

more liquor in order to get more and more money to help the alcoholics that we produce through the consumption of the liquor we produce through the state distillery. State gambling is contributing to this problem and in some cases creating it. Now we are being asked to go along with a funding mechanism, which requires additional gambling to produce additional money. If there is any way that I can cripple this effort, I intend to do it, and that's why I am voting against what Senator Pedersen is trying to do.

SENATOR HALL: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I am disappointed that Senator Pedersen brings it to us because he understands the dynamics of compulsive gambling. The one who ought to be the watch person is the one who is allowing the marauder to come in and do the things that the watch person should prevent from taking place. My one vote is not going to stop this from happening, but I want the record to be crystal-clear on why I am voting against it, and I've tried to make it as clear as I can what it is you are doing. I am going to ask, in case Sen...no, I will see how Senator Pedersen handles it.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Janssen, your light is next.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Hall, and members. I have a few questions to ask of Senator Pedersen, if he would reply.

SENATOR HALL: Senator Pedersen, will you respond.

SENATOR PEDERSEN: Yes.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Maybe I am looking at this a little different than Senator Chambers is. Now the 10 percent of the 1 percent, which is \$180,000, and you are asking for \$50,000 of that \$180,000?

SENATOR PEDERSEN: Yes.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Right away? Not unless it...it doesn't have to grow. Say we stay at a stalemate for the next three years and that 1 percent, or the 10 percent of the 1 percent stays at \$180,000, you are still going to ask for \$50,000 out of that \$180,000.