

matter of fact, that argument was made on the floor here by the proponents of the lower tax and I think gambling is rather like booze. It is not good for people, but people like to do it. And so what does the state do in that kind of a situation when people like to do something that is not very good for them? Well, they tax it. They try to put it just a little further out of reach just to make them think a second time, just to make sure that it isn't the easiest thing in the world to do. And you have effected the demand curve there by raising the price. Secondly, the argument that this comes out of the charities in my estimation is specious. There is two places where it comes from compared to the charities, that is out of operators and out of players, and it ought to come out of the players in my estimation. We should take it from the players. They shouldn't get a high return to feed that instinct to gamble. And that is what the injection of a tax does in this case. Hopefully, it takes that out of the player and maybe over time the player will come to find out that gambling is not a way to improve one's lot in life, that there are other ways that you have to invest yourself in if you're going to do well. But finally I want to bring out this point and it is one that Vard Johnson raised with me a day or two ago, I thought it was a good idea. He said, you know, this state could run a lottery, could legally, we could do it. We've got the law to do it, but we won't and the reason we won't is because we've got pickles. Whatever state tax base there is in the lottery business is used up. We gave it away and we gave it to the nonprofits. We gave it when we stood beside and watched the pickle industry grow as it has. This state couldn't go into the lottery business. It would give these same people that are out here fighting the pickle bill this year would be back saying, no, don't you go to a lottery. Basically we have given up that form of state tax base, if you will, and we've given it to the nonprofits and what have we exacted for that? What kind of a price have we exacted for giving up the state tax base? Three percent of gross profits. Seems to me that it is more than fair that the take here ought to be a little higher for the state as we have given up a \$137 million of business and of...millions of dollars of tax base, if you will, for these activities. So, three reasons: Number one, we ought to take it from the players. Number two, gambling is like booze; people like to do it; it's not good for them, so tax it, treat it like the sin that it is. And, third, seems to me that for the cost of the tax base that we've handed over here, we should be able to exact our fair share. Sixteen percent definite profit represents a fair share to me.