

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

February 20, 2004 LR 14

Senator Preister. Senator Baker, Senator Preister, and Senator Burling, the house is under call. Please report to the Chamber. All members are present or accounted for. The question before the body is cease debate on AM2599. A roll call vote has been requested. Mr. Clerk, call the roll on the question, please.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken, Legislative Journal page 697.)  
37 ayes, 1 nay, to cease debate, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: The motion was successful. Senator Smith, to close on your amendment, AM2599, to LR 14CA.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I believe it has been a good discussion so far and I hope that it remains as such. I do want to point out that if Senator Schimek didn't like the language of AM2599, there was the opportunity to amend it and I didn't see that prerogative exercised. So certainly I think that it is workable language. Is it vague? Yes. Can the Legislature trail it or follow-up next year, should this ultimately be adopted by the voters, to provide more specifics? Yes. Now, the next amendment after this one, which I think...and the subsequent one as well, I think is relevant to the closing of this one, in case members want to look to those in the same effort. The next amendment proposes that the registered voters of a county in which a casino location is authorized shall, after such casino location has been in existence for five years, approve or disapprove the continued presence of such casino location within the county. So basically, it's the five-year renewal. The one following that is...has to do with some of the revenues and how they're channeled. And then also a county board on AM2600 that a casino take place, "except that the county board of a county in which a casino location is authorized shall approve or disapprove all contractual agreements relating to casino gaming at such location," is that vague? Yes, it is. The Legislature could follow-up with that. And then, following that, is the 2.5 percent proceeds from such taxation shall be used for the treatment of gambling addiction. But let's talk about AM2599 being the right for a county to vote to approve or disapprove of a casino coming to that county. I think it's reasonable. It's appropriate. Do the citizens of Omaha want it, but the citizens