CHAIRPERSON JAMES:  At this point, I'd like to open it up for questions from commissioners and I'd also encourage the panelists to engage in discussion among yourselves. Commissioner McCarthy?

MR. McCARTHY:  Thank you for your testimony, Ms. Schlichter. We understand what it means for you to come and testify. It's very important to hear though, because while we hear about the up-side of the industry and there is some good stories, people getting jobs, people lifting their standard of living quality of life, we also know from a number of persons that there's a down-side to this and we haven't gotten a handle yet on how to get at that down-side. Nor have we reached the point where we perhaps ultimately can persuade people to share the responsibility of addressing the very kinds of problems you're talking about because yours isn't just a single story.

We know from most conservative surveys that there are minimally four and a half million pathological gamblers in this country and there's a much greater number of those in the category just below that, that we're struggling to define right now in a professional and defensible way.

I had a couple of questions, Madam Chair, first to Mr. Costas. I thank you for being here and for your testimony. I also thank you for the way you handled yourself in a broadcast that you and Joe Morgan and others manage to not only make watching games interesting but manage to preserve a lot of the historical ideals of sports in this country.
MR. COSTAS: Thank you. Thank you very much.

MR. McCARTHY: So we appreciate that role that you play. I've heard a couple of things lately that really disturbed me. First of all, I'm one of many readers of Pro Football Weekly. I naturally have to help my team, the 49ers, in the draft so I'm looking at all the best college players and so on.

MR. COSTAS: I thought the selection of Montana was brilliant and I congratulate you.

MR. McCARTHY: Thank you. Thank you. That came from me. That was one of mine. Yet, I noticed in a recent edition of Pro Football Weekly half the pages were devoted to gambling ads. Now, it's a private magazine and of course, they can do what they want and we haven't reached a point in this country where we're going to restrict the right of private magazines to do that, but it was just a signal about the many changes that are occurring in both professional and amateur sports in America.

That leads me to the more disturbing thing that I read lately though, that the spokesperson for the NFL justified accepting some advertising from organizations that represent gambling facilities. And that was a new advance here, a new level of acceptance.

MR. COSTAS: You mean casinos and --

MR. McCARTHY: Yes, not specifically named casinos, but larger trade organization kinds. And my question to you,
sir, is do you know of any of the team owners in any professional sport that have made any kind of articulate statement that tries to set down some kind of line in the sand, some boundary separating sports from gambling of all kinds here? Is there anybody out there providing leadership? We're awaiting the fallout from events in Louisiana. I mean, there are other things happening.

Is there anybody out there leading professional sports organizations that is really taking a position?

MR. COSTAS: Mr. McCarthy, all of the commissioners through the years have expressed their strong opposition to the spread of legalized gambling, especially as it pertains to their sports, not so much as it pertains to casino gambling and that sort of thing but as it pertains to wagering on their sports and in some cases they testified to that effect before Congress.

And, of course, there are at least a handful of incidents through history where they've taken action. Pete Rozelle, the NFL commissioner in the early '60's, suspended both Alex Karras and Paul Hornig for an entire season for betting on pro football games, not effecting their outcome, not betting against their own teams but betting on the outcome of pro football games. And the most notorious case is that of Pete Rose, who was banned from baseball and Bart Giomati and his successors took a very firm stand on that.

Prior to that, Bowie Kuhn had banned two of the most beloved players of all time, Mickey Mantle and Willie Mays, from
direct involvement in baseball because they were representing casinos. Now, that ban was subsequently rescinded by his successor, Peter Uberough, but I think there is some record, it may be spotty, but there's some record that at least officially the pro sports leagues strongly oppose the involvement of their athletes and their officials in gambling and oppose the spread of legalized gambling on team sports.

MR. McCARTHY: I very much appreciate those examples you gave but they are 10 to 30 years old in vintage and what has happened in this country is that we're now not talking about Nevada and Atlantic City of course. We're talking about state run lotteries in 37 states, some form of gambling in 48 out of 50 states. The world had changed rather dramatically in that period of time. So my question is more directed to today's leaders.

Is anybody speaking out, is anybody trying to preserve the ideals of sports in America. When I took my sons to -- attended their football games and I'm attending my granddaughter's soccer games, a lot of us still believe that there's much to be said for kids' involvement in sports and we don't want to see that tainted.

MR. COSTAS: Well, it's a broad question. I recognize that there's an irony in watching a baseball game and knowing that Pete Rose not only is banned from receiving any income from baseball or any direct involvement at present in baseball but is obvious hall of fame achievements cannot
officially be recognized. He's not been elected to the hall of fame for baseball achievements that occurred prior to the infractions that had him tossed out of baseball. But at the same time you can watch a ball game now and see either ads on the broadcast or even sometimes in stadium print ads for casinos and it's obviously legalized gambling but there is an irony there.

I think in answer to the broad question about sportsmanship, about proper behavior, that entails things other than gambling and I think that a number of the commissioners and owners have spoken out about that but they realize that it's a complex problem and they're up against difficult societal forces and in some cases they're up against the resistance of player's associations when it comes to imposing significant discipline.

Before this one point is lost and then I can give the microphone back to you, in mentioning these ads for these handicappers, at least one writer had dubbed them "scamdicappers." You say to yourself if somebody really has five guaranteed winners, "Phone in this week and I'll give you your first winners absolutely free and then after that I'll give you my guaranteed upset of the week," why bother to advertise in the paper? Why not just come right here until your expertise becomes so overwhelming that state officials escort you to the border because you've won billions of dollars yourself?

You know, if I had that kind of expertise, I'm a generous man, but I wouldn't want to be sharing it with
strangers, I'd just gamble myself and make all the money and be living on the Riviera.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Thank you. The Chair is going to recognize the commissioners in this order; Commissioner Bible, then Commissioner Dobson, then Commissioner Loescher.

MR. BIBLE: Of all the panels that we've had appear before us as we've been around the United States, this is the first one that has really dealt with, to a large extent, the problem that you've identified as being conducted illegally. The figures that our staff indicated to us in their briefing paper would be that 97 percent of sports wagering is illegal. Three percent is done legally.

It would appear that prohibition and prohibition of sports wagering is not effective, that it's not enforced. What is the problem and what would be the recommendations to solve the problems that have been identified and I assume, Ms. Schlichter, that your husband was not wagering in Nevada casinos, he was wagering with a bookie.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Do you have anyone in particular you'd like to address that or just open?

MR. BIBLE: I'd like to have Mr. Costas and Mr. Saum.

MR. SAUM: Well, I don't think that we need to -- I don't think the way to solve the problem is to legalize this across the United States. Obviously the NCAA and other sports organizations are fundamentally opposed to sports wagering
philosophically because the game is there to be watched and enjoyed for the spontaneous action and reaction on the field, for the coaches' decisions, the officials' decisions. We don't think that folks should come to the game and be betting on 19 and 20-year old athletes and their decisions out here.

What we believe needs to occur is that we -- first of all, we believe that society has been desensitized to the entire issue of sports wagering and of gambling in general. We need to raise their awareness of what is wrong with illegal sports wagering. We need law enforcement to step up to the plate and we, as the NCAA, need to continue to educate our athletes and our athletic administrators.

We do have policies and procedures that prohibit casino and gambling advertisement in our programs, in our championship events. There's no signage, et cetera, but I don't believe -- the NCAA does not believe that the way to solve this problem with illegal gambling is to legalize it.

MR. BIBLE: Can it be enforced effectively?

MR. SAUM: It can be enforced effectively and for the last two years -- the NCAA has always been interested in the gambling issue but for the last two years we've had a full time staff member doing this, that being myself. And we've worked extensively with United States attorneys, with the FBI, with local and state law enforcement and frankly, a lot of it is just educating those individuals and I say that very respectfully.
But I don't think that society, the general public, let alone law enforcement really knows what's going on in our communities and specifically in our situation on our college campuses. We're not just throwing this out when we say there's student bookies on every campus in America. There are and if we can raise the awareness of campus security, raise the awareness of local law enforcement, the FBI and the United States Attorneys' offices, then I think we can get somewhere, yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Any other questions, Commissioner Bible?

MR. BIBLE: No.

DR. DOBSON: Pardon me, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: That's all right. Commissioner Dobson.

DR. DOBSON: I'd like to express appreciation to all of the panelists for this very interesting presentation from each of you, especially you, Mrs. Schlichter for being willing to share a very personal part of your life that must have been extremely painful and I appreciate you being here.

Mr. Saum, you addressed most of your comments to illegal sports gambling. You didn't have much to say about legalized gambling on sporting activities. Would you like to comment on that?

MR. SAUM: Commissioner Dobson, Madam Chair and the rest of the commissioners, we -- fundamentally the NCAA is opposed to legal and illegal sports wagering, but much like this
Commission, we have not drawn a moral line in the sand that we are going to come out and attempt to change the law. Certainly we would be adamantly opposed to any further legalization across the United States. If we're going to have sports wagering, let's keep it in Nevada and nowhere else. Let's not allow individuals to wager from outside the state lines.

We also have a rule that our athletes, our coaches and everyone involved in athletics, including those of us at the national office may not wager legally. So we are opposed to it. But we also recognize that society or a segment of society believes that this is something that they believe should be permissible. So I don't think you will see the NCAA start a campaign to remove sports wagering from the State of Nevada, but you would see us jump to our feet if it would expand outside of state. For example, being that the State of Oregon which has the lottery that has to do with NFL games, we will not bring the NCAA tournament to the State of Oregon because of that.

DR. DOBSON: Mr. Costas, same question essentially.

MR. COSTAS: Mr. Dobson, this may not be directly related to your question but Ms. Price made a point that might be overlooked and I think it's very significant. With the geometrically expanding sports universe on television, with cable TV and now direct satellite television, you have more games which people can follow. Now, this bit of evidence is antidotal but I'm certain that the research backs this up as well.
There are some people who are able, I'm sure, to bet in a detached fashion, not follow the game and then just learn of the outcome, but in my experience, my father would almost only bet on the games that were on television. We lived in New York, so we knew the Yankees and Mets or Nicks or Rangers might be on television, but then he would consult what compared to today were the relatively meager offerings on network TV in his day, "Oh, the Broncos and the Bills are on," and then he'd mutter, "What the hell do I know about the Broncos and Bills?"

But he'd bet that game anyway because that game was on television and you can follow it. I think part of, and those who have a background in this, academic background, would know more about it, but I think part of the appeal here isn't just the outcome of the wager, it's the thrill and the adrenaline rush of following the wager, almost as if you're participating in the game to take it from its very beginning to its end with all the emotional ups and downs.

And now as more and more of that is available, it only makes sense that that increases the problem for those on the fringes. And I'm not sure what the percentage is but obviously there are those involved in gambling who represent the down-side that Art Schlichter represents, at the most extreme and with increased technology allowing for almost moment to moment interaction. You could bet not just on the outcome of the game but on the outcome of a drive. Does this drive result in points being scored? Does this inning result in runs being
scored?  Does this at bat yield an out or the batter reaching base?

I mean, you could, in theory, have hundreds and hundreds of events within the three-hour span -- or hundreds and hundreds of wagers within the three-hour span of a single sports event.

DR. DOBSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commissioner Loescher.

MR. LOESCHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I thought this panel was very interesting and I was particularly pleased with Mr. Price's testimony and she's one tough grandmother, I'll tell you that, but I wanted to ask a question of Mr. Curran and Mr. Salerno, if they could impart some information to the Commission.

This Internet exposure seems to be just at the beginning and looks like it has a chance to be very explosive right into our households, our living rooms and something that our college kids can access very easily. In the State of Nevada it seems like the chairman of the Regulatory Commission has a lot of power there in judgment as to how things get done. What is -- it seems like you're holding back the dam on the Internet with your regulations. How long do you think that that can occur given the marketplace? Is that a policy that can endure or will technology overwhelm you and the marketplace drive that opportunity?
MR. CURRAN: Commissioner, I think you're going to hear different responses from Mr. Salerno and me on this issue. We have taken a strong stand against Internet gaming in the past. I think that you pointed out some changes in society and in technology that have forced us to at least agree to look at what should be done to regulate, if anything, Internet gaming. That change has happened both here in Nevada.

I think it's also important to realize that we are really just a leading jurisdiction but a leading jurisdiction in the worldwide industry. I recently came back from Prague at an international conference of gaming regulators. There was much discussion there by my counterparts having to do with Internet gaming regulation and we have undertaken a study of how this can be handled. There are some jurisdictions, Australia is notable, that had already authorized Internet gaming and I believe they've licensed Mr. Salerno to participate in it in that jurisdiction.

There can be no question that the more strictly we regulate sports betting in Nevada, the greater the likelihood that offshore operations in the Caribbean and other places benefit from what we do to tighten our regulations. So I guess the short answer is we're looking at it, and we recognize it's a very difficult issue. At this point the problems, to me at least, overwhelm the benefits that would come from authorizing it.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Mr. Salerno.
MR. SALERNO: Well, first of all, I believe the Internet can be really regulated no differently than we've been regulated here by the Nevada Gaming Board. We have to keep track of every wager that's placed. If the Gaming Board would come in and do the same thing with the Internet, there would be no problem regulating it.

As Mr. Curran said, we have been licensed in Australia to take wagers over the Internet. In Australia it's all regulated by the Australian government. However, our company by choice has decided not to accept wagers from the U.S. and in fact, we will block out any wagers that are attempted to be made from the U.S. The Internet is definitely the wave of the future. It is a very exploding industry.

I was reading in USA Today now where you can get prescriptions over the Internet. You answer questions on the Internet, you can get Viagra or whatever your drug of choice is. So things are changing and I just feel that to keep the industry where it is, especially the legal industry, yes, we can definitely regulate it and it can be regulated more than everybody understands now.

MR. LOESCHER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Ms. Price, I had a question for you and I see your hand is raised as well. I just wondered for a point of clarification if you could explain why there are some who would not want winning sports teams, college teams in Nevada. I didn't quite follow the logic of that.
MS. PRICE: First let me comment on what was just said and it is impossible to govern gambling in the absence of a consistent policy from Congress. If Congress is going to say what Bill Bradley said in his statement, then they need to apply the law uniformly throughout the country and make that a policy statement at least as it applies to college sports.

With regard to my statement about the conflict within this state, when -- and even before, but with the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, that basically gave Nevada a monopoly on sports betting. That is that with the proliferation of gambling around the country, they cannot have sports betting. So the laws of Nevada apply.

Now, there is a gaming regulation that prohibits as they stated, gambling on UNLV. So if UNLV is a winning team, the casinos can't take book. Now, I've heard that there is more money played on the NCAA basketball than there is on the Super Bowl but the casinos can't take book if UNLV is playing. So there is that conflict. Now, I had legislation drafted, and they did hear me, but didn't act on it to not allow gambling on any teams for college sports in Nevada.

Then I said, well, allow gambling on UNLV even though I don't think that's a good idea for any of them, but allow it on UNLV. At least it's better than having the conflict that exists in this state because there will always be a cloud over our schools on whether they're being kept from having a winning team.
CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Thank you. Commissioner Lanni.

MR. LANNI: Thank you. I agree, it's an excellent panel, it was a good presentation. Mr. Saum, I have a question, if I may, of you. You had indicated and I was referring to your written testimony that this particular study of 1700 students from six colleges and universities in the U.S. were surveyed about their gambling behavior and it talked about the percentage of males and females that gambled once a week.

It goes on to say, "The data also revealed that the rates of pathological and problematic gambling among college students are four to eight times higher than reported for the adult population." Now, I've seen some studies about the overall population, Doctor Schaffer's and others, but about the adult population. There doesn't seem to be anywhere near that level of higher percentages in the overall adult population. What is it that college does to people during that four-year period that either allows them to change afterwards and move away from problematic or pathologic gambling or is there a correlation? I was very confused by that.

MR. SAUM: Commissioner Lanni, there's several thoughts I could share with you on that. The first thought is, is that our college communities are frankly artificial societies and many things that happen within that college campus stays on that college campus. Much of the indiscretions by our students and our student athletes are handled within that world. I think also studies would show that college students have binge
behaviors, whether it's a binge alcohol, binge drug, binge sex
or binge gambling.

There are studies that exist that college students
have these binge behaviors when they are within this artificial
community but when they leave and enter society, real life, that
they no longer have these binge behaviors. So I think it's the
atmosphere within the college, within the college community, the
artificial society. The first time these individuals are on
their own, the first time that these individuals can make their
own decisions.

Also the characteristics at least from the athletic
side of our greatest athletes, the items we mentioned such as
believing they can control anything they're involved in or
nothing bad is going to happen to me, aggressive behavior, et

cetera, those are the characteristics of our greatest athletes
but on the negative side it can put them at risk also.

MR. LANNI: I guess that says that we're going to
have a new category of binge pathological and binge problematic
gambling as a new category to study. We'll have to see how that
works. Mr. Salerno, I have one question.

MR. SAUM: Well, I think it is important to raise
awareness in that area, frankly. I think in the '70's I think
those of us that attended college in the '70's, we didn't hear
much about binge drinking or date rape. We do hear about that
in the '90's and our goal is to raise awareness of problem
gambling.
MR. LANNI: No, and I think that's quite valuable. Unfortunately I didn't attend college in the '70's, it goes back to the '60's for me. So we didn't know much of anything then. I may want to go back again.

Mr. Salerno, I have one question of you, if I may. Jim Dobson and I are both USC graduates and our football team is getting a little bit better for a change. Not quite there yet but it's getting better.

Mr. Salerno, I have one question on the aspect of Internet gambling. And I'm not a proponent of Internet gambling I must tell you that ahead of time but my question is, how can you control -- and you're a specialist in this, how can you control Internet gambling when it operates in Turk and Cacos (ph) Island in the Caribbean? How do you control that?

MR. SALERNO: How does government control that?

MR. LANNI: How does anyone control it?

MR. SALERNO: You really can't --

MR. LANNI: Thank you.

MR. SALERNO: -- as far as that, but Mr. Lanni, in places -- if it was in Nevada or if it's in Australia, you sure as hell can control it then and regulate it. I agree with you. That's part of the problem we're facing today is with all these Caribbean companies that are popping up that are accepting wagers from everywhere and everybody, it is a definitely problem and it will effect us here, the legal bookmakers in Nevada.
It's going to effect the entire country. There is no doubt in my mind about that but under the right circumstances it sure can be controlled.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commissioner Wilhelm?

MR. WILHELM: I have a comment rather than a question but before I make the comment I would respectfully advise the Chair as a fellow Virginian that in my case I've spent some time in Nevada, I would strongly urge you not to try to unravel the UNLV basketball history. Many have tried and all have failed.

I just have a comment following up on some of Commissioner McCarthy's comments and questions. I normally very much agree with Commissioner McCarthy's view that the gambling industry or industries would be well advised to step up to the plate and take responsibility for dealing with compulsive gambling problems in this country. I think that that would be in the best interest of all of the industries involved in legal gambling casinos, both commercial and tribal, lotteries, parimutuels and other aspects of legal gambling. And I think that it would be in the best interests of job security of the people who work in the gaming industry as well but I'm puzzled, Commissioner McCarthy, by your application of that concept to today's panel. Because according to the testimony and the staff briefings, there's about two and a half billion dollars worth of legal sports gambling in this country and there's somewhere,
depending on whose guesstimate you take, within $80 to $380 billion worth of illegal sports gambling.

There's no way that I could see for anybody to get the neighborhood bookie or the local college bookie to step up to the plate and share in the responsibility for the apparently rampant compulsive gambling problems that directly relate to sports wagering. So I concur with the concept that it's in the best interests of the legal gambling industries to step up to the plate on the compulsive gambling issue both in terms of prevention and research and increasing treatment opportunities, but I think that this panel shows really how big of a problem there is and the difficulty of addressing it. Because there isn't any way to make the sports gambling world, most of which is illegal, to step up to the plate on this and I think that's one of the dilemmas that faces this commission when we make our recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commissioner Dobson?

DR. DOBSON: Mr. Curran, just a quick question for you. It's obvious that Nevada prohibits gambling on sporting events taking place inside this state because the fear, obviously, that it would compromise the game. Considering the fact that visitors here are coming from all over the United States and, indeed, around the world, why wouldn't your concern extend to them as well as to sporting events in this state? What is different about the fact that sports gambling here could
have a negative effect on the outcome and compromise the game itself here but not elsewhere?

MR. CURRAN: I think part of the answer has to do with not just simply perception issues but the reality basis. I think that the fear is that because athletes or others who are closely involved in the games are -- would reside here and be involved in the community with local members in the community including those who are interested in betting them would be very much involved together, perhaps, on a day to day basis, that that just creates the possibility of greater influence and greater perception problems about the fact that the game is independent. It's played independently and we are simply permitting people to wager on the outcome of that game.

DR. DOBSON: Are you willing to acknowledge that you might have that kind of negative effect outside the state as well?

MR. CURRAN: Well, I guess I'll acknowledge that people can perceive what the inter-relationship is, sort of depending on where they begin their analysis or where they want to end. But I don't think that the fact that people come here from around the country and around the world for the Nevada gaming experience and as one part of that experience they visit the tables, they play the slot machines, they see the shows and one other thing they do while they're here is make a bet on the Super Bowl or on a game involving their home team or a team that they follow. I really don't think that that is problematic.
MR. SALERNO:   Excuse me, the team players from wherever these people are coming from don't live here in Nevada also. You have to remember that. That's a big concern here for us. If your team is from Wyoming or New York or wherever they're from, those players live there. They don't live in Nevada. Our players do live here.

DR. DOBSON:   Well, university athletics, obviously, recruits from all over the United States. That doesn't sound like a strong argument to me.

MS. SALERNO:   Sure, they recruit but isn't your environment, the environment that we present here is that sports betting is legal. If a student from UNLV lives in Chicago, he can't go to a local bookmaker and place a wager on that game.

DR. DOBSON:   I won't take any more time. I understand where you're coming from.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES:   All right, Commissioner McCarthy.

MR. McCARTHY:   I want to thank my friend, John Wilhelm, for once again contributing in a constructive way to some comment I made. I do think we have to have a sense of proportion on how we address these problems. And it is correct, as Mr. Bible pointed out awhile ago, that the vast large percentage of the sports betting we're talking about here is illegal and while our charge from Congress and the President is to look at legal gambling in America, I think we have the
latitude to add comments on an issue as important as this if we can get some guidance from the NCAA and other groups.

I would add at the very end of this comment, though that $2.6 billion is not chump change and if that's what's being bet on sports in Nevada, then I would suggest that proportionally those who would derive the fruit from that betting, Mr. Salerno and his peers, I might respectfully suggest should start thinking about the down-side that's caused from the number of pathological and problem gamblers in this country who may do nothing else besides sports betting here and illegally outside of the State of Nevada.

Let me ask, Madam Chair, if I may, Mr. Saum, if you can give us any guidance: What are the strongest ideas? What are the strongest suggestions that NCAA leaders over the years have proposed to deal with college gambling? Give them to us and I think this Commission membership would certainly like to look at those and review those and maybe include some kind of very supportive strong statement in its final report. It may be addressed to -- I'm assuming to state government leadership who charter certainly the public universities in their specific states but there may be many ideas. We're asking for help from people that have been studying this kind of issue for many years.

So not at this moment but specifically, if you could go back and talk to the NCAA leadership and look historically through what previous NCAA leadership boards have attempted to
propose to get at this, give us some guidance. I think this
Commission would be strongly disposed to help you in the
strongest terms.

One final question, if I may; do you have -- let me
ask Mr. Curran first. What's the division in that $2.6 billion
bet on sports on Nevada between professional sports and amateur
sports?

MR. CURRAN: I don't have those numbers with me but
I believe there's more bet on professional sports to a fairly
significant degree.

MR. McCARTHY: I would guess that but I'm really
interested in the number that's bet on amateur sports. Any
idea?

MR. CURRAN: I would hesitate --

MR. McCARTHY: Where can we get that information?

MR. CURRAN: I could supply that to you probably
before the day is over.

MR. McCARTHY: Would you please, we'd like to have
it in our record. If it's a billion dollars or something, I
mean, that's significant. That's something we should know
about.

Let me ask and I know this is very hard because it's
in the realm of illegal betting. That a demonstrous number
we've just been given, billions bet on sports outside of Nevada
in illegal form. Do you have any idea, and documentation on how
much of that is on amateur sports versus professional sports?
MR. CURRAN: Commissioner McCarthy, I don't want to lose any credibility in taking a shot at that number. I have the same numbers that have been shared here today of the illegal wagering between 80 and --

MR. McCARTHY: All right, if you could help us research that and try to pin that down, even if the number is cut in half, as long as we have some defensible evidence as to what it is. I think it's important that we know the number especially bet on amateur sports in this country.

MR. CURRAN: I would like to say, Commissioner McCarthy, the NCAA is appreciative of your comments and we do have ideas for an action plan and would love to share those with the Commission over time.

MR. McCARTHY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: And I would ask each of our panelists to do just that as well. The Commission is moving from our listening phase to our deliberative phase and as we do that it will be important for us to hear from each and every one of you in terms of things that you think would be helpful for us to know and in terms of recommendations that you'd like to make to us for our final report.

Again, I'd like to thank all of you for the time commitment that you've made to be here to share with us today and we hope that you will stay in touch with the Commission until we reach our final phase. It's very important for us to have your input.
MR. COSTAS: Madam Chair, may I make one quick point for 15 seconds and I'll stay on point.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Fifteen seconds, yes.

MR. COSTAS: In Art Schlichter's testimony, and obviously he can't be here to represent himself, one of the points he makes is one that's been eluded to today about even though it may represent a relatively small portion of the amount of money that's bet in total, there are billions of dollars bet legally and he endorses the idea of portions of those proceeds across the board, not in piecemeal fashion, but in all the various forms of legalized gambling, portions of those proceeds going to programs that would head off compulsive gambling or treat those who are in the throws of compulsive gambling.

If Art Schlichter himself, as you will see, as you heard from Mitzi's eloquent testimony and as you can read in his own testimony, if Art Schlichter once he is out of prison through a combination of therapy and medication and the wisdom he's gained through his own experiences, if he is able to move forward with the foundation that he has already formed and plans to be in the forefront of, he could be as powerful a spokesman on this issue as you would find anywhere. Not just because of his personal capabilities and how well-spoken and articulate he is but because obviously his own background as a well-known player and where he came from or where he wound up, I think that he would be as powerful a person as you could find anywhere in the country to make the case.
CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Thirty-two seconds.

MR. COSTAS: I'm sorry. Had it been 15 seconds to the commercial, I would have hit it.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Do you know what, I suspect that would be the case. With that, we're going to stand in recess for 15 minutes. Thank you.