forced to share space with wounded evacuees from the Bosnian battlegrounds. They apparently have been transported this way in order to avoid the UN-controlled border-crossings between Serbia and Bosnia. The purpose has been to give credence to Milosevic's claim of no longer supporting the Serb warriors in Bosnia. Not many in Montenegro would take such a claim at face value.

The single most important issue in Montenegro is defining its people's identity. Some claim that Montenegrins are Serbs, that indeed their country is the very heart of Serbdom, as a politician of the Narodna (People's or Folk) Party told me. Others say that Montenegro is a separate nation now endangered by Serb attempts to absorb it.

In Niksic, the ancient capital in which the ecclesiastical head of the Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Amfilohiye Radovic, resides, graffiti declare that he should leave Montenegro, though he is one of the few Serbian Orthodox hierarchs who was born there. Metropolitan Amfilohiye militantly espouses the Serbian cause, and the number of such supporters is growing as the ethnoreligious conflict continues. Both the leftist Democratic Party of Socialists (former communists), which holds a firm grip on power, and the right-wing People's Party are pro-Serb. Only the Liberals, who garner a mere 10 percent of the vote, staunchly proclaim ''Montenegro is Montenegrin,'' though there are others who insist on claiming the sovereignty for Montenegro accorded to it by the 1974 Yugoslav constitution.

If one visits only the Adriatic resorts one gets an impression of economic well-being, despite tourist workers' complaints that these resorts are operating at less than half of their capacity. Food in the hotels and at the markets is plentiful though expensive. Other consumer goods are available, since people have found a way to skirt UN sanctions. That cows graze on the lawn of the state government building in Podgorica (formerly Titograd) may be a better overall economic indicator.

In Podgorica as elsewhere, the socioeconomic difference between people is striking. In one section of the city the apartments for the old communist elite and the new entrepreneurial class feature TV radar disks for nearly every dwelling. Here people dress with an ostentatious display of wealth. But Podgorica's slums resemble those in greatly impoverished countries. Incomes, while considerably better than in 1993, range between $50 and $150 a month. Many workers, however, are paid only every third or fourth month, and approximately 60 percent of the work force is on ''forced vacation''—unemployed and with no welfare benefits. Even the casual observer will notice huge numbers of people hanging around the streets or the numerous drinking places. Even those who do eke out a meager living say that there is little hope for a better future. People survive by trading in the black market and by accepting bribes. Nearly everyone is engaged in smuggling, selling or reselling something—from the lucrative smuggling of gasoline and weapons to the pitiful reselling of single cigarettes. Police raid only the ''little fry.'' Bigger business is protected by the mafia, which is said to reach to the very top of government. Armed robberies in the rump Yugoslavia have increased from about 70 in 1991 to over 2,000 in 1992–93. Few robbers are apprehended.

However, the ''new'' Yogoslav dinar is fairly stable. After 1993's great inflation the government pegged the dinar to the German mark at a 1:1 ratio. While on the black market the dinar recently slipped to about a 2.5:1 ratio, it still appears to be economically viable. The locals believe that the hyperinflation of 1993 was approved or even prompted by the government in order to extract foreign-currency reserves from the population.

Montenegrins are traditionally Orthodox Christians with a small minority of Roman Catholics (derogatorily called ''Latins'') and Muslims (called ''Turks,'' though they are Montenegrin converts to Islam). The Albanian minority is predominantly Muslim, with a small number of Roman Catholics. There are virtually no Protestants or Jews.

The Orthodox Church was nearly wiped out during the communist period. During World War II it had sided with the Chetniks rather than the Partizans and the latter showed no pity toward the losers. Directives from Belgrade to eliminate church activities were taken seriously and religious life became nearly extinct. People would pass by a monastery without even looking at it lest they be called in for an unpleasant talk with the secret police.

Only during the last few years under the increasingly liberal Yogoslav regime was church life slowly reactivated. In the postocommunist period Orthodox Church activities are on the rebound. Right-wing nationalistic politicians believe that the church has not only a religious but a political role. Some clergy openly argue that the church should rule over the nation in these difficult times as it did in the distant past.

Adjacent to the former royal palace in Cetinje is a large monastic compound nestled against the mountain. Here the archbishop resides. A visit to the monastery was organized for a group of students and professors of which I was a part. Our guide, a middle-aged monk, spoke English fluently. He appeared to be well traveled but displayed an intense Serbian nationalism and an even greater angry anticommunism. He explained that the monastery had been destroyed twice, first by Muslim Turks and then by Latins. A display on the monastery walls credited both destructions to the Turks. Apparently the monk needed to believe that Serbs had been victimized by both of their current antagonists.

The Montenegrin government is now making amends for the communist period not only by restoring church properties but also by financing their repair. (The Catholics, on the other hand, complain that the return and repair of their properties is being hampered.)

Svetigora, the official publication of the diocese of Montenegro, is disturbing. Even the magazine's title has troublesome implications. Sveta Gora is the Serbian name for the Holy Mount Athos, the monastic republic in Greece. The journal's name suggests that Montenegro is not just a Black Mountain but a ''Mount of Light''—a ''Holy Mount.'' Combined with the ever-increasing claim made by the Serbian Orthodox hierarchs that the Serbs are ''the New Israel,'' the chosen people of God, a ''heavenly kingdom,'' a martyr nation that has suffered more than anyone else on earth except Christ, the name supports the dangerous conviction that all that the Serbs do is somehow of God.

A recent issue features a smiling Radovan Karadzic flanked by the patriarchs of Moscow and Belgrade. In a lengthy interview Karadzic, the leader of the Bosnian Serbs, claims the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit in all his political decisions and urges the political involvement of the Orthodox Church in the life of Serbians everywhere. He repeatedly emphasizes the goal of uniting all Serbs into a single state. In another interview Metropolitan Amfilohiye claims that ''the living God can be experienced in the East while the West is a wasteland.'' Another article explains why God allowed Russia, ''the elite people,'' to experience the apostasy of communism. The Herzegovian hard-line Bishop Atanasiye Jeftic associates NATO with Satan and links Ingmar Bergman's films to Protestantism, in which there is ''neither mercy, nor space for the human being, nor salvation.''

Svetigora's contents make one wonder whether the effort of some German and Dutch churchmen to expel the Serbian Orthodox Church from the World Council of Churches does not have merit. There is a parallel between the Deutsche Christen aberration during Hitler's era and this militant Serbian Orthodoxy. In Germany, however, there was resistance by a Confessing Church led by people like Karl Barth and Dietrich Bonhoeffer; the Serbian Orthodox Church has not yet produced such internal critics, just as Balkans politics has not produced its Václav Havel. The political threat in the Balkans is Nazism; the religious threat is idolatrous nationalism.●

GAMING LOBBY GIVES LAVISHLY TO POLITICIANS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, with monthly profits from single casinos running to millions of dollars, gambling promoters are using their newfound wealth to increase the spread of gambling. Grassroots community groups who raise concerns about new casinos are being outspent 50 to 1 in some areas.

In Congress, high-priced lobbyists are attempting to stop a simple effort to gather information about the impact of the spread of gambling.

A recent New York Times story, ''Gaming Lobby Gives Lavishly to Politicians,'' clearly describes issues that deserve our attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times News Service, Dec. 18, 1995]

SPECIAL REPORT: GAMING LOBBY GIVES LAVISHLY TO POLITICIANS

(By Kevin Sack)

In only five years, the gambling industry has bought its way into the ranks of the most formidable interest groups in American politics, spending huge sums to gain the kind of influence long wielded by big business, big labor and organizations of doctors and lawyers.

From the Empress riverboat casino in Joliet, Ill., to the Mashantucket Pequot tribe in Ledyard, Conn., gambling interests, which now run casinos in 24 states, have used vast profits gleaned from their craps tables and slot machines to fatten the campaign coffers of political candidates and wage multimillion-dollar lobbying offensives.

While state officials have been the primary beneficiaries of the industry's largess, there has also been a surge in contributions to federal and local officeholders.

Gambling-financed political action committees gave three times as much to congressional candidates and the national parties in the 1993–94 election cycle as they gave in the previous two years, according to Common Cause and the Center for Responsive Politics, two Washington-based organizations that monitor campaign financing.

The $2 million total for the cycle put the industry in the same league as long-established interest groups like the United Automobile Workers, which gave $2.4 million, and the National Rifle Association, which gave $2.2 million.

At the state level, meanwhile, the rising tide of gambling money has in many places become a flood. In Florida last year, pro-gambling forces spent $16.5 million in an unsuccessful effort to win approval of casinos in a referendum. That sum was almost as much as the state's two gubernatorial candidates spent combined.

In other states, the industry's wealth has allowed it to outspend its opponents by as much as 50 to 1. In the process, that wealth has contributed to major corruption scandals in Louisiana, Missouri, Arizona, Kentucky, South Carolina and West Virginia, all since 1989, when legalized gambling began its cross-country expansion.

Perhaps most significant, the torrent of dollars has rapidly eroded a longstanding stigma against the intermingling of gambling and politics.

''Twenty years ago, if you got support from gambling interests it would have been the kiss of death,'' said Rep. Frank R. Wolf, R–Va., who opposes the continued expansion of gambling. ''If you were running for office in Illinois or Iowa an got money from gambling interests, you wouldn't want to tell your brother or mother.''

Noting that today's casinos are run by Indian tribes and Fortune 500 companies, not mobsters, gambling industry officials assert that it is only natural for a heavily regulated, high-growth business to play an active role in politics, just as public utilities and tobacco companies do.

''The only industry that is more regulated is the nuclear power industry,'' said Mark B. Edwards Jr., a gambling analyst for the State Capital Resource Center, a private group that monitors political developments for casino companies. ''Therefore, it's more important for the gaming industry to flex some political muscle.''

The gaming industry has focused its lobbying campaigns on state capitals, where governors, lawmakers and regulators hold the authority to determine whether to expand gambling, which companies will get gambling licenses and vending contracts, and how extensively gambling will be taxed and controlled.

Gambling opponents say the abundance of lobbying money, and the promise of bountiful tax revenue, has helped the industry move its operations into impoverished communities, with little attention paid to social consequences like the effect on compulsive gamblers or on small businesses there.

A backlash has begun to emerge in which grass-roots anti-gambling drives in some states have managed to neutralize the influence of big money. But that is no easy task.

In the last two years, campaigns to establish or expand legalized gambling in Florida, Missouri, Virginia and Connecticut have spent more money than was ever before spent in those states on any lobbying effort.

During Virginia's legislative session this year, gambling interests hired 48 lobbyists. In Texas, they hired 74, more than two for every state senator and one for every two members of the Texas House.

The lobbyists are often enlisted from the ranks of former public officials. The lobbying payroll in Illinois has included a former governor, a former state attorney general, a former state police director, two former U.S. attorneys, a former mayor of Chicago and dozens of former state legislators, including a Senate president and a House majority leader.

Two years ago a Nevada casino company, Primadonna Resorts, offered two Illinois lobbyists a compensation package of $20 million over 20 years if they could reel in a riverboat license.

For an April 1994 referendum on allowing slot machines in Missouri, committees financed by out-or-state casino companies paid out $4.2 million, outspending the proposal's opponents by 50 to 1, according to a study by Alfred Kahn, a retired professor of planning at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

The measure failed by one-tenth of a percentage point. Seven months later, the gambling companies were back, this time spending $11.5 million. The proposal passed with 54 percent of the vote.

The gambling opponents, Kahn said, ''were just overwhelmed by wall-to-wall television commercials.''

Like lobbying expenditures, campaign contributions have been flowing as freely as complimentary cocktails on a casino floor. Only one state, New Jersey, prohibits political contributions from gambling interests.

In Louisiana, in the heart of the nation's oil patch, gambling interests in 1993 and 1994 gave state legislators more than twice as much as did the petrochemical industry, according to a study by The Times-Picayune of New Orleans.

''I've been told by legislator after legislator that the gambling industry has become the single largest political influence in their states,'' said Robert Goodman, a professor at Hampshire College in Amherst, Mass., who is the author of ''The Luck Business'' (Free Press, 1995), a book critical of legalized gambling's spread. ''It's a sea change in the political landscape in the states where the gambling industry is operating.''

As in many other states that now have casinos, the spending in Illinois has been spurred by competition among gambling concerns whose interests conflict.

Wealthy businessmen who want to obtain casino licenses from the state, which now allows casino gambling only on riverboats, are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in campaign contributions to help persuade legislators to expand gambling to Chicago and any number of suburbs.

Fearful of new competition, the owners of the state's 10 existing casino licenses are contributing hundreds of thousands more to protect their monopolies. In doing so, they have placed themselves in an unusual alliance with those who oppose gambling on moral or social grounds.

In Washington, the rise of the gambling industry has created influential power brokers. In a single afternoon last June, Steve Wynn, chairman of Mirage Resorts, one of the country's largest Casino companies, raised nearly $500,000 for the presidential campaign of Bob Dole, the Senate majority leader.

The fund-raising luncheon, at a posh Las Vegas country club, came one day after Dole had traveled to Los Angeles to level a withering attack on what he described as the mercenary values of the entertainment industry.

Dole opposes new taxes on the gambling industry, said his spokesman, Clarkson Hine, but supports creation of a federal commission to study gambling's effects. The industry opposes such a commission, believing that it could lead to heightened regulation. But Hine said Dole ''feels strongly'' that regulation should be left to the states.

In any event, Mirage Resorts is hardly the only gambling-industry player in the capital. The 370-member Mashantucket Pequot tribe, virtually unknown until it opened the Foxwoods Resort Casino in Ledyard, Conn., in 1992, is one of many others, having given $465,000 to the Democratic National Committee and $100,000 to the Republican National Committee from 1991 to 1994.

Gambling money is so abundant that on occasion it reaches out even to the most vocal of gambling opponents, like Gov. Kirk Fordice of Mississippi, where casino operations have been growing for five years.

In 1993, Fordice accepted $73,500 in contributions from casino interests, almost a third of all the money he raised that year. Then, beginning last Jan. 1, he swore off accepting any more gambling money, although he declined to return the earlier bounty.

The purpose of the new policy, said Andy Taggart, his campaign manager, was to take an issue away from his opponent in the gubernatorial race this year. Fordice won.

It was political money, along with the promise of new tax revenue for recession-racked states, that provided the kindling for the wildfire spread of legalized gambling in the 1990s.

In 1988, only Nevada and New Jersey had casinos. Now, 24 states have casinos on land, water or Indian reservations, and 48 states have legalized gambling of some kind.

In the last four years, annual legal-gambling revenue has grown by 50 percent, to $39.9 billion. That is nearly a quadrupling since 1982, according to an annual survey by Christiansen/Cummings Associates, a consulting firm that specializes in the gaming industry. On average, profit margins are high, ranging from 15 to 20 percent, said Will E. Cummings, managing director of the firm.

''Without the outside influence coming in'' to lobby in this state or that, ''there would be no spread of gaming,'' said William N. Thompson, a professor at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas who is co-author of ''The Last Resort: Success and Failure in Campaigns for Casinos'' (University of Nevada Press, 1990). ''The opponents don't get to make their case.''

In the last year, though, the industry has suffered several financial and political failure, suggesting that the market for betting may finally be saturated. A casino in New Orleans and riverboats in Louisiana and Mississippi have failed, and voters and lawmakers have rejected the expansion of gambling in a number of states.

Industry analysts say some of the backlash can be attributed to growing revulsion with the amount of gambling money in politics, and to concern about corruption among holders of public office.

In the most recent scandal, the FBI said in August that it was investigating whether video poker operators in Louisiana had bribed lawmakers into killing anti-gambling legislation earlier this year. That inquiry is continuing, but many of the legislators who are targets of it either have chosen to retire or failed to win re-election this fall.

In Pennsylvania, state Attorney General Ernie Preate, Jr. pleaded guilty in June to hiding campaign contributions from operators of illegal video poker games. And from 1989 to 1992, lawmakers in Arizona, Kentucky, South Carolina and West Virginia were convicted of accepting bribes from gambling interests.

Frank J. Fahrenkopf Jr., president of the American Gaming Association, the industry's trade group, told a congressional committee last month that singling out legalized betting as a corrupting influence was unfair.

''The problem,'' said Fahrenkopf, a former Republican national chairman, ''is that where there is money, there is the potential for corruption, and that is by no means confined to gaming interests.'' After listing political scandals from Teapot Dome to Abscam, he added, ''To suggest that it is unique to our industry is manipulative, cynical and, frankly, dishonest.''

Even when operating within the law, though, gambling supporters have sometimes lacked subtlety.

In 1994, the president of the Louisiana Senate, Sammy Nunez, handed out envelopes to colleagues on the Senate floor, each containing a $2,500 campaign check from a casino owner. Nunez lost in a bid for re-election in November.

In Illinois in 1993, Al Ronan, a legislator turned casino lobbyist, pulled lawmakers off the floor and handed them white envelopes containing campaign checks of $50 to $300.

''The gambling companies have been like a bull in a china shop,'' said William R. Eadington, director of the Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming, at the University of Nevada at Reno. ''These were companies that did not have the sophistication to understand the nuances of political activity.''

Some exports, noting the intense issue that gambling money has become in some states and localities, believe that the industry has turned into its own worst enemy.

Despite devoting $16.5 million to the referendum on casino legalization in Florida last year, pro-gambling forces were crushed at the polls, 62 percent to 38 percent, at least partly because of voter discomfort with that level of spending.

And given the corruption investigation in Louisiana, candidates for governor there spent much of the race this year trying to trump each other's anti-gambling stands.

Further, after St. Louis County Executive George Westfall accepted more than $150,000 in contributions from companies competing for a riverboat casino license, the County Council this year approved a ban on the industry's political donations.

In recent months, some casino companies have decided to put a stop to their own multimillion-dollar political wagers.

One such company is Mirage Resorts, which spent more than $10 million in a four-year failed campaign to place a casino in Bridgeport, Conn.

''Our company policy right now is that we are not going to go or in any jurisdiction and actively lobby to change any law, to actively try to convince people,'' said Richard D. Bronson, a member of Mirage's board and president of the company's development arm. ''Look what happened in Connecticut.''

Added Alan M. Feldman, Mirage's vice president for public affairs: ''It has told us that this isn't our bag. We're just not political animals.''●

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 132

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair if House Joint Resolution 132 has arrived from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. LOTT. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 132) affirming that budget negotiations shall be based on the most recent technical and economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office and shall achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 based on those assumptions.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask for the second reading of the joint resolution, and I object to my own request on behalf of the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

CLOTURE VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED TO THE LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL POSTPONED UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill be postponed to occur on Wednesday at a time to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the minority leader.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am prepared now to go to the closing statement so that the staff of the Senate can proceed home in view of the ice and the weather that we are confronting. I wondered if the Senator from Nebraska had any further comments, or could we go ahead and proceed to close the Senate?

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from Mississippi for his offer. I will take 5 minutes allotted in morning business, and then I will be glad to join others on my trek home, if that is satisfactory with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I certainly understand that. Then I will have to reserve the right, depending on what is said, for 5 minutes of my own.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I would not be on the floor tonight, and had not intended to be on the floor tonight, until I saw a bevy of Republicans coming on the floor to try and beat up on the President, in particular, and the Democratic Party in general. When I heard that, I have responsibilities as the lead Democrat on the Budget Committee, and I decided to stay here and hear what is going on.

The Senator from Washington made several statements that I would like to take issue with. One thing that the Senator from Washington requested was that if I was concerned about the back-loading on the Republican budget plan, where 60 percent of the savings in the Republican budget plan to balance the budget are put off until the sixth and seventh year, did I have any suggestions as to how we could eliminate that. Well, I sure do.

If we would eliminate the $242 billion tax cut that basically benefits the wealthiest among us, for the most part, that would be one way we could alleviate that.

I would also like to comment briefly on the several statements made on the floor by those on that side of the aisle regarding the President of the United States breaking his agreement with regard to the continuing resolution that we worked out 2 weeks ago, I guess it was. I was there. I was part of that agreement. The President has not broken his word. The President of the United States said that he would accept a 7-year plan to balance the budget. And he has had a pretty good record as President, because under President Clinton, we have had 3 straight years of reduction in the deficit of the budget of the United States of America. That is the first time that has happened since Harry Truman. So this President has had some experience in fiscal responsibility.

The President has said in that agreement that he would agree to balance in 7 years, and that we would accept Congressional Budget Office numbers, with the understanding that CBO would review those numbers with the Office of Management and Budget and outside experts to make sure that their projections were as nearly accurate as possible.

He also said the other condition of making that agreement was the fact that we wish the Republicans to enter into discussions with us to protect programs that the Democratic Party has worked long and hard to protect—Medicare, Medicaid, educational programs, veterans benefits, agriculture, and others. We did not feel that, rushing to judgment, the Republicans had lived up to their part of that agreement. So, therefore, I think that there can be legitimate differences of opinion. And because that was worded in that manner, I think almost anyone could have interpreted that particular agreement as they wanted to.

It has been mentioned by my friend from Nevada that—and we are talking about the appropriations bills—if the President would just sign the appropriations bills, that would alleviate some of the problems. The appropriations bill should have been passed by the Republican-controlled Congress by October 1, 1995, when the new year began. Here we are in December, just passing appropriations bills—it is very late, almost 90 days late— and then we say to the President of the United States that because it is so late, because we are so late getting these to you, of course, you cannot veto them. That would be unfair.

We have also heard said that the President had shut down the Government. He has not. The President of the United States, through the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, made offer after offer, which the Republicans rejected, regarding a continuing resolution that would not have been necessary to have 1 day of shutdown. So I do not think it is fair to blame the President of the United States for that.

I am happy to say that I think, given the circumstances, we are now making some progress, as Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE earlier indicated on the floor. I am not sure that we accomplish a great deal with partisan bickering over something that we have placed, for their deliberation, consultation, and hope of resolving, in the hands of the President of the United States, the majority leader, ROBERT DOLE; the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH; the Democratic leader in the House, Congressman GEPHARDT; and our own TOM DASCHLE, the Democratic