

Department of Revenue does not have the expertise to develop and implement the standards which are needed to ensure quality treatment for individuals with gambling addictions. The division does not now nor will it under the provisions of LB 275 provide direct services for compulsive gamblers. No counselors will be hired by the state. The money in the Compulsive Gamblers Assistance Fund comes from the 1 percent of the lottery proceeds that by law is allocated to assist compulsive gamblers. It is not new money. It does not come from the General Fund. It is now and will continue to be deposited on a quarterly basis in the Compulsive Gamblers Assistance Fund to be dispersed at the direction of the Nebraska Advisory Counsel on Compulsive Gambling. The specific amendment I propose to add on LB 275 simply removes the 10 percent limitation and instead inserts language stating that no more than \$50,000 can be used for administrative purposes. This is important. At the present time, there is no limitation as to how much of the money in the Compulsive Gamblers Assistance Fund can be used for administrative purposes. Recent discussions with the current director of the Division on Compulsive Gambling indicates that administrative costs this year will run approximately \$34,000, and that is with a part-time director and no certification responsibilities. It is simply not feasible to expect the Department of Public Institutions to take over this division and the accompanying additional responsibilities, and limit their spending to less than they are spending at the present time. That is why I want to allow them enough money to handle the responsibilities and yet put a cap on what they can spend administratively. I think that \$50,000 should allow them enough money while ensuring that as much money as possible goes to direct services. I urge you to support this amendment, and if there are any questions, I would try and answer them. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Pedersen. Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Madam Chairman and members. I rise to support the Pedersen amendment. I think it will be a good amendment. I think it will probably spell out what he wants to do with this bill. Right now, I think a lot of people think as the revenues increase there is going to be a lot of dollars there, and by putting the 50,000 dollar limit, I think that is a good approach and I support the amendment. Thank you.