

maybe a commitment by contractual equipment eventually that you're locked in for X period of years.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yeah, it can certainly lock you in for a period of time. Now assuming that the Royals were purchased, if they were then sold, the money to retire those bonds would then be there. So, I mean, it...the...I think Senator Withem mentioned one scenario. Another scenario has come up as far as whether there's possibility of using this to ensure that if there is not...if it's not sold to a group from within the city or I should say a group of citizens, it could be sold to a potential buyer and the city used as a bridge to make sure that the entity stays there. If that's the case, it would be just...

SENATOR WARNER: Short term.

SENATOR LINDSAY: ...as I mentioned, kind of a bridge loan sort of an...

SENATOR WARNER: Yeah.

SENATOR LINDSAY: ...approach. But your scenario, I can't say it's not a possibility, no. But I think that...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR LINDSAY: ...because they would be in that situation, revenue bonds, that the revenue from the lottery would be what's funding the bond. The...yeah, and you could tie it in for that. Yeah, I guess it's...I'm thinking aloud.

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. I think that gives me sufficient understanding.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Chambers, on the Wesely amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I would like to ask Senator Wesely a question, just so that I'm clear on what his amendment does. Senator Wesely, exactly what will your amendment do?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Wesely, would you respond, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, on page...well, on line...line 4 of the