

money sooner and UIC saves money in reduced staff time and processing costs. We expect to process more than \$40 million in direct student loans this academic year. At our sister campus in Urbana-Champaign, direct lending resulted in 2,500 more students receiving their loan proceeds at the beginning of the fall semester, compared with the previous year.

A Harvard University official echoed the sentiments of our financial-aid people when he said, "Now that we're no longer caught up in the paper chase from many lending institutions and guarantee agencies, we have more time to deal with real issues."

There's another good thing about the direct lending program that was not mentioned in your editorial. It offers a greater variety of repayment options. In addition to the standard repayment plan spread out over 5 to 10 years, students can choose: an extended repayment period with lower monthly payments, a plan in which payments increase over time, a plan with payments pegged to the borrower's income.

The advantage of these options, of course, is that they give college graduates the freedom to take lower-paying but socially useful jobs and still repay their student loans.

Federally guaranteed bank loans haven't been abolished. In fact, they make up more than half of the \$25 billion in annual student loans. But UIC, like most of the state universities in Illinois, has switched to direct lending—with excellent results. The program is good for our students and good for Illinois taxpayers, and it shouldn't be abolished or weakened.—David C. Broski.●

#### IRANIAN BEHAVIOR

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on Iranian behavior and the continued need for sanctions to be placed upon this barbarous regime.

The Iranian regime's stubborn insistence on actions which only serve to isolate that nation and its people, threaten to cast Iran into total deprivation. The sponsorship of international terrorism, continued efforts to build weapons of mass destruction, and human rights violations against innocent Iranians, threaten to throw the country back into medieval times, where all the technology of the West and the ease of our daily life will be absent from the Iranian nation, due directly to the abusive rule of this primitive regime.

Iran is isolated and universally viewed as a pariah state. Its actions are abhorrent to the civilized world. As long as this warped, terroristic regime continues to punish the Iranian people with its misrule, this condition will continue. The tyrants in Tehran must understand their aggression and abuse of the good people of Iran will not last, and one day they will be brought to task for their actions.

While the tyrants continue to rule in Tehran, sanctions are a clear way to keep up the pressure on Iran and to deny them the ability to carry out their aggression on the outside world as well as against their own people. We do not take these issues lightly. It is a pity that the regime cannot act like a civilized country and not be so abusive. If only Iran would not conduct these brutal actions, we would not have to place sanctions on it.●

#### CUTTING TAXES NO MATTER THE COST

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, our colleague, Senator RUSS FEINGOLD, has been leading the charge in trying to get us to use common sense and not have a tax cut at this point.

I have been pleased to join him in this effort.

The Chicago Tribune, a newspaper that is independent but with a slight Republican leaning, had an editorial titled, "Cutting taxes no matter the cost" that makes a great deal of sense.

I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

#### CUTTING TAXES NO MATTER THE COST

Republican lawmakers who know better will swear that a tax cut is necessary, that the savings from balancing the budget and shrinking government should go to small businesses, families with kids and others who will spend it better than Congress.

The same lawmakers will insist that they must honor a House-Senate compromise reached last summer to cut taxes by \$245 billion, even though a few will acknowledge that a smaller number—or better yet, no tax cut at all—would make their job of balancing the budget in seven years that much easier.

But for now, as Republicans on the Senate Finance Committee clearly showed last week, the need to maintain party unity, appease the party's conservative elements and confront President Clinton on the budget is overriding sound judgment, economic logic and tax policy.

On Friday, Republicans on the tax-writing panel announced they had agreed to a \$245 billion package of tax cuts over seven years that includes a permanent \$500-per-child tax credit, significant reductions in capital gains taxes and breaks for corporations. The unanimous agreement insured that the measure will pass the full committee this week and made it likely it will be added to a budget-balancing bill for a full Senate vote later this month.

The deal also ended weeks of growing GOP division over tax cuts. Several weeks ago, for example, Sen. Bob Dole of Kansas candidly suggested that a smaller tax cut package might be appropriate and that it made sense to let the expensive family tax credits expire in five years. He was attacked immediately by rival presidential candidate Sen. Phil Gramm of Texas for backpedaling on the promised GOP tax cuts. Soon after, Dole dutifully got back in line.

In fact, the \$500-a-child tax credit is the package's costliest provision, yet does nothing to boost long-term economic growth. But Gramm and conservative constituencies like the Christian Coalition believe families that forgo income to raise children deserve an allowance, and they're insisting on nothing less.

What many Republicans still don't get, however, is that their own analysis say the tax cuts will add \$93 billion in extra debt and interest payments to the \$5 trillion of red ink that the nation has collected.

Any savings earned from balancing the budget should be used to shrink the national debt, not to finance tax breaks. That would be the fiscally prudent course. But, as the Finance Committee has shown, politics outweighs prudence of any kind these days.●

#### GAMBLING FEVER

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached article be printed in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 10, 1995]

#### GAMBLING FEVER

(By William Safire)

HARPERS FERRY, W.VA.—At the age of 14. I was standing on a landing in the stairwell at Joan of Arc Junior High School in Manhattan, watching a crap game, when I felt the heavy hand of a teacher on my shoulder.

My protest that I didn't even have a bet down was unavailing; four of us, all seniors, were branded as gamblers. The shaming punishment: though permitted to be graduated, I was refused a place at commencement and denied a diploma.

That was back when gambling was viewed as wrong: when bookies and numbers racketeers were considered the scum of society; and when a lust for something-for-nothing was looked upon as a weakness of character.

Today, state-sponsored gambling is the national pastime. Nearly 100 million casino visitors, video gamblers and sports bettors wager close to a half-trillion dollars—with \$40 billion going to the "house."

And today, aboriginal Americans are exploiting those of us who followed in neon casinos on their reservations. The tribes are becoming a nation of croupiers, in league with national gambling interests, while pretending ill-gotten profits are used primarily to educate their children.

The "gambling industry"—none of its pious proponents call it the gambling racket—is the source of the greatest sustained, bipartisan political hypocrisy of our time.

Liberals, professing a horror of regressive taxation, turn a blind eye to the way state-sponsored gambling redistributes income upward, and how new casino permissions snatch welfare checks to fatten per-share earnings of casino stockholders.

Conservatives, ostensibly upholders of public morality, approve government advertising campaigns to entice citizens to gamble in lotteries and play the ponies at off-track betting parlors.

Gullible voters were sold this notion: since many people liked to gamble anyway, why not turn gambling's profits to public benefit?

But the result is the gambling epidemic, with its associated money laundering by criminals, corruption of public officials and "cannibalization" of local economics. Thanks to the public blessing of gambling by government, the moral stigma was removed and the high roller has become a folk hero.

The media cannot escape their share of the blame. From the hysterical hype of the Publishers Clearing House to the front-page and primetime publicity given sweepstakes winners (nobody covers the losers), we have glorified the pernicious philosophy of something-for-nothing.

Nothing is for nothing. Crime always goes hand-in-hand with gambling. Here in the relatively poor state of West Virginia, a former governor confessed to taking bribes from racetrack operators and a lottery director was jailed for rigging a video lottery contract. Disgusted, church groups recently leaned on legislators to reject riverboat gambling, and the pols suddenly realized that a pro-casino vote could be a loser.

Now the media are at last awakening. Gee-Whiz stories touting the craze are out and hard reporting of the spreading addiction is in.

The Economist cast into doubt the claim that gambling salvages local economies. USA Today headlined: "Nation raising 'a generation of gamblers,'" focusing on the ring corrupting schools in suburban Nutley, N.J. The best reporting was in Sports Illustrated's detailed expose of the gambling addiction rampant in the nation's colleges.

But television news is still gambling's friend. With young gamblers relying heavily

on the sports ticker that runs at the bottom of CNN's Headline News, that network has a special responsibility to show how the lives of many students are being ruined by the compulsion its ticker helps feed. A "Gambling is for suckers" crawl among the scores would do for starters.

Will the polls sense the coming voter revulsion at the "painless" revenue source that failed? Representative Frank Wolf of Virginia has introduced a bill to establish a "National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission"; let's see if the casino lobby can buy the votes to avert scrutiny and resigmatizing.

The yen to gamble is a personal weakness, but state-sponsored gambling is a banana-republic abomination that undermines national values. My gratitude goes to that tough teacher at Joan of Arc who stopped me before I started.

#### OPPOSITION TO THE WELFARE BILLS IS GROWING

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as there will be no rollcall votes in the Senate today, some Senators are away and may have missed the open letter to the President from Marian Wright Edelman, entitled "Say No to This Welfare 'Reform,'" in this morning's Washington Post. She writes:

As President, you have the opportunity and personal responsibility to protect children from unjust policies. It would be a great moral and practical wrong for you to sign any welfare "reform" bill that will push millions of already poor children and families deeper into poverty, as both the Senate and House welfare bills will do. It would be wrong to destroy the 60-year-old guaranteed safety net for children, women and poor families, as both the Senate and House welfare bills will do.

An accompanying Post editorial makes a further point about the Senate welfare bill:

Now here is the part you need especially to know: *Mr. Clinton's own advisers have told him that it would likely consign as many as a million more children to poverty, and it would provide several billions less for child care than his own proposal of a year ago.* [Their italic.]

Mr. President, something important is happening here. There is a growing recognition that the Senate made a terrible mistake 6 weeks ago. We voted 87 to 12 to repeal title IV-A of the Social Security Act—with almost no understanding of what the consequences might be.

Fortunately, the hard evidence has begun to come out. I only hope it is in time. Last Friday, the Los Angeles Times ran a front-page story about a September 14 report prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services. The report, which has yet to be officially released, concludes that the Senate bill would plunge 1,100,000 dependent children into poverty, and would also significantly deepen the poverty of children who are already living below the poverty line. I had the report made a part of the RECORD on November 1, and I hope every Senator will read it carefully.

Another analysis will become available in official form early next week. The Office of Management and Budget

et—in response to a request from this Senator along with Representative SAM GIBBONS and 10 other members of the conference committee on welfare—will release a report on Monday or Tuesday on the effects of the Senate and House bills on children. I fully expect that this new analysis will confirm what the earlier estimates indicated: either bill would be Armageddonic for children.

Over the years Congress may have missed opportunities to help dependent children, but never in our history have we calculatedly set out to injure them. The administration's own analysis shows that this is precisely what will occur under either bill now before the conference.

Mr. President, I ask that the open letter to the President from Marian Wright Edelman and the editorial from today's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1995]

SAY NO TO THIS WELFARE REFORM  
(By Marian Wright Edelman)

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

I am calling for your unwavering moral leadership for children and opposition to Senate and House welfare and Medicaid block grants, which will make more children poor and sick.

As president, you have the opportunity and personal responsibility to protect children from unjust policies. It would be a great moral and practical wrong for you to sign any welfare "reform" bill that will push millions of already poor children and families deeper into poverty, as both the Senate and House welfare bills will do. It would be wrong to destroy the 60-year-old guaranteed safety net for children, women and poor families as both the Senate and House welfare bills will do.

It would be wrong to leave millions of voteless, voiceless children to the vagaries of 50 state bureaucracies and politics, as both the Senate and House bills will do. It would be wrong to strip children of or weaken current ensured help for their daily survival and during economic recessions and natural disasters, as both the Senate and House bills will do. It would be wrong to exacerbate rather than alleviate the current shameful and epidemic child poverty that no decent, rich nation should tolerate for even one child.

Both the Senate and House welfare bills are morally and practically indefensible. Rather than solve widespread child deprivation, they simply shift the burden onto states and localities with far fewer federal resources, weakened state maintenance of effort and little or no state accountability. As you well know, these block grants are not designed primarily to help children or to make families more self-sufficient. They are Trojan Horses for massive budget cuts and for imposing an ideological agenda that says that government assistance for the poor and children should be dismantled and cut while government assistance for wealthy individuals and corporations should be maintained and even increased. Do you think the Old Testament prophets Isaiah, Micah and Amos—or Jesus Christ—would support such policies?

Neither the Senate nor House welfare bill is an example of the good competing with the perfect. Both are fatally flawed, callous, anti-child assaults. Both bills eviscerate the

moral compact between the nation and its children and its poor.

If child investments are unfairly and indiscriminately cut by many billions of dollars, there is perhaps some prospect of recouping the money over time when new child suffering becomes apparent, as it did after the Reagan cuts and as it will this time as pending cuts are many times worse. *But longer-term and perhaps irreparable damage will be inflicted on children if you permit to be destroyed the fundamental moral principle that an American child, regardless of the state or parents the child chanced to draw, is entitled to protection of last resort by his or her national government. If any piece of the framework or cornerstone of the laws—AFDC, Medicaid, family and child nutrition—is dismantled, we may not get them back in our lifetime or our children's.*

What a tragic step backward for America when so many children already are left behind. Both you and I know that there are lessons from American history, including the end of Reconstruction, when the immoral abandonment of structures of law and equity led to decades of setbacks for powerless Americans and battles we still are fighting today. What a tragic irony it would be for this regressive attack on children and the poor to occur on your watch. For me, this is a defining moral litmus test for your presidency.

We cannot heal our racial divisions or prepare our nation for the future unless we give poor black, brown and white children a healthy and fair start in life. These pending block grants will make that task so much harder. Together with the proposed tax policies, they widen the income gulf between America's haves and have-nots. You have spoken too eloquently and worked too long for children to wipe it out with your signature now.

It is nonsense for congressional leaders to argue that they are protecting children from a future debt children did not create by destroying the vital laws and investments children need to live, learn and grow today. That is the domestic equivalent of bombing Vietnamese villages in order to save them. It is moral hypocrisy for our nation to slash income, health and nutrition assistance for poor children while leaving untouched hundreds of billions in corporate welfare, giving new tax breaks of over \$200 billion for non-needy citizens, and giving the Pentagon almost \$7 billion it did not request.

The Children's Defense Fund wants welfare reform. But we want fair reform that does not pick on and hurt children and that provides parents jobs and safe child care. We want reform that prepares our children for the new millennium—not reform that pushes them back to past inequities within and among states.

We want to "end welfare as we know it." But we do not want to replace it with welfare as we do not want to know it. We do not want to codify a policy of national child abandonment.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt correctly said: "Better the occasional faults of a government that lives in a spirit of charity than the constant omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference." Every president since FDR—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan and Bush—preserved the minimal national guarantee of income assistance for poor children. It is a precedent I hope and trust you will uphold. What was right and compassionate in FDR's day is right today and will be right tomorrow.

There is an even higher precedent that we profess to follow in our Judeo-Christian nation. The Old Testament prophets and the New Testament Messiah made plain God's mandate to protect the poor and the weak