

West Virginia sports-betting regulations approved in June don't say that. In fact, they leave it to each sports book to decide whose participation in sports betting might undermine the integrity of a sports event.

It is odd that this decision would be left to the sports books, such that an individual may be prohibited from placing the bet at one sports book in the State but would be permitted to do so at another. The decision to leave this integrity decision to the sports books is even more concerning when you consider the potential conflict in the duties and motivation of the sports books.

Operators certainly want to protect integrity so that they are not accepting wagers on fixed games, but the West Virginia sports-betting law also requires sports book operators to "assist the commission in maximizing sports wagering revenues." How many folks will they really be turning away to protect the integrity of the game if they are also under a statutory mandate to maximize the amount of money coming in the door?

Other States have been more specific on this point but still leave open questions. Mississippi prohibits only coaches or participants from betting on a particular event. What is a participant? Does it include referees? Maybe they are a participant because they are on the field. But what about an athletic trainer or league executives? While Mississippi law does not answer that question, New Jersey put in place robust laws that specifically prohibit athletic trainers and members of a sport's governing body from placing wagers.

There is nothing wrong with there being differences among the States. That is the beauty of our Federal system. But it does seem that when it comes to protecting the integrity of the game and sports-betting market, there should be some consensus—at least some minimum standards—about who can place a wager. If States are allowed to fall behind, those looking to illegally profit off sports betting will simply migrate to where there are the fewest restrictions.

Protecting the integrity of sports from the dark side of sports betting is not a theoretical exercise. We are all familiar with the fixing of the 1919 World Series, Pete Rose's expulsion from baseball, and points shaving at Boston college. More recently, NBA referee Tim Donaghy both bet on games that he officiated and passed along tips to bookies. The qualifying match for this year's World Cup had to be replayed after the referee was found to have fixed the match. Just last month, there were signs of possible match fixing in a men's doubles match at Wimbledon.

As States move to legalize sports wagering, we must seize the opportunity to put in place world-class measures to protect the integrity of our sporting events and the sports-betting market.

To that end, an important part of the legislation I will be proposing is improvements to monitoring and enforcement that will benefit all of the stakeholders—sports books, regulators, governing bodies, and consumers.

These are complex issues, but I am happy to announce that much progress is being made. I look forward to continuing engagement with stakeholders and in the coming weeks releasing a legislative proposal to kick-start the much needed sports-betting discussion on Capitol Hill.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. HATCH. Now I would like to pivot to what would ordinarily be a subject unrelated to sports—the nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh to be an Associate Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court—but this is no ordinary nomination. Not only is Judge Kavanaugh an avid sports fan, he also moonlighted as a sports reporter for the Yale Daily News.

For Democrats looking to evaluate Judge Kavanaugh on the basis of documents other than his judicial record, his writings about college sports are apparently a gold mine. Take, for example, Kavanaugh's account of a midseason game between Yale and Cornell: "In basketball, as in few other team sports, it is possible for one person to completely dominate a game."

Prominent legal scholar Laurence Tribe, a Harvard law professor and adviser to Barack Obama—a friend of mine, actually—strained to make a connection between this casual observation and Judge Kavanaugh's judicial philosophy. He noted: "Kavanaugh's seeming fascination with single-player domination might be a muscular view of executive power." I had a good laugh at this. The idea that Judge Kavanaugh's observations about basketball somehow reveal his views about Executive power is beyond absurd.

What is next? What other hidden insights into the nominee's character can we glean from the most obscure sources? Should we do a deep dive on Judge Kavanaugh's zodiac sign to see what it might say about his judicial temperament? He is an Aquarius, by the way, and Mars is in retrograde. So we all know what that means: Judge Kavanaugh is going to destroy America. He is going to burn down the Capitol, coronate himself King, and make confetti of the Constitution. The stars are literally aligned for this man to usher in Armageddon. The real question is, How am I the only one seeing this? Why hasn't The New Yorker written a think piece about it already?

It should go without saying that if you really want to understand Judge Kavanaugh's view on the constitutional separation of powers, you won't find it by reading sports articles from a college newspaper, and you won't find it by reading his wife's work emails; you will find it by reading Judge

Kavanaugh's actual opinions as a Federal judge. Of course, Democrats know this, but like a kid procrastinating his homework—playing video games and microwaving Bagel Bites—they are looking for any distraction at all to avoid actually analyzing Judge Kavanaugh's judicial record. That is because Democrats know what they will find when they do: a nominee who is indisputably qualified for the Supreme Court.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle decide they are done procrastinating and actually want to examine his judicial record on separation of powers issues, I would point them to Judge Kavanaugh's opinions in three cases I highlighted here on the Senate floor earlier this month: *Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Oversight Board*, *Loving v. Internal Revenue Service*, and *PHH Corporation v. CFPB*.

Once you have gone through Judge Kavanaugh's highly regarded opinions and sterling record and concluded, as I have, that he is eminently qualified and possesses the judicial temperament and ability to be a great Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court, you will by all means turn to his college sports writing for a little light reading. You are sure to walk away with insight into the championship prospect of Yale's basketball and football teams in the 1980s; I just wouldn't hold out for any insight into his judicial philosophy.

While we are on the subject of documents outside his judicial record, I am surprised Democrats have yet to mention Professor Kavanaugh's student evaluations. The evaluations may not predict how Judge Kavanaugh would rule on hot-button issues, but they do add actual substance to the mountain of evidence that Judge Kavanaugh is, as 80 of his former students described him, "a rigorous thinker, a devoted teacher, and a gracious person." Notably, the evaluations reveal that Judge Kavanaugh was fair and balanced in the classroom—the opposite of the partisan hack some are now trying to make him out to be. One student wrote that "Judge Kavanaugh's presentation seemed very evenhanded." Another said that he "presented the other side quite well, even though he likely shared most of those conservative views," adding that "many of the Harvard Law School professors could learn from his acceptance of views across the political spectrum."

I am looking forward to Judge Kavanaugh's public confirmation hearings—now just 12 days away—where his judicial record on substantive legal issues will take center stage. That is what matters. But those things that are not front and center, be they his student evaluations or college sports reports, remind us that there is more to Judge Kavanaugh than his professional record and accomplishments, and they remind us that he is exactly the kind of standup person we should want on the Supreme Court.

Of course, you wouldn't guess that judging by the way Democrats and the media have treated him over the past few weeks. For example, earlier this week, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said she would cancel her meeting with the nominee, which, of course, she is free to do. What media reports ignored was that this same Senator had announced her resolute opposition before any nominee was even announced. Talk about jumping the gun.

In an effort to stir up social media controversy, another colleague of mine suggested in dark and gloomy terms that the Judiciary chairman's use of committee confidentiality was some nefarious tool to hide salacious details about the nominee. In doing so, he neglected to inform the tens of thousands who retweeted his misleading message that committee confidentiality is, in fact, a common practice that has been used by past chairmen from both parties.

Before our friends in the media report these disingenuous claims, they should apply rigorous fact-checking to see if Democrats are telling the truth or simply crying wolf to whip up their base.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Finally, I would like to say just a few words about criminal justice reform. We have been at an impasse since the Judiciary Committee took up the issue earlier this year, but recent reports suggest that negotiations with the White House may soon lead to a compromise. I have not been a part of those negotiations, and I understand that they are still ongoing and there is no final proposal on the table, but I am concerned that there is no mention of mens rea reform being included in that deal.

Sentencing and prison reform can do only so much if we continue to allow individuals to be sent to prison for conduct they did not know was unlawful, even when Congress does not specify that their crimes should be strict liability offenses.

Sentencing and prison reform must be paired with a solution that addresses the root problem of criminalization, which includes the lack of clear mens rea requirements in much of our criminal law. My Mens Rea Reform Act of 2018, which I introduced earlier this summer with Senate Judiciary Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY, provides that solution. It is supported by a broad range of groups from across the ideological spectrum, from the American Conservative Union to the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers.

To be honest, I am troubled that the bill is not part of the current negotiations. I am likewise troubled that we have not heard any discussion of a legislative fix for the Armed Career Criminal Act to ensure that dangerous, repeat offenders receive appropriately long prison sentences. Real criminal

justice reform should be about getting the policy right. That means we cannot be looking just to ratchet back prison sentences, but we must also be looking to close loopholes that prematurely let armed, dangerous criminals back on the streets.

Comprehensive criminal justice reform is long overdue, and I am pleased to hear that negotiations are continuing. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address those concerns.

I apologize to the leader for taking so long on these remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Utah.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LINCOLN PARK ZOO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this year marks an important milestone for a true treasure in Illinois. The Lincoln Park Zoo, located in the heart of Chicago, is celebrating its 150th anniversary.

From its inauspicious beginnings with the gift of two pairs of swans from Central Park in New York City, the Lincoln Park Zoo has grown to be a destination for Chicago residents and visitors alike. The zoo is visited by 3.7 million people annually.

Visitors to the zoo appreciate its central location; it is close to cultural and shopping attractions in Chicago. But what everyone loves about the zoo is that there is no admission fee in order to enjoy the zoo's exhibits. That is right; admission to the Lincoln Park Zoo is free. In 1878, 20 years after those swans arrived from Central Park, it was resolved that the Zoo would always be free and open to the public. Today, Lincoln Park Zoo remains the Nation's only privately managed, free-admission zoo in the country.

When people visit the zoo, they not only experience the seals, gorillas, polar bears, giraffes, the big cats at the Kovler Lion House, and a pygmy hippopotamus, they also are introduced to farm animals, equipment, and practices that reflect the importance of agriculture to my home State. For many urban children, the zoo allows an introduction to nature and agriculture in a way they may not otherwise experience.

Generations of Chicagoans have fond memories of spending summer days at Lincoln Park Zoo with their families. Many can tell you that it is worth

braving the blustery Chicago weather for a visit to Lincoln Park Zoo during Zoo Lights, their annual winter celebration.

I have always considered Lincoln Park Zoo to be a hallmark of a Chicago childhood. It is a place I wanted to share with my twin grandchildren, now age 7, when they come to visit. Hopping on the 151 CTA bus and wandering the zoo grounds in summer and winter has always been a great adventure for my family.

I want to join the community in celebrating the 150th anniversary of the Lincoln Park Zoo. The staff and volunteers of the zoo should be proud of their efforts to preserve and foster this Chicago treasure, ensuring future generations have the opportunity to create memories as I have done with my family.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week, on August 16, more than 300 newspapers across the Nation published editorials giving voice and testament to the vital role of a free press in our American democracy. It is such a crucial requisite of democracy that this role—this right of a free people—is embedded in our Constitution.

The words, the actions, and the service of the free American press are a daily counterpoint to the vile charges by many that the press is "the enemy of the people"—a smear that is commonly used by despots in societies that do not have the freedoms that our Constitution is intended to ensure and protect. It is all too clear today that each new generation must renew the Nation's dedication to our founding principles and ideals.

The Senate, on August 16, unanimously passed a resolution reaffirming the vital and indispensable role of the free press. I was proud to cosponsor that resolution. It is regrettable that such a resolution was even needed—or even timely.

I am proud that several news organizations in Vermont participated on August 16 in publishing editorials about the importance of a free press. I call to the Senate's attention one of these, written by Steven Pappas and published in the Times Argus of Barre, VT.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Times Argus, Aug. 16, 2018]

YES, WE ARE THE ENEMY

[Editor's note: Across the nation today, U.S. newspapers and news organizations are publishing, posting or broadcasting editorials opposing press-bashing. The idea was sparked by Boston Globe editorial page editor Marjorie Pritchard. What follows is our voice in that chorus of solidarity.]

We are the enemy. It's true. We say that with no hesitation.

If you abuse power, we are the enemy.