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Abstract

Established in 1859, Oregon, like so many other states, discovered quickly that a strong, viable economy was necessary in order to support the government and the civilians of the state. This paper follows the development of Oregon's economy over the years all the way to 1989 when the Oregon State Lottery introduced a sports wagering game that was meant to provide additional revenue to the state. This game, otherwise known as Sports Action became a controversial topic among many people. Professional and amateur sports leagues all took issue to this game and eventually federal intervention was called for. From this cry for help, the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act was created. This research contributes to our understanding of Oregon's actions and offers a look into the modern politics that our nation operates on through careful examination of government records.
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Introduction

When one thinks of Oregon, thoughts of scenic national forests, Portland and the multitude of football uniforms that the University of Oregon possess, come to mind. Most people normally do not immediately think of sports gambling when asked to describe Oregon, but the state is heavily associated with it. A state lottery established in the early 1980s to help out with the state's economy, set the foundation for Oregon to create a sports lottery later in the decade. When sports gambling was introduced in the state in 1989 it became a heavily contested issue in the years following.

Professional and amateur leagues both attempted to eliminate this form of gambling. Claiming that this type of gambling severely damaged the integrity of their respective sports, along with other justifications for opposing sports gambling, professional and amateur leagues sought ways to eliminate Oregon's new sports lottery. Some leagues, such as the National Football League (NFL) and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) merely threatened Oregon, while other leagues such as the National Basketball Association (NBA) brought this matter to the courts. But their individual efforts were futile. Seeking an alternative to combat this problem, the professional and amateur leagues turned to members of the United States Senate to help in their struggle.

In an attempt to protect collegiate athletes and professional athletes alike from the dangers of sports gambling while protecting the interests of the leagues at the same time, Senators DeConcini and Hatch introduced Senate Bill No. 474 in the 102nd Congress. This bill became Public Law 102-559 by late October of 1992. More commonly known as the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, this law sought to prevent state-sponsored sports lotteries. Protection of the leagues' interests and athletes at both the professional and
amateur level and prevention of their participation in such practices were the base of this legislation.

This paper examines the economic path that Oregon took to implement its state-sponsored sport lottery and the growing pressures that the federal government faced from professional and amateur sports leagues to limit it. These growing numbers of voices from sports leagues forced the federal government to quickly attempt to appease them by enacting the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act. This thesis will be validated through the examination of the federal legislation along with an abundance of newspaper sources pertaining to Oregon's sports lottery and relevant secondary sources that deal with Oregon's economic activity over time.
Part I: Oregon's Economic History

A. Statehood to the Great Depression

Since the beginning of Oregon's statehood in 1859, the state's economy had been
dependent primarily on agriculture. The 1860 United States Census found that more than half the
population of the state was employed either as farmers or as farm laborers.¹ This emphasis on
agricultural economics in Oregon's early years can best be explained by legislature such as the
Donation Land Act.

Passed in 1850, the Donation Land Act actively encouraged settlers in Oregon to pursue
farming as a means of life. Under this Act, 640 acres was granted to married men who lived on
the land and developed it for four consecutive years. Single men were granted 320 acres under
the same guidelines.² This Act enabled agriculture in Oregon to grow rapidly.

Along with Oregon being accepted as a state came the introduction of representation in
Congress. Two senators and one representative granted the state a voice in Congress, and then
encouraged economic expansion to occur even more rapidly. New roads were built throughout
Oregon, making communication and trade throughout the region easier, thus helping Oregon to
continue to flourish. Mining and logging operations, sawmills, and cattle stock-raisers also began
to thrive as well.³

The coastal areas of Oregon were also developed from the aid of Congress. Before
development, these areas were treacherous for seafarers. Strong winds in combination with rocky
headlands continually destroyed ships and early on claimed many lives. Over time, various funds
were granted by Congress for construction of vital facilities such as lighthouses, lightships and

¹ Tom Fuller and Art Ayre, Oregon at Work: 1859-2009 (Portland, OR: Ooligan Press, 2009), 21.
In this census 7,861 (43 percent) individuals were farmers and 1,260 (7 percent) were farm laborers.
In 1855, the acreage granted to married and single men degreased to 320 and 160 acres respectively.
³ “Oregon History: Uncle Sam's Handiwork,” Oregon Blue
stations for the U.S. Life-Saving Service. This made the coastal areas less dangerous and continued Oregon's economic climb.⁴

The population of the state grew just as rapidly as its economy did. In the early years of Oregon's statehood, the population of the state hovered around twelve thousand residents with the majority of the population being farmers. By 1900, the population had exploded to over four hundred thousand people.⁵ Agricultural jobs still dominated much of Oregon's economy. This was in large part due to Oregon's vast available natural resources.⁶

At the turn of the 19th century, agriculture was still the foremost cog in Oregon's bustling economy. Over seventy-eight thousand people worked on farms, in gardens, orchards, and pasturelands during the first decade of the 1900s. Mining was still prominent, but this occupation began to experience a decline. Wheat farming began to blossom in the state as well as ranching. Even though the agricultural based economy continued to propel Oregon, however, a slow steady shift from an agricultural economy to an economy that manufactured goods to be exported.⁷

During this economical shift to manufacturing, the timber industry began to grow and was spurred on by the introduction of railroads in the late 19th and early 20th century. Other means of transportation in Oregon, such as steamboats, also continued this trend. When the transcontinental railroads arrived in Oregon, additional, smaller railroads also were built, making

---

⁴ Ibid.
the ability to transport goods, such as timber, to other places for further manufacturing much easier.\footnote{“Oregon History: Emerging Economies,” Oregon Blue Book, \url{http://www.bluebook.state.or.us/cultural/history/history21.htm} (accessed October 28, 2012).}

Automation also assisted in the expansion of the timber industry. For example, in the late years of the 19th century, teams of oxen were used to pull timber out of forests. The turn of the century brought in the era of the steam donkeys, ultimately easing the transportation of logs through the forests.\footnote{Tom Fuller and Art Ayre, \textit{Oregon at Work: 1859-2009} (Portland, OR: Ooligan Press, 2009), 64, 74, 94.} Examples of automation such as this continued to drive the timber industry onward to the leading industry of Oregon's economy. Then the Great Depression hit.

The Great Depression proved to be harder on Oregon than other states. This was in large part due to the problems that the state faced throughout the 1920s. A drought and agricultural depression earlier in the decade left the economy already handicapped. When the stock market crashed on October 29th, 1929, the effects of the downturn proved even worse for Oregon's farmers.\footnote{Ibid, 104.} Wheat farmers had received $1.11 per bushel of wheat in 1929 only received 42ȼ per bushel in 1932.\footnote{David Peterson del Mar, \textit{Oregon's Promise: an Interpretive History} (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2003), 185.} Other industries Oregon were not left unscathed.

This downturn included the timber industry. Before the Depression, Oregon's peak sawlog production was four and one half billion board feet in 1929. This production fell to one and one half billion board feet just three years later. The number of jobs in the timber industry also declined during this time.\footnote{Tom Fuller and Art Ayre, \textit{Oregon at Work: 1859-2009} (Portland, OR: Ooligan Press, 2009), 104.} “Employment dropped by some 60 percent from 1929 to 1933,
wages by 77 percent.” These trends in Oregon's slumping economy came to an end when President Franklin D. Roosevelt introduced the New Deal economic program in 1933.

The New Deal was a series of economic programs and reform measures that President Roosevelt and a group of university scholars and liberal theorists created in order to respond to the catastrophic effects of the Great Depression. These programs and reforms were aimed at helping the American people weather the bad times, something that Roosevelt felt was the federal government's duty to do. The effects of the New Deal were felt nationwide and Oregon was no exception to this.

In Oregon two of the New Deal programs put unemployed people to work immediately. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) employed young, unskilled men in areas such as Cape Perpetua. While there, these workers built trails, planted trees, fought fires along with an array of other jobs. The Civil Works Administration (CWA) also employed a large portion of Oregonians for a brief period of four months. CWA workers of Lane County repaired roads and schools, revamped the sewer system and airport in the city of Eugene, taught adults, and ran a nursery school. The workers were paid about $1.00 an hour for their labors. These programs helped Oregon to start to get back on its feet economically but another New Deal program aided this recovery process even more than its predecessors.

Arguably the most influential program of the New Deal that affected Oregon was the Works Progress Administration (WPA). Under this program, many roads, bridges, schools and airports were built throughout Oregon. Like the CCC and CWA this program employed many jobless, unskilled Oregonians, but unlike these two programs the WPA also employed numerous

---

13 David Peterson del Mar, Oregon's Promise: an Interpretive History (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2003), 185.
15 David Peterson del Mar, Oregon's Promise: an Interpretive History (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2003), 196.
professionals. Men and women alike were employed through the WPA and the professions ranged enormously from dancers to librarians.\textsuperscript{16}

The biggest project in Oregon funded by the Works Progress Administration was the construction of the Bonneville Dam. Located approximately 80 miles upstream of Portland on the Columbia River, this project was started in 1934. Over the course of the next four years, this project employed hundreds. When it was completed in 1938, the Bonneville Dam greatly increased the region's electricity-generating capacity.\textsuperscript{17}

The New Deal and its programs helped Oregon greatly in a time of dire need. The projects that the CCC, CWA and WPA created for the unemployed in conjunction with the various other programs that were part of the New Deal helped to turn Oregon's slumping economy around. This positive economic trend continued and intensified when the United States entered World War II in 1941.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, 197. Under the Works Progress Administration, many of Oregon's most detailed historical records were created and organized by its employees.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
B. The Second World War to the 1970s

In just about any survey course that covers the United States from the Great Depression on, students are taught that the New Deal helped to reverse the disastrous effects that the Great Depression inflicted on the nation. But it was World War II that helped to bring the country fully out of the Great Depression. This notion held true for Oregon as well. When Pearl Harbor was attacked on December 7th, 1941, the United States was not only pulled out of the Depression, but also from the neutrality that it had held to up until that fateful day. Almost immediately, the nation was thrust into war mode. Oregon experienced this ‘war mode’ mentality first hand.  

The state immediately felt the economic effects of being in a war time mode. Due to the fact that Oregon was along the nation's Pacific Coast, it was considered to be directly in the warzone. Funds granted to Oregon by the federal government helped to build many facilities necessary to supplement the nation's war effort. Jobs for Oregonians emerged everywhere from the shipyards located on Oregon's coast, to military bases, to lumber and aluminum plants. This increase in available jobs created a surge in migrants moving to fill these needs. The economy of Oregon seemingly began to prosper and improve due to the nation's war needs.

Even when World War II ended, the effects of the wartime economy did not disappear. It remained consistent even when the soldiers returned to Oregon. The boost that the state's economy experienced from the war time needs and spending offered a vast number of new jobs to these returning soldiers. This in conjunction with the reemergence of the timber industry helped to keep Oregon moving forward economically.

From 1945 to the early 1990s, Oregon became a national leader in manufacturing forest products. Due to the infrastructure of roads that was created by the Civilian Conservation Corps

---

19 Ibid.
20 Ibid
during the Great Depression, forest access was dramatically improved. This fact, coupled with a shift from care of the state's forest to more of a harvesting mode, created even more of a growth in the logging and lumber industry. All the while, other industries of Oregon's economy began to reemerge along with the addition of several new industries as well.

Looking at Oregon's agriculture during the postwar years, finds similarities from before. Ranching and wheat farming remained staples in the field. However, specialized farming began to plant 'seeds' throughout Oregon's lands. Crops of alfalfa, sugar beets, potatoes and cranberries began to emerge all throughout the state along with vineyards for wineries. Overall, agriculture grew to be a far more complex industry in Oregon compared to previous decades.

Another new industry that surfaced during the postwar years was tourism. Oregon boasted very scenic attractions that many people found to make appealing vacation spots. From mountains to forests and deserts, to the beautiful Pacific shoreline, Oregon seemed to have everything a tourist desired. Again the semi-new road infrastructure did wonders to help tourism, making accessibility of such picturesque areas all the easier.

Like all fine things, this period of good economical times was about to be challenged during the early 1970s. It was around this time that, among both the general public and the state government, the need to protect the state's environment grew quickly. Before the 1950s, the northwestern part of the state was the primary site of timber production. By the time the 1950s came most of this region had already been utilized. This forced the industry to move east and south to continue operating.

21 Ibid
22 Ibid
At the same time foresters were becoming more efficient in harvesting trees. Technological developments, such as chain saws and tractors, contributed to this efficiency but these developments also reduced the need for actual manpower. This meant that even though the timber industry was flourishing economically the amount of jobs in the industry was actually decreasing. By the time the 1970s came around Oregon's timber industry was declining fast. Changes were required by Oregon's government in order to prevent the economy from slipping back into chaos.

\[24\text{ Colored Book page 221-3}\]
C. Onward to 1989

During the early years of the 1970s, Republican Tom McCall was in the midst of his first term as the state's governor. Popular among the public and media but not his own political party, McCall was an environmentalist who sought to broaden Oregon's industrial base while conserving the environment at the same time. Not surprisingly, this sentiment in Oregon corresponded closely with the nation's sentiments involving the environmental conservation movement. Ultimately this added to his popularity among the public and his willingness to confront wealthy Republicans on contentious issues such as environmental conservation granted him a second term as governor.

Throughout his two terms as Oregon's governor, McCall attempted on several occasions to diversify Oregon's economy. He knew that dependence on the timber and agriculture industries would eventually fail the state when those natural resources were depleted. Timber companies such as Georgia-Pacific and Weyerhaeuser were cutting at an extremely fast rate. This fact coupled with technological advances in the timber industry not only sped up this rate greatly but it also began to eliminate jobs in the industry.

In an attempt to prevent both the loss of jobs and Oregon's most abundant natural resource, Governor McCall required local governments to draft comprehensive zoning plans in an effort to control development while conserving the environment. At the same time he invested government resources in developing alternative energy solutions. Nuclear power was

26 David Peterson del Mar, Oregon's Promise: an Interpretive History (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2003), 239.
28 David Peterson del Mar, Oregon's Promise: an Interpretive History (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2003), 242.
one of these developments. His attempts at conserving Oregon's resources and continuing to develop their economy did not end when his second term was up; his successor followed the lead that McCall made.

Robert W. Straub served as governor from 1975-1979. Well-known for being a fiscally conservative individuals despite being a member of the Democratic Party, Straub continued where McCall left off. He strengthened land usage and energy laws. Governor Straub also continued to diversify Oregon's economy by introducing nonpolluting, labor-intensive industries into the already established economic infrastructure. One of the major nonpolluting industries that Governor Straub invested heavily in was mass transit such as Portland's light-rail system. After failing to get re-elected for a second term, Straub gave the reins over to his Republican counterpart, Victor G. Atiyeh.

Governor Atiyeh came into office in 1979 and served for two terms. Continuing in the trends that McCall and Straub previously set, Atiyeh strived to diversify and strengthen Oregon's economy further. In his eight years, Atiyeh improved the state's management, reformed land usage planning and established special programs for public safety in Oregon's fishing and lumber industries.

Additional measures were taken to improve the pre-existing industries as well. Governor Atiyeh strengthened Oregon's timber-dependent economy by reducing worker's compensation premiums. He also continued to develop the tourism industry and encouraged this industry to focus worldwide on attracting tourists to Oregon. All of these efforts by Atiyeh, however,

30 David Peterson del Mar, Oregon's Promise: an Interpretive History (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2003), 242.
32 Ibid.
paled in comparison to one of the newly instituted methods of generating revenue for the state that his administration sought to incorporate into Oregon's diversifying economy.

In 1984, amidst Aityeh's second term as governor, the Oregon State Lottery was created by an initiative petition. Its creators hoped to achieve several goals. The lottery was meant to create revenue for Oregon, thus boosting the state's suffering economy. It was also created to decrease Oregon's dependence on timber and agriculture. However, the most notable and probably unintended result of the creation of the Oregon State Lottery occurred later in the decade with the introduction of Sports Action.

Neil Goldschmidt (Democrat) was elected as Oregon's new governor in 1987. Despite the efforts made by the previous three governors, Oregon was in the thick of economic problems and high unemployment caused in large part to the recession that the entire nation had experienced earlier in the 1980s. Goldschmidt, however, had a plan for his state to emerge from these troubling times.

In his attempt to accomplish his economic agenda, Goldschmidt called for "an activist state role in the economy". Unlike his predecessors, Goldschmidt was more willing to focus on economic growth even if it came at the expense of conservation efforts of natural resources. New programs aimed to promote rural economic development were launched and Goldschmidt even created new ties with markets and economies world-wide. Japan, South Korea and Germany were just some of places where these ties were fostered during his term in office. Still determined to promote economic in any way, Governor Goldschmidt and Oregon State Lottery officials sought to incorporate another lottery game into their expanding repertoire.

34 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
Part II: Sports Action and Initial Opposition
A. What was Sports Action?

On September 6th, 1989, the Oregon State Lottery introduced an additional lottery game that it hoped would further aid the struggle to right the state's economy. This game was called Sports Action and it became the first successful sports wagering game to be offered by any lottery nation-wide.\(^{37}\) This was the first time that any state lottery nationwide had offered a wagering game where participants could bet on sports teams since Delaware's failed attempt in the 1970s.\(^{38}\)

Based on the outcome of games from the National Football League, Sports Action operated in the following way:

"In Oregon's 'Sports Action' game, players will bet at least $1 on the outcome of four to 14 NFL games. To win, a player must correctly pick every game on which he bets, using a point spread. Prices are expected to range from $8 for a four-game ticket to at least $8,000 for a player who calls all 14 games... The prizes may also get bigger, since the money bet on a category that is not won will roll over to the next week. For example, if no one picks all 14 games correctly, all the money bet on 14-game tickets will shift to the next week's betting"\(^{39}\)

Players could bet more than a dollar on tickets as well. For example, a player could bet five dollars on a four-game ticket or even a five-game ticket. The more a player bet on a ticket the higher the payout.

Sports Action became popular quickly among Oregonians. In its inaugural week, $221,000 was wagered. This amount was approximately half of what Jim Davey, director of the Oregon State Lottery, hoped for during the opening week.\(^{40}\) The second week brought in $337,000 and the third week totaled $412,000 which was closer to what Davey estimated ticket

---


\(^{38}\) See Appendix A for an example of Sports Action and Appendix B for a results page.

\(^{39}\) Ibid.

\(^{40}\) Ron Bellamy, "No Win Here: 'Now I Know Why They Call This Gambling!,'" Eugene Register-Guard, September 12, 1989.
sales to be around each week.\textsuperscript{41} The fourth week of Sports Action produced the first ticket in which all four games were picked correctly. The player of this ticket earned themselves $84,109 which was the biggest payout since Sport Action's debut a month earlier.\textsuperscript{42}

As mentioned earlier, the Oregon State Lottery and Sports Action was designed to aid the state's economy. The Oregon State Lottery was created initially to be an additional source of revenue to support economic development. Various industries such as tourism, fisheries, agriculture and manufacturing received assistance from the Oregon State Lottery. Over time though, Oregonians were granted a voice in deciding where else certain percentages of lottery funds would go.

In 1995 voters approved a constitutional amendment that specified public education would also receive a portion of the revenue that the lottery created. The Department of Education and Oregon University Systems were in charge of distributing these funds to specific areas within the education system. Another amendment in 1998 ensured that some of the revenue would be allocated to preserve, protect and develop Oregon's natural resources. The Parks and Natural Resources Fund was in charge of dividing this allocation equally between Oregon's state parks and watershed enhancement/salmon restoration.\textsuperscript{43} While the Oregon State Lottery focused

\textsuperscript{41} Associated Press “Entries Up; No Payoffs for 14 Picks,” \textit{Eugene Register-Guard}, September 27, 1989.
\textsuperscript{43} “History: A Look Back at the Oregon Lottery,” Oregon Lottery, \url{http://www.oregonlottery.org/About/Lottery101/History.aspx} (accessed November 1, 2012). “How Lottery Funds Are Allocated,” Oregon Lottery, \url{http://www.oregonlottery.org/About/Lottery101/HowareFundsAllocated.aspx} (accessed December 13, 2012). Four specific areas in education were given additional assistance from the Oregon State Lottery. They Education Stability Fund, colleges and universities, the State School Fund and bonds were these four areas.
on assisting several different areas of Oregon's economy and critical institutions, Sports Action focused solely on assisting one area.

From the beginning, Sports Action was created to assist Oregon's universities in two different ways. To be more specific, the revenue generated by this lottery game was used to support athletic programs and academic scholarships at Oregon's four-year colleges and universities. Sports Action generated over $36 million for these schools during the 18 seasons that this sports wagering game was played.\(^{44}\) Despite the popularity among Oregonians and the benefits that it provided to Oregon's colleges and universities, it became a controversial issue not only in the state itself, but also on the national level.

\(^{44}\) Ibid.
B. Response From Professional and Amateur Sports Leagues

As previously mentioned, when Oregon initiated Sports Action on September 6th, 1989, great controversy arose from this new sports betting game. Protests of Sports Action came from every direction. But, no other set of protestors made their voice heard more than the professional sports leagues on whose game this wagering was based. The National Football League and the National Basketball Association were among the leaders of this field.

The National Football League (NFL) spearheaded the protest effort largely due to the fact that the initial version of Sports Action was based on its football games. The NFL was not able to legally stop the Oregon State Lottery because it did not infringe upon any NFL trademark. The professional teams were identified by city and not by their names, making any case for legal intervention invalid.45

Put in a tough spot, the NFL could only complain and offer justifications to the Oregon State Lottery on why Sports Action should stopped. Its main justification for ending the sports wagering game was that gambling severely jeopardized the integrity of the professional games.46 Still upset that the state's lottery was utilizing its business to generate revenue for themselves, they attempted to stop Sports Action through the use of threats. Their biggest threat that was levied upon Oregon was the promise that the state would never be considered to have their own NFL franchise or host any league exhibition games for as long as sports betting on NFL games was permitted in the state. 47

The National Basketball Association followed the same overall path that the NFL did in terms of justification for banning Sports Action. Claiming that the wagering game "hold grave risks for the league", Commissioner David J. Stern also warned that basketball fans would start

46 Ibid.
to become more interested in the point spreads than actually how well their teams were doing and that eventually suspicion would arise with every questionable play. He argued that in basketball more than in football, the ability to affect the result of any game was much easier because basketball involved fewer players and that the actions of one particular player can greatly change the game. With this determination, Commissioner Stern vowed to fight Sports Action in court if it decided to add NBA games into the wagering game.

On December 11, 1990, the Oregon Lottery Commission voted 4-0 to add professional basketball to Sports Action. As promised, Commissioner Stern filed a lawsuit on behalf of the NBA in the U.S. District Court. In a statement regarding the lawsuit Stern said, "We have been left with no choice but to seek to protect our interest through the courts, and we anticipate commencing litigation in the very near future". Commissioner Stern and the NBA's lawsuit was not needed, though. After a year of Sports Action including professional basketball games in their services, the Oregon Lottery Commission decided to cut that aspect from its lottery game due to that particular game failing to become a financially practical option. The Oregon State Lottery ended up settling the lawsuit with NBA. Even after the settlement and discontinuation of wagering on basketball games, the NBA continued to criticize Oregon's lottery system.

In addition to the opposition by the professional leagues to Sports Action, amateur leagues also took issue with this lottery game. Most notable was the response from the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The NCAA had long been opposed to sports gambling for similar reasons that the NBA and NFL used in their protests. It claimed that gambling had an even worse effect on their athletes because they were younger and more susceptible to the undesirable side of effects of gambling. It also stated that any gambling that was associated with

intercollegiate athletics would clearly be inconsistent with the concept of amateurism and would question the validity of the educational institutions.\textsuperscript{50}

In an attempt to get the Oregon State Lottery to do away with Sport Action, the National Collegiate Athletic Association men's basketball committee maintained that as long as Sports Action continued to operate in Oregon, no post-season basketball would be allowed to take place in Oregon. Under this ruling, Portland's Rose Garden arena would not be able to host any tournament play. This was a serious blow to Oregon's economy because post-season collegiate basketball generated some of the highest amounts of revenue for sporting events.\textsuperscript{51}

Despite this vehement opposition from both professional and amateur sports leagues, Oregon continued to run Sports Action. Nothing was going to stop the state from continuing such a lucrative means of generating revenue for the state's colleges and universities. Frustrated by the lack of power that they had over the situation, the professional and amateur sports leagues decided to take another avenue in their fight against sports gambling: federal intervention.


A. Early Attempts at Control

As Oregon continued the attempt to balance its budget through the State's newly established sports lottery, other states were beginning to take an interest in this economic experiment. Proposals throughout various states were introduced in legislative bodies with the hopes of mimicking what Oregon had first began. These proposals continued to be introduced despite numerous objections from the professional and amateur sports leagues, various law enforcement authorities and even select church groups.\

In an attempt to prevent additional states from setting up sports lotteries, Senators Orrin Hatch (R-UT) and Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ) introduced on October 19th, 1989 Senate Bill 1772. More commonly referred to as the Sports Service Mark Protection Act of 1989, this bill attempted to amend the Lanham Trademark Act of 1946 to protect the service marks of professional sports organizations from misappropriation by state lotteries. After being referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee the same day, little support gathered in the Senate in the following months. In fact, apart from the two Senators that introduced the bill, only Senator Tim Wirth (D-CO) was added as a cosponsor.

On June 26th, 1990, a hearing for the bill was conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks. Testimony from players such as Reggie Williams, a linebacker for the Cincinnati Bengals, and Jeff Ballard, a pitcher for the Baltimore Orioles, helped to strengthen the cause for the legislation to be pushed through the Senate and to the

---

A sports service mark identifies the source of the services provided by the owner of the mark. For example, the San Francisco 49ers or the Green Bay Packers are considered service marks.
House of Representatives for further approval. However, for reasons not identified, the legislative process for S. 1772 was halted and was never resumed.

Another effort to prohibit these sports lotteries was attempted on July 23rd, 1990 when the House of Representatives House Judiciary Committee adopted an amendment to the Comprehensive Crime Control Act. This amendment, proposed by Representative John W. Bryant (D-TX), sought to prohibit sports gambling pursuant to State law. This revision to the Act passed in the House on October 5th, 1990.

At the same time, a similar sports lottery ban amendment had been adopted in the Senate. This revision was to the Copyrights Amendment Act of 1990. While this change was approved in the Senate, the House of Representatives did not approve this amendment for reasons that were unrelated to the sports lottery issue, thus ending another attempt at controlling state-sponsored sports lotteries. However an altered version of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act was passed in the late hours of Congress. The version, however, did not include a ban on sports lotteries, thus marking the final failed attempt at federal control on sports lotteries at the State level.

---


In addition to the players who gave testimony, influential members from both professional and amateur leagues also provided testimony to the Committee. Included were Paul Tagliabue-commissioner of the NFL, Stephen D. Greenberg-deputy commissioner of the MLB, Gary Bettman- senior VP and general counsel of the NBA, and Richard R. Hilliard-director of enforcement for the NCAA.

56 In simpler terms, this federal law sought to make sports gambling illegal. State laws would have to conform to the requirements of this federal law.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.
B. The Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act

On February 22nd, 1991 in the 102nd Congress, Senator DeConcini on behalf of Senators William Bradley (D-NJ) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT) introduced S. 474 to the Senate and the proposal was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Otherwise known as the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, this act sought to prohibit State-sanctioned sports gambling. Any legalized sports betting or gambling that was in existence prior to August 31, 1990 would be exempt from S.474.59 This bill was introduced in conjunction with S. 473. Known more commonly as the Sport Service Mark Protection Act, this bill had previously been proposed in the 101st Congress.60

In Senator DeConcini's opening statement for the bill, he declared that, "Gambling in general, and sports gambling in particular, continues to appear attractive to states as a means of raising revenue in these times of serious budgetary problems. However, Senator Hatch and I feel strongly it is inappropriate for the States to trade on the good will of professional and amateur sports and in the process risk causing serious harm to the integrity of sports".61 This clearly illustrated the feelings that some members of the Senate had towards gambling and the obligations that they felt to regulate the States in regards to this issue.

From the introduction of the bill into the Senate, support among members of the Senate grew as time progressed. Co-sponsors were added to the bill that intended to "prohibit all sports gambling conducted pursuant to State Law" on several different occasions. This newfound support, unlike in previous attempts, can be attributed to the immense pressure that the

59 This meant that Oregon, Delaware, Nevada and New Jersey could operate their sports lotteries because each state had some form of legal sports gambling established before August 31, 1990.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.

It should be noted that even though the Sports Service Mark Protection Act was introduced with the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, it did not survive the legislative process. In other words, this bill did not become public law.
professional and amateur leagues put on senators who represented states with sports franchises. Over approximately the next three months seventeen other Senators were added in addition to the original three. After gathering an adequate amount of support, the bill then proceeded to move on to the next stage in the legislative process.

On June 26th, 1991, the bill came before the Committee on the Judiciary which then referred it to the Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks. During this hearing, testimony both for and against this bill was presented to the Committee, with the majority of the testimony favoring the enactment of the bill. The occupations of the witnesses that testified in favor of this bill varied greatly. One witness was a professional football player, another a Senator and former professional basketball player, and three others were commissioners of professional leagues. Even a member of the National Center for Pathological Gambling and one from the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention testified in favor of the bill.

These witnesses presented multiple rationales for the need for federal control on the states. For example, Paul Tagliabue said that he did not want the National Football league to be used as "bait to sell gambling". In his opinion there needed to be a line drawn to make it "clear to the athletes, the fans, and the public generally... that gambling is not a part of sport". Valerie C.

---

Senator DeConcini represented Arizona, a state that was home to two professional sports franchises (Phoenix Cardinals and Phoenix Suns).
63 For a complete list of the co-sponsors added throughout the course of this legislative history, refer to Appendix C.
The names of the members who testified in favor of this bill to the Committee are as follows: Mike Singletary—linebacker for the Chicago Bears, Senator Bill Bradley from New Jersey, Paul Tagliabue—commissioner of the NFL, Francis T. Vincent, Jr.—commissioner of baseball, David J. Stern—commissioner of the NBA, Valerie C. Lorenz—director for the National Center for Pathological Gambling and James A. Smith—director of government relations for the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention. Representative Wanda Fuller—Kansas House of Representatives, James E. Hosker—President of the North American Association of State and Provincial Lotteries and David P. Hanlon, President and CEO of Merv Griffin's Resorts Casio Hotel and chairman of the board for the Casino Association of New Jersey. Thomas D. Carver—President of the Casino Association of New Jersey accompanied Mr. Hanlon and Thomas O'Heir—director of the Massachusetts State Lottery accompanied Ben Davidson during their testimony.
Lorenz reasoned that this legislation was necessary to curb the continued increase of gambling on young people. According to her, if the states to were allowed to establish sports lotteries the number of gambling cases involving young people would just increase astronomically because young people would see gambling as a condoned action for society.65 These were just some of the justifications presented to the Subcommittee for sending this bill on to the next stage of the legislative process.

As stated previously, this bill was not exempt from opposition. Various members of national and state lottery groups testified against the bill. Among these officials was the director of Oregon's State Lottery, James J. Davey. Even Ben Davidson, a former defensive for the Oakland Raiders provided a statement in opposition to this bill.66

Arguments and reasons opposing the bill were also presented that were just as compelling as the ones made in favor of the bill. Wanda Fuller argued that the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, if turned into Public Law, would be a "serious threat to a fundamental tenet of State sovereignty". Additionally, Ms. Fuller also explained that in a time when over thirty states were facing fiscal problems, federal intervention would be "unwarranted and unnecessary". Ben Davidson also insisted that professional athletes played only to win the game. According to Mr. Davidson, players were not concerned with covering the spread of a game. Thus the having federal legislation to control sports gambling was, in Davidson's mind, unwarranted.67

The Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks adjourned the lengthy hearing on the same day and over approximately the next month an additional five Senators were added.

---

66 Ibid, 3.
as co-sponsors. On July 17th, 1991 the Subcommittee approved the bill and sent it to the full Committee on the Judiciary for consideration. From this point more co-sponsors were added in support of the bill over the next four months.

On November 21st, 1991, the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably voted to send the bill on to the full Senate with a minor amendment to the wording of the bill. Five days later, the bill was reported in the Senate and another amendment in the nature of a substitute was made. In this amendment, the wording after the enacting clause was altered without changing the intent of the bill. Two additional definitions were added into the bill along with clarification for what was considered unlawful sports gambling. The applicability section was also altered in an effort of clarification.

The first session of the 102nd Congress ended shortly after this hearing and the only other activity that S. 474 underwent during that time was receive the support of an additional couple of Senators. Additions and subtractions of co-sponsors continued at the start of the second session of the 102nd Congress up until May 20th, 1992. On this date, the Senate reconvened and by the proposal of the majority leader, Senator George Mitchell (D-ME), an unanimous-consent time-agreement for consideration of S. 474.

Under this time-consideration, only ninety minutes of debate for the bill and for the amendments made by the subcommittee was permitted. Sixty more minutes were also both given to Senators DeConcini and Hatch for additional debate, but the debate was controlled by the senators. Chuck Grassley from Iowa was also given thirty minutes to present an amendment to

68 Refer to Appendix C to see what Senators were added as co-sponsors.
69 Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, S. 474, 102nd Cong., 1st Sess., Congressional Record 137 (July 17, 1991): D 916. Refer to Appendix C to see what Senators were added as co-sponsors.
70 Committee on the Judiciary, Professional and Amateur Sports Protection, 102nd Cong., 1st sess., S. Rep. 248. These amendments were primarily meant to simplify the bill as much as possible. By clarifying sections and adding definitions, members of the Senate ensured that no legal loopholes existed in this legislation.
71 Refer to Appendix C to see what Senators were added as co-sponsors.
the bill that if it was approved would have given the states a two-year window to opt out of coverage under the bill. Two additional hours were given to debate this amendment; with one of the hours under the control of DeConcini and Hatch. During this time Grassley argued that S.474 unfairly prevented forty-six states from the opportunity to operate sports lotteries. DeConcini and Hatch maintained the same arguments that they utilized when they introduced the bill last year. These motions were approved and another motion was made for a recess to be in the Senate until June 2nd, 1992. At that time, the Senate was able to resume the debate for S.474.72

On June 2nd, 1992, debate renewed over the amendment made by the Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks. The amendment was voted upon and passed in the Senate with a recorded vote of eighty-eight yeas, five nays. One Senator also voted merely as present during the debate. Additionally on this day, Senator Grassley's amendment was also submitted, debated, voted on by way of a voice vote and rejected.73

After the Senate finished debate over the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, the next day it requested the bill be sent to the House of Representatives for consideration and concurrence. Known in the house as H.R. 73, the bill was referred to the House Judiciary Committee which then proceeded to refer it to the Subcommittee on Economic and Commercial Law.74 On September 12th, 1991, a hearing was held by the Subcommittee to discuss the bill. Much like it was in the Senate hearing, witnesses both for and against this legislation offered statements regarding their position.

---

Witnesses for H.R. 74 tended to be of the same occupation as the witnesses for S. 474. The President of the Boston Celtics, Arnold "Red" Auerbach testified in support of the bill as did the assistant general manager for the Baltimore Orioles, Frank Robinson. Opponents for the legislation again were of the same mold as the witnesses that testified during the Senate hearing. Among these individuals were William C. Byrne, the athletic director for the University of Oregon who represented the State of Oregon and Robert G. Torricelli, a Representative in Congress from New Jersey.\footnote{Subcommittee on Economic and Commercial Law, \textit{Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act}, 102nd Cong., 1st sess., H.R. Rep. 26.}

Seeing that witnesses both for and against the proposed legislation were similar to the witnesses who testified in the Senate, the arguments and justifications made each way were just as similar. Frank Robinson, a supporter of H.R. 74, mimicked justifications made by Senator DeConcini in his opening statement to the Senate. Mr. Robinsons stated that "gambling jeopardizes the integrity of sports". On the other hand, Robert G. Torricelli argued that if instituted, the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, would endanger the economic health of Atlantic City casinos and subsequently negatively impact New Jersey's economic efforts. These were just some of the testimonies that were provided to the Subcommittee on that day.\footnote{Subcommittee on Economic and Commercial Law, \textit{Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act}, 102nd Cong., 1st sess., 1991, 38-9, 79-80.}
After this hearing, the House met on October 5th, 1992 and agreed to amend the title and suspend the rules and pass the bill through the use of a voice vote.\textsuperscript{77} Minor amendments were made to the bill by the House of Representatives. For example, an additional part regarding applicability was added and a date for the bill to take effect was also included. From here the House's amended bill was sent back to the Senate for consideration on October 7th, 1992.\textsuperscript{78}

On that same day, the Senate agreed to the amendments made by the House of Representatives through the means of a voice vote, thus clearing the measure for the President's signature. On October 20th, 1992 the bill was both enrolled in the House and the Senate. It was also presented to President Bush that same day.\textsuperscript{79}

Finally after one year, eight months and seven days, President George H. W. Bush signed S. 474 into law, thus becoming Public Las 102-559.\textsuperscript{80} This event marked the pinnacle moment of all the many hours spend by lawmakers in both the Senate and the House of Representatives who worked on this bill. All of the hours spent hovering over the bill, working on sensible amendments, fixing typos and conferring with colleagues were all made worth it when the President touched that pen to paper and finalized the long legislative process of turning this Senate bill into law.

\textsuperscript{77}Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, S. 474, 102\textsuperscript{nd} Cong., 2nd Sess., Congressional Record 138 (October 05, 1992): H 11756.

\textsuperscript{78}Suspending the rules is a method that is used to pass a bill quickly though the House of Representatives.

\textsuperscript{79}Ibid. Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, S. 474, 102\textsuperscript{nd} Cong., 2nd Sess., Congressional Record 138 (October 07, 1992): H 17434, 17436.

\textsuperscript{80}Ibid. Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act, S. 474, 102\textsuperscript{nd} Cong., 2nd Sess., Congressional Record 138 (October 20, 1992): S 18262, 18263, H 12610.
Conclusion

In many respects, the enactment of the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act into public law followed the same legislative path as many other bills did before it. The bill was introduced into the Senate, discussed heavily, amended and agreed upon, sent to the House of Representatives for the same process to occur, brought back to both the House of Representatives and Senate, agreed upon again and then was sent to the President for signing. All of these complicated, time-consuming steps represent examples of the normal legislative process in action. However, what sets this legislative process apart from so many others was the amount of support that it received from the beginning and throughout the entire process. The amount of protest from professional and amateur leagues against Oregon's Sports Action and in support of federal intervention was overwhelming. Ultimately it was this amount of support that set this particular legislative history apart from the rest.

Oregon was simply trying to find a way to create revenue, and an enticing means to accomplish this was utilizing people's inherent love for sports and gambling. The revenue created from Sports Action was even used for a legitimate cause (university funding. Despite protest from many individuals and institutions, this easy and highly beneficial method of obtaining revenue continued. When enough individuals cried for intervention the federal government finally intervened and put an end to state-sponsored sports lotteries. Oregon was still able to keep their sports lottery because of the exception provided in S.474, which was a small battle lost in the grand war against sports gambling.

Oregon eventually succumbed to the pressure that professional and amateur leagues placed upon the state. In 2005, 16 years after it began, Oregon lawmakers voted to end Sport
Lawmakers did this in an attempt to lure in the high-profile, extremely profitable sporting events that for so long they were denied. True to their word, the National Collegiate Athletic Association brought the NCAA men's basketball tournament back to Oregon in 2009.82

Using Oregon and the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act as examples, perhaps one can see the importance and power of what effect one's voice has in our government today. One voice eventually becomes two and before you know it, people everywhere are flocking to join the cause. Whether it is an attempt to curb sports gambling or an all out assault against poverty or world hunger, one individual can make a meaningful difference. Oregon's sports lottery and the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act serve as testaments to this fact.

81 Sports Action was allowed to operate until 2007 according to the bill that ended the sports wagering game.
Appendix A
Example of Sports Action

How Much? The dollar amount you want to play: $2, $3, $4, $5, $10, or $20.

How Many? Decide on the number of events you want to play: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 or 14.

Pick The Winners! Pick the teams or Special Plays you think will win and mark those selections or use the Quick Pick option. Be sure your selections equal the number of events you've marked in the "How Many?" section.

"Example of Sports Action"
http://www.parisfranceinc.com/portfolio/oregonlottery.org/sports/s_howto.htm
Appendix B
Sports Action Results Example

## Sports Action Results

### Play Sports Action!
Oregon’s sports lottery game!

**Results: August 6-9, 1998/Week No. 467**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAVORITE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>UNDERDOG</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>POINT SPREAD</th>
<th>HANDICAPPED SCORE</th>
<th>WINNING TEAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 PHILADELPHIA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+ 2 1/2</td>
<td>17 1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 4 Total Points Scored by both teams during ENTIRE GAME</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+ 36 1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &amp; 6 Total Fumbles Lost by both teams during ENTIRE GAME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+ 1/2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETROIT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 Arizona</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+ 4 1/2</td>
<td>14 1/2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ATLANTA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10 Tennessee</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+ 3 1/2</td>
<td>34 1/2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 &amp; 12 Total Points Scored by both teams during ENTIRE GAME</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 36 1/2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLINA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14 Jacksonville</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+ 1 1/2</td>
<td>28 1/2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16 Buffalo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 8 1/2</td>
<td>21 1/2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18 Miami</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+ 3 1/2</td>
<td>22 1/2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20 Chicago</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+ 5 1/2</td>
<td>19 1/2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22 ST. LOUIS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 3 1/2</td>
<td>16 1/2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS CITY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24 Tampa Bay</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 3 1/2</td>
<td>16 1/2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26 New Orleans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+ 8 1/2</td>
<td>15 1/2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28 Cincinnati</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+ 2 1/2</td>
<td>19 1/2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALLAS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 Oakland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+ 7 1/2</td>
<td>23 1/2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32 SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+ 6 1/2</td>
<td>33 1/2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEATTLE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34 Indianapolis</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+ 7 1/2</td>
<td>28 1/2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ENGLAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36 Minnesota</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+ 7 1/2</td>
<td>35 1/2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Play Game

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prize Pool</th>
<th>Prizes Payout Per Minimum $2 Play</th>
<th>Prizes Per Share</th>
<th>Number of Winning Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>3,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>4,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 of 5</td>
<td>$21.80</td>
<td>$10.80</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 of 6</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$13.80</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 of 7</td>
<td>$54.40</td>
<td>$17.60</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 of 8</td>
<td>$62.80</td>
<td>$28.40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 of 10</td>
<td>$428.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 of 12</td>
<td>$148.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 of 14</td>
<td>$111.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proceeds Benefit Intercollegiates Athletics and Academic Scholarships. Players must verify all selections. Statistical source: Associated Press Box Score. Oregon Lottery Sports Action is NOT associated with, sponsored or authorized by the National Football League or any other professional sports league or organization.

"Example of Sports Action Results"
http://www.parisfranceinc.com/portfolio/oregonlottery.org/sports/reslt467.htm
## Appendix C
### List of Cosponsors Added To S. 474

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Party Affiliation</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Helms</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Gramm</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 09, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Coats</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 1991</td>
<td>Senator McCain</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Garn</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 08, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Fowler Jr.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Wirth</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 03, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Akaka</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Danforth</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Simon</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Boren</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Kassebaum</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Inouye</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Dole</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Bond</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 08, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Kasten</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Lugar</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Shelby</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Sanford</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Harkin</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Thurmond</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Rudman</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Daschle</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 01, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Levin</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 03, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Nickles</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 29, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Glenn</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Burns</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Stevens</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Smith</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 05, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Symms</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 06, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Roth</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 07, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Jeffords</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 07, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Murkowski</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 08, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Lott</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 09, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Warner</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 09, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Durenberger</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Pryor</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Bumpers</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Bingaman</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Chafee</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Adams</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Pell</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Lieberman</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Hefflin</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Robb</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19, 1991</td>
<td>Senator Conrad</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 1992</td>
<td>Senator Sarbanes</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 1992 (Removed March, 04, 1992)</td>
<td>Senator Johnston</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 1992</td>
<td>Senator Burns</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 1992</td>
<td>Senator Riegle</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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