

say charitable gaming. Maybe we want to do it for local option lotteries. We want to submit those fingerprints to the FBI and then we say that, well, you know, the teamsters is a pretty rough union. They've been around, they've had some black marks on their ledger in the past, maybe we ought to take fingerprints of everybody who is an over the road driver and it's a member of the Teamsters Union and we ought to submit that to the FBI. At what point does it stop? At what point do we say these individuals don't need to be fingerprinted? And every one of those examples that I gave you tend to be people who move in and out of the business, move in and out of a state, move in and out with the industry. Granted, racing is a seasonal industry. It's seasonal within the state itself. It moves from one end of the state to another as the weather improves and as the seasons begin and end at different tracks. Over the road drivers go in and out of the state. Gaming individuals travel within the gaming industry. They work at different areas, they move in and out as the jobs appear and disappear. Why shouldn't they be fingerprinted? Now there may be those who say they should be fingerprinted. I would argue, at this point there is no justification for an individual to be fingerprinted because they happen to clean out a stall on the back side of the State Fair grounds, but that's what we do with LB 200. And we begin that process of saying, you're going to be on the FBI fingerprint roles and where does it end? Where does it end? Where does a young person, I guess who, has a part-time job during the summer, has their fingerprints taken just so that they can shovel manure at probably minimum wage and we're doing that to protect, I guess, against some sort of fraud, some sort of potential hazard in the industry of illegal activities. I say it's overkill at best. It's the kind of issue that needs to be stricken from this bill. I think the rest of the bill is fine, deals with what the commission may do in terms of revocations of licenses and I believe that's the way problems within the industry ought to be addressed through the commission. They don't need to be addressed through a broad brush approach to say, everybody who works in this area ought to be fingerprinted. They have control, I guess, in someone's mind of being able to fix a race. What's the difference between that individual and an individual who monitors, runs the race track, votes on when those racing dates are going to be held, who may have individuals that are beholdng to them because of those decisions, those powers that they can exercise. I would argue that there is none and if anything, those individuals who basically are in charge make the decisions should be more