

1                   COMMISSIONER DOBSON: You remember at the conclusion of  
2 the second day of our last meeting I made a comment that there was  
3 an item that did not get a second. It frustrated me a great deal.  
4                   It had to do with the lobbying of the lotteries, or at least the  
5 targeting of lotteries in the inner city, and that I thought that  
6 we had really moved too fast through that item. I made a motion  
7 at the end of the day that even though it had been looked at by  
8 the Commission earlier, that we consider it again. You seconded  
9 it, and it passed unanimously. It's in that same spirit that  
10 these two items are back before us.

11                  COMMISSIONER LANNI: The point of information I had is  
12 it was considered before. I don't think that it's a new  
13 consideration.

14                  COMMISSIONER DOBSON: It was not voted on before, so it  
15 is not -- we're not coming back to reconsider.

16                  COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Madam Chair, I'd like to make a  
17 procedural observation, and I prefer to make it out, because it's  
18 not a regular substance of these. We've had boat loads of  
19 recommendations, and that's fine and good and well. But we spent  
20 two days doing these things, and then the research subcommittee  
21 was directed to take another look at the 50, or 60, or whatever  
22 the number was future research recommendations which were  
23 recommended by, I believe mostly or entirely by Jim, which some  
24 people in the research committee, frankly not so much myself, but  
25 more Jim and his staff and Leo, spent vast amounts of time doing  
26 over the last weekend as well as over the last 10 days on the  
27 commission staff.

28                  I thought that when we had this research subcommittee  
29 check-in a little while ago, that we agreed on these things, the

1 things that Leo says are unanimously supported by the subcommittee  
2 and are being now copied, or retyped, or whatever it is, for all  
3 the commissioners. Now we've got these other two, which as far as  
4 I'm concerned, are about future research.

5               I just object to this because according to this  
6 procedure I could show up tomorrow with some other set of  
7 recommendations. I don't intend to do that unless goaded further,  
8 and I would hope nobody else does, either. So I don't understand  
9 why we're dealing with this.

10              COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I think, John, if you feel that  
11 way, you ought to vote against it, but I make a motion that we  
12 accept these two recommendations, starting with the first one.

13              CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Let me address the procedural  
14 question first. At the end of the last Commission meeting, I  
15 think there was some concern that if we looked at the document, if  
16 we looked at the recommendations, there may be a gap. There may  
17 be -- we talked about the fact that looking at it in total, there  
18 may be some areas that needed to be addressed, and I pleased with  
19 commissioners to please limit that, that nobody should come in  
20 with 20 recommendations or 50 recommendations.

21              COMMISSIONER WILHELM: We went through these. They  
22 didn't even get a second. Again, I'm not even addressing the  
23 substance.

24              CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Right, I understand.

25              COMMISSIONER WILHELM: We went through this. They  
26 didn't even get a second. Why are we doing this.

27              CHAIRPERSON JAMES: I understand.

28              COMMISSIONER WILHELM: We've got books of stuff to  
29 consider between now and tomorrow night.

1 CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commission Dobson, you did make a  
2 formal motion. Is there a second?

3 COMMISSIONER MOORE: I second.

4 CHAIRPERSON JAMES: It has been moved and seconded.

5 Discussion.

6 COMMISSIONER LEONE: I just want to be sure that we are  
7 going to come back to John's procedural point. I think John's  
8 procedural point is important. I think these particular  
9 recommendations should not necessarily be sacrificed in that  
10 procedure because I agree with Jim. I think most commissioners  
11 think they're perfectly reasonable ideas. But I think we do have  
12 to close out now.

13 CHAIRPERSON JAMES: No question.

14 COMMISSIONER WILHELM: Why should we close now? We're  
15 not going to close. Suppose I come up with some insight this  
16 afternoon or tomorrow? I mean, I haven't -- I raised this one  
17 once before. I said I didn't come in with 70 recommendations in  
18 order to get down to eight.

19 COMMISSIONER LEONE: You make a good point, except we  
20 all got this 12 days ago, so I just don't think it's fair to say  
21 that this recommendation from Jim is kind of coming in -- this is  
22 a May 21st one, and I think -- I agree with your point, I just  
23 think it's not -- it doesn't apply to something that we've all had  
24 for almost two weeks. Maybe. Obviously if you disagree.

25 CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commissioner Lanni?

26 COMMISSIONER LANNI: I think people reading this report  
27 can take a look at the process and they're going to find us to be  
28 reasonably inane probably on a number of issues, but specifically  
29 on this one. When we had -- maybe unreasonably inane in some

1 cases. But I would say that the concern I have is that when you  
2 had -- I mean, we had two days of meetings, as John had pointed  
3 out, in which a number of recommendations were made. You may  
4 remember the posse of recommendations that I made because I  
5 assumed that there would be other ones that would be so egregious  
6 that they would need my time to respond to.

7 What concerns me is we're going to look absolutely  
8 foolish to have recommendations that were proposed without seconds  
9 now suddenly brought back -- not suddenly, I'll drop the word  
10 suddenly -- returned for reconsideration without getting seconds.

11 I think someone -- clearly logic is going to say why suddenly --  
12 I'll say suddenly now -- did someone determine that there should  
13 be a second for something that we couldn't even get a second for  
14 last time it was raised.

15 Even if substantively these are issues that I could  
16 support, I could not vote for this because I think it's outside  
17 the procedure, and I think it's inappropriate, and it's revisiting  
18 something that couldn't get a second before. For that purpose  
19 alone I cannot support it, either one of them.

20 CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Well, we have already today  
21 received substitute language for recommendations. We've done that  
22 this morning, we've done it already. Jim, I don't know if you  
23 would be prepared to offer it that way. I would like to just get  
24 to a vote on the substance on it and not spend a great deal of  
25 time.

26 COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I agree. Call for the question.

27 COMMISSIONER LANNI: Point of order. What are we  
28 voting on?

29 COMMISSIONER DOBSON: We're voting on the motion to the

1 first recommendation.

2                   COMMISSIONER LEONE: Madam Chair, could the maker of  
3 the motion read the motion?

4                   COMMISSIONER DOBSON: The motion reads the Commission  
5 recommends that the Congress should delegate to the appropriate  
6 federal agency the task of annually gathering data concerning  
7 lottery operations in the United States, including volume of  
8 purchase, demographics, lottery players, and patterns of play by  
9 demographics, nature, content, accuracy, and type of advertising,  
10 spending regarding problem pathological gamblers, spending on  
11 regulation, and other relevant matters.

12                  CHAIRPERSON JAMES: So that is the motion before us.  
13 All in favor? Any opposed? One no, the motion carries. The  
14 second one?