

therefore, put another individual out of business. Now someone is going to say, well, we allowed him to continue his operation for the extent of his contract, the city may not renew that when that contract expires anyway. I would say at least that is an improvement over past actions of this body when contracts have been abridged, but the point I want to make is this. I don't think that probably five people in this body have seen Mr. Clatterbuck's operation, yet we are, with this amendment, going to put him out of business. I don't think that is right. He has expended a lot of money doing business. It has an impact upon his business. It has an impact upon his customers. It has an impact upon the people who will come to his motel and to his lounge if he is not allowed to operate, and I don't think it is right. I think we ought to consider that. I would hope that this body, before you decide you are going to put a person out of business, that you will learn, you take the time and the trouble to learn about the investment the individual has made, about the licensure he has achieved, the status within the community, and then vote based upon that information rather than upon someone's likes or personal dislikes, rather than upon the point of view perhaps within the agency. For example, last year on this floor under all sorts of pressure, this body adopted language relative to pickles which did, in fact, put an entire group of people out of the pickle business. I don't know whether it was good or bad. Apparently after a year's discussion and revelation, the department decided they were too strict. So this year they have come forward and said, well, let's put them back in. We have got to relax the regulations a little bit. We have got to up the percentages for those individuals to make it attractive enough. Last year, the basis was we want to discourage gambling, gambling is bad, destroys the moral fiber of the state and of individuals, therefore, we ought to do all that we can to discourage it. All of a sudden as revenues decline, we took a different tack. We said, maybe it isn't so bad, maybe it ought to be encouraged a little bit. We have got to up the handle a little bit, up the percentage a little bit. So now we are going to go back and try to encourage some of those individuals who went out of business last year to go back into business. The question I want to ask you at this time, is it this body's responsibility to legislate against a single individual business? I don't think so. Now we can say by the definition we are legislating against an entire entity, we have the right, and we do, we have the responsibility, and we do, we have the obligation, and we do, to define the parameters of gambling. But I ask you when those parameters thus defined