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

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

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

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

I thought that when we had this research subcommittee
check-in a little while ago, that we agreed on these things, the
things that Leo says are unanimously supported by the subcommittee and are being now copied, or retyped, or whatever it is, for all the commissioners. Now we’ve got these other two, which as far as I’m concerned, are about future research.

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

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

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

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

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Right, I understand.

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

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: I understand.

COMMISSIONER WILHELM: We’ve got books of stuff to consider between now and tomorrow night.
CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commission Dobson, you did make a
formal motion. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I second.

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: It has been moved and seconded.

Discussion.

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

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: No question.

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

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

CHAIRPERSON JAMES: Commissioner Lanni?

COMMISSIONER LANNI: I think people reading this report
can take a look at the process and they’re going to find us to be
reasonably inane probably on a number of issues, but specifically
on this one. When we had -- maybe unreasonably inane in some
cases. But I would say that the concern I have is that when you had -- I mean, we had two days of meetings, as John had pointed out, in which a number of recommendations were made. You may remember the posse of recommendations that I made because I assumed that there would be other ones that would be so egregious that they would need my time to respond to.

What concerns me is we’re going to look absolutely foolish to have recommendations that were proposed without seconds now suddenly brought back -- not suddenly, I’ll drop the word suddenly -- returned for reconsideration without getting seconds. I think someone -- clearly logic is going to say why suddenly -- I’ll say suddenly now -- did someone determine that there should be a second for something that we couldn’t even get a second for last time it was raised.

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

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

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: I agree. Call for the question.

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

COMMISSIONER DOBSON: We’re voting on the motion to the
first recommendation.

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

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

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