

to change what it is he is offering and it would be at a cost to himself. But I can't...I just can't support an amendment that's going to say we should exempt this one operator across the State of Nebraska and say that he never has to comply with the law that we're setting forth in LB 767. As I said, we are already grandfathering him in as we are other businesses that are in operation at this point in time to allow them to continue to run until the end of their contract. And, with that, I would just I'm opposed to the Schmit amendment and I ask others of you on the floor to vote against it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Conway, please, followed by Senator Hartnett.

SENATOR CONWAY: Mr. President and members, I rise in support of Senator Schmit's amendment, at least conceptually. I'm not sure that this will absolutely accomplish what he had in mind in the sense that in discussion we're talking about the extent to which a renewed contract may or may not be...follow the same terms and would fall into that. But we are looking at rather extensive investments on the part of a couple of communities that had the foresight and the willingness to move forward with these particular programs and because of that expense we are talking about a relatively limited period of time. And by taking out that expiration date of those contracts, I think that would enhance the opportunity for those. Possibly, it would take additional language to really accomplish what he has in mind. But I am going to support the concept because I think any time that we can extend and better reclaim the fixed costs that are...that are involved in these particular games, I believe Senator Hartnett's schemes, I guess we identify them in this particular provision, are somewhat different than those that we have but when you look at the keno and/or the scratch ticket situation, we are talking about extensive investments on the part of these communities. They are being well accepted in those communities, generating revenue that is being used for community betterment and the like and I think any time that we can have an extended period of time to recapture those particular costs, that would behoove the people who are involved. The fact that there's only two communities involved at this point maybe just simply reflects the fact that these were communities that have been active for a long period of time, recognizing the value of this particular activity in their communities and, short of that, possibly more communities would have been involved if they thought that there was any