

significantly in the eyes of the beholder. And the best proof of that, on this particular issue, is a very simple one. Remember this, the original Supreme Court decision interpreting what lottery meant, I repeat the original Supreme Court decision was the thing that allowed a pickle card, a video lottery. In other words, lottery, as defined by the Supreme Court, included all of these things and it was an amendment or a bill by Senator Hoagland that made "the technical correction" that said, despite the fact that this is a lottery, we don't like this particular kind of lottery. So, I think it is clear that this amendment does nothing more than revert back to the original definition of lottery of the Supreme Court, which happened to include videos. Now in the minds of different individuals in here that is either a big, or a little, or a moderate change, but from a purely technical standpoint it is nothing more than one form of lottery as opposed to another, and this bill deals with lottery, the whole concept of lottery. So it would be just as germane for this bill to have an amendment proposed at this time that "outlaws" pickle cards, or outlaws this particular type of lottery as it is to say and this particular type which is included in the Supreme Court definition is also a lottery. So even though it is significant in the minds of the beholder, if you happen to be violently opposed to videos, from a purely technical and draftsmanship point of view and legal point of view, all you are dealing with is one more form of lottery. So irrespective, irrespective of whether you are "violently opposed" to videos, or fanatically in favor of them, I think at least you have the obligation to rule the issue germane. The argument that it is "a sneak attack", heck about 70 percent of our amendments are in that fashion, I suppose somebody could perceive them that way. So I would urge you, at least on the germaneness issue, irrespective of the merits, irrespective of the merits on the germaneness, it falls within the germane category.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Haberman, then Senator Chambers.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, question of Senator Hoagland, please.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Hoagland, please.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Senator Hoagland, how did you vote this morning on the banking bill to move it to Select File? Did