

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, if you will open your bill book...just a moment, I will try and find it. I asked the counsel for the amendment, and what I am saying is this, I am looking it up, is that the language that has been stricken, and, pardon me, Eric, will you tell me what section that is in? Thank you, Eric. AMO811, page 24, we define what is legal gambling under the lottery law, and by striking certain language, we have outlawed the equipment which the Crown Court uses to conduct a lottery, and we have said, specifically, that we allow these types of opportunities; winning opportunities represented by tickets. Winners are solely determined by one of the following three methods: Random drawing of tickets, et cetera, et cetera, keno, and the correct matching of certain numbers. Now I think that if I were innovative enough I could probably take the Crown Court's equipment and meld it into this situation, but that is not going to happen. A businessman is not made that way. He understands the rules, he understands what is being done to him, and he is not going to try to circumvent it. But what we are doing here is we are taking out of business one particular business. I don't see any reason for that. We are not saying that a certain city can't conduct a lottery. We are saying that this particular individual who operated within the law, he has set up his business within the law, and I might just add that he was in the business once before with other equipment which we had also outlawed. You know, after awhile, a guy becomes a little paranoid of this kind of an operation. This will be the second time the gentleman will be declared out of order and I don't think it is right. I think if there is something wrong with it, that is something you can talk about, but to my knowledge, there has been no evidence, there had been no testimony, Senator Korshoj, that indicates that the type of lottery conducted at the Crown Court is any higher risk, lower risk, higher pay-back, lower pay-back, than any other type of lottery operation in Bellevue or any other community. And so I would ask you, again, and Senator Smith can probably explain it better than I can. I am sure she has a point of view, it is probably counter to mine, but I just...I think there comes a time when equity ought to be considered, and I think in the terms of equity, due process, I think we are making a mistake. It is not anything to me. It makes no difference to me, personally, except that I think that in this body from time to time, we ought to look at equity. Check page 24 of AMO811 and Section 22. You will see what I am talking about.