

(formerly Beirut College) is the most rapidly growing institution of higher learning in Lebanon and is an increasingly important resource for talent in this expanding region.

The House report contains similar language.

The Committee notes that over the years a number of quality educational institutions have received both development and Economic Support Fund assistance, including the American University of Beirut, . . . and the Lebanese American University. The Committee recommends that best efforts be made to continue assistance for institutions of this nature, with the highest priority assigned to those lacking alternative sources of funding.

Mr. President, I believe that continued support of these two institutions is in the national interest of the United States. As I have stated, continued funding of these institutions is a congressional priority and I hope that the administration will agree. ●

THE BENEFITS OF LEGAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, as immigration reform legislation moves closer to the House and Senate floors, a new study has appeared that confirms what many of us on both sides of the aisle have been saying all along: That legal immigrants confer net economic benefits on American society.

The study, entitled "Immigration: The Demographic and Economic Facts," is authored by University of Maryland professor Julian SIMON (no relation) and published by the Cato Institute and the National Immigration Forum in association with a diverse coalition of over 20 organizations. I would like to include for the RECORD a Los Angeles Times article from December 11, 1995 previewing the report's findings, which include the following:

The current rate of immigration is only about one-third the rate of immigration at the beginning of the century.

Total per capita government expenditures are lower for immigrants than for native-born Americans.

The effect of immigration on Americans' wages is limited.

Because new immigrants are more concentrated than native-born Americans in the youthful labor force ages, they tend to contribute more to the public coffers than they draw out.

Educational levels among immigrants have increased from decade to decade.

These conclusions again confirm that current levels of legal immigration are not a problem for America. In fact, the legal immigrants of today demonstrate the same work ethic and imagination that characterized their predecessors of decades ago, and continue to be a vital component of our Nation's well-being.

The same cannot be said of illegal immigrants. These individuals should be the subject of our attention as immigration reform legislation winds its way through Congress. This administration has demonstrated an unprece-

dent commitment to preventing illegal immigration through increased enforcement at the border and in the workplace. We in Congress should continue this effort and work hand in hand with the administration in this endeavor. In so doing, however, we should not disturb our system of legal immigration, which works now and has worked in America for centuries.

The difference between legal and illegal immigration is the subject of much public confusion. It is up to Congress, with the help of such reports as the SIMON report, to keep the two issues distinct, and to focus its attention on the real immigration problem: illegal immigration.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 11, 1995]

STUDY PAINTS A POSITIVE PICTURE OF IMMIGRATION

COSTS: BOTH LEGAL AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS USE FEWER GOVERNMENT RESOURCES THAN NATIVE-BORN CITIZENS, REPORT SAYS

(By James Bornemeier)

WASHINGTON.—A new study on the effects of immigration finds that total per capita government expenditures are much lower for immigrants—legal and illegal—than for native-born citizens.

The report also paints an upbeat picture of immigrants' educational achievements and asserts that the nation's natural resources and environment are unaffected by the influx of immigrants.

"As of the 1970s, immigrants contributed more to the public coffers in taxes than they drew out in welfare services," the report says. "The most recent data * * * show that each year an average immigrant family put about \$2,500 into the pockets of natives from this excess of taxes over public costs."

The study, to be issued this morning in Washington by the National Immigration Forum, an immigration-advocacy group, and the Cato Institute, a conservative think tank, comes at a time when Congress is wrestling with major immigration bills and public opinion is increasingly negative on immigration issues.

Legislation is progressing in both houses of Congress to clamp down on illegal immigration and—to the dismay of many immigration advocates—restrict entry of legal immigrants as well.

The issue has split Republicans, some of whom see the free flow of legal immigrants as an economic boon to the country. Immigrant-rights groups say the political activism to stem illegal immigration has unfairly led to the limitations on legal immigrants.

But groups pushing for stronger restrictions on immigration branded the report, authored by University of Maryland professor Julian L. Simon, as biased.

"Julian Simon is not a liar," said Dan Stein, executive director of the Federation for American Immigration Reform, "but he gets as close as anyone can be to one. He is intentionally deceptive, manipulative and grossly in error." Signifying the sensitivity of the issue, more than 20 interest groups and think tanks have signed on to the report, and they span the political spectrum—from the immigrant-rights group, the National Council of La Raza, to the Progress and Freedom Foundation, an organization closely associated with House Speaker Newt Gingrich.

House Majority Leader Dick Armey, a strong supporter of legal immigration, is scheduled to address the Capitol press conference where the report is to be released today.

Among the report's most controversial findings is Simon's conclusion that government expenditures are lower for immigrants than for native-born Americans.

According to the report, the average immigrant family received \$1,404 in welfare services in its first five years in the country. Native-born families averaged \$2,279, Simon writes. The report makes these other points:

The number of illegal immigrants in the United States—estimated at 3.2 million—is not very different from a decade before.

More than half of illegal immigrants enter legally and over-stay their visas; less than half enter clandestinely.

New immigrants are more concentrated than native-born citizens in the youthful labor force ages when people contribute more to the public coffers than they draw out.

Immigrants on average have a year less education than natives—about the same relationship as has been observed back to the 19th century.

Such optimistic findings collide with the views of other researchers.

"His numbers are conventional and unremarkable," said Mark Krikorian of the Center for Immigration Studies in Washington, "The question is what sort of spin Julian puts on them. He has his bias, and the bias has a very significant influence on the interpretation he has put on the facts."

As an example, Simon says the number of immigrant high school dropouts has been declining. For example, Krikorian said, Simon reports that the number of immigrant high school dropouts has been declining.

"But what he doesn't mention," said Krikorian, "is the gap between the percentage of American high school dropouts and the percentage of immigrant high school dropouts is widening. It's pretty obvious that the education gap is increasing. By not addressing [that] he makes his document an advocacy document." ●

TRIBUTE TO PATTY CALLAGHAN

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I wish today to give tribute to one of Eastern Montana's treasures, Patty Callaghan. Patty recently retired after 20 years with Action for Eastern Montana.

Patty retired as executive director to attend Luther Seminary in St. Paul MN. She hopes to return to eastern Montana as a lay leader with rural churches.

Montana needs more leaders like Patty Callaghan. Rural Montana needs the love for and knowledge of our state that people like Patty have.

Patty's work with action actually led to here decision to choose the seminary. When funding cutbacks in the programs that she administers forced her to look to other resources, Patty found the churches responding generously. She found the needs of rural communities to be much the same as the congregations—energy, leadership for change, accountability, respect and compassion.

Patty has dealt with many family issues that will serve her well in her new life. She found the work at Action for Eastern Montana rewarding and the Glendive community generous when a need was identified.

In a recent tribute to Patty, family members, coworkers, friends and many

others including Montana's Governor Marc Racicot expressed their respect and appreciation for her life's work.

I would also like to express my profound respect and admiration for Patty Callaghan and what she has done for eastern Montana. Public service can bring out the best and worst in people. With Patty, her compassion and caring has only deepened. Eastern Montana desperately needs this commitment to its communities.

Thank you, Patty. We wish you the best and look forward to seeing you again soon. ●

HATE SPEECH ON NET

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an editorial in the November 17, 1995, issue of USA Today, called Hate Speech on the Net.

As many of my colleagues are aware, college campuses have been at the center of the debate over hate speech. Several universities have established restrictive rules on speech and have punished students with probation or even dismissal. These rules, while certainly established with the best intentions, do raise serious issues of free speech.

As Americans, we are allowed to say what we want, as long as it does not threaten public safety, no matter how much it may offend others. Voltaire is credited with saying, "I disagree with what you say but I am ready to fight to the death to preserve your right to say it." I would like to add: and then I will speak out against what you have said. As this editorial points out, a recent episode at Cornell University illustrates that a better response to hate speech is often an eloquent reply.

I ask that the full text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From USA Today, Nov. 17, 1995]

HATE SPEECH ON THE NET

A tasteless but not harmless college prank got the national attention it deserved this week when four Cornell freshmen made the mistake of sharing their raunchy degradation of women via the Internet.

The four sent an e-mail message listing "75 reasons why women (bitches) should not have freedom of speech." After the message was spread—and attacked—they expressed "deep remorse." In an apology published in the campus newspaper, they insisted they didn't mean any of the things they wrote.

Please.

If they didn't mean to trash women, why was their list so demeaning, degrading and threatening? If they meant to share this list with just a few of their buddies, why did they send it on the Internet, where so many other students pulled up the list that at least one school's computer system crashed?

Their juvenile attempts at humor included such sexist slaps as: "Big breasts speak for themselves." "Female drunks are annoying unless they put out." "If she can't speak, she can't cry rape." Other suggestions were simply too vulgar to repeat.

Freshmen with the brains to get into a prestigious Ivy League college should have known this list was not harmless fun.

Cornell acknowledged this episode "offended, angered and distressed." But its judi-

cial administrator concluded Thursday that the students did not violate the college's code of conduct.

That judgment will further infuriate those outraged by this sexist attack. But this sorry tale takes a turn for the better.

As the students' bad taste became public, the e-mail response was so loud and large that it brought a prompt response from the university.

The students now have "offered" to attend gender-sensitivity training, perform community service and apologize in person to senior Cornell administrators.

Had the students been denied the right to make their sexist views public, those views might have gone unchallenged and unchanged. All of which shows again that the best remedy for offensive speech is not a restrictive rule but an eloquent reply. ●

TRIBUTE TO MS. ELEANOR L. CARTER

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to commend one of my constituents, Ms. Eleanor L. Carter, on the occasion of her retirement from the Federal Government.

Ms. Carter, a native of Chicago, IL, will retire as a claims representative with the Social Security Administration after 35 years of service. She started work on August 11, 1960 as a "balancing clerk" for the U.S. Department of Treasury. After a year of service, Ms. Clark transferred to the Social Security Administration, and after several promotions, she continues to be an asset in her capacity as a claims representative.

Mr. President, I join Ms. Carter's family and many friends in congratulating her on an exemplary career, and wishing her all the best for the future. Illinois has benefitted greatly from her superb service.

COMPUTER BETTORS CAN BE SURE OF LOSING

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Richard Roeper, who is a regular columnist with the Chicago Sun-Times, recently had a column headed, "Computer Bettors Can Be Virtually Sure of Losing," which I ask to be printed in the RECORD in full after my remarks.

It is not simply an editorial column with that conclusion. Mr. Roeper goes into the specifics of what happened to him when he placed bets.

Some people wonder why we should have a commission to look at the whole phenomenon of legalized gambling in the United States.

It is spreading rapidly, and I don't know what we do about the phenomenon of computers and gambling, just as one example.

The column follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Dec. 10, 1995]

COMPUTER BETTORS CAN BE VIRTUALLY SURE OF LOSING

(By Richard Roeper)

"The technology will allow people to bet on anything they choose to, and if it's legal, someone is sure to set up a service."—Bill Gates, discussing the potential for gambling on the Internet in *The Road Ahead*.

Sooner rather than later, you're probably going to be able to sit at a computer in your home office and lose everything you own, including the computer you're sitting at in your home office.

Such are the perils of gambling and the wonders of technology.

Lately there's been a lot of talk about setting up "virtual casinos" on the information highway—onscreen gambling emporiums that will be constructed on computer networks so that you won't have to fly to Las Vegas or even drive out to Aurora to play craps or roulette or poker. All you'll have to do is log on, enter an access code, provide a credit card number and bingo!

Bingo. They'll probably have that, too.

If you win, you'll receive electronic credits. If you lose, you'll be charged on your next Visa or American Express statement.

This is a frightening concept. As it is, real casinos are designed to provide a cushion between you and reality. The absence of clocks, the lack of windows, the waitresses providing you with complementary drinks, the conversion of hundred-dollar bills into toyish black chips that you flick around like bottle caps—all are tools to make it easier to separate you from your money.

And it works. Those huge, tacky, gleaming, zillion-dollar palaces in Las Vegas are owned by the folks who are taking the bets, not the folks who are making the bets. They build the 5,000-room hotels and the cages for the white tigers and the pirate ships and the fake pyramids with your money.

Still, at least when you bet with chips, you're vaguely aware that they represent real money. Watching a stack of those chips shrink can be a painful experience; you can see and feel some proof of the fact that you're losing.

Others around you, including the employees of the casino and your fellow gamblers, also provide some stimuli. But if you're alone at a keyboard, there's no human element, nobody to cluck in sympathy when you lose, or slide some chips your way when you win. There's no sense that you're truly risking your money. So it will be ridiculously, tragically easy for the gambler to log on and lose a huge chunk of money in a single session online.

I put this theory to the test by playing a three-day round of blackjack on my personal computer and keeping a record of my "wins" and "losses."

The game on my Windows '95 program is called "Dr. Blackjack." Little boxes at the top of the screen keep track of wins and losses for each session, as well as a running tally for a player.

Monday, 8:43 a.m. I set the computer for \$50 wagers and tell the electronic dealer to deal—and our respective cards appear on the screen almost instantly. With a click of the mouse, I can then decide to stay, hit, split, double down, even buy insurance against a dealer blackjack. As soon as I make my decision, the computer plays out the dealer's hand in literally the blink of an eye, much faster than the slickest human dealer.

By 9 a.m. I'm up \$450, each winning hand accompanied by an electronic deedle-deedle-dee! of joy, each losing hand stomped on by a sharp buzzer.

After two hours I'm at the \$500 mark in winnings. A nice round number, so I sign off. Don't have a stack of chips to pocket, don't have a dealer to tip.

Monday, 4:47 p.m. My plus-\$500 total is waiting for me when I sign on. I'm playing with the casino's money, so I up my wager amount to \$100 per hand.

Monday, 5:03 p.m. Down \$2,300. That is not a misprint. During one stretch I lost nine hands in a row. A note appears on my screen, telling me I've lost too much in one sitting and should take a break.