of strings. In their view, whether liberal or conservative strings, they are still strings.

We know there may be some areas where we may not be able to accommodate the Governors. By and large, they are looking forward to designing their own plan when it comes to welfare. We also have a provision where you can opt out of the Food Stamp Program. What the Governors would like, of course, is more block grants. We are not able to do that because we do not have the votes.

I asked the Democratic Governors, when I spoke to the full session of the National Governors' Association at 9:45, to take a look at this proposal. We believe it can be approached on a nonpartisan, bipartisan basis. It is what the Governors have been telling us for years, in both parties, that they wanted—more power to the Governors, power to the States, power to the people.

This is all sort of patterned after the 10th amendment to the Constitution, which is part of the Bill of Rights. It is only 28 words in length, which says, in effect, that unless the power is vested in the Federal Government, it ought to be with the people and with the States.

Most Governors, regardless of party, believe that should happen, whether it is welfare reform, whether it is Medicaid, whatever it is. They believe they can better implement and rate the programs at less cost, less redtape, less bureaucracy, and provide better service to the people who must rely on Medicaid, food stamps, welfare, and AFDC—whatever the welfare program might be.

I was very encouraged after the meeting with the Republican Governors. They know there are some differences on the Republican side. They will be weighing in very heavily on the proposal this week. We hope to take it up either Friday or Saturday of this week and finish it sometime next week or the following week. I hope that before we conclude, we will have broad bipartisan support.

PRAISE FOR GIFT BAN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on another matter, I want to again thank my colleagues, Senator LOTT and Senator MCCONNELL, as well as Senator LEVIN, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator FEINGOLD, and many others on both sides of the aisle who worked together on the gift ban proposal.

As I said on the floor on Friday, I think we made a lot of progress. I read the editorial in the New York Times which indicated many fought it to the bitter end, which was not true. Editorial writers are entitled to their opinion, but they are not entitled to lie. If they had followed the debate, they would have known there was a lot of work going on all week long, in good faith, by Democrats and Republicans, by the leader, by the Democratic leader.

What we finally did was say, ''OK, we agree on this. We cannot agree on three things. We will agree on what we agree on and vote on what we cannot agree on.'' That is precisely what we did.

So, to the editor, whoever wrote that in the New York Times—I do not normally read it, but Sunday was a slow day—I hope that they will try to at least stick with the facts, maybe once a year, twice a year. We do not want to overdo it for the New York Times, but every little bit would help. They are entitled to facts, they are entitled to opinions, but understand what the facts are. And it is supposed to be the paper of ''all the news that is fit to print''—some say a 10th, but I say all the news fit to print. We hope for more responsibility from the editorial board of the New York Times.

The primary purpose was to thank my colleagues for all the work they did and the good-faith effort. I think we made a giant step forward, and, hopefully, we will ease the concerns of many of our constituents when it comes to Members of Congress and gift rules.

Also, lobbying reform was another bipartisan effort on the floor. I thank my colleagues who were engaged in that.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader's time.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 1:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak up to 5 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] is recognized to speak for up to 30 minutes.

The Senator from Illinois.

THE EXPLOSIVE GROWTH OF GAMBLING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in November of last year, when I announced I would retire from the Senate after 1996, President Clinton suggested that with the freedom from political restraint I now have, and with slightly more credibility because political opportunism would not be the immediate cry of critics, I should, from time to time, make observations about our Nation, where we are going, and where we should go.

One of the marks of our civilization, virtually unnoticed as we discuss the Nation's problems, is our fastest-growing industry: gambling.

Local governments, Indian tribes, and States—all desperate for revenue—increasingly are turning to what appears to be a quick and easy solution: legalized gambling. And, temporarily, it often works. Poverty-stricken Indian tribes suddenly have revenue. Cities like East St. Louis, IL, with every possible urban malady, find themselves with enough revenue to at least take care of minimal services.

There are four basic questions:

First, how rapidly is this phenomenon growing?

Second, what are its advantages?

Third, what are its disadvantages?

Fourth, is there a role for the Federal Government to play, and should it play a role?

Gambling is not a new phenomenon. The Bible and early historical records tell of its existence. Gambling surfaced early in U.S. history, then largely disappeared as a legal form of revenue for State and local governments. It remained very much alive, however, even though illegal, in the back rooms of taverns and in not-so-hidden halls, often with payoffs to public officials to ''look the other way'' while it continued. I particularly remember traveling overseas and back while in the U.S. Army. The troop ship became one huge gambling operation with dice or cards, activity slowed only by the occasional walking tour of a conscientious officer whose coming would be foretold by someone taking the voluntary watch for his fellow enlisted men—and they were then all men—who gambled. After the watchman's signal, suddenly that portion of the ship's deck or hold could meet the highest puritanical standards. Within seconds of the disappearance of the dreaded officer, the games would begin again. Participation had no appeal to me, not primarily for moral reasons, but I have always been too conservative with my money to enjoy risking it that way. What I remember about those shipboard activities was the enormity of the stakes that could be built up—enormous for enlisted men on meager salaries in 1951–1953—and the ability of some of my friends to continue their activity with almost no sleep.

Gambling's appeal, particularly for the idle—and a troop ship is loaded with them—is clear.

Early in our Nation's history, almost all States had some form of lottery, my State of Illinois being no exception. When Abraham Lincoln served in our State legislature from 1834 to 1842, lotteries were authorized, and there apparently was no moral question raised about having them. In 1839, for example, the Illinois House of Representatives voted unanimously to authorize a lottery to raise funds ''for the purpose of draining the ponds of the American bottom'' in the vicinity of what is now East St. Louis, an area that to this day has a severe drainage problem, and a city that today has a significant gambling presence.

In Illinois and other States the loose money quickly led to corruption, and the States banned all forms of gambling. Illinois leaders felt so strongly about it, they put the ban into the State constitution. For many years, Louisiana had the only lottery, and