

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended to the hour of 4 p.m. with the time equally divided between the majority and minority.

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

BETTING ON COLLEGE GAMES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my good friend from the State of Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK, has come to the floor a number of times in recent weeks to talk about some legislation that he favors. He favors a ban on legal betting on college games in Nevada.

This legislation has received the following comments from respected publications from around the country. George F. Will:

Congress now is contemplating a measure that sets some sort of indoor record for missing the point.

Sports Illustrated columnist Rick Reilly:

In fact, passing the bill would be like trying to stop a statewide flood in Oklahoma by fixing a leaking faucet in Enid. Nevada handles only 1 percent of the action on college sports. Not that bookies and the mob wouldn't very much like to get their hands on that 1 percent.

A Chicago Sun Times editorial:

A Nevada ban is more likely to push wagers underground or on to the Internet. A ban would do little to stop betting on college games.

Sporting News, a columnist by the name of Mike DeCourcy:

The NCAA has put no thought whatsoever into this push. This is strictly a public relations move that offers no tangible benefit.

Business Week:

Now the NCAA is looking to fix its image with a bill only a bookie would love.

USA Today, founder Al Neuharth:

University and college presidents and coaches properly are concerned about the integrity of campus sports, but the solution to the problem is getting their own houses in order.

I understand the NCAA is based in Kansas City and they have some jobs there. I am sure this move ingratiate the NCAA to my friend from Kansas. The fact is, this issue does not come close to doing anything to solve the problem. No, Mr. President, I do not gamble. I live in the State of Nevada. I have been chairman of the Nevada Gaming Commission, the top regulator

of gaming. I do not gamble. I do not gamble on games or anything else, but I know a little bit about gambling, having been the chief regulator in the State of Nevada for 4 years.

While my friend says this legislation has widespread support, I have only read a few of the editorial comments. This legislation is held up to ridicule. Of course, we get college coaches coming in saying they do not want their kids playing and having people bet on them.

The NCAA makes billions—I am not misspeaking—not millions but billions of dollars from NCAA football and basketball. If they are so sincere in stopping betting on these games, why don't they not allow these games to be telecast? Just do not have any college games on television—no football games, no NCAA Final Four, no Rose Bowl, just outlaw them.

The NCAA is all powerful. They could do that, they think. They have been such a dismal, total failure regulating amateur athletics that they think now they have something they can finally win. What they are going to do is outlaw college betting in Nevada, the only place in the country where you can do it legally, and as has been said, less than 2 percent of the betting on college games takes place in Nevada. Over 98 percent of gambling on college games takes place in Washington, DC, in the State of Idaho—all over the country. It is done illegally. If the NCAA is so concerned about betting on college games, let's do something about the illegal betting that takes place; let's not go after the legal betting.

Lindsey Graham, on Hardball, a few weeks ago said:

You're not going to stop illegal betting by passing the bill.

Of course not. Originally, the NCAA, in all its wisdom, said if we take away the 1.5 percent of the legal betting and leave 98.5 percent and they do not allow the State of Nevada to post odds, it will stop all over the country. Everybody will stop running the lines on these games.

Again, of course, the NCAA, for lack of a better description, simply does not know what they are talking about. John Sturm, the president of the Newspaper Association of America said:

If Congress prohibits gambling on college sports, the association believes newspapers will continue to have an interest in publishing point spreads on college games, since point spreads appear to be useful, if not valuable, to newspaper readers who have no intention of betting on games.

I already established I do not bet on games, but I love to know what the point spread is on a game. It makes it more interesting. If UV is going to play in the Final Four and play Michigan State, Duke, or a team such as that, I want to know the point spread to see who is favored. That does not mean I am going to run down to the corner bookie and bet on the game or, if I am in Las Vegas, I will not go to the Hilton race book, MGM, or one of those places.

I would not know how to place a bet if you asked me to, but I do know the way they do it in Nevada is better than the way they do it in the service stations, bowling alleys, and bars because the illegal bookies base their game on credit, usually a week at a time. People place bets with their illegal bookie during the week. On Monday or Tuesday, they come around to collect that money. That is where the real trouble starts.

In Nevada, you could be Kirk Kirkorian, one of the richest men in the world—he owns the MGM and a number of other things around the world. As rich as he is, if he walked into his own race book, the rules are that he can get no credit. It has to be all cash. If he wants to bet on a ball game, he has to put up cash. There is no credit.

It goes without saying which is the better system. The better system is, in Nevada you can only bet what money you have in your pocket. No credit is allowed. For the illegal bookies around the country, credit is the name of the game. They do not break as many knuckles as they used to, but they sure put their loans out to people who ask to borrow the money. They pay exorbitant interest rates, and that is when people lose their homes, cars, and property.

When this bill comes up—and it will come up—this is not going to be a laydown. The merits are on the side of what is going on legally in the State of Nevada.

This issue is a sham, it is a farce, it is a diversion designed to deflect attention from an organization that while swimming in money itself, earned from the sweat of the college kids, is incapable, it seems, of doing anything positive.

My favorite—and it happened recently—is St. John's University. Their coach, who was almost hired by the local professional basketball team, is Mike Jarvis. He has a kid who had a used car. The kid trades in the used car for another used car. They suspended him from playing for three games.

That really helps the game a lot. A kid has a used car and trades it in on another used car, and they suspend him from playing. What the NCAA does is harass and intimidate people. We have an example in the State of Nevada, Jerry Tarkanian, one of the most successful coaches in the history of America. They eventually ran him out in the State of Nevada. He is now coaching at Fresno State. They harassed, did everything they could to embarrass him. He sued them. It took 8 or 9 years, but he won the lawsuit. They had to pay him money for what they did to him. By then he had already been run out of the State.

The NCAA recently signed a multi-billion dollar broadcasting contract. That is not a bad deal for a nonprofit organization. Players, coaches, athletes recognize the unaccountable and often unquestionable power of this organization. They have been sued lately.

They had to pay out millions of dollars to assistant coaches who they would only allow to receive—I forget what the ridiculous sum was—\$12,000 a year, \$8,000 a year. The coaches sued them and, of course, the NCAA lost. They had to pay that judgment. They lose all the time in court.

To avoid scrutiny on them, this is an effort to throw out a red herring, something maybe people will take after, rather than who they should take after, and that is them.

This legislation, supported by my friend from Kansas who comes here all the time and talks about it—I know Senator JOHN MCCAIN, the senior Senator from Arizona, also favors this legislation—does nothing to address the problem of illegal gambling on college sports. No one supports illegal gambling on college sports except illegal bookies. They will be the primary beneficiaries of the legislation. That is not me speaking. I read to the Senate a few excerpts from editorials around the country.

A friend of mine called me. I care a great deal about her. She has recently suffered the loss of her husband. She has some money as a result of that—not a lot but a little bit. Someone called her and said—I won't mention a name—if this legislation passes, talking about the Brownback legislation, if it passes, you give me \$20,000. At the end of 1 year I will give you \$200,000 because that is how much money I can make by taking illegal bets. I can't do it now because people who want to bet come from all over the country to bet legally in the State of Nevada.

Illegal bookies love this legislation. One who I heard from in the heartland of America told me—not in Kansas but very close to Kansas—this will be the best thing that Congress could ever do for his business.

I have spoken to law enforcement authorities. There is no question that one of the scandals—referring to Arizona State, where there was some illegal betting taking place on Arizona State—was discovered because Nevada reported it. They could tell something was wrong because of heavy betting on Arizona State. You can bet a little on Arizona State football, but their basketball team has never been much to bet on. They could tell because of the betting that took place at Arizona State that something was wrong. They notified authorities, and that is where the arrest took place. That is where they were able to make a case against the illegal betting taking place at Arizona State.

What we should do is look at a way to stop illegal betting on college campuses. College presidents are concerned about it, as well they should be. Remember, what is going on in Nevada is legal and involves less than 2 percent of gambling in our country. Eliminating gambling legally in the State of Nevada on college games will do nothing but help illegal gambling on college campuses. We don't need new laws. We need better enforcement.

John Sturm, whom I quoted earlier, President of the Newspapers Association of America, in a letter to the House Judiciary Committee, made clear, basically, if Congress prohibits gambling in Nevada on college sports, it is not going to stop anything that goes on in the rest of the country. Certainly it is not going to stop newspapers from publishing these lines.

President Sturm also dispels another myth perpetrated by the National Collegiate Athletic Association that people use the spreads to place illegal bets. In fact, a recent Harris poll found that 70 percent of those who look at point spreads do so only to obtain information, such as me, about a favorite college team, about information on upcoming college games.

Another myth paraded around by the proponents of banning legal wagering on college games is that this is done because of a unanimous vote by the members of the National Commission to Study Gambling. Wrong again. That vote was very close. One of the members of the committee was from Nevada. He abstained. He said if he had been called upon to vote, it would have been a 5-4 vote. That is far from unanimous. The reality is, this proposal was given little consideration by the commission. They had many other things to talk about. The proponents of the ban have the right to their opinion, but they are absolutely wrong. Their opinion in this case lacks substance.

We need to step back and take a look at this. We need to understand the legal business of America is not going to lay down and say, OK, run over us. There has been some criticism about not letting this bill go forward, not having a time agreement on it.

This is something we need to talk about. This involves not illegal gambling on college games—if they want to enforce the law that now prohibits illegal gambling or if they want to pass a new restriction on illegal gambling, I will stand beside them and do that—we are talking about less than 2 percent of the gambling that takes place on college games and it is done legally.

Danny Sheridan, one of the top oddsmakers in America, USA Today, sets the line. He came to Washington. He has talked to a number of Members of Congress. He said: I will talk to whomever you want to talk to. He said: I don't gamble but I set the line. I will continue to do it no matter what they do in Nevada.

We have had people parading on the floor—I shouldn't say "parading." We have had a couple people talk on several occasions about how bad what goes on in Nevada is. We are not going to go without offering a response to that. The time has come to offer that response.

The other thing that flabbergasts me about this is, we have people who have come to Congress who say their No. 1 issue is to make sure they protect States rights. States should be able to do what they want to be able to do.

Well, we find a real problem with that sometimes. Take, for example, products liability legislation. I practice law. The State of Nevada had a different set of standards than did Utah, Arizona, California, other States in the country. They are not all the same. But we developed those standards over the years in the State of Nevada. It is not right that Congress comes in and says: We are going to change them. We are going to have one standard system for everybody.

Well, that is what States rights is all about. It is not what States rights is all about in this instance. The State of Nevada made a decision in 1932 that they were going to allow legal gambling. People should leave the State of Nevada alone. There are no scandals involved in college betting in Nevada. We do our best to protect the integrity of what goes on there with strict requirements. Obtaining a gambling license in the State of Nevada is not a right; it is a privilege. They are very hard to get. Very strict scrutiny goes to anybody who can run one of these sports books. I must say there is not much scrutiny given to the illegal bookings and charging of exorbitant fees, making all this money, and having all this underreported income. It seems that people should be happy with what Nevada has done on its own. It is a matter of States rights. Why don't they leave us alone?

NCAA President Cedric Dempsey was quoted last year as estimating that illegal wagers would be closer to \$4 billion a year. In Nevada, they wager about \$60 million a year. That is a small part of \$4 billion. So I hope people of goodwill—Democrats and Republicans—will look at this legislation and try to understand how unfair it is and how it is going to only exacerbate a problem we have with people betting on college games illegally. It won't make it better; it will make it worse.

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

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2912

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand S. 2912, introduced earlier today by Senator KENNEDY and others, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2912) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to remove certain limitations on the eligibility of aliens residing in the United States to obtain lawful permanent residency status.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for its second reading, and I object to my own request on behalf of the majority.