Act is one such strategy that strives toward the ultimate goal of restoring the former vitality of our cities which can only help make our country stronger and more competitive. The days of expansive Federal aid are clearly past, but that is no excuse for the National Government to turn a blind eye to the problems of the cities.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 62—COMMERCIAL REVITALIZATION TAX CREDIT

Whereas, many American urban centers and rural areas are plagued by chronic economic distress, including aging infrastructure and business disinvestment; and

Whereas, to be successful in breaking the cycle of economic erosion, unemployment and abandonment of older neighborhoods, new measures must be taken to regenerate private investment; and

Whereas, new approaches must be fostered to address the problems of our cities; and

Whereas, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison (TX) has introduced the Commercial Revitalization Tax Credit Act (CRTCA) of 1995 to encourage business investment and reinvestment in specially designated revitalization areas; and

Whereas, the CRTCA would offer a 20 percent tax credit in one year, or a 5 percent credit each year for 10 years, to defray the cost of business construction, expansion or rehabilitation in specially designated areas; and

Whereas, tax policies designed to target private entrepreneurial activities in declining urban and rural areas enjoy bipartisan support, Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That The United States Conference of Mayors strongly urges Congress to support this session the CRTCA; and be it further

Resolved, That The United States Conference of Mayors urges Congress to approve this credit this session at the full benefit level for which it is proposed.●

DIETRICH BONHOEFFER

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to bring attention to the life of one of the 20th-century's most inspirational leaders, the anti-Nazi theologian, Dietrich Bonhoeffer. The author of numerous books, most notably, ''The Cost of Discipleship'' and ''Letter and Papers From Prison,'' Mr. Bonhoeffer spent time in the United States as a student at Union Seminary in New York.

It was after his stay in the United States that Dietrich Bonhoeffer returned to his native Germany and voiced opposition to the practices of Hitler and his Nazi regime. As an ardent pacifist, not only did he speak out against Nazi terrors and propaganda, but Mr. Bonhoeffer was centrally involved in transporting Jews from Germany to Switzerland in an effort to spare them from the Nazis.

In 1943 Mr. Bonhoeffer was arrested and sent to the Buchenwald concentration camp. Then, at the age of 39, on April 9, 1945, just 2 days before the arrival of the Allied forces, Dietrich Bonhoeffer was hanged by the Nazis.

Despite Dietrich Bonhoeffer's heroics, he is still regarded by German law as a traitor. Ten years ago, German Parliament condemned Nazi ''people's courts'' and voided their convictions. However, the declaration did not pertain to the SS courts, where Mr. Bonhoeffer was condemned. today, I formally urge my colleagues on both sides of the isle to support posthumous rehabilitation for Mr. Bonhoeffer and to urge the German Parliament to declare that all convictions by the SS courts were illegal.

Mr. President, Dietrich Bonhoeffer should serve as an inspiration to all of us for he sought change where change often times seemed impossible. He joined his church, and changed it. He lived in Nazi Germany where the message of a superior Aryan race separated man from man and thus man from God. But, rather than accept the Nazi dictatorship, he openly opposed Hitler and the regime. for his conviction to justice, equality, and peace, Dietrich Bonhoeffer had his life violently taken from him. Surely he deserves our best efforts to legally clear his name and to celebrate his legacy of courage and commitment.●

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS FRANCHISES IN SEATTLE

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on February 2, the citizens of Seattle and of Washington State were dealt yet another low blow in their continuing struggle to maintain three professional sports franchises in Seattle. Unfortunately, it now seems that just as one team reaches the pinnacle of success in Seattle, another outsider owner of a local team decides that he no longer wishes to call Seattle its home. Last Friday, the owners of the Seattle Seahawks announced their intention to move the team from Seattle even though they have 10 years remaining on their contract with King County.

Why are they leaving? The Seahawk owners cite inadequate playing facilities and a lack of local government and community support. Lack of support? Consider the numerous years of sell-out crowds in the Kingdome. Consider the local and State subsidies that have supported this organization. If there is no community support, why did the Seahawk organization retire the No. 12 jersey? The number was retired in honor of all the Seahwawak fans who have long served as the ''twelfth man'' on the Seahawks playing field. Lack of support?

As many of my colleagues may know, a great deal of my political career has been focused on maintaining a presence of professional sports franchises in Seattle. My involvement started late one evening in 1970, when the owners of the Seattle Pilots baseball team loaded their moving vans and headed east to Milwaukee, WI, after only 1 year in Seattle. As Washington State attorney, general, I successfully sued the American League to bring a new baseball club to Seattle in 1977—the Seattle Mariners—a suit that also resulted in the creation of the Toronto Blue Jays.

During its first 17 years of existence, the Mariner organization faced many of the expected challenges that confront any new sports franchise. This young baseball team was only able to produce two winning seasons in its first 17 years. While the adversity continued on the field, the difficulties facing the franchise off the field quickly became even more owerwhelming. The Mariners organization suffered increasing financial losses, fueling speculation that the team would leave Sattle. All of the succession of Mariner owerns were underfunded outsiders unable to take the risks necessary for success. Finally in 1992, the threat became a reality, and the owners of the Mariners announced their intentions to move the baseball team to Florida. The fans, myself included reacted. A provision in the Mariners' contract with King County prohibited the midnight-loading of the moving vans. This local-option provision required that prior to any relocation to another city, the team first be put up for sale for 120 days and sold to any local buyers with a reasonable offer. With on 2 weeks left before the 120-day period expired, local business and community leaders, myself included, were able to secure the local resources to purchase the Mariners and keep the Mariners safe at home.

Last fall, after 18 long years, the fans of Washington State, and the team they fought so hard to keep, were finally rewarded when the Seattle Mariners won the American League Western Division Title. This championship fever should be the reward for fans when they dedicate themselves to supporting a professional sports team, not what is currently happening in Seattle and Cleveland.

Unfortunately for the fans of professional sports team, today's loyalty and gratitude given to professional teams is being returned with seriously harsh slaps in the face. Looking for news of a sports franchise relocation? Just open a newspaper. Within the last 18 months, two professional football organizations have moved cities and three more have announced their intentions to move prior to the 1996 season.

Mr. President, something has got to be done to bring some stability back to professional sports. Some question the role of the Government in professional sports leagues. I do not. Professional sports franchises rely on Federal tax dollars, participate in interstate commerce, and affect millions of people across the country. I have no doubt that there is a role for the Federal Government in creating standards and expectations of behavior. That is why I have cosponsored the Fans' Rights Act with my colleagues from Ohio, Senator GLENN and Senator DEWINE.

The Fans' Rights Act, S. 1439, seeks to restore stability and integrity to the current chaos that marks franchise relocations. It does this by giving professional sports league officials the ability to enforce their own rules through a limited antitrust exemption. This limited exemption will ensure that league officials can block franchise relocations they believe not to be in the best interests of their sport. The bill also provides for a 180-day notice period before any team can move. During that time, public hearings must be held, at which time a home community would have the opportunity to induce the team to stay. Finally, the Fans' Rights Act would prohibit the outrageous practice of teams buying the league's approval of a proposed relocation. Current practices allow the paying of relocation fees to the leagues and individual teams prior to the vote by the individual team owners to approve the move. The bill would require that the relocation fee be paid only after the vote of approval has taken place. The era of professional sports teams moving, only to leave behind fans, businesses, and communities who have invested emotional and financial support must come to an end, and this legislation attempts to do just that.

As chairman of the Consumer Subcommittee within the Commerce Committee, I intend to hold hearings on Fans' Rights Act sometime in early March. I will seek testimony from commissioners of all four professional leagues, player representatives, team owners, and elected officials from cities impacted by franchise relocation.

When this bill comes to the floor, it is also my intention to offer an amendment to include a provision similar to that that kept the Mariners in Seattle in 1992. Essentially, this provision would require a team to be put up for sale to local owners for 120 days prior to any relocation at a price to be set by arbitration. Fan loyalty and local support must be rewarded with local ownership, not the removal of the team.

Unfortunately for the Seahawk fans, even if we could enact the Fans' Rights Act into law tomorrow, this legislation will not reverse the clock in Seattle. The decision to relocate the team has been made, although a lawsuit is pending against the organization is a King County Superior Court, an action I believe likely to succeed. I have been invited by King County Executive Gary Locke to serve on a small task force of business and community leaders who will work together to ensure that professional football in Seattle does not become part of Seattle's fading history.

I would also like to take this opportunity to commend King County Executive Gary Locke, King County Prosecutor Norm Maleng, and members of the King County Council for all of their efforts thus far to save the Seahawks.

In closing Mr. President, I would like to send a message to sports fans in Washington State and around the country. While we are in the midst of troubling times with sports teams coming and sports teams leaving, I would like to assure each of you that your loyalty to professional sports franchises will not go unrewarded. Throughout the 8 weeks of the Mariners playoff excitement this fall, the residents of Seattle and the citizens of Washington State were part of an amazing roller-coaster ride that reached beyond anything that could ever be expected from professional sports. The great sense of community pride and support toward a single team, however, must be rewarded with loyalty from the team back to the community. The Seattle Mariners displayed this loyalty in their final game of the season, when all of the Mariner players came out of the clubhouse 20 minutes after game's end, to applaud the 58,000-plus fans who had encouraged the team during the championship run.

Mr. President, the Seahawks will not move and, I believe, Cleveland will not be deserted by the NFL either.

Mr. President, every fan deserves the opportunity to applaud his or her local sports team, and for loyalty from the owners in return. I hope that passing the Fans' Rights Act can begin to recognize that fans are equal players in the world of sports.●

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON GAMBLING

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent column in the Washington Post. Cowritten by our former colleague from Maryland, Joseph Tydings, the column cogently describes the importance of a national study on the social and economic impacts of gambling.

The impacts of gambling are regional, national, and international in scope. Local and State governments simply do not have access to the information they need to make wise decisions. Although local and State task forces and commissions continue to produce reports, these entities are not equipped to deal with the regional and national ramifications of local and State policies and tend to focus only on the short term. As the authors suggest, a national commission would help States a great deal.

Although the column is focused on Maryland, States and municipalities across the country are facing the same choices. Strapped for cash, many turn to casinos, riverboats, and lotteries. Gambling should not be the only choice. Identifying alternative sources of revenue will be prominent among the issues considered by a national commission.

I urge my colleagues to read the column and to work with me and the bipartisan group supporting S. 704, the Gambling Impact Study Commission Act.

I ask that the Washington Post column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1996]

CASINO GAMBLING: BRING IN THE FEDS

(By Joseph Tydings and Peter Reuter)

The recent opening of slot machines at two Delaware race tracks is a small event in itself but is yet another step along the path to coast-to-coast casinos that many states are reluctantly and uncertainly following. Notwithstanding the pressure from the Delaware move, Maryland's Joint Executive Legislative Task Force to Study Commercial Gambling, on which we served as chair and executive director, recommended against casinos last November.

One of the task force's major conclusions has been largely ignored by the media—namely, that the problem of legal casino gambling is a national one; Maryland cannot deal with this on its own. The problem cries out for attention from the president and Congress. Unfortunately, the casino industry has mobilized cash and lobbyists to prevent federal action on the issue.

The Maryland Task Force, in its full report, unhappily noted that, lacking a significant federally funded study, it has a very limited basis for making projections of what would happen if Maryland opened its doors to casinos, which nowadays get 70 percent of their revenues from slot machines. Given the limited statistical and economic analysis available, its opposition to casinos reflected a sensible caution.

Casinos do provide a credible promise of substantial financial gains to those states that are the first in their region to introduce them. Foxwoods casino in Connecticut (owned by the Mashantucket Pequot tribe under 1988 federal legislation that allows Indian tribes to operate casinos on certain tribal lands) now yields that state $115 million in tax revenues. Most of it comes from residents of Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New York who come to play in the world's largest casino. It employs more than 10,000 workers, offering good wages and benefits to many who would otherwise have more menial and unreliable jobs.

Not surprisingly, the state of Massachusetts feels it must also allow slots to compete and is now negotiating with the Wampanoag Indians to let the tribe operate a casino. The state of New York, which created a long legislative and referendum process to prevent a rash decision on casinos, has also responded to Connecticut by starting down a path that could lead to their introduction in 1998.

But the economic gains that entice states to open their doors to casinos are only substantial if neighboring states aren't competing for the same customers. If Maryland were the only state in its region to allow casinos, it might be able to justify building casinos that relied heavily on spending by Virginians, Pennsylvanians, Washingtonians and West Virginians. However, just as the Foxwoods' success had caused Connecticut's neighbors to move toward casinos, so would Maryland's advantage, if any, be short-lived.

The case for casinos has an element of vodoo economics—namely, the claim that providing a new form of entertainment will increase the economic base of the community or state by increasing local spending. Casino expenditures by Maryland citizens would come entirely through reductions in other leisure spending or even in spending on food, shelter and education. Casinos can provide economic development only by attracting spending from other states. Moreover, if casinos lead to greater consumer spending nationally, then clearly it has to come from reductions in people's savings—scarcely a desirable change for a country that chronically undersaves.

There are also important social costs to having casinos readily accessible. Many people have difficulty controlling their gambling, particularly in the artificial environment of a casino where liquor is freely offered and the game is available at all hours. Big gambling losses and the obsessive pursuit of gambling opportunities may lead to