

school. I could understand the theory of what the teachers were saying, but didn't learn what I needed to know—that was in a book. I've always been a hard worker and knew if I could get my foot in the door somewhere, I would do a good job. After identifying a job in manufacturing, I still had to fill out the job application as well as read and sign forms. To this day, I don't know what I signed. I could only hope I would not do something that violated what was in those forms.

I went as far as I could in jobs with the minimum amount of reading or writing involved. My supervisors considered me a valuable employee and never suspected I had trouble reading. I felt I had the potential to do more. When a literacy program for adults started at my local library, I finally had an opportunity to get the help I needed so I could do more.

It wasn't until a few years ago that I discovered the reason why I had so much trouble learning to read and write. I have a language-based learning difference—clinically diagnosed dyslexia and attention deficit disorder. At least now I know what I'm dealing with. It was not my fault—I was smart enough. What I needed was a teaching and learning method that worked for me.

There is a difference between learning to read and reading to learn. I first needed to learn how to read and that has taken time. I've been working on my education for almost nine years and I am still taking classes two nights a week. During the same time, I have had to work to support myself. Like most adults, I do not have the luxury of going back to school full-time because I must fulfill other obligations and responsibilities.

There is no "quick fix" solution—two years and you're finished. It is a long process. It is one we all must agree to commit to. There are many more adults like me who, with the right help, can get better jobs and lead more productive lives. They, too, can begin to "give back" to the system.

Thank you for your commitment to help improve the adult literacy system. Around the country, there are many adult learners equally committed to improving the system in addition to their own education. It's great to know we have people like you working with us to make it possible for adults who cannot read, write, or speak English to get the help they need.

Sincerely,

ELAINE W. RANDALL.●

THE GAMBLING LOBBY VERSUS FRANK WOLF

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Congressman FRANK WOLF is a Republican and I am a Democrat, but we have joined with Senator LUGAR and others in proposing a commission to look at where this Nation is going and the question of legalized gambling.

The most casual observer must recognize that we are headed for some problems.

I was pleased to see the editorial in the Washington Post, "The Gambling Lobby v. Frank Wolf," which I ask to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The reality is that one of the reasons the gambling lobby is so effective is the huge amounts of campaign contributions that are provided.

And, as we know from indictments and convictions across the land, the

gambling gentry do not hesitate, from time to time, to get into illegal activity to promote their enterprises.

I am proud of my colleague, FRANK WOLF, for what he is doing, as I am proud of Senator RICHARD LUGAR and the other cosponsors in the Senate.

The Post editorial follows:

THE GAMBLING LOBBY V. FRANK WOLF

A funny thing is happening with the gambling issue in the House. Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.) has been pressing for a useful bill to create a national commission to study the economic and social impact of the spread of gambling, and the bill was making good progress. Mr. Wolf's bill has already cleared the Judiciary Committee and is supposed to go to the floor of the House in early March.

But in the interim, the bill has gone to the House Resources Committee, which claims jurisdiction because the measure affects gambling on Indian reservations. House Resources now plans another set of hearings on the bill, and Mr. Wolf is understandably worried that the hearings might be used to further delay consideration. Given the wide support the bill has—it's hard to argue against a national study of gambling's spread or to pretend there are no national implications to this trend—the danger is that the bill will be killed not directly but by endless delay and amendment.

The American Gaming Association (the gambling industry likes the 17th century drawing room sound of "gaming") insists that it is not opposed to a national study of gambling. But it sees the Wolf bill, as written, as just the first step in an effort by Congress to impose some federal rules on an industry that has so far been largely regulated by the states. It also complains that the commission as set up in the Wolf bill now has no representation from state officials (governors or legislators), even though one of the main purposes of the committee is to provide more objective information to local officials than they usually get from the gambling industry.

These objections strike us mostly as clever ways for the industry to gum up the progress of useful legislation. In particular, it would be foolish to limit the commission's mandate. With the spread of gambling—especially to Indian reservations, whose casinos have ways around state regulation—there may well be a case for some national rules. If any event, it's certainly an issue the commission should debate.

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 Mr. Wolf's bill and construct some ingenious stratagems to weaken it. The issue is whether the House leadership will play along, mouthing kind words about Mr. Wolf's efforts while trying to undermine them. The leaders should not play that game. They should keep the promise and let an undiluted version of the Wolf bill go to the floor on schedule.●

MAIL BALLOT VOTING

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I suppose there is no columnist whose writings I read, and with whom I agree more consistently, than Carl Rowan.

And his recent column about the mail voting experiment in Oregon is no exception.

Every move forward to enlarging the voter franchise has been resisted. That

includes giving voting rights to African-Americans, native Americans and to American women.

And the secret ballot which we prize so much today was not part of our early history.

We have gradually made improvements, despite the objections of many people who were wedded to the status-quo.

I do not suggest that on the basis of the Oregon experiment, we should nationally move to mail voting yet, but I would like to see several States try it, because my instinct is that it is likely to be an improvement over the present system.

I ask that the Carl Rowan column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

A KNOCK AT MAIL BALLOTS IS A KNOCK AT DEMOCRACY

(By Carl Rowan)

The political mentalities of the 1770s and 1950s are bursting out all over now that Oregon has had a successful mail ballot to fill the seat of disgraced Sen. Bob Packwood.

I hear cries that the mail ballot cheapened the election, robbing the vote of the sacred majesty that the framers of our government intended.

I hear complaints that the mail ballot permitted uneducated people "who don't even know the names of their congressmen" to vote.

We're told that it allowed all people to vote without expending the small amount of energy and sacrifice of going to a neighborhood polling place, undermining the notion that "the vote is a precious thing."

This is swallowed by some as the sentimentality of patriotism, but it is, in fact, undemocratic gibberish that ought not override the fact that the Oregon election lifted the percentage of voters to about 65 percent of those eligible, a figure that made democratic participation almost as high as in European countries. It saved Oregon about \$1 million. And it produced results that any Republican could applaud.

So we are to deplore this election as a violation of what "the framers" intended? I remember that the framers counted black citizens as three-fifths of a vote. And women as zero percent of a vote. Naturally, neither I nor my wife is much impressed by a reminder of what the framers believed about the semi-slave status of African-American males, or women.

The framers created a situation under which many states could decree that only the propertied could vote. When that idea and "poll tax" requirements were beaten down, polling places were located where millions of poor, ill minority citizens could not get to because they lacked transportation or couldn't leave their jobs.

Nothing in a neighborhood polling place could be more sacred to deprived citizens than casting their first ballot—primarily because the mail ballot allowed them to do so.

So spare me this balderdash about how this country must return to a respect for what "the framers" intended!

I find especially offensive the complaints that mail ballots were cast by "uninformed, uneducated" citizens. In the 1950s some states had laws requiring "literacy tests" for those seeking to vote. That was implemented in ways where white registrars could deny the ballot to blacks who couldn't answer "correctly" such questions as "How many bubbles in a bar of soap?"

Everyone I've heard deploring the mail ballot would be incensed if anyone accused

them of harboring the racist and sexist views of the framers. Yet they peddle those views almost mindlessly.

We either treasure democracy or we don't. If we do, the more of it the better. So I say of the Motor Voter law and mail ballot: "Welcome and hooray!" •

SENATOR COHEN: WHY I AM LEAVING

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I received a note in the mail from Marion Plancon of Staten Island, NY, and she enclosed an op-ed piece written by our colleague, Senator WILLIAM COHEN, for the Los Angeles Times.

Somehow I missed seeing the original publication of it.

But I have found through the years on the Senate floor and with my service with him in the House, that our colleague, BILL COHEN usually makes sense.

And his call for greater civility, less hostility, more reason, and less shouting is a call that should be heeded in this body, and also by the American public.

I wish that the extremes of partisanship and hostility were only in the House and Senate or only between the administration and Congress.

Unfortunately, we do reflect the American public sometimes more than we should.

We should be a reconciling force, and I fear that we are not.

I ask that the WILLIAM COHEN op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times]

WHY I AM LEAVING

(By William S. Cohen)

Last week, I announced that I would not seek reelection to the Senate for a fourth term. I have been moved by the reaction of my constituents and colleagues. Many expressed sadness over my decision, and nearly all were perplexed. Why are so many leaving the Senate? How can the center hold? Won't the system fall apart?

It is not a case, to continue with Yeats's words, "that the best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity."

Such a poetic construct presumes too much and maligns the character and capabilities of those who have most recently arrived in Congress and those who have chosen to remain.

Those of us leaving the Senate do so for unique and deeply personal reasons. I suspect, however, that we share a common level of frustration over the absence of political accord and the increase in personal hostilities that now permeate our system and our society.

Increasingly, public officials face: Too little time to reason and reflect; the hair-trigger presumption of guilt pulled at the slightest whisper of impropriety; the schizophrenia of a public that wants less government spending, more government services and lower taxes, and the unyielding demands of proliferating single-issue constituencies.

Too many hours are devoted to endless motion without movement, interminable debate without decision and rhetorical finger-pointing without practical problem-solving.

Our republic, we know, was designed to be slow-moving and deliberative. Our Founding

Fathers were convinced that power had to be entrusted to someone, but that no one could be entirely trusted with power. They devised a brilliant system of checks and balances to prevent the tyranny of the many by the few. They constructed a perfect triangle of allocated and checked power, Euclidean in symmetry and balance. There could be no rash action, no rush to judgment, no legislative mob rule, no unrestrained chief executive.

The difficulty with this diffusion of power in today's cyberspace age is that everyone is in check, but no one is in charge.

But more than the constitutional separation of powers is leading to the unprecedented stalemate that exists today. There has been a breakdown in civil debate and discourse. Enmity at times has become so intense that members of Congress have resorted to shoving matches outside the legislative chambers. The Russian Duma, it seems, is slouching its way toward the Potomac as debate gives way to diatribe.

We are witnessing a gravitational pull away from center-based politics to the extremes on both the right and left. Those who seek compromise and consensus are depicted with scorn as a "mushy middle" that is weak and unprincipled. By contrast, those who plant their feet in the concrete of ideological absolutism are heralded as heroic defenders of truth, justice and the American way.

The departure of centrists from party ranks may be cheered by ideologues in the short term. But unless the American people are willing to embrace one party dominance and governance for extended periods (or turn to the British parliamentary model, which I don't recommend), then elements within the liberal and conservative factions will necessarily move back to the center, toward compromise and, yes, consensus.

The American people are experiencing a great deal of anger and anxiety at this time. The stern virtues of self-discipline and fiscal prudence have given way to the soft vices of mindless consumption and selfish gratification. We are now paying for the wages of our sins, and ironically, our citizens are angry with political leaders who have indulged their appetites, purchased their votes and passed the bills to the next generation. The road to fiscal solvency and sanity will not be easy, and it surely will not be paved with the bloated promises of blandishments of political extremists.

I have devoted nearly a quarter of a century to public service and a search for common ground in a society that is growing in complexity and diversity. Although I have decided to enter the private world to pursue new challenges and opportunities, I remain convinced that the American political system will pass through this transitional phase in our history and return to the center, the place where most people live and a democracy functions best. •

JAMES THOMAS VALVANO

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, March 10, 1996, marked what would have been James Thomas Valvano's 50th birthday. It has been almost 3 years since the Queens, NY, native lost a rather public battle with cancer. The intent here, however, is not to eulogize. And any attempt to do so would pale in comparison to the impassioned eloquence of that offered on this floor by my distinguished friend and colleague from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS on April 28, 1993. I did not know Jim Valvano—barely knew of him. But I am aware of the good work done by the

foundation he founded in the final weeks of his life.

On March 4, 1993, Jim Valvano was awarded the inaugural ESPN Arthur Ashe Award for Courage at the American Sports Awards. In an acceptance speech that was widely noted and shall long be remembered, he announced the creation of the V Foundation for Cancer Research. With a Churchillian stoutness of spirit, Valvano set forth the mission:

It may not save my life. It may save my children's lives. It may save someone you love. . . . [I]t's motto is, "Don't give up, don't ever give up." That's what I'm going to do every minute that I have left . . . so that someone else might survive, might prosper and might actually be cured of this dreaded disease. . . . I'm going to work as hard as I can for cancer research and hopefully, maybe, we'll have some cures and some breakthroughs.

Since that night the V Foundation has raised more than \$2.3 million for that mission. Here are just some of the organizations and programs to which the V Foundation has contributed: \$250,000 to fund a national public awareness campaign through the NCCR [National Coalition of Cancer Researchers]; \$100,000 to fund Dr. Gerold Bepler at Duke Comprehensive Cancer Center; \$100,000 to fund a 2-year grant for Dr. Phil Hochhauser at Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center in New York; \$100,000 to the UNC Lineberger Cancer Center for construction of the Jim Valvano Cancer Research Lab; \$100,000 to fund Dr. Leland Powell at the University of California at San Diego; \$100,000 to fund the research of Dr. Thomas Gajewski at the University of Chicago Comprehensive Cancer Center; \$29,000 to the Kosair Children's Hospital in Louisville, KY, for the construction of the Angela Valvano Classroom.

Any basketball coach who carried a collection of Emily Dickinson poems in his gym bag and quoted Edna St. Vincent Millay and Ralph Waldo Emerson to sports reporters most certainly knew the impermanence of athletic achievements. Records are broken, victory banners fade, championship rings tarnish. But when all of these are long forgot, James Thomas Valvano will be remembered to the beneficiaries of the foundation that bears his name. And through them, to us all.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire text of Jim Valvano's remarks at the 1993 ESPN Awards be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. That's the lowest I've ever seen Dick Vitale since the owner of the Detroit Pistons called him in and told him he should go into broadcasting.

I can't tell you what an honor it is, to even be mentioned in the same breath with Arthur Ashe. This is something I certainly will treasure forever. But, as it said on the tape, and I also don't have one of those things going with the cue cards, so I'm going to speak longer than anybody else has spoken tonight. That's the way it goes. Time is very precious to me. I don't know how much I