

income for what they do, and to, in essence, continue to operate in a normal fashion. I have not read or seen where the outlets other than the pickle parlors have been in violation of the law. I have not read or seen where there has been a convenience food store that has had problems with the Department of Revenue. I have not read or seen where there has been a beauty or barbershop that has had problems with the Department of Revenue. I have not seen a gas station or an off-sale liquor store that has had problems with the Department of Revenue. What we are doing is we are severely limiting those outlets that are available if we do not adopt this amendment. Senator Johnson talks of the moral issue and the tolerance that society has, at what point does that bubble burst, at what point do you break through, and he argues that in the case of the video lottery that it was the point where they ended up in the Hinky Dinkys. He offered the option that it was society no longer being able to tolerate that. Well, there is another part to that equation. If you think back, and Senator Landis has mentioned \$137 million being gambling and, yes, it is gambling. Now what is the biggest gambling entity prior to pickle cards in the state? It is parimutuel gambling. It was Ak-Ben. And what were those video lotteries competing with dramatically? Who were they competing with? Whose handle did they affect? They affected Ak-Sar-Ben. And that was the other part of that equation in terms of the outcry from the public, and that is exactly what you are seeing here in pickle cards. That is exactly the way it is shaking down this time. The outcry is coming from the papers, and the editorials are generating news stories, and the news stories are generating the editorials, and we are walking down the same path, Senator Johnson. We are walking down the same path. It is not an equation that is just the public outcry. It is an equation that says the gambling dollar is one that is vied for by all those who participate in gambling, and why shouldn't the charitable organizations who put the money that is raised to good cause be allowed to have an even footing with regard to the outlets that they are provided. We talk about the accessibility to children. That issue with regard to accessibility to the track has been raised. No need to bring it back. To not adopt this amendment is a very hypocritical vote, I would think, for this body to undertake. It is important that we allow for these to continue. Nobody has, nobody has spoken and said that it is not an option that we want to do away with. Nobody that has talked to date on any of these amendments has said that. The issue is one of where is the legitimate outlet and I would argue that those outlets that are listed, outside of