

more wide-open in this respect than about any other comparable country. This, in itself, would be objectionable to many people, but what is worse is the close and growing connection between gaming clubs and organized crime, often violent crime in London and other big cities."

I am not a prophet of doom. The language used by the minority in which they say that they do not believe we need fear any such influx, I say to you is answered not by me but by those who are experiencing it today.

Now, we have to face this problem. If we take this out of the Constitution, what will its effects be? I do not go back now in history more than four weeks.

The State of Rhode Island has a Constitutional Convention in session. Unlike ours, it is open ended. It has been going on for a couple of years.

They came up with their proposal; in their proposal they did what the minority asks us to do, to take out the restraint on lottery. That proposal, that Constitution was to be submitted to the voters of Rhode Island four weeks ago tomorrow on November 7, 1967.

They withdrew that constitutional proposal in its entirety from the voters of Rhode Island because the whole constitution faced defeat in toto and the major reason for it was the elimination from the constitution for Rhode Island of this restriction on lottery.

Let me read you from the Providence Journal of September 17, 1967, from its editorial: "The proposed constitution also eliminates an existing ban on the running of state lotteries and if the draft is approved, every voter in Rhode Island can expect to see a dozen different bills before the legislature as soon as possible to put the state into the gambling business in spite of the unhappy experiences of New York and New Hampshire."

Then they went on to say in the editorial, and I quote, "With reluctance but with firm conviction the *Journal Bulletin* recommends rejection of the proposed new State Constitution at the special election, November 7.

"The good in the draft, and there is much that is good, that is very good, is outweighed by the bad."

Then the power of this giant known as the public began to make itself felt and so Governor Chaffee of the State of Rhode Island likewise said that the greatest con-

cern that he has in this proposed Constitution of Rhode Island is this subject of lotteries and the subject of wire tapping.

On November the 6, 1967, they withdrew the entire proposal from the people, rather than face complete defeat.

Now, I think you have a right to ask me this question: suppose this particular proposal of our Committee's is defeated? What would you do?

My answer to you is very simple. I have been working so far as this Constitution is concerned since 1930. My first published article was on October 30, 1930. That is a long time ago.

I will take the good with the bad and wherever I am invited, I will be there trying to put over all of the whole proposal, but I ask you this now in advance: ought you to put this kind of a lead burden on this constitution by taking out what has been in every Constitution of Maryland, by failing to profit by the experience of Rhode Island, by being unwilling to believe what has happened in other areas where it has failed to financially relate and where as it has in England, these persons who predict that it will not do anything about the corruption and the present gambling which is unlawful, but that it will bring within itself worse evils. These are the situations for you to consider, and we hope most earnestly that you will vote for our recommendation, which is a vote to keep the restriction, the restraint on lotteries in the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions of the Committee Chairman for purposes of clarification?

Delegate Scanlan?

DELEGATE SCANLAN: Judge Sherbow, apart from the extension of the present constitutional prohibition to the political subdivisions whereas in the present Constitution it applies to the General Assembly only, is there any intention on the part of your Committee to broaden the prohibition against lotteries?

For example, the present prohibition says "no lottery grant shall ever hereafter be authorized by the General Assembly."

Your suggested language which says "lotteries shall not be sanctioned by the State", leaves aside the political subdivisions. I understand your point there. Is it your intention by the language suggested in there to broaden the concept of the lotteries? For example, a lottery grant to my