Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I want to speak just briefly on two subjects.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL E. MOSS

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I served for 10 years over in the House. Handling the garage entrance there has been a police officer, D.E. Moss. I learned today he is retiring today. I am probably like most of my colleagues. We just do not thank people around here enough. Here is an officer who is great to us who serve in Congress. More importantly, he has been great to the public. He has just made a great impression for the U.S. Government and has served our people well.

I think of him. I think of Ed Litton who is down in the Dirksen Building, an officer who works there at the subway. But it is true of the people who record what we have to say, whether it has merit or not, the people who sit at the front desks, the pages, the people who work the doors, all the people who really make this place function so well.

D.E. Moss' retirement is a good occasion to remember that we are in debt to a great many people.

Mr. CRAIG. Would the Senator from Illinois allow me just a few comments in that regard?

Mr. SIMON. I would be pleased to yield to my colleague.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAUL SIMON

Mr. CRAIG. While I do not want to speak of Mr. Moss—and I am pleased you recognized him—I want to speak about you for just a moment, and to thank you for the relationship you and I have had on the issue of the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We were not successful a few moments ago on another very important vote.

But I must say, in all fairness—and I want the Record to show this—that over the years that you and I have worked side by side on this issue, I think most of the public watching would have said, ''Isn't that interesting. Here is a liberal and a conservative.''

We took the politics out of this. It was a bipartisan effort, a strong one, on the part of the Senator from Illinois and this Senator. Out of that relationship and our commitment for fiscal responsibility, I have developed a very fond respect for you and all of the work you do. While you and I disagree on a lot of issues, we have worked together very, very well.

Let me thank you publicly, and for the Record, for the tremendous effort you put forth and the contribution you have made toward bringing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to the American people. A very special thanks to the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my colleague from Idaho, and my thanks to Senator COVERDELL from Georgia. I knew Senator CRAIG when he was Congressman CRAIG. We said hello, but that was just about it. But I had a chance to work with Senator CRAIG here and came to have great respect for him. I am grateful to all those who were helpful to us: Senator HATCH, Senator THURMOND, Senator HEFLIN, Senator BRYAN, others in both political parties.

A balanced budget constitutional amendment, one of these days, has to pass. The question is, how much we are going to hurt our Nation before we pass it. There is just no question, if we had passed it back when John F. Kennedy complained about spending $9 billion on interest—today we are spending $344 billion on gross interest—what a much better country we would have. We cannot wait another 5 or 10 years. We are going to have chaos.

THE GROWTH OF LEGALIZED GAMBLING

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I will speak just briefly on another subject. That is, Senator LUGAR and I and Senator WARNER and a total of 25 of us on both sides have introduced a bill to say, let us have a study of the growth of legalized gambling in our country.

This is not the most Earth-shaking thing, but the fastest growing industry in our country is legalized gambling. And there are problems with that. It is the only form of addiction that Government promotes. We would be shocked if we saw a sign saying, ''Smoke Marlboro cigarettes. You know, they're fun to smoke'' or ''Drink more whiskey. You'll really have a good time,'' because both of those provide revenue for Government. But we do not seem to be shocked when there are billboards, like on the south side of Chicago, saying, ''The Illinois lottery—this is your way out.'' This is the impoverished area of Chicago. That is not the way out for people. It is education. It is hard work. It is the kind of things that we know have to be done.

So Senator LUGAR, Senator WARNER, and I introduced this legislation. To the credit of Senator STEVENS and his committee, it was reported out by voice vote. Now we want to move it through the Senate. The House has already passed a bill. We have to work the two out.

My hope is that we could get this done quickly. I spoke last week to Senator DOLE. I would love to see, before BOB DOLE leaves, the Senate have us pass this legislation.

The New York Times 3 days ago had an editorial urging the Senate to pass this legislation.

The Christian Science Monitor has an editorial. The last paragraph reads:

> It's time society knew the real costs of gambling. The Senate should pass the measure without delay.

I hope we do this. I have no illusions. We are not going to stop legalized gambling in this country. We are not going to close Las Vegas or Atlantic city. But I think we should be looking at the possibility of steps to limit the growth. For example, you can now or shortly will be able to, on the Internet, gamble by computer using your American Express or Visa or some card. We do not know where that is going to lead. I think a commission ought to be looking into this.

There are people who get addicted. I got into this because my mother is a member of a Lutheran Church in Collinsville, IL. And a substitute teacher at a Lutheran school of that church, unknown to her family, got addicted to gambling. They thought the money was going for rent and paying the bills and so forth. One day they came home and there was a note saying you could find her in the shopping mall parking lot. She had committed suicide. She went to a riverboat casino and got addicted. And you know, these stories multiply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these two editorials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1996]

GAMBLING IN THE SENATE

Despite intense opposition from the gambling industry, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee has approved a worthwhile measure to create a national commission to review the social and economic impact of casinos and state-run lotteries. Chances are good that it would win easy approval by the Senate, much as a similar bill unanimously passed the House in March. But there remains a danger that Senate Republican leaders may try to kill the measure quietly by failing to allow time for a vote on the Senate calendar.

The bill approved by the Senate committee is a somewhat watered down version of the House plan, which was proposed by Representative Frank Wolf, a Virginia Republican. But it is a marked improvement over the revision proposed earlier by Ted Stevens of Alaska, the committee chairman. The compromise fashioned by Mr. Stevens and the bill's sponsors—Richard Lugar, Republican of Indiana, and Paul Simon, Democrat of Illinois—grants the commission adequate subpoena power and a sufficiently broad mandate to examine gambling's consequences in communities around the country.

As various forms of gambling have spread across the nation, there has been little effort to examine the economic and social impact. State and local political leaders faced with deciding whether to approve gambling in their area, or expand its presence, often have little hard information available to assess the advantages and disadvantages to their communities.

Bob Dole, now in his final days as Senate majority leader, has indicated support for a Federal commission, despite heavy financial support for his Presidential campaign from the gambling industry. But, at least for now, the bill is not on the list of measures he hopes to pass before he departs the Senate around June 11. Mr. Dole's likely sucesssor, Trent Lott of Mississippi, has voiced reservations about forming a national commission.

With pro-gambling lobbyists working overtime to defeat those good idea, the best step now would be for Mr. Dole to bring the bill to the Senate floor before he departs. In doing so he can serve the public good and demonstrate his independence from a wealthy special-interest group.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 20, 1996]

GAMBLING: A BAD BET

The Senate Governmental Affairs Committee last week approved a bill to set up a national commission to study gambling in the United States.

The bill calls for the commission to examine the social and economic impact of gambling on communities and individuals and issue a report within two years. it would look at all forms of gambling, including new forms of interactive computer technology and gambling over the Internet. Three commission members would be named by the president, three by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and three by the Senate majority leader. The board would hold public hearings and have the power to subpoena witnesses.

Such a study, which joins a number of state-sponsored inquiries, is long overdue. The states' headlong rush over the last 20 years into lotteries, bingo, riverboat casinos, and other gaming was accompanied by promises of economic development, more state funding for schools and other services, and ''harmless'' entertainment.

Not one of these promises has come to pass. Instead of economic development, discretionary spending is drained away from other, more-productive spending on goods, services, or entertainment. Instead of spending more on education or social services, legislators have taken away general funds in equal amounts and merely replaced the money with lottery and keno revenues. Instead of harmless entertainment, there is organized-crime involvement, gambling addiction, and a whole host of personal problems fed by the lure of ''easy money.'' The states, themselves addicted to gaming revenues, are forced to invent new games to augment lottery earnings lost to competition.

The gambling industry opposes creation of this commission, worried it will find that gambling causes more problems than benefits for states and communities.

It's time society knew the real costs of gambling. The Senate should pass the measure without delay.

Mr. SIMON. I urge Senator DOLE, if possible, prior to Tuesday, to bring this up. I would hope we could pass it quickly. If that cannot happen, I hope Senator LOTT or Senator COCHRAN, I am not voting on who will be the leader over there on their side, but I hope that we could move on this quickly. I think it is clearly in the national interest. This, again, is not an attempt to stop legalized gambling in this country. It is an attempt to say ''Let's look at where we are.''

I see the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. He is nodding, either because I was speaking, or he wishes to speak. I yield the floor to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

MEDICARE TRUST FUND SOLVENCY

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise today with grave concerns that the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund is no longer creeping toward insolvency, but galloping toward it.

This is very serious news. Based on the Medicare trustees' report released yesterday, Wednesday, June 5, the Medicare HI trust fund is going bankrupt earlier than expected. In fact, according to the trustees' report, of which three of the six trustees are members of President Clinton's Cabinet, the trust fund may run out of money as early as calendar year 2000.

What is happening to the Medicare trust fund is pretty basic. The program is paying out more than it is taking in. This simple dynamic, if left unchecked, will lead Medicare to bankruptcy in less than 5 years. And, simply put, bankruptcy of the trust fund means there will not be money to pay the hospital bills of our senior citizens and disabled individuals reliant on Medicare.

Medicare is on a collision course, and we cannot afford not to act. Taking no action to avert Medicare's collision course toward bankruptcy means leaving millions of seniors and disabled beneficiaries with an empty promise. I believe this is wrong.

It is time to put politics aside.

To address Medicare's financial crisis, it has been suggested appointing a bipartisan commission to develop a solution. I support the establishment of a commission. A commission could facilitate addressing the Medicare crisis. But, I cannot support the idea of establishing a commission if this is a delay tactic or a tactic to avoid addressing the issue.

I am concerned because, frankly, the administration's track record in proposing a solution is not good. Last year, the administration ignored the Medicare crisis. President Clinton's fiscal year 1996 budget did not include any proposals to shore up Medicare's fiscal debt, nor did his budget claim there was a problem. We are facing a crisis. A crisis requires action.

There is a lot of talk about wanting to get down to business to solve the Medicare trust fund crisis. Didn't anyone notice that we tried that last year? That in the Senate we put forward a proposal that would have truly preserved and protected the Medicare Program, not just through the next 5 years, but for the next generation.

Our proposal would have kept our promise to leave a legacy of a robust Medicare program for our children and our grandchildren. And yet, the Clinton administration played politics with Medicare and waged a ''Medi-Scare'' campaign. Yet, again, Democrats now are saying that Republicans are resorting to scare tactics.

I do not agree that scare tactics include alerting the public to factual information reported by the Medicare trustees.

''Medi-Scare'' tactics were used last fall as Congress worked to preserve and strengthen the Medicare program.

Instead of debating the issues and focusing on the need to preserve Medicare, others resorted to political rhetoric that played on the public's emotions and distorted the truth. Democrats kept talking about Medicare ''cuts'', when not one of the Republican proposals would have cut benefits. The program was not ''cut,'' in fact, spending would have increased every year under the Republican reforms. And, then there was the final emotional play linking changes to the Medicare program to a tax cut. According to the Washington Post last September, even this tactic was refuted: ''The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically.''

Now, is the time to put partisanship aside. Time is running short, and we need to work together to avert the crisis.

There are three very basic, but crucial facts that we can not avoid—these three facts are:

Fact: if changes are not enacted into law, the trust fund will continue on its course toward bankruptcy and there is no provision in the law allowing for HI expenditures to be made on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries.

Fact: according to the Medicare trustees, Medicare will be bankrupt in 2001.

Fact: the year 2000—the last year the Trustees believe Medicare will be solvent, is less than five years away.

Given the very short time-time Medicare will remain solvent, and given the demographic progression of the Medicare program, we cannot afford more delay. We are already 2 years closer to insolvency because we lost a year to address the problem, and the program is one more year closer to bankruptcy than we expected, yet we are miles away from reaching an agreement on a solution.

Demographic trends will continue to increase financial pressure on the trust fund. Today, there are less than 40 million Americans who qualify to receive Medicare. By the year 2010, the number will be approaching 50 million, and by 2020, it will be over 60 million. While these numbers are increasing, the number of workers supporting retirees will decrease. While we have almost four workers per retiree today, we will have about two per retiree by the year 2030.

Yet, my friends on the other side of the aisle will point out that the President took action in 1993 to extend the life of the HI Trust Fund—he raised taxes. President Clinton's 1993 budget he enacted into law included two taxes to bail out the trust fund. First, the 1993 Clinton budget increased taxes on workers by taxing all wages earned, and second, the 1993 budget increased the amount Social Security benefits are subject to taxation from 50 percent to 85 percent.