

May 31, 1991

LB 714A  
LR 24

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...to reimburse depositors unless the other one passed.

SFATOR WITHEM: Yeah, I think I agree with Senator Will and others that because this is clean, because it separates the issues, because my objection earlier to tying the two together was that they would be intertwined in the same ballot issue, and pro-lottery, antidepositor people might...would have to choose and might vote no and it might bring the lottery down. I did not support that. But now the fact that they are...now the fact that they are not intertwined, I would be supportive of it. As a matter of fact, I would suggest, and I am kind of wondering why it hasn't been done, rather than using lottery money, using General Fund appropriations as a possibility, and gutting some otherwise worthless piece of legislation, like LB 714A, as an example, or some other bill that we don't need, and placing that...this constitutional language into that, so we wouldn't even have to be based on the lottery. But I think what Senator Wesely and others have said is correct. It is really about time that we took this...we thought we'd resolved this issue last year. Some of us that had been lukewarm on support before supported payment. We thought we'd resolved it. The courts did not agree that we had the right to resolve that, and the poor depositors continue to be pedaled false hope that by coming down here and lobbying the Legislature that somehow we are going to magically overturn the Supreme Court decision by passing legislation. I think that is cruel to those individuals that we are doing that to them. I think the courts have said you can't do it under the Constitution, we ought to take it to a vote of the people and see if...

(MACHINE MALFUNCTION, NO TAPE OVERLAP, SOME DEBATE LOST)

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: ...will confuse, you're going to put both things on the ballot like this because a lot of people think, well, I'm not going to support any lottery that's going to give money to Commonwealth. When you get outside of Lincoln it's not very popular to give money to Commonwealth and this amendment, part 2, would be defeated very handily and I think it would also, there's a possibility that it may bring down the part 1 of the lottery. And I think that would be a big shame to do that because people will get confused out there. They will think they're voting for Commonwealth because somebody might say, well, if you vote for this you're going to vote to give money back to Commonwealth. Even though it's going to be two separate