

of Commonwealth. This Legislature never said that the regulation of Commonwealth pursuant to state law was inadequate. We said there might have been some questionable practices, we might have differed in our judgment. We never said it was inadequate. This Legislature never said that the NDIGC Act contained provisions which reasonably implied that the NDIGC was an instrumentality of the state. We didn't say that. We talked about it, we dealt with it. We didn't say that. Now come on, you've got to be intellectually honest. Senator Haberman is absolutely correct. We need to change the word inadequate to questionable. We need to at least reflect that which we did when we spent one year studying the Commonwealth issue and for us to now come in and say things that we know not to be true is dishonest. I support his amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, Senator Johnson said many of the things that I was going to say and I discussed this. I think it's heavily presumptuous and I think it is absolutely dishonest for those of you who intend to vote for this bill, and obviously many or most of us will, I think it is completely dishonest and it is a lie, and I'll use the strong words, to deliberately put in the bill findings which were never approved by any court, which were specifically rejected by this body, both in its approval of the committee report by the committee and on the floor, and I start at Section 4, or I mean page 2, Section 4. It says, after carefully considering the facts the Legislature finds all these things. We find that there is a valid legal basis and the claims are meritorious. Okay? Now that was never done by this Legislature. In fact, those specific things were repudiated. Now go ahead and do it, go ahead and say you're guilty of every sin in the book and you write dumb laws and everything in government is wrong, vote it and pass it, but for criminy sakes, then don't cry year after year when you've changed all the rules of the games and anybody with 25 votes and a group that feels they want some money from state government comes in and gets 25 votes to get it because that's the principle you're setting up. The court did nothing more than settle a claim just exactly as I suggested earlier. Two sides come together, one claims somebody is guilty of something, the other one says, hey, your chances of winning are one in ten maximum, that's about what they figured they were, therefore, instead of fighting