

meant to say that I was perplexed because this is a complex issue. But the thing that I want to ask you now, Tim, and maybe this again is putting you on the spot, but I guess the reason I'm so surprised on this was the fact...

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR SMITH: I'll put my light back on again, thanks.

SPEAKER BAACK: Further discussion, Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I rise in support of the Hall amendment to LB 795. As Senator Hall explained, this is intended to preclude local option keno games from using devices that are currently being experimented with that essentially offer a keno game format but they do it in a way that is unlike any that has been offered to date. The result is that you have a device that a...well, it plays keno. It looks like a video lottery machine and it smells like a video lottery machine. It contains all the elements of video lotteries that make them so appealing to players and that, frankly, make them able to compete directly with pickle cards. They run games every 15 or 20 seconds. A player inserts a device or a card that has a number of credits on it that the machine reads and awards him with respect to whether or not he wins the keno games that he is betting on and, essentially, it's a continuous play type thing that actually attracts a different type of player than an ordinary keno game does. And I think we discussed the issue of video lottery in the General Affairs Committee this year and we advanced a constitutional amendment on a state lottery and a piece of enabling legislation that we'll be debating soon on General File, and we made the decision at that time not to include video lotteries, not to include machines of the type that Senator Hall's amendment addresses. And I think that as long as we're making that decision at the state level, probably we had not ought to let the local subdivisions that have lotteries back door us by bringing these same types of devices in and essentially cornering the market on that type of gaming. I think that it would be extremely unwise of a Legislature not to adopt this amendment and, in fact, to give this market to the local keno games. If this is a market that we think should be exploited by the state, or by any form of public gambling, I think the state ought to be the one looking into it. We had not ought to give this up to the local subdivisions and this is, indeed, an appropriate amendment to