

I think the problem is that the language that we have before us in Senator Abboud's amendment conflicts with the amendment that we just adopted, that being my amendment to split the funds, and I am not sure that we have it properly drafted at present. I have absolutely no problem with the idea of setting aside some money that would be used for the purposes as spelled out by Senator Abboud. I think it is a good proposal that we should address. Clearly you can't refute the arguments that there are people out there who are going to have problems, no matter what kind of, I guess, device is put in front of them, whether it be alcohol, liquor, whether it be gambling or anything else, any temptation that is laid before people, there are people that just can't handle it. But in this case, I think the fact that we are going to have state sanctioned gambling, in other words, we are going to be in the business ourselves with a lottery proposal that is passed by the voters, I think it is appropriate that we recognize potential problems that we could be facing, we could be enticing people into. But I would just ask that probably we make sure that the language is tight and it doesn't affect or make any changes in the amendment that dealt with the distribution amongst the two funds that we've established in the previously adopted amendment. And if that's okay with Senator Abboud, I think if we can bring it back on Select File and make sure we have it drafted properly, I am sure that it would be a easily adopted amendment at that time.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I rise also to support the Abboud amendment, especially at this point in time the concept of it, and I understand that they are working to try to make it so that it doesn't conflict with the adoption of the Hall amendment, which we just did adopt. You know, we all know about the fact that gambling for some people becomes addictive, and I think that this is an appropriate fund to take the money from to treat that problem should it develop for some folks in the future. The other thing is that in the constitutional provision, as you know, I would have liked to have removed videos as the one possibility for future types of gambling, but that was not, as I could see when I withdrew it, something that was supported by the body, and it is the most addictive type of gambling there is. And so somewhere down the line some years from now if that should occur that we would have a video lottery, I would want to make sure that we had the funds there to treat those folks who became