

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

March 24, 2004      LR 209

SENATOR CHAMBERS:      Mr. President, members of the Legislature, we're dealing with such a limited subject here that it's impossible to speak on it without being repetitive. I have always been in favor of a liberal interpretation of the germaneness rule, arguing that from my point of view the only time something should be considered nongermane is if it would put a second subject into a bill which would thereby make it unconstitutional. My view has never prevailed except on occasions where it was desired to advance the work of the Legislature and there would be a somewhat liberal interpretation. But as Senator Bourne touched on, when we talk about Article III, Section 2 (a), which is before us, if you look in Senator Brown's amendment, it is easy to follow. Line 8, any game of chance, any lottery, or gift enterprise which is in the provision of the constitution that Senator Landis will deal with, not only in the generic sense if that's the case, but we come down to line 13 where we talk about the state lottery that can be created, and in addition to that, lotteries, raffles and gift enterprises solely for charitable or community betterment purposes. If we go to page 2 of her amendment we can see in existing language, line 4 through 14, we're talking about wagering on horse races. Well, all of those are different types of gambling. A lottery obviously is not a raffle or you wouldn't need two terms. Lotteries and raffles are not horse races. And the wagering on a horse race is not the same as purchasing a lottery ticket. So I'm opposed to an interpretation which is so strict that it says unless it's the identical thing that is in the proposed amendment that is being offered as the underlying thing we're discussing, if the only time something is germane is if it says the same thing, then you cannot, in effect, amend it because it's not germane. I am not in favor of casino gambling, but I'm also not in favor of our system being handled in a way that from my perspective seems to be overly strict, overly confining. However many times this particular issue has been before us and has been discussed, I voted against cloture. I will vote against casino gambling, but now I'm looking at this the way I look at other aspects of the process and the system. If casino gambling which deals with games of chance, and the term games of chance, any game of chance is already in the constitution, how can this particular