condolences. But today we not only commemorate his passing but we celebrate his great life.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, as I understand it, the leader has announced that we would go next to the Agriculture appropriations bill. I further understand that leadership is discussing an agreement under which we will proceed to consider that bill.

Pending the completion of that discussion, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now go into a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 15 minutes each.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Pursuant to that request, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

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

FEDERAL SURPLUS

Mr. DURBIN. The United States has changed a lot in the last 7½ years. Mr. President, 7½ years ago we were deep into deficits. We were spending more each year than we collected in taxes. We were running up the largest national debt in the history of the United States. We have \$6 trillion in debt to show for that experience.

Many people have lost faith in the ability of this institution to correct this problem and to respond to what was truly a national crisis. In fact, some went so far as to suggest we should amend the Constitution of the United States to pass what was known as the balanced budget amendment.

On the floor today with me is Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia, acknowledged to be probably the most gifted Senator when it comes to the rules of this body and knowledge of the Constitution. He fought a battle, sometimes lonely but ultimately successful, in stopping Members from amending the Constitution and giving power to the Federal courts to tell the Congress to stop spending. Some in this body thought that was the only way we could stop the red ink cascading over the Treasury in Washington, DC. Senator BYRD prevailed. The amendment was defeated.

Amazingly, we stand today in this Senate, in this Capitol, in Washington, DC, with a complete change of events. We are no longer talking about the yearly deficits. We are talking about the yearly surpluses, the fact that the economy is so strong, so many people are working, so many people are earning a good income, businesses are successful, people are building homes, America is on the move. For 7½ years or more now, we have seen that prosperity not only lift the boats of the American people but also bring a new opportunity in Congress. For the first time in many years, we can honestly sit back and discuss and debate what to do with the surplus in the Treasury.

I think many Democrats share the feeling that we should be conservative in our approach with this surplus. I am not sure what tomorrow, next year, 3 years, or 5 years down the line will bring. I think the decisions we should make as to this surplus should be thoughtful. First and foremost, let's retire our national debt, the \$6 trillion debt. We collect \$1 billion a day in taxes from Americans, businesses, fam-

ilies, and individuals to pay interest on our old national debt. It is as if to say to our children, we are going to leave you the mortgage on the home we enjoyed our entire lives.

I agree with President Clinton and most Democrats; our first priority should be to reduce the publicly held national debt to zero. We can do it. We can do it in a short period of time. It will call for some discipline and some honest dialog with the American people. We can take the money from our surplus, pay down the debt in Social Security, pay down the debt in Medicare, strengthen those two very important programs, and bring down our national debt. That is our policy on the Democratic side of the aisle. That, we think, should be the first step that we make, the most important, the most conservative, the most disciplined.

The Republican side sees things quite differently. They believe if we are going to have a surplus, the first and most important thing we should do with that surplus is to give tax cuts. There isn't a politician alive who wouldn't like to address a crowd in his hometown and announce a tax cut. There is just no more popular set of words we can use in this business than: I'm going to cut your taxes. Is it the right thing to do? Is it the responsible thing to do?

Equally important, if we are to give tax cuts, who should be the beneficiaries? If we are going to have a surplus for the first time virtually in modern memory, what are we going to do with that surplus? Who will benefit from that surplus?

Over the last week and a half, we have heard the Republican answer to those questions. They have suggested if we have a surplus in America, if times are good and we can help somebody in America, the very first people in line for help should be the wealthiest in America. Now, is that the conclusion most American families would reach? I don't think so.

If you take a look at the proposal of the Republicans to eliminate the estate tax, and the bill that just passed to eliminate the so-called marriage penalty, you can see who the winners are. This chart I am presenting shows the Republican tax plan, their spending of our surplus. Almost half of our surplus is going to benefit the wealthiest people in America. The biggest winners? Mr. President, 43 percent of the total tax cut proposed by the Republicans goes to people making over \$319,000 a year. They get 43 percent of the tax breaks. It means for them, on average, an annual tax cut of \$23,000. That is almost \$2,000 a month.

The Republicans believe in good times, after we have been through all this pain, and we now have a surplus, the first group who deserves a break, the first group to deserve a benefit is the wealthiest people in America, those making over \$319,000 a year.

What about those on the other end? What about the people who get up and go to work every single day and may make a minimum wage or a little better than that? How will they fare under the Republican proposal? How were they considered when the Republicans sat down and said where our priorities will be, here are the people we will help. The lowest 20 percent of wage earners in America, those making less than \$13,600 a year, get less than 1 percent of the Republican tax cut. It is worth \$24 a year to them, \$2 a month. The Republicans didn't forget them, they will send them \$2 a month. For the wealthiest, it is almost \$2,000 a month.

The next group, those making up to \$24,400, see about \$82 a year from the Republican tax cuts. That comes to \$7 a month. Think about that for a second. If we are going to help the people in America who need help the most, shouldn't we be rewarding hard-working families who get up and go to work every single day, play by the rules, try to buy a home, try to build a community, try to provide for their children and their future or should we take this surplus and give it, first, to those who are making over \$300,000 a year?

Some people say that being in Congress is about a question of being "in touch" or "out of touch." The Republican tax plan is in touch with the wealthiest people. It is out of touch with regular families.

The Democratic side believes after bringing down the national debt, we should target tax cuts to help these working families who have been virtually ignored by the Republicans in their tax benefits.

On the floor of the Senate, we offered an amendment to say every family in America, every single family, can deduct every year \$12,000 in college education expenses. I have seen a lot of families with new babies. Everybody is happy to see the child arrive. After a few minutes, people turn and say: What a cute little boy. How in the world are we ever going to pay for his college in 18 years? People know that cost is going up. The average family knows how tough it is to pay it.

We say on this side, you deserve a helping hand to help your son or daughter be the absolute best they can be. We offered an amendment. Instead of the Republican plan for the wealthiest, we said let the people of America deduct \$12,000 a year in college education expenses from their taxes. It is a deduction which would mean, for some families, as much as \$3,000, and a helping hand to pay for tuition. Rejected, rejected on the floor of the Senate last week. They don't want that kind of tax cut. They want the kind of tax cut that gives \$23,000 a year to the wealthiest people in America but would not give to average families, worried about their kids going to good schools