

committee amendments do to the bill. And, if you have some questions, I'll try to answer them, otherwise that's the context of the committee amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Smith. Do you have an amendment on the desk?

CLERK: Madam President, I do. Senator Withem would move to amend the committee amendments. Senator, your amendment is on page 810 of the Journal.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the body, this is not, I don't think it's a major issue, although on bills like this anything can become major issues. The committee amendments, one of the things that they do is they limit the number of lottery, keno locations that the county could operate to five in any one city. I've had a concern, over the years, about the possibility of having way too many of these types of institutions in any one city or county. And what I'm doing is I'm striking the language that says, within a city or village, so that the county would be limited to five total outlets as opposed to five in Omaha, five in Ralston, five in Bennington, five in et cetera. At one time I'd understood that that was kind of the intent of the committee amendments. I've since learned maybe it wasn't the intent of the committee amendments. But I don't...I...I...that's what it does, and I would appreciate your support for it.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Withem. Is there anyone who wishes to speak on this amendment? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of both Senator Withem's amendment to the committee amendments and the committee amendments as a whole. The issue that Senator Withem raises, with regard to the language that he places in as a limiting factor, I think is a good amendment. It was clearly my intent, Senator Withem, that that be the proposal. I do not believe that the City of Omaha, or the City of Omaha and Douglas County should, if they proceed with a joint effort, infringe upon the City of LaVista, or the City of Ralston, for that matter. And I have no problem with the amendment that would limit that to those five locations. I think beyond the five locations would be excessive. And the committee amendments that deal with the limitation to Douglas County I have no objection to.