to achieve here and I believe that Senator Smith and the Department of Revenue are trying to do that. But I would just hope that we would allow the city to make the decision in this instance as to whether or not Mr. Clatterbuck is allowed to continue his operation. So often on this floor we find ourselves in the position where we place a burden upon an individual or upon a business. Most of the time, in my years here, we have attempted not to adversely impact an existing legal business which was established under existing law. There have been some rare occasions and I don't think those are the finest times of this Legislature. In this particular instance, this operation is existing today, it complements the rest of the business. It provides, I'm sure, a certain amount of revenue for both the business and the city, some for the state. It provides another avenue and whether that's good or bad, I don't know, but at least it was established under existing law. It was not established outside the law, it was established under existing law and I think it's unfair for us to, by statute, outlaw or eliminate an operation where a man has made an investment, without allowing him to recover that investment and I really don't know when he will recover it, if ever. But I think it's also inconsistent that we decide that one business shall stay in business and another shall get out of business since we really do not have the state lottery. If we had a state lottery, that would be our responsibility. But we have chosen to place that burden upon the...upon the cities, whether it's right or wrong. We do have a provision by the Department of Revenue but it's my understanding that that operation supervision is very limited. I do not know what they do to supervise the keno operations. It's kind of interesting that the keno has become a form of good gambling and is desirable and I hope that perhaps those entities who have adopted it find it a source of some revenue. But this operation is...this amendment, I want it understood, is simply for the benefit, as far as I know, Senator Conway might correct me or Senator Smith, as I drafted it it was for the benefit of a single business in Bellevue and I did not speak to the business man when I drew it. But I know of that existence and I think it would be equitable to adopt. If there...if it impacts a business in Senator Conway's district, perhaps he or Senator Smith can comment on it and explain why they chose to do this. I understand there are two separate kinds of lottery here and perhaps that is the reason why it was done in this manner. But I would just like to...I would like to ask a question also of Senator Smith at this time because the question has been raised with me several