

charity. That's why we did it. The purpose behind it was not one of community betterment, even though we may talk about that from time to time, the reason we did it was to allow for a source of revenue. We didn't want to raise the general sales and income tax. We didn't want to take away exemptions that existed. We didn't want to have to raise property taxes at the local level. We didn't want to send state aid to those local subdivisions of government and we didn't want to appropriate money to those specific charities. So we used a vehicle, that being charitable gaming, to allow them to do that. And if you just use the figure of roughly about 10 percent, and I know it's going to probably far exceed that in terms of the benefit to the charities and the amount of revenue that's raised for local subdivisions of government, you're looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 to probably 70 million dollars of that figure for 1992 that is going to local subdivisions of government or to charities, and I would argue that it's probably far in excess of that. The argument in opposition to that comment is that, well, that just means there's that much less going out to the folks who are playing the games, and that's true. Pay out tends to run between 65 and 75 percent, meaning that 25 percent goes to the operators or to the charities or to the subdivisions of government. So is that a good bet or not? Some would argue, and I might be one of them, to say that there are no good bets out there in terms of wagering but it has become the thing that we chose to do, to allow local subdivisions of government basically a tax source, and that's really all it is for them, it's a tax source. We have given them that. I would love to see us go back and take away the local lotteries, the kenos, pull those back in and let the state bring in that revenue and then decide where it goes. That won't happen. One of the strongest, if not the most difficult lobby to deal with, is the subdivisions of government, the municipalities, and they fight long and hard to protect the revenue. You can just look at the difference between '91 and '92 in terms of the change that a hundred million dollars that bumped up just over the creation of the additional local lotteries that were put in place after the special elections that were held. You're going to continue to see that grow. You're going to continue to see growth in terms of the state lottery as that goes on board and revenues come in there. And what's going to happen, if you look at the chronological display that Senator Wesely pointed out, you're going to see, and it's already happened, those forms of gambling that have been on line for a number of years, specifically horse racing, and then bingo, and then pickle cards, they're going to