

that often are the most productive. One of the finest commissions the Nation has had, the Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, produced its report in a little more than 1 year on a small budget and had significant influence.

Let a commission look at where we are and where we should go. My instinct is that sensible limits can be established.

For example, what if any new gambling enterprise established after a specific date had to pay a tax of 5 percent on its gross revenue. Those who are already in the field who are not too greedy should support it because it prevents the saturation of the market. Financial wizard Bernard Baruch said of those who invest in the stock market, "The bears win and the bulls win, but the hogs lose." Gambling enterprises that are willing to limit their expansion are more likely to be long-term winners. And those who know the problems that gambling causes should support this idea because of the limitations.

Or suppose we were to move to some form of supplement to local and State revenue again. States, Indian tribes, and local governments that do not have any form of legalized gambling would be eligible for per capita revenue-sharing assistance. It would require creating a source of revenue for such funding, but would bring some relief to non-Federal governments who do not want gambling but are desperate for additional revenue. There is no way—let me underscore this—of reducing the gambling problem without facing the local revenue problem.

Congressman JIM MCCREY, a Republican from Louisiana, has proposed that lotteries—now exempt from Federal Trade Commission truth-in-advertising standards—should be covered. Why should the New York lottery be able to advertise: "We won't stop until everyone's a millionaire."

These are just three possible ideas. The commission could explore others. The commission can look at how we deal with gambling opportunities that will surface later this year on an experimental basis on cable television and the Internet. How significant could this become? None of us knows.

We do know that two-thirds of problem gamblers come from a home where at least one parent had a problem with alcoholism. Should we be dealing more seriously with alcoholism, in part to deal with the gambling phenomenon?

These and other questions could be studied by a commission.

What should not be ignored by Congress and the American people is that we have a problem on our hands. We need to find sensible and sensitive answers.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, do I have time reserved under a previous order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes.

### GAMBLING

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, as always, the Senator from Illinois raises for this Senate the right questions and in a very sensitive way. I have said previously on this floor in discussing some other items that one of the growth industries in America, regrettably now, is gambling. There is more spent, at least for the more recent year I have seen, there is more spent for gambling in America than is spent on America's national defense. In a recent year, it was \$400 billion-plus just on legal gambling. We spend less than \$300 billion on America's defense. I think all of the questions that relate to this issue of gambling need to be asked and need to be studied.

It was interesting to me one evening when I had the television set on, though I was not really watching it much—and on one of the local stations in the Washington, DC, area they were doing their live drawing for their lottery. They do that live with these little ping-pong balls with numbers on them. It was on the screen. I never participated in those things. This was on the screen, and then across the bottom of the screen scrolled an urgent news bulletin. It was not so urgent that they would take the lottery selection off, because they were doing that live, they did not want to interrupt that.

So they kept on picking the lottery balls out and announcing the numbers. The news scrolled across the bottom of the television screen that Gorbachev had just resigned in the Soviet Union. I was thinking to myself, this is incredibly bizarre. Here is something that will affect the lives of virtually everyone in the world. The leaders of one of the major powers in the world resigns, but instead of cutting in with a news report, they cannot interrupt the lottery, so they scroll it across the bottom of the screen.

That is what we have come to, with respect to this issue of gambling in America today.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President if my colleague will yield for an observation. I thank him. As usual, Senator DORGAN is right on target on this issue.

Today, I regret to say, we have topped \$500 billion now in total gross income. It is a fast-growing industry in the United States.

Mr. DORGAN. That is probably legal wagers. There is substantial illegal wagering in America.

Mr. SIMON. That does not count what happens illegally. The second thing, the Senator mentioned in passing—as you saw them take these balls for the lottery—that you do not spend any money on it. Most people of our income level do not. It is the poor that they try to appeal to. And it is very clear, both from studies and from the advertising, that this is an attempt to extract money from the poor. We ought

to be able to get revenue in a better way for our Government.

Mr. DORGAN. I do not come to the floor suggesting that gambling is always wrong or ought to be made illegal. I think it is very useful to study, and I think that the commission approach makes a lot of sense. We ought to be evaluating what does all of this mean for our country? Who is affected by it, and how? That is what I think the Senator from Illinois was saying. I think it is timely and important. I have indicated that to Congressman WOLF and others, as well.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my colleague.

### LINE-ITEM VETO: WHERE ARE THE HOUSE CONFEREES?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to visit about two other items. One is the line-item veto. As the Presiding Officer knows, we passed a line-item veto here in the Senate in March. I voted for it, as I have on a dozen or 2 dozen occasions previously, because I think we ought to have a line-item veto. I voted for the line-item veto when President Reagan and President Bush were Presidents because I, as a Democrat, think that Presidents, whether Republican or Democrat, ought to have a line-item veto.

The House passed a line-item veto bill on February 6 of this year, and the Senate passed a line-item veto bill in March of this year. Now, there has been no progress since then because there has been no conference between the House and Senate. Why has there not been a conference? Because the Speaker of the House, who always told us he wants a line-item veto, decided he is not going to appoint conferees. So there will be no line-item veto until the Speaker decides he wants to appoint some conferees, and there is a conference and agreement, and then it comes back to both the House and the Senate.

Now, some will probably say that this is because the new majority and the Speaker may want to put their own spending projects in these bills and not have a Democratic President veto them.

This is a newspaper published on Capitol Hill. It says, "Gingrich Gets \$200 Million in New Pork," describing what was written, apparently, in appropriations bills that will benefit the Speaker. He may not want the President to target that \$200 million that was written into a bill that the Pentagon does not ask to be spent. Maybe the President would use a line-item veto to say this is \$200 million that the taxpayers should not have to spend on things the Pentagon did not want.

I noticed this morning in the Washington Post, "Extra Pentagon Funds Benefits Senators' States." It describes in some detail the extra funds put in for projects that the Pentagon has not asked for. These are things that will be built that the Pentagon says we do not want built. But money is added to

those bills to benefit some. The question is, Why would the President not have the line-item veto if all of us agree that he should?

Congressman BOB LIVINGSTON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, said, "We may not want to give it to this President"—speaking of the line-item veto—"right at the outset, but let's give it to him eventually." Those are his words. We may not want to give the line-item veto to this President at the outset.

Speaker GINGRICH, on February 6, before the House passed the line-item veto, said this:

We have a bipartisan majority that is going to vote for the line-item veto. For those who think this city has to always break down into partisanship, you have a Republican majority giving this to a Democratic President this year without any gimmicks, an increased power over spending which we think is an important step for America, and therefore it is an important step on a bipartisan basis to do it for the President of the United States, without regard to party or ideology.

More recently, he said, "My sense is we won't get to it this year."

There was a fervent debate by those who wanted the line-item veto. Somehow that ardor has cooled. Somehow the line-item veto is less important now.

The Speaker has been on a book tour. There is plenty of time to do that all across America and, apparently, to write two books this year, and to earn a bunch of money. But, apparently, there is not enough time to get to the line-item veto—appoint conferees and get to a line-item veto.

Well, Mr. President, there is an old saying, "You can put your boots in the oven, but that doesn't make them biscuits."

The Speaker can talk about the Contract With America and the line-item veto, but if he is not prepared to appoint conferees so that we can pass a line-item veto, then he continues to stall. I suppose the reason for that is he wants his own spending to be written into these bills, or so you would think from this kind of report—"Gingrich Gets \$200 Million in New Pork."

Well, I hope that we can come to a bipartisan consensus that the House ought to appoint conferees, that the Senate and House should have a conference this week, and that the conference should report back the conference report at the end of this week. That way we can pass the line-item veto.

Tomorrow, I intend to offer a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on the line-item veto to the State Department authorization bill. My amendment would say: It is the sense of the Senate that the Speaker of the House should move to appoint conferees on S. 4 immediately, so that the House and Senate may resolve their differences and we can pass a conference report.

I do not understand what this is all about if it is not dragging your feet to protect more Federal spending that

you want for your district in this bill. I thought we had decided on a bipartisan basis that a line-item veto was good for this country. We voted for it, believed in it, and wanted to give it to this President. I voted for it with Republican Presidents in office and I voted for it again. I would like this President to have it. So I intend tomorrow to offer a sense-of-the-Senate resolution and ask Senators to vote to send a message to the Speaker that if you have plenty of time to run around the country on a book tour, you have time, in my judgment, to appoint conferees.

How do you do it? Simple. Think of the names of a few of your friends and then pick some. That is not rocket science; that is just appointing conferees, which we do every day in the House and Senate.

There will be a bill coming to the floor in a few days that authorizes Defense spending. That bill includes a type of spending that is especially, in my judgment, appropriate for a line-item veto. We have something called star wars in this country. It has a better name now; it is not star wars, or ABM, antiballistic missile defenses; now it is BMD, ballistic missile defense system. That is a new acronym for the same old boondoggle. It is something that costs \$30 or \$40 billion, and it will protect against an adversary that no longer exists. But each one of these missile defense programs has a constituency that somehow seems unable to shut the program down. The Soviet Union is gone. That was the antagonist for which the ABM system was designed. The Soviet Union does not exist anymore. But the people who want to build a star wars program continue to plug away.

They added in the Senate Armed Services Committee \$300 million extra for national ballistic missile defense, and then they said let us essentially change the ABM treaty, abrogate the treaty, No. 1 and, No. 2, let us go for accelerated interim deployment in the year 1999 and final deployment by 2002. Well, this \$300 million is a perfect example of what the President ought to use a line-item veto on.

I intend to offer an amendment on the floor of the Senate to strip this \$300 million out of the Defense authorization bill. It does not make any sense to spend \$300 million we do not have on a project we do not need. This is exactly why this President ought to have a line-item veto. The notion that we do not have enough money for an entitlement for a poor kid to have a hot lunch in school, but we have enough money to stick \$300 million extra in a bill for star wars—I do not know what people are thinking about around here.

So I want to alert my colleagues that I am going to offer an amendment to cut this national missile defense funding. But more generally, this provision is exactly why we need a line-item veto.

#### MERGERS AND TAKEOVERS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I noticed this morning that there is a news report out that Disney Corp. is intending, for some \$19 billion, according to the news reports, to purchase Capital Cities/ABC. Now, it would be the second largest takeover in U.S. history if the Disney Corp. purchases Capital Cities/ABC. I am concerned when I hear, day after day and week after week, new proposals—friendly or hostile proposals—to merge America's largest businesses into larger and larger enterprises. We have seen merger mania in this country before, a wave that came and went, but it now seems to be coming again.

You only have to pick up a newspaper these days to see who is buying whom, some with leveraged buyouts, some in hostile takeover proposals, and others simply friendly mergers. But it is inevitably true in this country that when two corporations become one larger corporation, especially in multibillion-dollar deals, it impedes competition.

You have less competition in this country as you have more concentration. Nobody seems to care very much about it. We have a thousand attorneys working in the Federal Government on antitrust issues. Under the leadership of Anne Bingaman down at Justice, they are more active now, and I salute them for that.

We need to get more and more active to make sure that these mergers are in the public interest. We need to ensure that a decision by two corporations to combine to make a larger corporation, and grab a larger market share, does not impede the competition that drives the free market system.

I have a list of the large proposals for mergers just in the last week and months, large financial institutions, large manufacturing institutions. Frankly, I think we in the Congress ought to take a close look at this practice. I intend to ask the committees of jurisdiction to do that.

If a person goes downtown and buys a shirt or a blouse at a department store, you will be required to pay a sales tax, a tax for the transaction. I, personally, think we ought to have a fee that is supplied to those who want to buy corporations.

We had a \$25 billion acquisition several years ago in which KKR purchased Philip Morris. I think they should have paid a fee. That fee ought to be used as a resource bank of funds for investment capital for small businesses. When big businesses combine and provide less competition and more concentration, we ought to get a fee from that that is used as seed money and seed capital for small businesses, which represent the development of more competition.

I hope that in the coming weeks we will be able to discuss this in relevant committees. I do not have any notion about what the proposed merger between Disney and Capital Cities/ABC is