

Committee of the Whole and of the delegates expressed in debates as to the purpose of the provision under consideration or of the language used is indeed entitled to great weight but the court must also consider the fact that the people in voting on the adoption of the constitution are entitled to assume that ordinary words are used in their ordinary meaning and that this cannot necessarily be controlled completely by statements of intent of the delegates to the Convention as to the meaning they intended.

I think, therefore, the question is easy to answer to say that some effect will be given to the statements on the floor. I think it is very difficult to formulate any statement as to how much effect and whether it will be given overriding effect. I think it is almost impossible for anyone to say. Let me say, also, and I assume in addressing this question to the Chair you are asking only for a personal opinion of the Chair. I have no ability to give any kind of an official opinion to this question and I am sure you understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sickles.

DELEGATE SICKLES: I think the Chair is responding and I am perfectly satisfied with your explanation.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Delegate Case to present Committee Recommendation SF-3.

Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: In explaining the procedure that would be open after we came back from the dinner hour, you said it would be possible after the vote on the Commission Recommendation that a motion for reconsideration could be offered and the applicant for the motion for reconsideration could explain the purpose of the motion for reconsideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is true.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: I would like now to move that the vote be reconsidered. I have not in my possession the specific motion that I would like to offer but I have seen it. Specifically as I understand the situation, we have adopted the Commission Recommendation which was changed orally during the discussion and was never read back by the Chair. I do not know exactly what I voted on.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said Commission Recommendation. You mean Committee Recommendation.

Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: Committee Recommendation.

What we passed is that lotteries shall not be authorized by the State or its political subdivisions.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: In the discussion of that amendment there were those of us, I think, that thought that only meant that the State and political subdivisions would be barred from authorizing lotteries to be conducted by the State or the political subdivisions.

There were others that voted either for or against the amendment because they thought it went much further than that because they thought it prohibited lotteries, whatever that term may mean, from being conducted by any private group that had to receive a license or commission from the State or its political subdivisions. I believe that was the issue to which Delegate Sickles referred in his question to the Chair. Therefore, with the request of the people who drafted the motion even if they have no faith in it, if the reconsideration prevails, I would offer a motion that lotteries will not be conducted by the State or political subdivisions for the purpose of raising revenues. That would make it clear that private groups whether they be fire departments, churches, Elks, or Rotary, may conduct gambling games which are not declared illegal. For that purpose I move that the previous vote be reconsidered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate James.

DELEGATE JAMES: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Several times you referred to a motion to be offered by others the exact text of which you do not have. I assume you mean amendment to be offered by others.

Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: I do and I now have it in my possession.

It would read, "If the vote on the Committee Recommendation was reconsidered"—

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a second, is that the amendment marked B?