

percent of the amount involved. Now I made a couple of notes just to touch briefly on. Senator Johnson's argument surprised me and the drafting of this bill does not surprise me because those who are interested in setting up lotteries had something to do with this bill, but to take the moral position that the end justifies the means is highly cynical. Since the end use of this money is for a worthwhile project, namely, to provide special education services, any way that you derive that money would be good. Based on this a highwayman should be able to clean up his ill-gotten goods or money by the use he puts it to. A mitigation for a bank robbery ought to be based on how the money was spent. If half goes to a charity, then the robber, I think, should get some consideration which he won't. Senator Johnson, you are probably aware that a little known or little mentioned person in history was James Wilson. I believe he was the first Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court. He signed the Declaration of Independence, I think. I think he signed the U. S. Constitution. Yet his personal fortunes were always in disarray because he had a terrible gambling habit and could never control it. So despite his intellectual capability, his ability to amass large amounts of money through land speculation and other means, he lost a great percentage of it, lost his personal dignity because of his gambling habit. Senator Simon and Senator DeCamp, the horse races make it on the \$2 bettor. Lotteries make it on the vast numbers who will buy these lottery tickets so to say that you are looking for people making fifteen to twenty thousand dollars to be the purchasers of these tickets would go against the estimation as to how much money would be taken in or swag as they call it in the rackets, Senator DeCamp. If the list that currently is going around is highly desirable by those suckers who participate but mainly by the promoters who are going to take the large amounts of money from it, if they want it, let them have it based on the arguments we have had here. We should do away with the laws that prohibit and punish larceny by trick, Senator Johnson, because people ought not be foolish enough to be tricked. We ought to do away with the punishment for somebody passing a bad check because the one receiving it ought to exercise more caution and care and know the person he is dealing with. We have defrauding of bailee which is a crime. That should be done away with because we are saying these people are too stupid to take care of their own concerns. The only time we give the argument against legislation designed to protect a vulnerable segment of the population is when we are dealing with the consumer who seldom has a consistent spokesperson in the halls of Congress, in the