

middle of these gambling issues because personally I think that it's probably in the best interest of the state if we don't have a lot of gambling. That's just a personal belief, but I do have an area there that is affected by the amendment and the voters in that municipality of Ralston chose to have an operation and for that reason I don't feel that it's a fair use of the funds, that 2 percent is a fair use of the funds to go to a different industry. I can understand the problems that the horse breeders have had. They have legitimate problems going on right now because of the ever-increasing types of gambling that are found in the state and I think maybe there might be some middle ground between the two sides, but it might be apparent that there may be no middle ground that can be adopted upon...while the bill is on Final Reading. So for that reason I'm going to be opposing it because of my area and I would urge other members, because of the unfairness of the use of the money, to oppose the amendment as well. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Abboud. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I want to make a comment that I would hope Senator Johnson would respond to because as I was listening to the discussion my initial reaction was, yeah, might as well as vote for this too maybe, but I've been thinking about it a little bit now and all the discussion has been reminiscent to me to every time we have an exemption bill on taxation we always talk about the merit of the people affected by the exemption and we always ignore the impact upon the whole tax structure. And I'm not aware, but maybe there is, it seems to me this will be the first time that we are putting together two forms of gambling to share receipts and I may be in error. Certainly there is authorization to use funds for more than one purpose as by local government, but I don't know that I'm ready today to vote to put two forms of gambling together, one dependent upon the other. I don't know what the ramifications of that is in the long run. I'm not arguing that horses shouldn't get a cut or a whole lot of other things shouldn't get a cut, but it seems to me we're embarking upon a new state policy of putting two types of unrelated gambling together to some extent, one, at least one dependent upon the other to be successful and I've never seen a unique idea in this body in all my years that it wasn't repeated later for something else and I don't know where that leads. So I'd appreciate, Senator Johnson, because at the moment I'm inclining to vote no, not on the basis of your argument of the importance