here and trying to understand. I guess my concern is that we have given...what we're doing is giving local government local control over a local lottery and I wouldn't want to see something like this placed in the law which tells them where they're going to put those...have their points where those are going to be held, I think. The state has made a policy decision as to where charitable gaming should be conducted. I think that we should allow the local then the control over the local lottery, at least in this area. And I won't be able to support it, Senator Lynch. Maybe if I had seen it before or if I could have time to digest it, I might see something different about it. But right now this is what I think I'm seeing in the amendment. So I would oppose it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, the Lynch amendment has some appeal on its surface and it's the type of amendment that could easily be adopted and the bill passed on over to Final Reading and nobody notice it until the enforcement starts to take place. And I don't know at this point but my guess is a number of city lotteries where the city contracts with a contractor and the contractor then establishes a facility in which people go in and play the lottery that those would become illegal under this. At least, that's what my theory is and that's the reason I'm not going to be supporting it. My home community...one of my home communities of LaVista last year did, in fact, pass a lottery. It has not been established. Probably when they set it up they could comply with this new requirement. I'm wondering though about the City of Ralston to the north. I happen to be familiar with this one because they're keno operation is in the same office complex where my office takes place and other than the fact that I can never find a place to park to get into my office anymore since that established, I don't think there are any problems with it. That place, I'm quite certain, does not have any type of liquor license nor does it achieve a particular percentage of its revenue. So I think...I think what we've done with this bill, it appears to me, Senator Smith, I've not paid as much attention as I should have but it appears to me as though we've been very, very careful throughout the passage of this bill that we not infringe on existing sort of operations that are out there. I'm afraid the Lynch amendment would probably do that. Now I tend to agree with Senator Lynch's what I think are his frustrations with the requirements that we