

be addressed comprehensively and with a serious commitment from the NCAA and its member institutions, including federal requirements enshrined in appropriate legislation.

While we heard considerable rhetoric at our Commerce Committee hearing concerning what the NCAA intends to do about illegal gambling on college campuses, there was very little testimony concerning what concrete steps at NCAA has taken to date. For example, the chairman of the NCAA's executive committee testified that during the ten years he has served as president of his university, he could not recall a single case of a student being expelled or otherwise disciplined for illegal gambling, even though he acknowledged there are illegal student bookies on his campus.

We are repeatedly told by the sponsors of this legislation that the NCAA has plans to set up its anti-gambling initiatives. The facts belie the accuracy of those assurances. For example, the NCAA's total operating revenue for 1998-99 was \$283 million. Within the overall budget, there was a line item for "sports agents and gambling" that equaled \$64,000. Similarly, the line item for 1999-2000 is \$139,000 out of revenue of \$303 million. Only three of nearly 300 NCAA employees are assigned to gambling issues, and those persons have other responsibilities in addition to illegal sports gambling.

The NCAA's own presentations to the NGISC and in other venues indicate that there are many other important steps that should be taken, beyond what this legislation would do, to address the problem of illegal gambling on college campuses. The NCAA and its members have failed to follow through on the very steps they recommended to the commission just one year ago. For example, much was made at our hearing about the NCAA's use of a new public service announcement during the telecast of the men's basketball tournament. There was little evidence that this PSA was shown either frequently or during times of maximum audience exposure. Furthermore, there is no indication that the NCAA followed the recommendation of the NGISC and specifics PSA commitments be written into the NCAA's television contracts. A \$6 billion, 11-year deal for the television rights to the men's "March Madness" basketball tournament was signed by the NCAA with CBS Sports after the NGISC made this recommendation in its Final Report.

There is a serious need for a combination of enforcement, education, and counseling initiatives to address illegal gambling by high school and college students. Unfortunately, the Commerce Committee took no testimony from those individuals on campus, in our states, and at the Federal level who are charged with enforcing the laws that already make this activity illegal. Similarly, we heard very little from professionals whose job it is to educate students about the dangers of

gambling abuse and to counsel those who suffer from such problems.

Finally, while this bill directly impacts Nevada, let me suggest to my colleagues we should be alarmed by the precedent that would be established if this bill becomes law. For over 200 years the Federal Government has deferred to the State to determine the scope and type of gaming that should be permitted within their borders. The Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act preempted that authority as it relates to sports wagering, but only prospectively. If Congress sees fit to overturn Nevada's sports wagering statutes that have been on the books for many decades, it sets a dangerous precedent that should be cause for concern for the other 47 States with some form of legal gaming operations.

We all agree as to the serious nature of the problem. Unfortunately, the legislative proposal will do nothing to address that issue.

As I have said during my testimony before the Commerce Committee, this legislation is an illegal bookie's dream. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, before my friend from Nevada leaves the floor, I intend to make a couple of comments on his statement. One of the most valued members of the committee is Senator BRYAN from Nevada.

Senator REID and I came to the House of Representatives together many years ago. I consider us to have a very warm and excellent relationship over many years.

I will miss Senator BRYAN very much as he leaves—not only the Senate but as a much valued member of our committee. Coincidentally, on the issue of sports, Senator BRYAN and I were able to work together on a couple of boxing issues that a lot of our Members did not care much about. But hopefully we were able to assist some people who come from the lowest economic rung of our society and prevent, at least to some degree, the exploitation to which many of them are subjected.

I preface my comments with a brief response to both Senators from Nevada. Again, I say that with respect and affection.

I did not invent this legislation, nor did it come from any Member of this body. It came as a result of the National Gaming Impact Study Commission, a commission that met for a long time and came up with this strong recommendation. Then the issue was picked up by the NCAA coaches. Some of the most respected men and women in America, obviously, are our college coaches, people of the level of Dean Smith, Joe Paterno, Jim Calhoun, and so many others who have made this a high visibility and important issue, at least to them, including the presidents of the colleges and universities across the country.

I will not rebut their comments or try to respond to all the comments

made by Senator BRYAN, except to say I respect his view. But I do believe there is a compelling case that has been made, not by this Member but by the college coaches and the university presidents who say this is placing these young—as Coach Calhoun called them—kids in the path of temptation that is something that could be very unhealthy for them.

So I respect the views of my friends from Nevada. I hope we will have a vigorous debate on this issue, and hopefully we will be able to address it one way or another. But I do believe it is an issue of some importance, at least if you believe those who are closest to these young men and women, our college athletes.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCAIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. I will just acknowledge his very generous comments. I appreciate that.

Let me respond in turn. I have been privileged and honored to serve in that committee with him as chairman. We have worked on many, many issues, not only the athletic issues which we have addressed, but both of our respective jurisdictions are going to enjoy expanded air service as a result of his leadership, providing nonstop service to the Nation's Capital from our respective States. So I assure him my comments are in no way intended to be personal to him. It is a difference of opinion. The Senator from Arizona, who is a tenacious advocate and fearless defender of his own State, can understand the Senator from Nevada obviously has serious concerns. They are honest differences of opinion with the Senator from Arizona. I wanted to state that for the RECORD.

Again, I thank him for his very generous comments.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank Senator BRYAN. I will come to the floor sometime in September to chronicle his many accomplishments and the admiration and heartfelt affection I have for Senator BRYAN. But at the moment I say we will respectfully disagree. I think we will have both an interesting and, I hope, illuminating discussion of what has become, in the eyes of many, an important issue. I thank Senator BRYAN for his kind remarks. I will miss him, although I want to make it clear that he is not departing this Earth. In fact, he may be going to a much more rewarding and comfortable lifestyle.

THE SITUATION IN FIJI

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, let us imagine for a moment that a ragtag group of armed rebels in Australia was able to infiltrate the parliament in Canberra and put a gun to the head of the Australian Prime Minister. Let us imagine that these rebels, led by a failed indigenous businessman who claimed to speak for the native people and against those of European descent who had "colonized" the island, held

the Prime Minister and members of his government hostage for several months in the Parliament building. Let us also imagine that, during this period, central government authority across Australia withered as armed gangs set up roadblocks, occupied police stations and military barracks, torched homes and businesses owned by those with different ancestry, seized tourist resorts, and generally terrorized innocents across the country.

What would America's response be to such a violent takeover of a democratic government and the abduction of its prime minister by race-baiters who proclaimed that under their "new order," there would be no place in government or, indeed, in society for those with different ethnic roots, and who reveled in the armed chaos they had inspired? At a minimum, I would expect the United States to impose tough sanctions on the illegitimate regime; mobilize our allies in Asia and at the U.N. Security Council to speak forcefully and with one voice against the coup; and join like-minded nations in resolutely affirming that the country in question would suffer lasting isolation and international condemnation until constitutional governance and the rule of law were restored.

Unfortunately, this scenario is playing out as we speak in Australia's neighbor Fiji, an island nation in the South Pacific that is home to some of the warmest, most gentle people I have had the pleasure of meeting. George Speight, an ethnic Fijian and failed businessman, led a coup on May 19 that toppled Fiji's democratically elected government and its first Indo-Fijian prime minister, Mahendra Chaudhry. Speight, whom the Economist calls a "classic demagogue," is utterly disdainful of democracy, law, and Fijians of Indian descent, who constitute 44 percent of their nation's population.

If Speight has his way, democratic rule, racial harmony, and basic justice in Fiji have no future, and nearly half of Fiji's people, disenfranchised by the coup, will have been relegated to the status of second-class citizens and unwitting hostages of a government that abhors them for the color of their skin. As Speight bluntly puts it:

There will never be a government led by an Indian, ever, in Fiji. Constitutional democracy, the common-law version—that will never return.

The hostages, including the deposed Prime Minister, have been released, and Speight's forces have apparently cut a deal with Fiji's military and traditional leaders for the composition of a new government—a government led by an ailing figurehead controlled by the coup leader. The new cabinet will be comprised exclusively of ethnic Fijians, with the sole official of Indian descent relegated to a non-cabinet post as one of two assistant ministers for multi-ethnic affairs. The country's multi-racial constitution has been officially scrapped in favor of a document being prepared by the new government

that "is almost certain to reduce Indo-Fijians to political footnotes," in the words of one observer. The economy, and the tourist industry that sustains it, are in shambles.

Democracy is dead in Fiji. Rule by law has succumbed to the law of the jungle and one man, in league with armed criminals, has personally destroyed a successful experiment in representative, multi-ethnic rule. The United States must stand firm in our absolute refusal to ratify the results of a coup that ended democratic governance in Fiji. We cannot and shall not condone the violent establishment of a government and a constitution predicated on racial exclusion. We should be prepared to suspend what little amount of assistance we provide to Fiji if the government remains intransigent. More importantly, we and our allies in Asia and Europe should make clear that Fiji will remain isolated until the interim government in Suva establishes a clear blueprint for a return to democratic rule by an administration that does not include George Speight and his criminal allies. We cannot compromise on the principle that the Indo-Fijians who constitute nearly half of their nation's population must once again have a voice in its affairs.

The haunting words of an ethnic Fijian social worker vividly capture the agony of a nation that many people believe to be as close to paradise as can be found on this Earth. He laments: "Fiji was such a nice place. We promoted it as 'the way the world should be.' Now it is the devil's country."

Let us use the resources at our disposal as a great and moral nation to oust this devil and return Fiji's government to all of its people.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an editorial from the July 19th edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "Goodbye to Fiji" be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have two additional comments.

There is a lot of unrest in Asia today. Indonesia is ridden with ethnic strife, a very important country that is the largest Moslem country in the world and one whose fortunes, economically and ethnically, have declined severely.

The Solomon Islands, an area where American blood was shed many years ago, has been mistreated by ethnic strife and armed gangs taking over and lawlessness and banditry being the order of the day there.

In Fiji, we see, again, ethnic unrest that is harmful not only to the country, but the people who are most affected first will be the poorest people in Fiji, many of them the ethnic Fijians whose livelihood is gained from the now disappearing tourist industry.

Finally, the United States has a special obligation as the world's leader. I think we as Americans are most proud that, following World War II, we began

to redress some of the wrongs we had inflicted on some of our own fellow citizens. After a titanic civil rights struggle, we are at least on the path to assuring equality for all in this great Nation of ours. For us to sit by and watch an ethnic group be subjected to a constitution and rulers that place them in a permanent inferior status, flies in the face of everything the United States has stood for and, clearly, in our assertion that all men and women are created equal and endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights.

I hope the administration, the American people, and those of our allies, in Asia and all over the world, including at the United Nations, will do whatever they can to restore equality and equal opportunity in this very lovely island.

It is important for me to note that I visited this beautiful country on several occasions, which is one reason why I have a very special feeling for it and a special sense of sadness because it is a beautiful country filled with very gentle people.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

GOODBYE TO FIJI

Say goodbye to Fiji, and say it soon. The country is going rapidly down the tubes.

Two months ago, Fiji wasn't such a bad place. It ambled along at a South Pacific pace. The locals were laid back and well fed, and prone to a languor induced by regular cups of kava, the narcotic beverage of preference in those parts. Tourists flocked in from Australia and New Zealand, attracted to resorts with names like Buca Bay, Rukuruku and Turtle Island, where "The Blue Lagoon"—an execrable film that launched the cinema career of Brooke Shields—was shot 20 years ago. In a nutshell, Fiji was so serene that even honeymooners from the American Midwest were not ruffled by the grueling journey it took to get there.

All that changed on May 19, when a man called George Speight barged into parliament with a throng of thugs and took Mahendra Chaudhry, the Prime Minister, hostage—along with most of the country's cabinet. They were released only last week, and have all been stripped of office.

Mr. Speight is an ethnic Fijian, of Melanesian stock, and Mr. Chaudhry is of Indian descent, as is 44 percent of the country's population. The former maintains that he was acting in the interests of the Melanesian majority, who constitute just over half of all Fijians. The Indians, he declares, are "the exploiters" and "the enemy." Unabashedly racial in his vision of Fiji, he insists on the permanent exclusion of Indians from government office. He calls also for curbs on the commercial mobility of Indians, who control a lion's share of the Fijian economy.

The Indians, cast as "outsiders" by Mr. Speight, are descended from indentured plantation workers who were brought to the archipelago by the colonial British administration a century ago. Most Indians are fourth-generation Fijians. From where we stand, that makes them no less entitled to all the rights of citizenship—whether political or commercial—than an ethnic Fijian might be.

Mr. Speight doesn't see things that way. Neither, alas, does Fiji's Great Council of Chiefs, a body of tribal elders that enjoys ill-defined, but very real, powers under the country's racially skewed customary law. To their discredit, the chiefs have given their

imprimatur to Mr. Speight's objectives, as have sections of the armed forces.

The country's interim prime minister, appointed by the army chief while Mr. Chaudhry was hostage, last week unveiled a "Blueprint" for the "protection" of indigenous Fijians. The document comprises an ill-judged plan for commercial affirmative action, designed to "advance the interests of" the country's ethnic majority. Indians are to be excluded in areas where they are "over-represented," and ethnic Fijians are to get preferential royalties, subsidies, tax breaks, rents and licenses.

The problem with this ethnic gravy train, of course, is that Fiji will soon run out of gravy. The sugar industry, manned by Indians, is in disarray. Tourism, which contributes \$235 million per annum to the economy—and which is second only to sugar in Fiji's economic schema—has ground to a jarring halt. After the recent invasions of luxury resorts by knife-wielding "traditional landowners," it's hard to see those Aussies, Kiwis and Midwestern honeymooners coming back. A flight of disenfranchised Indo-Fijians to Australia and New Zealand is under way. This will drain Fiji of its best technical and entrepreneurial stock.

Mr. Speight and his cohorts will learn swiftly that running an economy is a lot harder than storming a parliament. There is no more than a blueprint for economic suicide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the Senator from Arizona, for his remarks in regard to this challenge, especially as it relates to the South Pacific.

Today, we have received very troublesome information about parts of Indonesia where there is this kind of tension which is threatening the peace, well-being, and the capacity of individuals to exercise their own religious beliefs in ways they see fit. This troublesome disorder is to be noted and understood, and we should speak out on it. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his remarks.

THE MISSOURI RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about something closer to home for me. Perhaps one of the most important things that has ever been known or understood in the economy of Missouri is the Missouri River. It is part of the lifeblood of our State. It transports commerce from one part of the State to another and from our State down through the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico and around the world.

There are some troublesome issues regarding the flows in the Missouri River. They relate to the energy and water appropriations bill which includes specific measures relating to language in this year's bill that is identical to language found in previous bills.

Under normal Senate procedure once a committee acts and reports out a bill, the bill comes to the floor, and if a Senator does not like a certain provision in the bill, then that Senator has the right to move to strike that position. That is a guaranteed right.

However, it appears that one of the provisions, which is totally consistent with language that has been in previous bills regarding flows in the Missouri River system, is not to the liking of some individual Senators. In particular, the minority leader has indicated his opposition to Section 103. Senator DASCHLE has done what he could to prevent debate on this section, and has worked to make sure the bill does not come to the floor at all.

That is a harsh and inappropriate way for us to act. If any Senator does not like a provision, then that Senator can move to strike the provision, and the Senate can vote on such a motion. Unfortunately, this election to stall; to interrupt the progress and business of the Senate; to say we do not want to allow a bill to come to the floor as it was reported by the committee and as it has come year after year is a way to interrupt the business of the Senate, is inappropriate.

I was pleased that earlier this afternoon the majority leader filed a cloture motion on the energy and water appropriations measure, but it is unfortunate that he had to do so. I regret the majority leader had to take such action, but because the Democrats insisted on stalling the normal legislative process, such action was necessary.

The Missouri River and the Mississippi River are the two most valued treasures of Missouri citizens. They are essential for not only transportation in our State but about 40 percent of all the people in our State get their drinking water out of those rivers. They are important for irrigation and for cost-efficient transportation.

I have had the privilege through the decades of fighting to protect that resource, not only for human consumption but for transportation as well. As attorney general, I was involved in litigation that went all the way to the Supreme Court. I was pleased to be part of that, to be a moving factor in that litigation which protected our waterflows at that time in the river.

I watched as the Missouri River, when it had inadequate flows, paralyzed a community. I remember years ago when I was Governor, an ice bridge developed. This was a natural impairment of the flow north of Missouri in the river and north of the city of St. Joseph. Instead of the water flowing down, the ice jam backed up the water.

The river levels fell and a great city such as St. Joseph, MO, was without water. When I went to look at the water intake facility for St. Joseph, I noticed the water was a foot or two below the intake. We worked night and day to get a new pump and a new system of drawing water out of the river. Proper river flows are essential to the well-being of our State.

In the committee report of the energy and water appropriations bill, Section 103 prohibits the expenditure of resources to diminish the flow or to otherwise tamper with the flow of the

river because the river flows are so essential to the well-being of our State. The Corps' plan for rewriting the way the river will be managed is known as the Missouri River Master Manual. It would send additional surges of water down in the spring, which would cause flooding, and withhold additional water in the fall, which would cause low levels in the river.

If you make the level of the river low in the fall, the crop which has been grown can't be shipped as efficiently when there is inadequate river flow for transportation. Of course, you may not have a crop to ship if in the spring you release so much water that you cause widespread flooding. This flooding potential concerns many of our communities. I have worked closely with the rest of the Missouri delegation in the Congress, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Mid-America Regional Council 2000. We uniformly oppose management of the river in a way that would cause flooding in the Spring, and then a restriction of the flow of the river in the fall which would make impossible the kind of transportation upon which our farm, agricultural, and other industries must rely.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has recently recommended to the Army Corps of Engineers a spring pulse or spring rise on the Missouri River. This recommendation is irresponsible and dangerous. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service wants to do this because it is interested in improving environmental conditions for certain species of fish and birds. We all are concerned about fish and birds, the shorebirds, the piping plover, and the shark-like pallid sturgeon fish. But this protection should not come at the expense of the lives of thousands of people living downstream.

Section 103 to H.R. 4733, forbids any funding in the bill from being used to revise the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual to allow for an increase in the springtime water release program during the spring heavy rainfall and snowmelt period in the States. This spring release, or spring rise, or spring pulse would be dangerous for all citizens living and working downstream from Gavins Point, located on the border of Nebraska and South Dakota.

It normally takes about 12 days for water to travel from Gavins Point to St. Louis. During the spring, weather in the Midwest is especially unpredictable. It is usually said if you don't like the weather, just wait a bit. If it is that unpredictable, especially in the spring, it is very difficult to correctly predict the weather for a 12-day period. And if you are going to send a big pulse of water down the river and then, as you are in the process of doing so, there is a substantial rainstorm or series of storms that develop, the very purpose of restricting flooding and providing a basis for reasonable flow in the river is defeated. If you are already sending a charge of water down the