

ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1145

NATIONAL GAMBLING IMPACT AND POLICY COMMISSION ACT

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to create the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 497

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established a commission to be known as the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 3. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—

(1) GENERALLY.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members, appointed from persons specially qualified by training and experience to perform the duties of the Commission, as follows:

(A) three appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(B) three appointed by the majority leader of the Senate; and

(C) three appointed by the President of the United States.

(2) CONSULTATION BEFORE APPOINTMENT.—Before the appointment of members of the Commission (including to any vacancies), the appointing authorities shall consult with each other to assure that the overall membership of the Commission reflects a fair and equitable representation of various points of view.

(3) TIMING OF APPOINTMENTS.—The appointing authorities shall make their appointments to the Commission not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) DESIGNATION OF THE CHAIRMAN.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and majority leader of the Senate shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among the members of the Commission.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) INITIAL MEETING.—No later than 60 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(e) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(f) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

SEC. 4. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a comprehensive legal and factual study of—

(A) gambling in the United States, including State-sponsored lotteries, casino gambling, pari-mutuel betting, and sports betting; and

(B) existing Federal, State, and local policy and practices with respect to the legalization or prohibition of gambling activities and to formulate and propose such changes in those policies and practices as the Commission shall deem appropriate.

(2) MATTERS STUDIED.—The matters studied by the Commission shall include—

(A) the economic impact of gambling on the United States, States, political subdivisions of States, and Indian tribes, both in its positive and negative aspects;

(B) the economic impact of gambling on other businesses;

(C) an assessment and review of political contributions and their influence on the development of public policy regulating gambling;

(D) an assessment of the relationship between gambling and crime;

(E) an assessment of the impact of pathological, or problem gambling on individuals, families, social institutions, criminal activity and the economy;

(F) a review of the demographics of gamblers;

(G) a review of the effectiveness of existing practices in law enforcement, judicial administration, and corrections to combat and deter illegal gambling and illegal activities related to gambling;

(H) a review of the costs and effectiveness of State, Federal, and Tribal gambling regulatory policy;

(I) an assessment of the effects of advertising concerning gambling, including—

(i) whether advertising has increased participation in gambling activity;

(ii) the effects of various types of advertising, including the sponsorship of sporting events;

(iii) the relationship between advertising and the amount of the prize to be awarded; and

(iv) an examination of State lottery advertising practices, including the process by which States award lottery advertising contracts;

(J) a review of gambling that uses interactive technology, including the Internet;

(K) a review of the extent to which casino gambling provides economic opportunity to residents of economically depressed regions and to Indian tribes;

(L) a review of the effect of revenues derived from State-sponsored gambling on State budgets; and

(M) such other relevant issues and topics as considered appropriate by the Chairman of the Commission.

(b) REPORT.—No later than 2 years after the Commission first meets, the Commission shall submit a report to the President and the Congress which shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as it considers appropriate.

SEC. 5. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS AND SUBPOENAS.—

(1) The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such materials as the Commission considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(2) ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES.—The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place within the United States.

(3) FAILURE TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.—If a person refuses to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1), the Commission may apply to a United States district court for an order requiring that person to appear before the Commission to give testimony, produce evidence, or both, relating to the matter under investigation. The application may be made within the judicial district where the hearing is conducted or where that person is found, resides, or transacts business. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as civil contempt.

(4) SERVICE OF SUBPOENAS.—The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(5) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—All process of any court to which application is to be made under paragraph (3) may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency may furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

SEC. 6. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Subject to the limitation provided in subsection (e), each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Subject to the limitation provided in subsection (e), the members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—Subject to the requirements of subsection (e), the executive director shall be compensated at the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. The Chairman of the Commission may fix the compensation of other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for such personnel

may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(d) **PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.**—The Chairman of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(e) **LIMITATION.**—No payment may be made under the authority of this section except to the extent provided for in advance in an appropriation for this purpose.

SEC. 7. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the Commission submits its report under section 4.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act (H.R. 497) would create a national commission to study the economic and social impact of gambling in our country.

The legislation is the concept of our colleague, and my good friend, Congressman FRANK WOLF of Virginia. This measure is on the floor of the House largely because of his articulate advocacy and persistence. A study of the impact of gambling on our society—focusing on both its positive and negative aspects—will be a helpful tool for policymakers at the Federal, State, and local government levels. FRANK WOLF has identified a very important public policy issue and he deserves high praise for his efforts.

On September 29, 1995, the full Judiciary Committee held a hearing on H.R. 497. At that time, we heard from 15 witnesses, including 8 Members of Congress. Also, subsequent to our hearing, the committee received 15 additional statements for the record from other interested organizations and individuals.

During our hearing, we heard virtually every point of view on gambling and its effects. For example, we had testimony on the problem of compulsive gambling. We also heard from a university professor focusing on the economic aspects of gambling—that is, job creation, impact on tourism, State and local government revenue, et cetera. We also heard testimony from the chairman of the National Indian Gaming Association, documenting how the emergence of an Indian gambling industry in recent years has had a positive impact on employment, economic development, and overall self-sufficiency for Indian tribes. Still others testified regarding the relationship be-

tween gambling and crime, including organized crime.

Based upon this extensive committee record and personal study, I concluded that a study commission on gambling in the United States is a good idea. As the Washington Post proclaimed in its headline for an editorial endorsing the bill: "For Once, a Useful Commission!" The Post went on to observe that "commissions can * * * play the useful role of bringing to national attention issues that were previously submerged or debated in fragmentary ways."

In my view, it is particularly timely for us to have a balanced, impartial, and comprehensive look at whether or not the spread of gambling is good for this country. Over the last two decades, legalized gambling has expanded extensively throughout our country. Currently, 48 States allow some form of legalized gambling. We have State-conducted lotteries, riverboat gambling, Indian gambling, and casino gambling. For better or worse, gambling has become a commonplace part of the American culture. Just this week, the Washington Post illustrated the explosive growth of gambling:

What had been a mob-infested vice has become state-approved fun—a new national pastime. While 70 million people attend professional baseball games each year, 125 million go to government-sanctioned casinos. Adults now spend more money gambling than they spend on children's durable toys. Three times more pilgrims from around the world visit the pyramid-shaped Luxor Hotel in Las Vegas than visit Egypt. Casinos rake in more profits than movie houses and theaters and all live concerts combined.

The Washington Post, March 3, 1996 at A1.

Many believe that this widespread expansion of legalized gambling has had numerous negative effects. In some instances, this conclusion is undoubtedly true. For example, many opportunities to gamble are now available to minors who are not ready to make a mature judgment about the nature of this kind of activity. Furthermore, compulsive gamblers frequently have a negative, sometimes tragic, impact on their families.

The traditional linkage between gambling and crime is also an obvious concern. To give just one example, a GAO report issued in January concluded that "the proliferation of casinos, together with the rapid growth of the amounts wagered, may make these operations highly vulnerable to money laundering." General Accounting Office, "Money Laundering—Rapid Growth of Casinos Makes Them Vulnerable," GAO/GGD-96-28, B-259791 (January 1996) at 2. As gambling continues to spread, these negative effects and others spread with it.

In addition, the proponents of H.R. 497 have pointed out the lack of reliable information about the actual effects of gambling. We simply need better and more accurate scientific and behavioral data concerning gambling. Because of this lack of information, State and local policymakers, who are

considering the legalization of gambling in various forms, are often vulnerable to exaggerated claims about the positive effects of gambling and the prospects for painless revenue generation. Just 3 months ago, a Maryland State study commission concluded:

The Maryland Congressional delegation should support the immediate creation of a national commission to study issues related to commercial gaming and should recommend that the commission complete its work within one year.

States are unable to confidently make decisions about casino gaming because of competitive concerns about the decisions of their neighbors and because of the inadequate data and analysis available to them. *The Task Force believes that the proposed national commission on gambling, currently being considered by Congress, could make a significant contribution to public policy development.*

Final Report of the Joint Executive-Legislative Task Force to Study Commercial Gaming Activities in Maryland, December 1995, at xiv (emphasis added).

I also want to stress that I have listened to the critics of H.R. 497 as introduced, and they too have some valid points to make. In particular, they said that they do not fear the outcome of an objective study. However, they did express concern that the Commission as proposed in the original version of H.R. 497 might be biased against gambling per se and that it was only charged with looking at the negative effects of gambling.

I believe that this Commission can do the most good if its study is as neutral, objective, and comprehensive as possible—considering the views of all sides of this issue. In that spirit, I proposed a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 497, which the Judiciary Committee adopted on a voice vote.

My substitute included the vast majority of the provisions contained in H.R. 497 as originally introduced, but it added language so as to assure that all points of view would be represented on the Commission. Specifically, the bill now requires that the appointing authorities consult together to ensure that the overall makeup of the Commission fairly and equitably represent various points of view. It also drops the requirement that one seat on the Commission go to a State Governor. I want to avoid going down the difficult road of specifying which group gets what seat on the Commission because I believe that is a decision better left to the collective wisdom of the appointing authorities—the President, the Speaker, and the majority leader of the other body.

In addition, the amendments add language that would require the Commission to study both the positive and negative aspects of the economic impact of gambling. I believe that the opponents of H.R. 497 will agree that these changes are a good-faith effort to address their concerns about the fairness and balance of the Commission.

At the Judiciary Committee hearing, I heard members of the committee express particular concern about the

issue of advertising concerning gambling activities. Because of that concern, the amendment adds language that would require the Commission to study that issue. At the suggestion of our colleague, Congressman HOKE, we added even further specificity to the advertising language, and I appreciate his contribution and his willingness to work with us on this issue.

Senator DICK LUGAR, as well as the Governor of my own State of Illinois, Gov. Jim Edgar, raised the issue of gambling through the Internet and other interactive technologies. The amendment adds language directing the Commission to look at this aspect of the issue. We have also added language that will require the Commission to study the impact of revenue from State-sponsored gambling on State budgets. With respect to all of these changes, my thinking is that the more comprehensive the Commission's study is, the more useful it will be.

Another major change the amendment would make is to shorten the time period for the study commission from 3 to 2 years. The Maryland study commission urged that we make the time period even shorter. This will reduce the costs involved with this effort. The amendment also made changes of a technical and conforming nature.

During committee consideration of this bill, Congressman BONO, Congressman SCHIFF, and Congressman GALLEGLY expressed concerns about whether the proposed Commission would end up being overly biased against gambling operations in general, and Indian gambling operations, in particular. I worked with these members to craft language to amend H.R. 497 to address these concerns. These changes include: First, language to clarify that the Commission is to study all forms of commercial gambling include State lotteries, casino gambling, pari-mutuel betting, and sports betting; second, language that clarifies that the study of political contributions should include all political contributions that influence public policy on gambling, not just those of gambling operators; and third, language originally suggested by Congressman FRANK that would require the Commission to study the extend to which casino gambling has provided economic opportunity for Indians and residents of economically depressed areas. I also agreed to add language to the report that further addresses their concerns about the fairness of the makeup of the Commission.

Subsequent to our consideration of the bill, the Resources Committee sought and received sequential referral of the bill to review specifically its effect on Indian gambling. After its consideration, that committee made a suggestion of one amendment that would clarify the bill's description of the gambling regulatory policies to be studied so that it now includes tribal regulatory policy. I have accepted that

amendment, and it is part of the substitute text we consider today. I want to thank Chairman DON YOUNG for his cooperation in this matter. I also want to note that by cooperating with the Resources Committee, the Judiciary Committee does not waive any of its traditional jurisdiction over Federal gambling statutes and gambling issues generally.

I think all of these changes make the bill more balanced and comprehensive, and I appreciate the contributions of all of these members in working with us to make this a better bill.

I have discussed the various changes contained in my substitute amendment, as well as the Resources Committee amendment, with Congressman WOLF, and he has indicated his full support for all of these changes.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the improvements embodied in the committee amendment and to pass H.R. 497 as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this legislation, H.R. 497, which would create a national gambling commission to study the impact of gaming on this country. My time is short and my opposition is well documented in my testimony last year before the Judiciary Committee.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, what we are about to do here today goes against everything this new Congress is supposed to stand for—and that is limiting the ever increasing intrusion of the Federal Government into our everyday lives. Gaming and its regulation has been the sole responsibility of our individual States and it is my belief that this is where that responsibility must remain. Creation of a national gaming commission to study the impacts of gaming simply infringes on that right and we should be taking a very dim viewpoint of that action.

Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, this proposed commission leaves the States out in the cold. The proponents claim that the purpose of the study is for the States to be well informed about the gaming industry. First, let me say that the States are extremely well informed about what their job is and they don't need Washington to tell them how to do it. After all, they deal with the regulation of gaming on a daily basis. But this proposed commission avoids the State's expertise by precluding our Governors, State legislators, mayors, and locally elected officials from a major role in the study. This is of such concern that in a recent letter, Governor Roy Rowland of Connecticut, cited his deep concern and specifically requested that State and local lawmakers have representation on the commission.

The approach taken by this bill is the usual Washington-knows-best syndrome. Let's just say, I object to that premise.

This legislation should also require that commission recommendations re-

garding State gaming policy issues must be directed to State and local governments. But it does not. Does this mean new costly Federal laws or regulations will be implemented on gaming at a time when we are working to reduce regulation? And, once again, when our States are the best ones to be handling this issue, why are we advocating more Federal intrusion?

A final point I'd like to make is that if we are going to have a study, this bill should be inclusive of all forms of gaming present in 48 of the 50 States including casino gaming, State lotteries, charitable gaming, Native American gaming, Internet gaming, sports betting, horse and dog racing and other pari-mutuel activities. Why does this bill exclude charitable gaming from its study? If you want a study on gaming, why are we picking and choosing, rather than including every type of gaming?

Mr. Speaker, we don't need another costly Federal study and we don't need more intrusion on our States' right to guide their existence. I urge defeat of this bad legislation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], a cosponsor of the bill.

(Mr. LAFALCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 497, the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act. I wish to commend my colleague from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], for his efforts and his leadership in bringing this legislation to the House floor today.

The legislation before us today addresses issues and concerns that I have sought to bring to the attention of Congress since 1994. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I conducted hearings in 1994 that documented the rapid proliferation of casino gambling throughout the United States and examined the economic impact of Government-sponsored gambling on small businesses, on individual communities, and on the Nation as a whole.

Based on the findings of those hearings, I introduced in 1994 the National Policies Toward Gambling Review Act to authorize a Federal study of the economic and social implications of this widespread growth of legalized gambling. This proposal, like that introduced by Mr. WOLF, creates a new national commission, along the lines of the commission that last studied gambling in 1976, and would expand its study to all aspects of gambling in all States and localities. I reintroduced my bill in the current Congress as H.R. 462, and was delighted to sign on Mr. WOLF as my first cosponsor. When he subsequently introduced his most similar bill, H.R. 497, I was pleased to sign on as his lead cosponsor.

The 1994 Small Business Committee hearings convinced me that widespread legalized gambling has raised serious

questions that few local officials, and American society generally, are prepared to address. The hearings also confirmed what a New York Times article headline had proclaimed several weeks earlier, that gambling is now bigger than baseball as a national pastime. Some 125 million people visited casinos in 1994, a whopping 36 percent increase from 92 million in 1993. Annual attendance at professional baseball games averaged only 70 million. Casino revenues increased by a whopping 33 percent between 1993 and 1994, from \$30 billion to \$40 billion, and easily exceed the combined revenues for other major leisure activities, including movies, books, recorded music, spectator sports, theme parks, and arcades.

Americans wagered \$462 billion on all forms of legalized gambling in 1994, more than the entire gross national product of Communist China. More than \$360 billion was wagered in casinos in 10 States and on Indian reservations in 24 States, most of which were built after 1991. All but three States now permit parimutuel betting, slot machines, video poker, keno, bingo, or other forms of gambling. And 36 States actively encourage gambling with government-run lotteries.

This is a far different situation than existed when the last national commission issued its report on gambling in 1976. Legalized gambling was then confined to Nevada, and was under consideration in Atlantic City. The focus of the commission's study was the influence of organized crime in gambling, not the various economic and social implications of widespread gambling across the country. For Nevada, and later Atlantic City, gambling provided what experts termed a monopoly export economy—the popular conception of gambling as a model for economic development in which new jobs, higher tax revenues, and other economic benefits are created for a local economy by tourists from other locations. This model offered the added benefit of hiding the economic and social problems of gambling—including bankruptcies, gambling addiction and crime—which tourists simply took home with them.

As gambling has spread across the United States, and even to locations on our border with Canada, it has become clear that this model of gambling as economic development is no longer effective. States and localities now compete with Indian reservations, with other States and with other countries to lure potential gamblers or, at minimum, to keep their own gambling revenues at home. Casinos that were touted as bringing jobs and economic enrichment to communities in 1994 are now going bankrupt.

What we now have is an economic model of gambling that the casino industry itself refers to as "convenience" gambling. Rather than confining gambling to specific locations for purposes of economic development, gambling is made readily available to all potential customers. In a convenience gambling

economy, discretionary spending is diverted from other forms of entertainment and consumer expenditures to casinos and other gambling establishments. Restaurants, hotels, and other competing local businesses lose revenues and fail. Scarce resources are diverted to the least productive local activities and economic wealth becomes concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. In short, rather than the economic panacea promised by gambling promoters, the opposite of economic development appears to be occurring in many communities.

The social costs of gambling also have become more visible as gambling has spread to more locations. However, there is little comprehensive data, for example, on the costs of gambling-related crimes, on personal losses and bankruptcies or on lost jobs and work time due to gambling. Nor do we know the costs inflicted on families in terms of gambling-related alcoholism, abuse, divorce, or suicide.

Recent studies in Iowa and Missouri found that between 3 to 6 percent of gamblers become compulsive gamblers and that a large percentage of compulsive gamblers resort to crime to cover their losses. Other studies have estimated the public costs of each problem gambler, in terms of treatment, services and court expenses, as between \$13,000 and \$35,000. Even at the lowest cost estimate, according to witnesses in our 1994 hearing, an increase in gambling addiction of only one-half of 1 percent of a State's adult population would translate into added costs of \$73 million a year in a small State like Iowa and more than \$780 million in new costs in a large State like California. Such costs could eventually nullify any economic gains from gambling.

Concern with the economic, social and moral implications of Government-sponsored gambling has created something of a public backlash against the gambling industry. In the November 1994 elections voters from Florida to Wyoming rejected 90 percent of all State and local referenda to legalize or expand gambling operations. Last November, gambling initiatives were defeated in Washington and Massachusetts, while special panels in Maryland and Connecticut rejected new casino proposals. This suggests a growing public consensus that the pace of future casino development should be more measured and that future growth of gambling generally must be given greater scrutiny at the local, State, and national levels.

A report issued in November by a special Maryland task force to study casino gambling is particularly instructive and highlights two of the most important issues in the legislation before us today. In recommending against casino gambling, the task force concluded that casino gambling is an issue Maryland cannot address on its own. Since the economic benefits of gambling come largely from reductions in other consumer spending or by at-

tracting spending from other States, the task force said that the issue must be addressed on at least a regional, if not national, basis. The task force also concluded that, given the limited statistical and economic analysis available, it needed far more information to understand all potential consequences of initiating casino gambling.

Contrary to the arguments of some in the gambling industry, the bill before us today does not seek to restrict or regulate organized gambling, nor is it intended as a preliminary step toward such regulation. It merely responds to a growing public demand for more and better information about gambling. And it responds to requests by officials in Maryland and elsewhere for a broad analysis of gambling that can incorporate information from all States and from Indian tribal jurisdictions.

As State and Federal funding for social services and other programs continue to decline, local officials will come under even greater pressure to heed promises of new revenue and greater prosperity in legalized gambling. It is imperative that these officials, and the public generally, have all the information available to make reasoned and prudent policy decisions.

Nearly 2 years have passed since I first proposed legislation to create a national commission to study gambling. It was needed then, it is imperative now. I urge adoption of this important legislation.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chief sponsor of this bill.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong, strong support of this bill. The bill has over 150 to 160 cosponsors.

Let me begin by thanking Chairman HYDE personally for his work on this effort. I want to commend the gentleman. I appreciate the good work that he has done. I also want to thank Alan Coffey, who I have known for about 30 years, for his outstanding work; and lastly for Joe Gibson, your staff, and your other staff people who have done a superb job.

This is important. There are now 48 States that have some form of gambling, whether it be lottery, casino gambling, and whatever the case may be. This is important to stop and take a close look at it. Now, there are going to be many other things, and I have spoken from the floor on this issue many, many times.

I believe it is inappropriate, the spread of gambling that has taken place in the country. All you have to do is read the Washington Post series that was on Sunday and Monday and Tuesday and again tomorrow to see that from two States we have grown to roughly 48 States.

Let me just say—it is not in my statement—for the record, powerful interests in this city have been hired to derail this bill. Prominent people in the Republican Party and prominent people in the Democratic Party from the K Street corridor have been hired to detract and derail and stop this bill.

This bill is going to pass today by an overwhelming vote. There literally is very, very little opposition because it is a fair study that the American people want to see. What is the impact with regard to economic cannibalization, what impact does it have, and what is the impact with regard to corruption and political contributions? What is the impact to social aspects with regard to Gamblers Anonymous and things like this?

So we are going to watch it, and I appreciate the efforts in the House. It is bipartisan. We have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. I remember one day I was giving a 1-minute speech and the gentleman from Michigan got up and said, "I want to be on that bill." We have come together in the best interest of this body.

In closing, I appreciate the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], making this a priority item to bring up, and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] in not allowing some of these people that are—and I am reluctant to get into their names—who have been hired by the gambling interests to derail this bill.

My closing comment is, I personally care about this almost as much as I care about a lot of things that we are taking. I am going to watch what happens on this bill. I am going to watch and see what takes place over in the Senate.

What I would ask is those who have some problem with this bill, this bill ought to be allowed to pass, whereby we can set up a national commission, whether it be for 18 months or 2 years, whereby 9 men and women of decency and honesty who are not tied into any particular community can look at and examine this issue.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and his staff very, very much from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Speaker, as the original sponsor of the pending legislation, I rise in ardent support of H.R. 497, the Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act and appreciate your scheduling this important legislation for floor consideration. Also, I would like to take a moment to recognize the diligent efforts of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and his able staff in guiding this legislation through the committee process. It was a pleasure working with Chairman HYDE in bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 497 is complicated. It would charge the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission with the duty of making an objective, comprehensive, and impartial legal and factual assessment of gambling. Let me be clear. This legislation does not outlaw

gambling. It does not tax gambling. It does not regulate gambling. It merely recognizes that gambling is spreading throughout the country like wildfire and it needs a hard look. This is our responsibility as Federal legislators to create a commission to bring together all the relevant data so that Governors, State legislators, and citizens can have the facts they need to make informed decisions.

In the early 1970's Congress was concerned about problems related to gambling, and it established a commission similar to the one pending before the House today. Since the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling issued its 1976 report, gambling has greatly expanded, and it has grown in many ways that are contrary to the recommendations of that early report. In 1976 only two States had casino gambling. Today, every State but two have some form of legal gambling. According to U.S. News & World Report, people wagered \$482 billion in 1994 on all forms of gambling, 85 percent of which took place in casinos in 27 States, most of them built in the past 5 years. As gambling proliferates in casinos, on riverboats, on Indian reservations and elsewhere, problems such as crime, political corruption, cannibalization of existing businesses, gambling addiction, family breakups, and suicide appear to be a growing and unfortunate consequence. It is time for Congress to take a comprehensive look at gambling and its associated problems.

The gambling industry and its proponents argue that this study is not needed because this issue should be left up to the States. Well, Governors Lowry, Washington; Bush, Texas; Dean, Vermont; Carper, Delaware; Sundquist, Tennessee; Merrill, New Hampshire; Cayetano, Hawaii; Voinovich, Ohio; and Racicot, Montana disagree and support H.R. 497. I have heard from many State attorneys general and legislators who also support a national study of gambling. H.R. 497 has received wide editorial support as well from papers such as the Washington Post, Dallas Morning News, Los Angeles Times, Cincinnati Enquirer, Philadelphia Inquirer, Richmond-Times Dispatch, Capital Times, Madison, WS, Sacramento Bee, Chicago-Sun Times, Sun-Sentinel, Fort Lauderdale, FL. Also, this legislation is supported by the Christian Coalition, Traditional Values Coalition, Concerned Women for America, American Family Association, Focus on the Family, Family Research Council, and others. Recently, a coalition of 16 churches in America wrote the House and Senate leadership in support of this important legislation.

Why do so many Governors, State attorneys general, State legislators, and citizens support H.R. 497? The reason is that there exists little credible or reliable information about gambling, and much of the information that does exist is produced by the gambling industry itself. Joseph Tydings and Peter Reuter, chairman and executive director respectively of Maryland's Joint Executive Legislative Task Force to Study Commercial Gambling, in an opinion article which ran in the Washington Post, wrote:

The problem of legal casino gambling is a national one. . . . 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.

Mr. Speaker, Congress can no longer turn a blind eye to the stories of poor mothers play-

ing the slots with their children's lunch money or the Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal article that indicated that more money was bet in casinos, \$29.7 billion, in 1994 than was spent on all taxable sales, \$27.6 billion, in the State. No longer can we ignore reports of teenagers so addicted to gambling that they prostitute their girlfriends to pay off their mob debts. And Congress will no longer be able to disregard accounts of Americans so distraught over their mounting gambling debts that their only perceived recourse is suicide.

Mr. Speaker, America has begun to focus on the issue of gambling and its related problems. By passing H.R. 497 today, Congress will take a meaningful step toward bringing together all the relevant data so that Governors, State legislators, and citizens can have the facts they need to make informed decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD four editorials in support of this legislation, as follows:

[From the Saturday Oklahoman, Oct. 28, 1995]

STUDY COULD HELP

The battle over legalizing casino gambling in Oklahoma apparently will be fought at the polls instead of in the courtroom.

Casino proponents have gathered 202,993 signatures on petitions to place the proposal on the ballot, the secretary of state says. A leading opponent says his group believes it would be useless to challenge the petition, based on past Supreme Court rulings. Instead, foes will focus on defeating the proposal, possibly at the time of the presidential primary on March 12. Casino boosters want to question on the November 1996 general election ballot.

In either case, Oklahomans will have time to study the issue and should try to get all the information they can to help them make their decision.

Of interest in this respect is an editorial in The News Journal of Wilmington, Del. It raises concerns about casinos due to open this year at Delaware racetracks.

News stories in the paper estimate perhaps \$400 million will be poured into 1,200 slot machines the first year. But the profit to the state would be only \$8 million, about 2 percent of the wagering. The slot machines would return 90 percent or more to the bettors, with the rest going to track owners, purses for the horses, slot machine leases and state administrative costs, according to the paper.

The editorial worries about the potential for abuse existing in all aspects: gambling contractors, casino employees, bettors, owners and operators. It notes that smaller operations like Delaware's are considered more susceptible to corruption than the big gambling meccas, like Atlantic City and Nevada.

"While much is said about the possible benefits from slots to racing and new jobs, businesses and revenue, how much is really known about the influence of organized crime, the potential for political corruption and the social toll on individuals and families?" the paper asks.

The editorial supports legislation pending in Congress to establish a National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission to help states evaluate the effects of legalized gambling. Such a study could also prove useful also for Oklahoma as it is confronted by efforts to expand gambling activities in the state.

[From the Indianapolis News, Feb. 29, 1996]

LOOKING AT THE FACTS

Since it's only a study commission, it might be pertinent to wonder why the gambling industry wants to delay or water down House Resolution 497.

This proposal, by Rep. Frank Wolf, R-Va., would establish a national commission to study the economic and social impact of legalized gambling.

The problem for the gambling industry is the fact that such studies tend to hurt their cause. Researchers who study this business keep finding unpleasant facts and information that make it harder for the industry to make its case to local and state governments.

University of Illinois economist Earl Grinols, for example, keeps coming up with studies showing that the economic development claims offered by the industry are exaggerated or false. He finds that off-track betting outlets, for example, do not generally bring new economic development to a community but transfer discretionary spending from retail businesses such as restaurants to gambling establishments.

Additionally, the facts on gambling addiction are devastating to legalized gambling promoters. The financial costs are difficult to pinpoint precisely, but they run into the billions of dollars when all factors are weighed. Families wind up on welfare when fathers or mothers get addicted. Crime increases as the addicted turn to theft, forgery and other such practices to feed this habit. But the human cost is harder to weigh. Some people have committed suicide. Others wind up all but abandoning their children in favor of this form of entertainment.

Wolf's proposal is timely. Critics claim the issue is a state or local matter. But the federal government allows Indian gambling initiatives to circumvent state or local government jurisdiction, and there are other national implications of legalized gambling's proliferation in recent years.

Sen. Richard Lugar, R-Ind., has made a proposal similar to Wolf's, offering it in his presidential campaign. Lugar and Wolf have been joined by many other members of Congress. In Indiana, newspaper publisher George Witwer, as a candidate for governor, has called for a state study commission, and legislation in the General Assembly may be adopted to provide for a legislative study committee on the subject.

The Washington Post warns that the gambling industry will be trying to stop or delay the national proposal in Congress. A recent editorial noted: "The gambling industry has a great deal of money, has been making large campaign contributions and recently hired some of Washington's most influential lobbyists. We have no doubt that the industry can bring a lot of pressure against this bill and construct some ingenious strategies to weaken it."

Congress ought to listen to Wolf, Lugar and others calling for a study commission on this issue. There is much at stake, as such a commission would point out.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 5, 1996]

TAKING A HARD LOOK AT GAMBLING

Rocked to attention by the explosion of legal gambling across the country in the past two decades, Congress is belatedly, but sensibly, considering legislation calling for a comprehensive national study on the social and economic effects of gambling. Lobbyists accuse government of trying to stack the deck to expand its regulatory reach. But without a study and reliable data, what conclusions can be drawn?

The bipartisan legislation, endorsed by 143 cosponsors in the House and 16 in the Senate, calls for the creation of a commission to conduct a two-year national study of the effects of gambling. Its recommendations are expected to provide guideposts for states and localities in dealing with legal gambling's transformation from sleepy enterprise to a national economic force.

As recently as 1984, just two states, Nevada and New Jersey, allowed casino gambling. Today nearly half the states have casinos on land, water or Indian reservations. Only Utah and Hawaii have no state-sanctioned gambling.

The increase in the number of gambling outlets clearly seems to have changed the public's betting habits. According to the General Accounting Office, between 1984 and 1994 the annual amount bet on legalized gaming—including casinos, lotteries, parimutual betting and sports books—jumped by 137%, from \$147 billion in 1984 to \$482 billion in 1994, more than twice the current annual budget deficit that consumes so much congressional attention.

Rapid-fire expansion of legal wagering has meant new jobs and tax revenues to state and local governments, but it has also resulted in serious problems. Though most of the evidence is anecdotal, signs of the social and economic downside are proliferating, from housewives blowing monthly household budgets to sharp-suited toughs showing up in town.

What is the extent of gambling addiction? Has its expansion increased criminal activity? Has political corruption become a problem? Is there a multiplier effect on jobs from gaming? Or does legal betting drain money away from other businesses and drive them into the ground?

As it now stands, there are no clear answers to these questions. Opponents, including the American Gaming Assn., argue that by involving itself in an expansive gaming study, the federal government is potentially interfering in local matters. But this is only a study. If gambling is the sure-fire winner that proponents say it is, there ought to be nothing to worry about.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1995]

GAMBLING NATION?

On the opposite page, Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.) makes a strong case for his bill to set up a National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission. His point is hard to refute: If the United States' headlong rush into becoming Gambling Nation is a great idea—good for business, for the social order, for government revenues—surely a fair-minded commission would discover such a thing. And please, no talk about "undue government interference with free enterprise." As Mr. Wolf points out, there is absolutely nothing in his bill that involves taxing or regulating gambling. He simply suggests that states and localities that get inundated with pro-gambling propaganda—and politicians who get inundated with political contributions from gambling interests—get a chance to see how all the arguments for gambling pan out in reality.

What needs to be understood in this debate is that the central issue is *not* the end to all legalized gambling in America—this is not a replay of the arguments over Prohibition. For better or worse, most Americans seemed to accept the situation that existed some years ago in which large-scale casino operations were confined to the states of Nevada and New Jersey. This sent powerful messages: that casino gambling was not a routine activity and that communities had good reason not to turn themselves over to gambling. The nation effectively accepted that many people liked to gamble, but it also accepted that organized commercial gambling was not the sort of activity that ought to become a routine part of life. Implicit in this national compact was an understanding that the potential for crime and political corruption ought to be contained. Call it the enclave theory of gambling.

Several things have happened since. One is that popular resistance to taxes has moved

governments all over the country to sponsor their own forms of gambling through lotteries and other games. The idea was that a portion of the public treasury would be filled with money "voluntarily" handed over in bets. Once Atlantic City got going, many economically strapped communities that saw no other way to support themselves figured they too should get a piece of the action. Jobs in casinos look mighty attractive to the unemployed and underemployed, and local officials staring at huge local budget problems tend to look kindly on any new revenue sources. Finally, there was the 1987 Supreme Court ruling legalizing gambling on Indian reservations, which opened up whole new areas of the country to gambling—and gave a new moral justification to casinos as Native American leaders argued that their people were at last getting their due.

This is how large social changes happen—in small increments that no one notices much until a big transformation has taken place. Mr. Wolf and his allies are suggesting that on gambling, the country look ahead before it is too late, or too complicated, to turn back.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the committee in a brief colloquy.

Was it the intent of the Committee on the Judiciary to include the U.S. Territories, Commonwealths, and possessions within the meaning of the terms "United States," "States," and "political subdivisions of States" as used in section 4 of this legislation?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is our intent that the U.S. Territories, Commonwealths, and possessions be included in H.R. 497, as the gentleman has stated.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, while having some reservations which I will note later, I rise today in support of H.R. 497.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of gambling has increased considerably in the United States over the last two decades. While before many Americans were confined to gambling in the States of Nevada and New Jersey, or to parimutuel betting, today fully 48 of the States of the United States participate in some form of gambling. This has provided a new stream of revenue for State and municipal treasuries, which has in turn provided additional services to the residents of those States.

The issues this legislation tries to address are very comprehensive, and I commend the chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee for trying to address these issues. For most Americans, gambling provides leisure-time entertainment. For a small minority, however, many of whom are those who least can afford to lose their limited earnings or savings, gambling is an addictive, destructive habit. The question is, as a matter of public policy, Are the drawbacks to permitting

gambling so destructive that legal gambling should be restricted or eliminated?

While I am not a gambler, as I noted earlier, gaming activities are being used by almost all States for public purposes. Gaming operations are also now being used by American Indians throughout our country to raise money for improvements to schools, hospitals, and roads on their Indian reservations. As a member of the Committee on Resources, I am especially concerned that Indian gaming not be unfairly targeted should this legislation become law.

My concern is that there may be individuals who want to use this bill in an attempt to stop or curtail gaming throughout the United States, and that this opposition is centered on moral grounds but more particularly, that this is an attack on the successes which have been achieved by American Indians through gaming.

If this were truly a moral concern, why is the Commission being empowered to study only gaming? Why not also include the study of alcohol consumption, the use of cigarettes and tobacco among teenagers and adults, and abortion, too? Are those activities any more or less moral than gaming?

Again, for those who may be determined to eliminate Indian gaming, I find it very unfair to target only gaming in this Commission. Those of us on the Committee on Resources are familiar with the long-standing problems within Indian country. By most, if not all measures, our American Indians are at the bottom of the ladder when it comes to housing, income, education, or any other measure of economic development. Here are a few facts which portray the dismal conditions in which many of our first Americans live.

I ask my colleagues to keep in mind that the locations of the reservations on which many American Indians now live, are not locations of their choosing. Many tribes were forcibly moved to these reservations from much more desirable locations at which they could and did provide for themselves.

Fact: the life expectancy of an American Indian is 47 years; the life expectancy of all Americans is 78 years.

Fact: the 1990 census determined that 30.9 percent of our Nation's Indians live in poverty; the poverty rate for the U.S. population was 13.1 percent.

Fact: in 1991, the unemployment rate on Indian reservations was 45 percent; for the United States, when that number goes above 7 percent we take significant action to reduce it.

I could go on, but I think my point is clear: the Indians are in trouble, and they can use whatever assistance is available.

Mr. Speaker, through the judicious use of gaming operations, Indian country is slowly pulling itself up the ladder of life. Indian gaming is a well-regulated system that is serving its purpose remarkably well. No one is forced to gamble and all the profits received by the tribes go directly to tribal uses.

The U.S. Government does not have the money to make all the capital improvements needed on the reservations, and through the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, Congress has established a system to pay for improvements in Indian country through voluntary, private contributions. After 500 years of mistreatment, this is one Indian program I feel good about—it is voluntary, efficient, and privately funded.

I have heard accusations that Indian gaming is fraught with criminal activity including Mafia and other syndicate-type operations, but the truth is these allegations have been investigated by Federal authorities and they are unfounded. In fact, at hearings I helped organize, the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified before the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs during the 104th Congress that there is no truth to these allegations. Indian gaming is a well-managed, highly regulated activity providing widely disbursed public benefit.

I appreciate the willingness of the Committee on Judiciary to remove some of the most egregious anti-Indian-gaming provisions contained in H.R. 497, as it was introduced. Given Congress' efforts over the years to monitor and regulate this activity, I am concerned that other amendments offered by the Committee on Resources were not included in the legislation to ensure Indian gaming received fair consideration. For example, given the extent to which Indian gaming is federally regulated, and the complexity of those regulations, I believe it would be beneficial to include on the Commission persons with an expertise in this area.

I also want to express my concern with the limited time in which the Committee on Resources was afforded to consider this bill. H.R. 497 was referred to the Committee on Resources for the period beginning December 21, 1995, through February 28, 1996, most of which time the House was adjourned or in pro forma session.

Finally, I want to express my appreciation to Chairman HYDE for his willingness to include the territories in this legislation.

□ 1200

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the gentleman in a brief colloquy.

Is it the intent of the Committee on the Judiciary that the Commission be free to study the public safety costs that gambling operations, including those operations on Indian reservations, impose on local government and local law enforcement agencies?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is our intent the commission would be free to study the public safety cost that gambling operations, including those operations on Indian reservations, impose on local law enforcement agencies. I believe that is implicit in subparagraphs A, D, G, H, and M of subsection 4(a)(2).

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman. I strongly support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to Members' attention a matter of importance brought about from the proliferation of gaming operations in northern California.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act. I believe, however that it is important to clarify one aspect of the legislation.

Like many other regions of the Nation, the Indian tribes in northern California are establishing gaming operations in order to provide a much needed source of revenue for depressed rural areas.

While, I support the efforts of native American communities to establish a self-sufficient form of revenue, the residual impacts of the gaming operations on local communities are having unanticipated consequences.

Not long ago, the Elem Indian colony, in Lake County, CA, erupted in 5 days of shooting over control of two casinos where video poker and pool are played. On more than one occasion, the county swat team and law enforcement officials have been called to the scene to prevent the continuation of hostilities between the two competing factions. Tensions on the reservation are high and are directly attributable to the operation of the gaming facilities.

The resulting hostilities have been a drain on local law enforcement. The county government is not recompensed for its services relating to the reservation.

I would hope that the Commission would study the financial and public safety costs of Indian gaming operations on county and municipal law enforcement.

Although the legislation does not directly address this topic, I have noticed that section 4, subsections D, G, and H, include reviews relating to crime and the effectiveness of law enforcement and regulatory polity as it relates to Indian Gambling. It would seem to me that the Commission should address the impact and cost of native American gaming operations on county law enforcement.

It is my hope that the Commission will address the concerns of northern California communities, and communities across the Nation that reside near native American gaming facilities?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I rise in support of H.R. 497, for it covers an area that provides information for all of us to move forward and to ensure that gambling is not hurtful.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor this important legislation, which establishes a nine-

member Commission to study gambling in the United States—including gambling on Indian reservations, State-sponsored lotteries, casino gambling and sports betting.

Gambling has become an important part of American life. Americans are betting and losing more money each year than it spends on all spectator sports combined. Gambling has also become a major source of revenue for many State governments. I am concerned, however, that we do not completely understand the impact of gambling on our society.

Just yesterday, the Washington Post reported the story of a Louisiana woman who became addicted to video poker. She described it as an addiction as powerful as any drug. This woman squandered her entire savings, including a trust reserved for her grandson's education, on the video poker games which are in many of the State's bars and restaurants. Do State governments that push gambling have any responsibility for people who become hooked was just one question that the article asked.

The Commission established by this bill would be required to conduct a comprehensive, legal and factual study of the impact of gambling on Federal, State, and Tribal governments in an attempt to answer some of the questions that have arisen from the Nation's new obsession.

The Commission would also study the influence of political contributions on the development of public policy regulating gambling, as well as the relationship between gambling and crime. The bill requires the Commission to review the effectiveness of existing practices in law enforcement, judicial administration, and corrections to combat and deter illegal gambling and illegal activities related to gambling. The bill also directs the Commission to study the effects of advertising and whether it increases participation in gambling activities.

America has become a gambling nation. This bill will study the effects, both positive and negative, of our new favorite pastime and I believe it is important to do so.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not come at this issue as a Pollyanna. I mean, I have on rare occasions bought a lottery ticket and played the ponies in my day.

I must be very frank with you, Mr. Speaker, I watch this gambling explosion now in the last two decades since 1974. It really has become something we as a country really need to look at and study.

Two decades ago we spent \$17 billion on gambling in this country; in 1994, \$482 billion. Americans lost \$40 billion of what they bet, more than 6 times what they spent on all spectator sports combined, and while 70 million people attend professional baseball games each year, 125 million go to government-sanctioned casinos. Adults spend more money gambling than they spend on children's durable toys. Lottery ticket sales have increased 829 percent since 1982.

Something is going on, and you can relate it to a lot of different things; the stagnant wages of 80 percent of the population who have not seen an increase in wages basically, real increase, since 1979, may attribute to that. I mean, are we really to the point the American dream means pinning your hopes on a weekly basis on the lottery?

We have got to look at this. There are serious social implications with respect to gambling. Gamblers Anonymous, in Illinois, did a study. A third of the people said they lost or quit their jobs because of gambling. Seventy-six percent said they missed time from work because of gambling. Forty-four percent had stolen from work to pay for gambling debts. It goes on and on and on.

I am conflicted by this issue, because of how the native Americans in our country have been become resourceful and done well economically because of this, and I understand that concern, and it is a legitimate concern that we have to face.

But it seems to me, with all of this proliferation of gambling in the country, we need to really have a serious, rational look at it, and I support the efforts on the part of my colleagues bringing this up, and commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 497, the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] for their leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we dearly need a commission to study effects of gambling in the United States. One only needs to read the front page of last Sunday's Washington Post to understand why. Legalized gambling in the United States has exploded 2,800 percent in the last two decades, from \$17 billion in 1974 to \$482 billion in 1994.

As has been earlier stated, Americans lost \$40 billion of what they bet, more than 6 times what Americans spent on all spectator sports combined. We need to ask ourselves what this explosive growth is doing to our economy, our communities and to our families.

There is disturbing evidence of urban decay, public corruption, despair and suicide among addicted gamblers. We must know for certain what the net effects of legalized gambling are.

The stakes are too high to let these questions go unanswered, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation so that we can have the facts as we make decisions about what role gambling should play in our country.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the question we face today is not whether one is for or against gaming. The fact is that gambling has been part of our society for a long, long time—and it probably will continue to be that way. The question we face today is what role should the Federal Government play in regulating gambling. I am not sure what that role should be. I am not convinced that today's system of checks and balances is broken. Today, the States have been used as the primary regulatory body that oversees commercial gaming. Like my friend from Massachusetts, I thought the Republicans would be happy knowing that the States are regulating gaming operations—much like the Republicans want the States to regulate WIC, school lunch programs, welfare, and Medicaid.

But if this study is going to happen, it should not be used as a vehicle to attack Indian gaming and the sovereignty of tribal governments. Mr. Speaker, if one was reading the Washington Post this morning, they may be led to believe that Indian tribes who engage in gaming are basically unregulated entities operating casinos across the country. But as we know, nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that Indian gaming is the most heavily regulated gaming industry in America. The tribes have three layers of regulatory bodies they have to deal with. The tribes themselves have their own law enforcement and court systems to provide oversight on the reservations. And tribal regulatory and control standards are generally equal or greater than State or industry standards. The tribes must also deal with a host of Federal regulators—including the Department of Justice, the FBI, the IRS, and the Department of Interior. And as a result of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988, the States have also been given a role to limit Indian gaming during the compact process.

Mr. Speaker, another fact is that in Indian country, the money generated from gaming must, by law, be used for purposes to benefit the tribes. Today, the tribes employ 140,000 people nationwide, with about 85 percent being held by non-Indians. The tribes have used their gaming dollars to build schools, homes, and health clinics to better serve their members. But I have some real concerns about this bill. I am concerned that while this Commission will focus a great deal of its time on Indian gaming, there is no guarantee that a person from Indian country will even be a member of the Commission. I hope any Senate bill will include a provision requiring two members of the Commission be from federally recognized tribes who engage in gaming. Finally, Mr.

Speaker, I remain deeply concerned that there are some people in the House who would like to use this bill as a vehicle to attach amendments that would be detrimental to Indian gaming. If this bill passes the House and moves over to the Senate, I would hope that body would reject any attempt to add such amendments to this bill. Such a move would be unwise and counterproductive. It would lead many people who support this bill, to actively oppose it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of H.R. 497, which would establish a national commission to study the impact of gambling in America.

Numerous studies have been conducted on the impact of gambling, studies which have generated a variety of conclusions, largely dependent on who funds them.

This commission will be unique in that it will hopefully provide an objective and dispassionate view of the economic and social effects of gambling. This kind of information is vital if we are to make responsible decisions about commercial and governmental gambling.

If gambling continues to generate popularity as a revenue-generating mechanism, we will need accurate information in order to help State, territorial, local governments, and Indian tribes make decisions about gambling.

Earlier in this debate, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], entered into a colloquy to clarify the roll of territories in this legislation. I support the effort of my friend in that regard.

I am especially interested in what the commission's findings will reveal about the affects of gambling on our local economies. My home of Guam is considering legalizing casino gambling as a way to attract more tourists to our island. I do not think it is necessary, but we need information in order to make that decision better and more effective for our local community.

Support H.R. 497.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise against the bill because of its negative impact on native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, a National Gambling Commission is in many ways an unnecessary intrusion by the Federal Government into the business of State and local and tribal governments. It will cost millions of dollars to fund the Commission and its study, which can surely be put to better use.

There is no evidence that such a study is even necessary. The gambling operations of the native American tribes, which would be one of the subjects of this study, have shown no evidence of any connection with organized criminal activity. The bill does not provide a requirement that there be native American members of the Commission.

The bill's study does not cover all forms of gambling.

Indian gambling has produced hundreds of thousands of jobs, both directly and indirectly, and has been of tremendous economic benefit. This is the first time that the tribes have been able to bring in a significant amount of revenue, and they have used it for hospitals, schools, and other improvements to their communities.

Creating this Commission will create another Federal bureaucracy which will have subpoena power.

Regardless of one's position on whether gambling is a positive or negative force, the States and localities must decide for themselves, and they are already doing so.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

(Mr. LOBIONDO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I proudly represent the Second District of New Jersey, which includes Atlantic City and the casino industry in Atlantic City. New Jersey also has a State lottery and racing and other types of legalized betting.

In turn, New Jersey is able to provide programs for senior citizens, programs for the disabled and programs for schoolchildren that would not be there if it were not for this source of revenue.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an area for the Federal Government to get involved in. It is an area that has been run by the States. It is an area that has been based on the approval by the people of those States.

Gaming includes a wide variety of activities in States. It involves racing, lottery, sports betting, charitable gaming, and the casino industry.

I would like to at least suggest that this study be completed by those involved in the industry at the State and local level, those who know it best, and that its results be shared with States and local governments, and that if Federal issues are to be examined, that the agenda should focus on Indian gaming and gaming on the Internet.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, what this study is going to find. It is going to find that there were a lot of jobs that were created because of the industry, good-paying jobs, with good benefits. It is going to find that has been a reduction in the welfare roles because people have been put to work. It is going to find a highly regulated industry that is extremely well run. It is going to find that services provided to the elderly and disabled would not have been there if this industry would not be allowed to flourish, and it is also going to find

that educational funds for our children have been enhanced because of the revenues that they receive from the gaming industry.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to begin by saluting the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for his hard work on this particular bill.

We are hearing a lot about what this bill is and what it is not. I think one of our former Presidents once said, "Education is expensive, but ignorance is even more expensive." This bill is about educating the American people. It is not about mandating the States. It is about getting information out to the people about what the gaming industry and the gambling is doing to our small businesses and our families and our wages. That is what this is about.

I recommend the "Luck Business", by Robert Goodman, to see some of the devastating consequences that gaming is having in our small communities.

Second, this is about values. Our values in American society are not to say to our children, "Go out and win the lottery. We are going to go out to 7-Eleven and buy enough tickets and go gaming and gambling, and that is the way to make the American dream." It is about hard work and sacrifice and commitment.

So let us study and see what this proliferation of gambling is having on American families and American small businesses. That is all this bill does.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, which should have had jurisdiction over this bill.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for bringing it to our attention and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the Committee on the Judiciary for reporting it.

I wish that our committee would have spent more time on it because of its significant impact on Indian gaming in this country.

But I think with the proliferation of gambling in the United States, we have got to ask these questions. We have got to start to have some answers as to the real impacts of gambling. There is a lot of impact that appears at first, and a lot of it appears positive, but there are obviously some ongoing studies, anecdotal evidence from communities that

some of it that is so positive in the beginning maybe turns out not to be the case later.

□ 1215

I must also say that I am concerned that this resolution starts to get into a number of areas that are beyond those generic questions as to the impact of gaming on our families and our communities and our social structure. Many of the areas where States have made decisions, the people have voted to engage in this activity, and we do not get back into trying to create some type of Federal regulatory body.

But I think the resolution on balance is a good one. I would hope that the members of the Commission will remain sensitive to the unique status of the Indian tribes and the laws and the treaties governing those tribes and the laws that govern their ability to conduct gambling as a result of State activities in which those tribal lands reside.

So I hope that this Commission will be productive, and I hope that it will be able to report back to us, so that decisions can be made by us, I think individually, because I think we are going to find out most of these decisions reside with the States, as they have properly in the past. But maybe this national Commission will have enough status so that local communities and States can make informed decisions before plunging into the further expansion of gambling before they know the results and whatever the downside may be.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I might remark, as one from New Jersey, which has a strong gambling casino industry, nevertheless I believe this is a study that is long overdue. I rise in strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation which would set up a commission to study the impact of gambling on our Nation. I also do this as one from New Jersey a State that has a casino industry that is nationally prominent. This study is long overdue and I commend my good friend from Virginia for his hard work on this important issue. In doing so, he has recognized what many of us have also grown aware of—that the moral, social, economic, and political ramifications of gambling are far too great to go unaddressed any longer. We must carefully evaluate what has become an uncontrollable epidemic that has destroyed peoples lives and families.

All we need to do is look at the staggering statistics on gambling. The amount of money legally gambled has skyrocketed by 2,800 per-

cent since 1974—from \$17 to \$482 billion in 1994. Moreover, the \$40 billion in revenue raised in 1994 from all gambling related activities is more than all of the combined revenue raised from movie theaters, sporting events, theme parks, cruises, and music concerts.

The economic impact of gambling on community businesses can be devastating. Money that would normally be invested into local economies is instead being thrown away at the nearby casino. Local merchants, retailers, and restauranters are seeing business dry up because the money that people used to spend on their goods and services is being gambled at the card table, the slot machine, the scratch off lotto cards.

The reality of individual and family owned businesses going out of business is exacerbated by the corporate structure of casinos. Casinos provide cheap food and entertainment on site in order to keep gamblers near the action, and to keep spending money. So, in order for restaurants to remain competitive and attract business, or just to take advantage of a State's liberal gambling regulations, many restaurants generate more money from their video poker machines than they do from selling food.

And, as individual dependency on gambling grows, so too do the loss of homes and jobs. Families are faced with bankruptcy and unpaid bills. Divorces increase, families break up, and chronic gamblers contemplate suicide. Theft and crime increase. Crime rates are twice as high in places with gambling. In 1994, towns with casinos saw a 5.8-percent jump in crime while the national average fell 2 percent. And, a 7.7-percent increase was seen at places with casinos in operation for less than a year.

People such as Betty Yakey, a 65-year-old woman from Louisiana, lose \$190,000 to the lures of gambling. In doing so, she used up her grandson's college savings. Other people in Betty Yakey's position sell off possessions and file false theft reports to collect insurance to feed their habit. This habit not only destroys the life of the gambler, but also the lives of spouses and children, and in Betty Yakey's case, grandchildren. Gambling is not just an individual problem, but one that a whole family must face together. And, it is an issue that must be recognized and addressed by gambling interests.

However, the irony in all of this is that those responsible for making sure that gambling habits like Betty Yakey's continue to be fed are the same people who are responsible for writing gambling regulations and issuing casino licenses. These are our State legislators, many of whom have been corrupted by the gambling lobby.

State legislators facing sagging economies justify gambling with the argument that, without the revenue generated by gambling, they would be forced to either increase taxes or cut programs. But, they set gambling policy having already received huge amounts of money from gambling interests within the State. In Illinois in 1995, gambling PAC's contributed \$1.2 million to State legislators, including almost \$100,000 each to the Governor and the House Republican and Democratic leaders. In Louisiana, gambling put more money into campaigns than the next four industries combined. In 1994, gambling interests gave \$3.1 million to parties and candidates, making them one of the top five special interest contributors.

Gambling is a drug, an addiction just like alcohol or cocaine. The bottom line is that the gambling industry and State legislatures do nothing to stop the promotion of gambling as family entertainment. They are willing to watch small businesses fail, crime spread, and families fall apart—all to raise revenue, precious revenue. See, gambling is a State tourist attraction, as are theme parks and ski resorts. Mississippi generates two-thirds of its gambling revenue from out of State, mainly from Florida and Tennessee. People flood into Mississippi and spend their money, then they leave and take their problems home with them.

It is estimated that Gamblers Anonymous groups have almost doubled to over 1,000 since 1990. Is this what we want to perpetuate in the United States? State-supported addiction? Is it worth destroying peoples lives, families, the moral backbone of our Nation, just to make some money? I certainly think not.

We must move forward and scrutinize the impact of gambling on all levels. Support Congressman WOLF's legislation. Our Nation can't afford to do without it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I appreciate the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor, and I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particular interest in one section of this that the committee was gracious enough to accept as part of this. I am on the committee and was glad to be able to add this.

It has to do with the effects of advertising concerning gambling. Because my concern with respect to gambling advertising, as with the advertising of other vices, such as alcohol and tobacco, is that what happens is something that is essentially negative and bad, for a person gets glamorized and misleads the public into thinking that there is something very positive and fulfilling and wonderful and glamorous about partaking in this.

What happens with our legislation is that it calls for a review, particularly, and an assessment of the effects of advertising concerning gambling, including whether the advertising has increased participation in gambling activity, the effects of various types of advertising, including the sponsorship of sporting events, the relationship between advertising and the amount of the prize that is going to be awarded, and an examination of State lottery advertising practices, including the process by which States award lottery advertising contracts.

I think it is terribly important, because what it strikes me is happening

is we are undermining and misleading the public with respect to creating the false impression that gambling is a legitimate, bona fide, way to get rich quick. That is really what is behind so much of the advertising.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, and I am very happy about this, there was an attempt in the telecom bill to make casino gambling advertising legal on television. That had been brought in from the other body. When in conference, and I was a conferee on that committee, I was able, with the help of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and a number of other people, to make sure that that specific section was knocked out.

Mr. Speaker, we need this to find out exactly what the impact is of advertising on gambling.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, when the 104th Congress began, it was our mandate, it was alleged, to enhance the role of State government, to reduce the role of Federal regulations, to ease the burdens on industry. And now here we are, a year later, creating a new Federal commission to review an industry that has always been the province of the State government, an industry about which the Federal Government has never been involved and has no expertise. And, to compound the problem, this new Commission will all be named by elements of the Federal Government. No involvement by the attorneys general, who have enforced the laws for 200 years, no role by the State Governors, who have had this responsibility, and no role by tribal leaders, who now have the fastest growing element of this industry. We have managed to ask a recommendation uniquely from the one element of government in the entire country with no expertise, no knowledge, and no involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I see the realities that the Commission may carry the day. Let me at least suggest this: The other body has a chance to improve it, get the Governors involved, get the industry involved, get the tribal leaders involved, to make it a better report.

While I may still believe that it is the role of the Federal Government that is not appropriate and I oppose the commission, let us at least for the record make this clear: The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] in his statement earlier made clear, this Commission does not have a mandate for new Federal taxes. It is my belief it does not have a role in new Federal regulations. I have heard no Member come to this floor talking about new Federal taxes on this industry.

Let the record at least be clear on this: this is the most taxed, most regulated, most inspected industry in the United States today. In New Jersey alone we have 1,000 inspectors for 12 casinos. The petroleum industry, the chemical industry, the drug industry,

none of them have that level of involvement. If you own any part of any company involved in casino gaming in New Jersey, you, your family, your finances, your holdings, are inspected.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the other body we can make this a commission that really involves the industry and our States in what is a State industry.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight with reference to this legislation.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1996.

Hon. HENRY HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HYDE: On Tuesday, March 5, the House will consider on the suspension calendar, H.R. 497, to establish a Commission to study the impact of gambling in the United States.

A portion of this legislation directs the Commission to study the impact of campaign contributions on public policy related to gambling.

Under House Rule 10(h) 12 and 15 the Committee on House Oversight has jurisdiction over matters pertaining to "corrupt practices" and "the raising, reporting, and use of campaign contributions for office of Representative. . . ."

The parliamentarian has indicated in consultations with the Committee that the consideration of this bill on suspension does not constitute any precedent for avoidance of this Committee's jurisdiction in future matters that relate to campaign finance as a matter of Federal public policy.

I would appreciate your entering this letter as part of the record during the floor consideration of H.R. 497.

Thank you very much for your cooperation on this matter.

Sincerely,

BILL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN].

(Mr. ENSIGN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I have several contentions with this bill. First of all, I have heard testimony over the last year about that this bill is just a study, and what is wrong with a study? One of the reasons for this study is just to give States the information so that they can make the decision about whether they should have gambling legalized or not, because there is the assertion made that the States do not have the proper information to make that decision at this point.

The sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], his own State defeated a State measure that would have legalized gaming in Virginia, even though they were opposed, I think it was something like 16 to 1, by the casino industry to try to legalize it in that State.

State after State after State is defeating legalized casino gaming. It seems that they do have the information to make the decision that is proper for their own State. And that is my biggest contention with this bill.

Where in the Constitution can anyone point out to me that this body has oversight over legalized casinos that are regulated by a State? Nowhere in the Constitution.

Now, if one wants to regulate Indian gaming or regulate Internet gaming, that is interstate commerce, we certainly have the constitutional jurisdiction to do that. But we do not have the jurisdiction in this body over regular casinos.

Second, this legislation should require that the study commission make recommendations regarding purely State gaming policy issues, and that those recommendations be directed to the States, not to this body. Because our biggest fear is that people will take this information into this body and make either taxes, which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], referred to, or more regulations. We feel that this is a thinly veiled disguise for future regulation of the gaming industry. This is purely a State issue that should stay at the State and local level.

Last, let me conclude by saying that to improve this bill we should at least have local and State input. People on the gaming commission should at least be local mayors, legislators, and State Governors.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, even though the gentleman is bitterly hostile to what we are trying to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ROGERS]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of this venture into the inquiry on gambling is going to be about \$4 million. It occurred to me that this Congress, and I approve of its measures to a large extent, is seeking ways to cut spending, so the \$4 million you might say means nothing. We can gamble that away in 2 minutes.

But this same Congress, which is now about to vote \$4 million for this gambling commission, has eliminated the Administrative Conference of the United States, a little, small bureau that was very useful, which only cost \$1.5 million. We zeroed it out to save \$1.5 million. And now, in a double or nothing mode, we are doubling the expenditure for the purpose of this commission. That is a little odd, and it gives me a great discomfort about the priorities that my own leadership is trying to set in cutting the budget. That is No. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make one other observation. When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] was at the well, he very properly

enumerated a lot of different statistics about what others had learned and other studies have created about the evils of gambling. That is the point.

We all know what the evils of gambling are. We can call the Library of Congress and in 6 minutes get every single report and analysis ever made on gambling and have it on this floor for final consideration of what evil gambling poses to the American public, and we need no commission at all. We have the information at hand. We know it is bad when gambling becomes a vice, not just a play thing.

So I am eager, if at all, to defeat this resolution and go about the business of cutting the budget.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this has been the month of self-repudiation by the Republican majority. Last week, the Party of Free Enterprise brought forward a bill which said that while the free enterprise system can handle telecommunications and computers and automobiles, it is not quite up to peanuts or sugar. So peanuts and sugar remain exempt from the free enterprise system in this Republican bill.

Now the party that talks about States' rights is planning to spend millions of Federal dollars on a study that will, among other things, look into the enormous national question of, and I quote from page 6, "an examination of State lottery advertising practices, including the process by which States award lottery advertising contracts."

Apparently the States, now we are going to test them. We are going to let them experiment with easier issues like Medicaid, welfare, a few things like that. Once they have shown that they can handle Medicaid and welfare, then maybe we will let them handle the tough issue of lottery advertising contracts.

Now, how do people who purport to be advocates of States' rights tell us we are going to spend millions of Federal dollars to investigate the way the States issue lottery contracts, and tell the States how to do it better? Because on page 5 it says this commission shall look into gambling and make such changes, it says, existing Federal, State, and local policy and practices with respect to legalization and propose such changes in those policies and practices as the commission shall deem appropriate.

Here come big brother and sister, not out of the goodness of the heart, by the way, under this fiscally responsible Congress. These people will be paid at an annual rate of \$115,000 a year for 2 years, depending on how many meetings they have. They can self-pay. They can generate meetings for themselves until they myth the \$115,000. And they will be investigating the States

and proposing recommendations and changes in what the States do.

This confirms my view that there is not on the other side any consistent belief in States' rights. The people on the other side believe that the issue should be decided at that level of government where they will like the outcome.

□ 1230

There are many over there who do not think that people should gamble. The States have, from their standpoint, been lax. So forget about the States rights stuff. We will stick Thomas Jefferson back on the shelf. We will spend millions of dollars to make these recommendations of what the States are doing. I presume we will probably be then asked to act on these things.

By the way, whatever happened to the notion of government not interfering with individuals? How dare these adults earn money and go out and gamble. How dare they offend the morality of some of our friends on the other side who do not think it is right.

I read the Washington Post series. Do my colleagues know what it sounded like yesterday? Prohibition of alcohol. Sure, we can find in any human endeavor people who abuse it. There are people who smoke too much and drink too much and gamble too much and they buy more expensive cars than they ought to buy, and there are people who watch too much C-SPAN and become adversely affected.

But in a free society, in a free society, particularly people who purport to distrust government do not answer that by saying, The government will tell you what to do with your money; you are not doing it wisely. That is obviously the premise behind this.

Then, of course, we have the Indians, who have been running casinos quite successfully. And they listen to these kinds of assaults on them and, as I have said before, I believe that this kind of legislation further convinces native Americans that the only mistake in Pat Buchanan's immigration policies is that they come 300 years too late, because the native Americans have been running the gambling quite successfully and they have been benefiting from it. And here comes big brother and sister, millions of dollars, forget about the States, forget about the Indians, forget about individuals rights. We know better and we will tell you what to do. It is wholly inconsistent.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to quote Shakespeare, and probably inartfully, but me thinks "thou doth protest too much" seems to hang over this Chamber today.

I have never heard so many Members defending States rights. This is virgin territory for them, and I welcome them to the ranks of States rights defenders, but I almost began to imagine the Stars and Bars were being waved over there with some vigor because, God forbid, the Federal Government cross into a State to examine its gaming industry.

First of all, there is no proposal to regulate here. There is no proposal to tax. The only proposal is to recommend changes. We do that every day in the thousands. We are great change recommenders. But that would be based on a study made of an industry that is indeed an interstate industry. It is a national phenomenon, and it deals with big, big money. It has an impact on commerce.

Money that is spent in a casino is not money that is spent in a local store or retail outlet, and that is fine. Let people spend the money the way they want. Let them gamble up a storm. I once heard about a slot machine that took wristwatches when you ran out of money. That is all right. Let it happen. But let us know about it. Let us study it. Let us find out what the impact is on our society, on our commerce, and on the people engaged in this activity.

It is a legitimate activity. I would never want to declare it illegal. But what is wrong with learning something about it? I do not think there is anything wrong with it.

All this bill does is set up a commission. We assume and hope and expect that it will be fairly constituted by people of intelligence and integrity, and at the end of the 2 years we will know something about a major industry dealing with important money in this country. I do not see anything wrong with that.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member is pleased to support H.R. 497, legislation to establish a National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission to study gambling in the United States and recommend any appropriate changes in public policy in light of the Commission's findings. The results will provide an objective body of data about the gambling industry which does not currently exist.

This issue is certainly worthy of examination and H.R. 497 is a reasonable step on which to proceed. Over the past 10 years various types of gambling have spread to most every State. The expanded availability of gambling has greatly increased the number of people participating in and the amount of money spent on gambling on a regular basis. Such a large increase over such a short period of time certainly warrants a study of the issue.

It should be noted that this legislation in no way targets one type of gambling over another. Nor, for example, is it intended to concentrate on Indian gaming more than charitable gambling or keno more than video poker.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges support for H.R. 497.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 497, The National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act, I would like

to encourage all of my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican to support the establishment of such a commission.

With the recent explosion in the number of casinos across the country, concerns have been raised about the effects of expanded gambling. Advocates of legalizing gambling promise economic growth, jobs, and windfall of tax revenues. However, we must also consider the negative impacts which include regulatory costs, lost productivity and more importantly, the social costs.

This legislation would create a blue ribbon panel charged with the duty of conducting a comprehensive and objective study of gambling in the United States. Negative impacts of gambling on State and local economies, small businesses and families can no longer be ignored. Crime and social problems related to gambling could add to already overburdened criminal justice and social welfare systems. This issue is of particular concern to myself and my district because of largely unrestricted Indian gaming and its impact on the community. But this is more than a local issue. It is an issue of National social and economic importance.

Mr. Speaker, the States, local governments and citizens need unbiased and factual information about gambling. Gambling must be carefully studied to provide citizens with all the information they need when deciding whether to allow legalized gambling in their communities. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 497.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 497, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 497, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF INTERAGENCY ARCTIC RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 108(b) of Public Law 98-373 (15 U.S.C. 4701(b)), I transmit herewith the Sixth Biennial

Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (February 1, 1994 to January 31, 1996).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 1996.

REPORT ON DEFERRAL AND PROPOSED RESCISSIONS OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-182)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral, totaling \$91 million, and two proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling \$15 million.

The deferral affects the Department of State U.S. emergency refugee and migration assistance fund. The rescission proposals affect the Department of Agriculture and the General Services Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 1996.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore. [Mr. ROGERS] at 1 p.m.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1996

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, last year the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights subpoenaed members of the Florida proposition 187 committee, a grassroots organization interested in curbing illegal immigration. The Commission went so far as to subpoena all of the group's internal documents, including reports, memos, and computer-generated printouts. In the words of one housewife who was paid a visit by a U.S. marshal, she felt intimidated and harassed by the Commission and felt like she was living in the land of the Gestapo.

By statute, the Commission is granted subpoena power to conduct fact-finding hearings on discrimination and racial tensions. But whose civil rights are they protecting? It certainly does not appear to be the rights of those Floridians who were exercising their constitutional rights of free speech and free association.

Regardless of any individual's personal beliefs or political associations, no one should be subjected to this type of intimidation by Federal agencies. It is for this reason that I am introducing the Civil Rights Commission Amendments Act of 1996 to prevent further fishing expeditions at the expense of law-abiding citizens. The bill would allow the Commission to subpoena only government officials, or in cases where a person's right to vote has been violated.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PROMOTING GREATER EDUCATIONAL CHOICE

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus on a very serious debate that has been going on back here in Washington over the last several weeks. In fact, it is a debate that reminds me, the longer I serve in Congress, the more convinced I become that Washington just does not get it.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the fact that the District of Columbia appropriations spending bill is now held up in the other body under the threat of a filibuster, and for one simple reason. That is because Senate Democrats are opposed to the notion of giving low-income students, those students who come from low-income families here in the District of Columbia, educational choice.

The House version of the District of Columbia appropriations bill contains language that appropriates funds for a