

I believe it is a matter of equity, Mr. President. I do not believe that this body intentionally tries to impose hardship upon a business if they can avoid so and still maintain some degree of continuity. Since the emphasis, in this instance, is upon grandfathering existing businesses, it seems to me to be consistent to allow that business to continue, given the willing...the city's willingness to allow it to continue. If a city decides not to allow it to continue, they can, of course, not renew the contract.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Smith, you are next, but may I introduce some guests in the north balcony. Senator Conway has 25 eighth graders from Wakefield, Nebraska and Senator Conway says that the teacher's name really should be John Tarczan but it's John Torczon, I believe. And we did receive Easter eggs from Wakefield, Nebraska at Easter time which we all appreciate so we know that you're in the egg business up there. Would you folks please stand and be recognized by the Legislature. Thank you all for visiting us today. Senator Smith, please.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the body and Senator Schmit, I rise to oppose your amendment, Senator Schmit. I believe that we have already addressed this issue in Bellevue by grandfathering that operation in for the duration of the contract. We're allowing them to continue even though it's outside what we're going to have as the requirements of this bill when it becomes law. I don't believe that...for one thing, this definitely does not meet the requirements that we're going to set out in LB 767 because what you're seeing there in that operation is two dice games and a roulette wheel. Is that how you pronounce it, roulette wheel? Roulette wheel. Well, I have some relatives that end with "yette". And they're "ette" too. Okay, anyway, I don't believe that the other communities across the state would look at this as being equitable if, in fact, we pass a piece of legislation and allow one community, one operator to continue to operate outside the confines of the law, having other kinds of things that they're offering as gambling devices than other communities are going to be allowed and that's really the point I'm trying to make here. That would be allowing one community a special privilege, in fact, one operator across the state special privileges. And I guess that the point was raised a little bit ago about some other amendment perhaps being unconstitutional and I'm not sure that you could ever consider this to be constitutional. I realize that this operator, if he decided to try to renew his contract, would have