

THE CHAIRMAN: Churchill Murray.

DELEGATE E. C. MURRAY: Would this permit private parties to operate a lottery, private parties beyond what we normally have in mind in churches and fire halls and that sort of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: If the legislature permitted it, the answer would be yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: This would not forbid it. Whether it was permitted would be up to the legislature. Do you have a further question, Delegate Murray?

DELEGATE E. C. MURRAY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: State it.

DELEGATE E. C. MURRAY: Would this not subject the legislature to pressure over and over and over again.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a matter of debate. You can argue that right now, if you wish.

DELEGATE E. C. MURRAY: I can argue it now?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I am just pointing out that it is not a question addressed to Delegate Scanlan. The Chair suggests it is properly a matter of debate and not for question. You may argue the point right now.

DELEGATE E. C. MURRAY: Then I wish to argue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

DELEGATE E. C. MURRAY: By way of example, an adjoining county badly needed a hospital some years ago and they permitted slot machines to come into their counties with this in mind. The hospital was built and it has nearly fallen down, but the slot machines are still there and are benefiting primarily two or three racketeers who placed them there who are not natives of the county at all. This is not a perfect parallel, but what I am trying to illustrate is that I am not necessarily opposing charitable institutions doing this and I am not necessarily opposing doing this for worthwhile causes if anyone can determine what that means, but I am afraid of the breadth of the permission that it appears that this puts back in the law. We need to know what is in this bag of apples.

Now, whether we should mention this in the constitution at all or not is a separate question but if we are going to do that,

then should we open it wide to private operations?

THE CHAIRMAN: The question arises on the motion to reconsider. Is there any further discussion?

Delegate Neilson.

DELEGATE NEILSON: Fellow delegates, I rise to oppose the motion to reconsider and urge that those who voted yes a moment ago vote no this time. I do not think that any of us who want to set ourselves up as being the judges on the Court of Appeals to decide just what the effect of the language is as it now stands as we have just accepted it. I would suggest that we not attempt to bring in that element.

I speak of those who run these things, whether for governmental purposes or for private interests and I would suggest that we keep it all out and let the court decide how far it will go in its wisdom. Vote no on the motion to reconsider.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in favor of the motion to reconsider?

Delegate Koger.

DELEGATE KOGER: I would want to ask a question of Delegate Scanlan.

THE CHAIRMAN: His time has expired. We will permit one more question.

Delegate Koger.

DELEGATE KOGER: I would like to ask the Chair a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ask it of Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE KOGER: I would like to be sure that I heard Delegate Scanlan correctly say if a private corporation in the State of Maryland wanted to hold a lottery to support a study of cancer, statewide, and when it would go to support and fight cancer, it would be all right provided that —

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: That would be all right provided it did not violate the specific statute that the legislature had enacted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor?

DELEGATE BARD: Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak in favor of the motion to reconsider. There are a goodly number of us here who feel that there is a fine