stop a national study of gambling's effects on America? Why are they trying to stop a bill that will allow an objective, comprehensive, and impartial legal and factual assessment of gambling, a bill that does not outlaw gambling, that does not tax gambling, that does not regulate gambling?

Why would they turn a blind eye to the stories of poor mothers playing the slots with their children's lunch money, or teenagers so addicted to gambling that they prostitute their girlfriends to pay off their mob debts, or the accounts of Americans who are so distraught over their mounting gambling debts that their only perceived recourse is suicide.

From what information we have gathered today, we see a picture of gambling hurting people and businesses. How many suicides and near misses does it take to make the case? How many bankruptcies and broken homes? How many failed careers, failed marriages and broken dreams are needed to register on the misery meter?

What is the gambling industry afraid of? What is driving their effort to stop this national commission to study the explosive influence of gambling on the American culture?

Money and power.

Consider these facts:

In Missouri, the gambling lobby spent $11.5 million, mostly raised from out-of-state companies, on a successful 1994 referendum to allow slot machines in casinos. According to an Associated Press report by Jim Drinkard, ''after failing in its first attempt to legalize slot machines on Missouri riverboats, the gambling industry took no chance and spared no expense.'' Following a pattern that has been repeated across the country, Drinkard reported that it hired the chief strategist for then House Democrat majority leader, considered to be Missouri's most visible politician, paying her $218,750 to help win passage of the 1994 referendum.

In Louisiana, the gambling lobby contributed $1.07 million to State legislators in 1993 and 1994, $1 out of every $5 given to lawmakers and three times as much as was given by the petrochemical industry.

In Florida, the gambling lobby spent $16.5 million on an unsuccessful referendum campaign to legalize casinos in 1994, only $1 million less than the Republican and Democrat gubernatorial nominees spent in the Governor's race combined.

In Connecticut, four gambling groups spent $4.9 million over the last 4 years in an unsuccessful campaign to lobby the State for a casino.

In my own State of Virginia, gambling lobbyists spent over $1.1 million over 2 years to convince the general assembly to legalize casinos.

In Illinois, the gambling lobby contributed $1.24 million to candidates for State office between July 1, 1993, and June 30, 1994. Also in that State at one point gambling interests in Illinois had under contract people who formerly were Governor State senate president, house majority leader, attorney general, State police director, circuit judge, Chicago mayor, and two U.S. attorneys. The former head of the State gaming regulatory board now lobbies for a major gambling group and at least three former board officials are on casino payrolls.

According to figures compiled by the Center for Responsive Politics, a nonpartisan research group in Washington, over the past few years the gambling industry overall gave at least $4.5 million to the Republican and Democrat parties and their candidates for Federal office, including $1.8 million in ''soft money''—unregulated, unlimited contributions to party committees donated since 1991.

These money and power brokers have been at work since House passage of the national gambling study bill to negate any responsible, fair or objective effort in the Senate to pass similar legislation. And with their money and power, as today's Washington Post headline proclaims: ''Don't Bet on a U.S. Gambling Study.''

How much longer will the best interests of the American people take a backseat to the influence of money and power in Washington?

Money and power.

□ 1530

GRAPES OF WRATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, every country has the perfectly legitimate right to respond to terrorist attacks upon its borders and its people, regardless of whether those attacks were provoked or not. Such has been the case in southern Lebanon, the home of my grandfathers, where Israel has undertaken Operation Grapes of Wrath in order to end the terrorist Hezbollah attacks across the border into northern Israel.

This tit for tat, this eye for an eye, this cycle of violence has gone on for well over a decade now. Ever since Israel's bombardment into southern Lebanon, and indeed, into Beirut itself in 1982 to rid Lebanon of the PLO, they have occupied what they have called a buffer zone in southern Lebanon in order to protect its northern borders.

This Israeli occupation has led to the growth of Hezbollah, or Party of God. This Lebanese group has sought to end this occupation, and therefore has undertaken needless, uncalled for, unprovoked terrorist attacks into northern Israel. These have been undertaken, and in the past have been guided by unwritten agreements by which Israel and Syria, the two main power brokers in the region, have agreed not to attack each other directly. Therefore, Hezbollah operates as a proxy for outside powers, in this case obviously financed and trained by Iran and given the green light by Syria to operate in Lebanon.

In order to end these attacks, Israel undertook Operation Grapes of Wrath. As I say, every country has that perfectly legitimate right to respond to terrorist attacks across its border. Today we saw a dramatic change in its operation. We saw a dramatic turn of events in which innocent civilians who have been killed over the last week or so of this operation escalated into which the death count now stands at close to 100 innocent civilians killed in an Israeli bombardment of a U.N. base camp in southern Lebanon, these innocent civilians having tried to flee, according to Israeli warnings beforehand, in order to prevent harm to themselves.

Whether it was a mistake, whether it was just another message being sent in the long list of messages in which Lebanon is used as a chessboard in which outside powers play their game in Lebanon, remains to be debated, and is currently being debated in the highest echelons of Israeli government.

President Clinton, much to his credit and however late it may be, has, within the hour, from St. Petersburg, Russia, called for a cease-fire in the Middle East. He has issued his sympathy to the families of those innocent civilians killed in today's state-sponsored terrorist act, and he has called for a cease-fire to take place, I hope, immediately. The President is to be commended for this call, however late it is in coming.

But the final resolution, the final resolution of this conflict will only occur when a peace treaty is reached between those two main power brokers, Israel and Syria. It is time to quit using Lebanon as a chessboard. It is time to quit using the lives of innocent civilians, women and children, in order to send political messages to one party or another.

Let us hope that, as has happened in the past in the Middle East, with this outrageous action today and with this uncalled for action, that perhaps it will be the last salvo and we will see a true breakthrough and peace occur.

That peace will occur when the Lebanese Army, which in my opinion is quite capable of disarming Hezbollah, disarming them completely, put it in writing if need be, as Israel is demanding, with Syria guaranteeing the safety of Israel's northern border along with the Lebanese Government, and assurances that Hezbollah will stop these attacks once they are fully disarmed, and second, and at the same time, and no waiting until on down the road to see what happens, but at the same time, then I call upon the Israelis to recognize U.N. Resolution 425 and withdraw their forces from southern Lebanon at the same time.

Let us put it in writing. Let us do it, however, by unwritten agreement or whatever, but this is the only solution to the current eye-for-an-eye, tit-for-

tat cycle of violence that has taken too many innocent lives, has caused too much suffering, and has inflicted economic damages upon a country friendly to the United States, upon a country that has not been responsible for these terrorist actions, the country of Lebanon, too weak to handle it, strong in my opinion, growing stronger militarily but not politically, because of the controls the Syrian Government has in that country.

But if we want to see peace, a truly just and comprehensive peace to which the President spoke today, to which all parties aspire, then it is time we get to the root of the problem. It is time we reach that agreement that would be a major step forward in Israel's recognition by all Arab countries in the region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WELLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A EULOGY FOR RON BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the house, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier today there was a resolution that was passed by this Congress honoring former Secretary Ron Brown. I was unable to attend that because I was in a hearing of a subcommittee on which I am the ranking member, but I did want to do this then, and I take the time now to do it.

Mr. Speaker, one or two days after the tragic death of Ron Brown, I was traveling to an event in my district and listening to KNX news station. Dave Ross, reporting for CBS news radio, came on the air and gave what I consider to be a tremendous eulogy for Ron Brown.

I would like to share it with the Members of the House.

Mr. Ross entitled his tribute, ''death of a salesman.''

A tragedy freezes time. Events you would otherwise ignore become significant.

Pictures of a Cabinet official eating breakfast in a tent end up on the front page. And the story of a trade mission which otherwise couldn't compete with the FBI's latest unabomber suspect or the standoff in Montana becomes the center of attention.

Before now the only time you heard of Ron Brown was when some new piece of evidence surfaced in his Justice Department investigation.

He was suspected of spending too much on travel and using international junkets to reward campaign contributors.

Some junket. Breakfast in a tent and travel in a plane so poorly equipped no passenger airline could legally fly it. But a salesman can't stop to wonder whether the plane is safe or what his critics are saying—there's a product to move.

Instead of gun boat diplomacy, Brown's philosophy was MacDonalds diplomacy. If you want to spread democracy, sell American products. Sell a way of life where people spend their time making money instead of making enemies.

The old Yugoslavia, which had a healthy economy, then killed it, seemed to defy that philosophy. But a good salesman keeps trying.

My boss used to have a plaque on his desk which said, nothing happens until something is sold. It was there to remind us that those people in the sales department, the one's who got their hands dirty closing deals, were the people who kept our paychecks from bouncing.

Trade missions, and I've attended a few, are pretty boring. Business executives talk about exchange rates, ownership rights, local taxes. It's nothing newsworthy. It just creates thousands of jobs.

A toast then, to the salesman. Traveling on a shoe shine and a smile. Sometimes, on a wing and a prayer.

Thank you, Mr. Ross. I know that the family of Mr. Brown thanks you as well.

INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago, I was a single working mother with three small children, receiving no child support and earning close to the minimum wage. Even though I was working, I was earning so little that I was forced to go on welfare to provide my children with the child care, the health care, and the food that they needed. Even though I was educated and had good job skills, I still was not earning enough to fully support my children. My story bears repeating tonight, because too many families today are in the same predicament I was 28 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress is truly serious about reducing dependence on welfare, then let us increase the minimum wage. Let us make work pay, and let us make sure that paying working parents enough to support their families and take care of their children is a priority on our agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage has not kept up with the increase in the cost of living. Workers these days can put in a full day of work, 40 hours a week, at minimum wage and still live below the poverty line. The new majority in Congress wants to cut the earned income tax credit, kick single moms and their children off welfare, and reduce health benefits for low-income families, but they will not even hold a hearing on increasing the minimum wage. If we want to reduce reliance on public assistance, Mr. Speaker, does it not make sense to make work pay? Should not entry level jobs pay more than public subsistence?

In addition to making economic sense, a minimum wage increase is also a matter of basic fairness for millions of working Americans. Mr. Speaker, in 1960, the average pay for a chief executive officer of some of the largest U.S. corporations was 12 times greater than the average wage of their factory workers. Today, those same CEOs receive wages and compensation worth more than 135 times the wages and benefits of their average employee, the average employee at the same corporation. In some instances, Mr. Speaker, the difference is more than 200 times. That is not fair, and it is not fair that about 70 percent of minimum wage earners are women, adult women with children. It is not fair that from 1973 to 1993, real income for working men, men with high school diplomas, dropped by 30 percent.

Businesses are doing well, Mr. Speaker. Private business productivity has been increasing. Profits are up, but wages are stagnant. What is wrong with this picture? Is it not time to let American workers share the fruits of their labor?

Speaker GINGRICH and his allies say they support traditional American values. Let us return to the traditional American value of paying an honest wage for an honest day's work. Let us raise the minimum wage, and let us do it now.

GROUNDS FOR OPPOSITION TO THE ANTITERRORISM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to elaborate, if I might, on the remarks that I made with respect to the so-called antiterrorism bill earlier. As members know, we are constrained by time in our remarks, and by having 5 minutes today, perhaps I can make a little more clear or elaborate a bit on what the grounds were for my opposition.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote in part from a story written in today's Washington Post, as follows, excerpting from the story:

It marks the first time in more than a century of law on the writ of habeas corpus that Federal judges would have to defer to State court determinations on whether a prisoner's constitutional rights were violated. A writ of habeas corpus is a way for Federal judges to assess whether a defendant's conviction is unconstitutional because, for example, his right to a fair trial was infringed. The writ orders the State to produce the prisoner, the body, or the corpus, so that he can make his case to a Federal court.

Mr. Speaker, I had indicated in my previous remarks that this past weekend my wife and I attended a play, were observers at a play that was given in Honolulu in a very small venue. I do not think there were 20 people there, mostly students. It was a student production, student-directed. The set was very simple. There are only three characters, if you will. The play was called ''Death and the Maiden.'' It comes from a work by Schubert and is a beautiful piece, orchestral piece. Death and