

Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Shimkus
Horn	Ney	Simpson
Hostettler	Northup	Smith (MI)
Hulshof	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Hutchinson	Nussle	Souder
Isakson	Packard	Spence
Istook	Paul	Stearns
Jenkins	Pease	Stump
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)	Sununu
Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)	Sweeney
Kasich	Petri	Talent
Kingston	Phelps	Tancredo
Klink	Pickering	Tauzin
Kolbe	Pitts	Taylor (MS)
Kuykendall	Pombo	Taylor (NC)
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Terry
Largent	Ramstad	Thomas
Latham	Reynolds	Thornberry
Leach	Riley	Thune
Lewis (KY)	Roemer	Tiahrt
LoBiondo	Rogan	Toomey
Lucas (OK)	Rogers	Trafficant
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Upton
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
McCrery	Roukema	Walden
McHugh	Royce	Walsh
McInnis	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
McIntosh	Ryun (KS)	Watkins
McKeon	Salmon	Watts (OK)
McKinney	Sanford	Weldon (FL)
McNulty	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Metcalf	Scarborough	Weller
Mica	Schaffer	Whitfield
Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Miller, Gary	Sessions	Young (AK)
Moran (KS)	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Myrick	Shays	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9

Abercrombie	Callahan	Mink
Bentsen	Coburn	Obey
Brown (OH)	Lofgren	Slaughter

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra	Frost	Shuster
Billbray	John	Strickland
Brown (CA)	Lipinski	Thompson (MS)
Capps	Quinn	Towns
Clay	Reyes	Wu

□ 2155

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 49, I was unable to be on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 42, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 744

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name taken off H.R. 744. It was mistakenly placed on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to speak for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for the remainder of the week and next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have had our last vote for the week. There will be no votes tomorrow, on Friday, March 12.

On Monday, March 15, the House will meet at 2 p.m. for a pro forma session. Of course, there will be no legislative business and no votes that day.

On Tuesday, March 16, the House will meet at 9:30 a.m. for the morning hour and at 11 a.m. for legislative business. Votes are expected after noon on Tuesday, March 16.

□ 2200

On Tuesday, we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices.

Also on Tuesday, March 16, the House will take up H.R. 819, the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 1999.

On Wednesday, March 17, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider the following legislative business:

H.R. 975, a bill to provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports and to establish a steel import notification monitoring program; and H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999.

On Thursday, March 18, we expect a national security briefing on the House floor from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m. to discuss the ballistic missile threat. Of course, all Members will want to attend.

The House will then take up H.R. 4, a bill to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, we expect to conclude legislative business next week on Thursday, March 18.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman could address one concern that we have. On Tuesday, I know that the schedule is relatively light in terms of business. We have the two suspensions which I suspect are relatively non-controversial. I am wondering if it would not be possible to help the folks on the West Coast if we could not roll and postpone votes until about 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. ARMEY. Let me thank the gentleman for his inquiry. I think it is an important point, a point a lot of Members have made, but in the interest of a good bit of the committee work that we hope to conclude in preparation for the appropriations season soon before

us, we really feel that we need that time to have Members in town. Therefore, we constructed the schedule to that end.

Mr. BONIOR. Could the gentleman inform us when he expects the supplemental appropriation bill to come to the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate that. I believe the Committee on Appropriations reported a supplemental bill out today. We will probably find it filed on Tuesday of next week and would have it available then for the week following.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague and wish him a good weekend.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank him and I hope you all have a good weekend.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 15, 1999

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND
COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 94-304 as amended by section 1 of Public Law 99-7, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. WOLF of Virginia;
Mr. SALMON of Arizona;
Mr. GREENWOOD of Pennsylvania; and
Mr. FORBES of New York.

There was no objection.

GAMBLING EFFORT DIES IN
PENNSYLVANIA SENATE

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

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House today the following Philadelphia Inquirer headline where it says gambling efforts die in Pennsylvania Senate. This Monday, the Pennsylvania State Senate rejected a resolution by the vote of 28 to 21 calling for

three statewide gambling referendums. Gambling was rejected despite the gambling lobby's political campaign contribution of \$606,000. This is a very large amount of money for a State with no gambling except for horse racing and State lotteries.

Madam Speaker, people got involved at the grass roots level. The people learned the truth about how gambling is bad for families and communities, especially the poor and the Nation's youth. Also, the newspapers had the courage to speak out about how gambling brings crime, and corruption, and cannibalizes local businesses and breaks up families.

What took place in Pennsylvania should give great hope to any community that if it wants to eradicate and remove gambling or keep it out, it can do it. I congratulate the Pennsylvania State Senate for its actions on Monday.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 8, 1999]

GAMBLING CONTRIBUTIONS

GAMBLING INTERESTS HAVE DONATED GENEROUSLY TO RIDGE, LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

HARRISBURG.—Gov. Tom Ridge and legislative leaders have accepted at least \$606,000 in contributions from gambling interests and their lobbyists in recent years, according to a report published Monday.

Ridge received about \$240,000 from gambling interests, including lobbyists, since he began raising money for his 1995 campaign. Legislative leaders and their committees took in \$366,100, according to the analysis by The Philadelphia Inquirer.

Lawmakers and lobbyists rejected the notion of any link between campaign money and legislative action. Further, they said the gambling interests have been relatively restrained in their giving, compared with what has taken place in other states.

"I don't think the industry really felt that (large contributions) was the approach they wanted to take," said Obra S. Kernodle 3d, a lawyer-lobbyist who is a principal in a Philadelphia company that wants to build a riverboat casino.

"I can't see a relationship between the contributions and a vote on any issue—especially this issue," said Senate Minority Leader Robert J. Mellow, D-Lackawanna.

Anti-gambling activists say the contributions are unseemly and that the money at least helped push gambling to the top of the 1999 legislative agenda.

Gambling legislation "is being passed on a cash and carry basis," said Tom Grey, a national antigambling activist who has been involved in efforts to defeat the referendum bill. "Legalized gambling gives (lawmakers) the cash, and they carry the bill."

"Special interests, through campaign contributions and hiring every lobbyist in town, are driving the system with the pedal to the metal," said Barry Kauffmann, executive director of Pennsylvania Common Cause. "It's an increasingly troubling part of the way the process is being run."

The referendum bill, which the House approved last month, would let voters state their opinions about three potential expansions of legalized gambling: riverboat casinos, video poker in bars and slot machines at four horse tracks. Lawmakers then must shape legislation to legalize any new games.

Ridge has said he would sign the bill, but also says he will demand that any actual expansion of gambling would have to be approved, project by project, in subsequent local referendums.

It is impossible to determine how much gambling interest spend on lobbying, because current disclosure laws provide no meaningful information. A tough new disclosure law takes effect in June.

Among the campaign-finance reports examined by The Inquirer were those listing contributions during the two election cycles to Ridge, the Republican and Democratic leaders in both houses, House and Senate campaign committees controlled by the leaders, and funds maintained by the Republican and Democratic state committees.

Most of the gaming-related contributions to Harrisburg leaders in recent years, about \$438,000, came from the horse-racing industry and its lobbyist, records show.

And most of that came from four lobbying firms with horse-racing clients—Pugliese Associates, Greenlee Associates, S.R. Wojdak & Associates and the law firm of Buchanan Ingersoll—that contributed a total of \$311,000 to the governor and top lawmakers, records show.

Riverboat-gaming advocates gave about \$85,000; casino companies donated a total of \$58,000; and video-poker interests gave about \$25,000. The Inquirer reported.

SWIFT VOTE DOOMS BID FOR BALLOT QUESTION (By Glen Justice, Ken Dilanian and Rena Singer)

HARRISBURG—With virtually no debate, the Pennsylvania Senate yesterday killed the effort to expand legalized gambling in the state and left little room for the issue to be resurrected anytime soon.

The Senate voted, 28-21, to declare as unconstitutional the bill passed last month by the House that would have authorized a public vote on the gaming issue. By doing so, the Senate essentially eliminated any chance of legalizing gambling while Gov. Ridge is in office. Ridge, whose term ends in January 2003, has insisted on a referendum before he would consider signing any gambling bill.

"If gambling isn't dead, it is in a pretty deep coma, and I don't see it coming out," Senate President Pro Tempore Robert Jubelirer (R., Blair) said after the vote.

The governor echoed that view, saying it was "time to move on" to other issues. And one longtime supporter of legalized gaming, Sen. Robert Tomlinson (R., Bucks), conceded "it's going to be a long time" before any new forms of gambling come to the state.

The end came swiftly to the proposal to ask voters in the May 18 primary whether they approved of riverboat gambling, slot machines at horse-racing tracks, and video poker in taverns. The House had debated for 10 hours over two days last month before approving the proposal to place the nonbinding questions on the ballot.

But the Senate wasted little time in dispatching the issue. As soon as the issue came to the floor, a gaming opponent, Sen. David Brightbill (R., Lebanon), invoked a parliamentary maneuver by asking the Senate to consider the bill's legality under the state constitution. One senator rose briefly to oppose the move, and then the roll-call vote was taken.

Within minutes, the issue that had commanded the legislature's attention since January was over.

The vote was a blow to the horseracing industry, which has been losing customers to Delaware and West Virginia, where slots are legal. Another loser was the tavern industry, which saw the video-poker proposal as a way to boost what it says are sagging sales. Mayor Rendell saw riverboat gambling as a way to raise money for Philadelphia's schools.

"There is nothing on the horizon that will provide our kids with adequate funding for

education," Rendell said yesterday, with resignation and a touch of bitterness in his voice. "I'd like to ask the senators who voted this way: Where is funding for our kids going to come from? I'm just perplexed."

But opponents, including church groups and community activists, hailed the vote. They had warned that an expansion of gambling would lead to a plague of social ills.

Several lawmakers said yesterday that the Senate's move to declare the proposal unconstitutional was a quick way to kill a bill that did not have the votes. The vote has no legally binding effect. That would be for the courts to decide.

"It's definitely a signal there weren't sufficient votes for all three forms of gambling to get on the ballot," said Senate Majority Leader F. Joseph Loeper (R., Delaware), adding that the vote was "a litmus test for where the rest of the issue would have gone."

Proponents—and even some critics—had been saying the votes were there to send the bill to the governor's desk. But they spoke too soon. Most senators who had been undecided as late as last week ended up voting against gambling yesterday.

The margins going into yesterday's vote were seen as too close to call.

The day opened with a strong showing by more than 100 pro-gambling demonstrators, most from the state's racetracks, who jammed the capitol's hallways carrying signs.

But gambling backers saw a bad omen early in the day when Rendell, long a supporter of riverboat gambling, pulled out of a scheduled news conference so he could keep lobbying for the bill.

Interviews with 47 of 50 senators or their aides two weeks ago showed senators were nearly tied on the issue, with nine undecided, three unreachable, and one who declined comment. Of that group, 10 voted to call the referendum unconstitutional; two voted against that finding; and one, Sen. Anthony Hardy Williams (D., Phila.), did not vote. Williams said he was upstairs in the office portion of the buildings during the vote and did not make it to the floor in time. He said he would have voted against gambling.

Some last-minute decision-makers said they receive considerable constituent input against gambling. Sen. James Gerlach (R., Chester) said he was shown a poll paid for by gambling opponents indicating that 65 percent of his district was against riverboat casinos, 65 percent against video poker, and 55 percent against slot machines at horse-racing tracks.

Gerlach said he voted that the bill was constitutional because he supports referendums, but added that he would have voted to defeat gambling.

"This became the quickest and least painful way to bring closure to the issue," said Stephen C. MacNett, counsel to the Senate Republicans.

Sen. Vincent Fumo (D., Phila.), who has supported riverboat gambling in the past but had worked to defeat the current bill, called it "a polite way of letting it go away."

Fumo's usually ally, Rendell, expressed frustration.

He noted that gambling is allowed in West Virginia, Delaware, New Jersey, Connecticut and New York. "I mean, we're like ostriches—we stick our heads in the sand," he said.

The vote caused friction between the two powerful men.

Rendell called Fumo's stance "a shame, because he did it for a purely political reason. He's always been a supporter of our [riverboat] legislation."

Rendell said he meant that Fumo was worried about "what gambling would do on the ballot in May to the turnout," presumably to Fumo's choice for mayor, Democrat Marty Weinberg.

Fumo rejected that assertion, saying he did not believe a referendum would have hurt Weinberg. He said he opposed it because he thought it would lose, killing chances for gambling forever.

"I don't know why he went on such a fool's errand," Fumo said of Rendell. He added that he was miffed at the mayor for calling Democratic senators.

I've delivered for him when nobody else would," Fumo said. "This just makes it harder the next time I have to do something for him."

Gaming advocates had fought for years to advance the issue and had pushed especially hard in recent months, hoping the May ballot was a window of opportunity.

Tavern owners statewide held rallies and visited lawmakers to push poker. The horse-racing industry continued its effort in the hope of bolstering its competitive position with slot-machine revenue. And riverboat companies such as President Casinos Inc., Ameristar Casinos Inc., and Epic Horizon LP added their lobbying clout.

Gaming interests and their lobbyists made political contributions totaling more than \$606,000 to Gov. Ridge and a handful of legislative leaders in the last two election cycles. In recent years, though gambling bills have met with varying degrees of success, none has been signed and advocates were hopeful that 1999 might be the year.

But Pennsylvania's antigambling lobbyists, a diverse group of religious and community interests, worked hard after the House passed the bill to have the upper chamber defeat it.

Michael Geer, president of Pennsylvanians Against Gambling Expansion, said the grassroots work done by activists in his camp had an effect.

"The reason it happened is [senators] heard the voice of the people in the state," he said.

But gambling supporters said the defeat had more to do with the way the bill was structured.

"It's difficult with three issues intertwined in the bill," said Bob Green, president of Bucks County's Philadelphia Park race-track. "If it was just ours, it probably wouldn't have been a problem."

Calling the vote "setback," some supporters said they would be back.

"We can't just go away," Green said.

HISTORY OF GAMBLING BILLS

Efforts to legalize gambling in Pennsylvania have, for the most part, been unsuccessful. In 1972, Pennsylvania became the fourth state to authorize a government-sponsored lottery. Since then, things have not gone well for legalized-gambling proponents. Here's a look at the recent history:

1983: The state's worsening financial condition prompts a flurry of gambling bills, including one proposal to legalize slot machines in the Poconos to fund education statewide. Half a dozen bills that would legalize gambling await a vote by the legislature throughout the next year but go nowhere.

1985: Philadelphia City Council approves a resolution requesting the state legislature to allow the city to legalize video-poker machines. The legislature doesn't.

1988: Gov. Robert P. Casey signs a bill allowing nonprofit organizations to raise funds through small games of chance, such as "punchboards." He vetoes a bill to authorize off-track-betting facilities, but the legislature overrides his veto and the bill becomes law.

1989: The State Horse Racing Commission approves the first application for an off-track-betting outlet, in Reading.

1990: Casey vetoes a bill that would have legalized gambling on video-poker machines in bars, restaurants and clubs.

1991: The House rejects a riverboat-gambling bill, which Casey had promised to veto.

1994: Gov.-elect Ridge promises to veto any bill that would legalize riverboat gambling without first submitting the issue to voters in a nonbinding statewide referendum. Proponents push without success to win passage of a bill that would authorize a referendum.

1997: The Senate passes a bill that would allow slot machines at horse-racing tracks, but it fails to gain House approval.

Feb. 10, 1999: The House passes a bill that would authorize nonbinding statewide referendums on slots, riverboats and video poker on the May 18 primary ballot.

March 8, 1999: The Senate votes to declare the House bill unconstitutional, killing the effort to place the referendums on the primary ballot.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

BALTIMORE ORIOLES TO PLAY EXHIBITION GAME IN HAVANA, CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, this Nation and baseball lovers around the world mourned the passing of the Yankee Clipper. Joe DiMaggio's career was certainly brilliant and worthy of the praise and the eulogies we have heard these past few days. As a testament to his career, many people who never saw him swing a bat or steal a base felt a sense of loss, a loss felt not only for the man but for the institution that he so nobly represented, the game of baseball.

Baseball, Mr. Speaker, transcends generations. The names of Ruth, Gehrig, Mantle and Aaron are as familiar to baseball fans of today as they were during their playing days.

Baseball also transcends borders, Mr. Speaker. The passion we Americans have for the game of baseball is not confined to this nation. That same passion can be found in many parts of the globe, including the nation of Cuba.

On March 28, the Baltimore Orioles will travel to Havana, Cuba, in pursuit of that passion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Baltimore, MD (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Baltimore Orioles' goodwill mission to Cuba. In the past year we have witnessed several historic events that are significant to the evolving debate surrounding Cuba, its citizens and United States efforts to promote democracy.

Last year, Cuban citizens were allowed to celebrate Christmas. In January, Pope John Paul II conducted a series of open air masses across the country that were televised. And recently, direct humanitarian charter flights to

Cuba and cash remittances to Cuban relatives of U.S. citizens were resumed and the provision of medicine and food was authorized.

These initiatives were the precursors to future efforts toward peaceful cross-cultural engagement, including people-to-people contact among academics, media and yes, even athletes.

The last major league team to play baseball in Cuba was the 1947 Brooklyn Dodgers, who held spring training in Havana to insulate Jackie Robinson from the racial hatred so prevalent in the United States at that time. Fifty-two years later, the role has changed. The first major league team to visit Cuba in 40 years, on March 28, 1999, the Baltimore Orioles, will be ambassadors of peace.

Sports has historically been an arena in which athlete-to-athlete contact has led to off-the-field or court engagement. Moreover, baseball as the national pastime of the United States and Cuba is the natural choice to promote goodwill among our countries' citizens. It is time that we reach out to the Cuban people with such democracy-building efforts.

I am proud that the City of Baltimore is in the forefront of an initiative that will help to chip away the barriers that have isolated the citizens of Cuba from the United States. I applaud Mayor Kurt Schmoke and Peter Angelos, the Orioles owner, for seizing the opportunity to strengthen a historic bond between the Cuban and American people.

Let us all take note, democracy is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary times. I urge my colleagues to support the Baltimore Orioles and the City of Baltimore in their efforts.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me add that this exhibition is not an abandonment of our Nation's policies toward Castro or his regime, nor is it a weakening of our resolve against the tyranny of communism. The proceeds from this game, in fact, will go to build baseball stadiums, not politics. But it is an opportunity to showcase what is common to the people of the United States and Cuba, a passion for the game of baseball.

I want to join the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) in congratulating Peter Angelos, the owner of the Baltimore Orioles, who has done so much for baseball, so much for Baltimore and is now doing so much to reach out a hand to try to bring better relations but doing so in the context of not accommodating a regime with which we do not agree but telling a people that is sometimes under that regime that we want to be their friends, if not the friends of their government.

Governments cannot come together unless the people they serve find a common ground.

This exhibition will not dissolve the differences between our two governments but it will allow the people of both lands to share in their common passion.

Once again this spring, children in this country will pick up their bats and gloves and