

offer strikes a change that is what I would consider a substantive change. It is a loosening of the provisions that deal with the chain, if you will, the tier system in terms of the manufacturing, and the distribution of bingo paper. As Senator Hartnett pointed out in an earlier amendment, the tracking of bingo paper has allowed the department to do a much better job of regulation and oversight of various bingo games. This provision in the bill, under Section 6, page 8, it would strike lines 14 through 19, which is the only new language that is found on that page. And it reads as this, the section deals with the definition of a manufacture with regard to production of bingo paper, and it has been, in the past, a ban that the manufacturer could not be a distributor, distributor could not be a licensee, the licensee could not be a seller, and we had those built in structures to ensure that there would not be any, for lack of a better term I guess, shaky operations that took place between a manufacturer and a distributor. And so that there would be one license to be a manufacturer of the paper, and you could conduct that operation through the department without any problems. But we didn't want any intertwining of those responsibilities. We didn't want a manufacturer to be a distributor of paper. One of the things that we had talked about was the fact that there was, not only in the pickle area, but in the bingo area, there was paper that was bootlegged. In other words, it was not sanctioned by the department, it had not been, in many cases, paid for, not gone through the same system of checks and oversights. In other words, a bingo game could, in essence, not show up because it had been played on paper that had not been recorded. What we do here, with allowing a manufacturer to be a distributor, is, I think, break down those barriers that we tried to put up. We felt at the time when the legislation was put in place it was important, not only to guarantee that the operators were functioning on the up-and-up, but that there was no problem within the chain of exchange of these types of purchases. So that it was clear that the individual to look at, in this case, would be the distributor, because the manufacturer had the responsibility of doing only basically the printing of the goods. They then, in the next step, sold to the distributor, who then took it to the licensed bingo operator, who purchased from the distributors. What we would do in this...without this amendment is allow a manufacturer to also be a distributor. And I would consider that to be a substantive change over what we have proposed to be, I think, a very good system of checks and balances within the distribution of paper bingo. I think this is one of the