

the...not immediately, but when it does lapse over it goes into the General Fund. Of the 40 percent remaining, 33 percent of that is what they can spend at this point in time. We know there are going to be additional start-up costs if this Hall amendment is adopted. We know that the 2 percent tax is paid by keno now for on-line gambling will go down because of the electronic game activity, so that means less money will come in as their share the way it now stands, and we know that there is going to be increased enforcement and regulatory responsibility in the Charitable Gaming Division. And I also offer to you that the interim study that we will be looking at this summer in the General Affairs Committee will be looking at the appropriateness of the amount of money that now goes to the Gaming Division for its different responsibilities in the gaming activity. So with that, I would just ask for your consideration for the amendment. Thank you. And with no further ado, I will have a call of the house.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: We still have speakers. Thank you. Senator Warner, on the Smith amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Johnson, members of the Legislature, I would rise to support the amendment. I think a couple of things have been said by Senator Smith that I strongly agree with, and there are start-up costs. You will recall on the other bill that we have going across, the General Fund is used for those start-up costs to the amount of \$2 million, then to be repaid back to the General Fund in time. There is going to be start-up costs here and, obviously, the adjustment can be made later if you want. Now those who have problems with enforcement, you do not cure the enforcement issue, if you feel there is one, by cutting the funds. What you could do if you wanted to is direct how some of those enforcement funds were used. If you feel there aren't sufficient people out doing the inspections or investigation or whatever, I assume you could go into the mainline appropriation bill and, of their 33 percent, say X amount of dollars shall be used for enforcement purposes and enforcement purposes only. You could be as specific as you like, I believe. It may not be good management but it certainly could be done, but you are not going to improve enforcement by restricting the funds, but you can direct how those funds are used if that is the will of the body. But I think it is extremely important that you do not undercut the ability to have the necessary enforcement on a new form of or an expansion of some type of gambling which by reducing those funds is exactly