

File by the Government, Military Affairs Committee, but was one of those bills that we didn't get to, so it was reintroduced this session and again put out by the committee. What the bill does, it deals with campaign contributions. It would put in a prohibition for any campaign contributions to be made to a state office, which would include the constitutional officers, including the Legislature, but it would prohibit any firm that would have a...would be applying for a contract with the state to provide the gambling services to the state to the extent that we now have it, and they would be prohibited from this. It is totally prospective. It is not retroactive, but it would prohibit them from making...being awarded a contract if they had made a contribution three years before, as well as it would be a prohibition they could not again make a campaign contribution after the point of that contract for three years. The concept, the reason for putting it in, came out of an article that I had read in December of '93, in one of these that we all get, this happened to come from the Midwest Council of State Governments, and one of the articles indicated that Indiana had passed such legislation and also indicated that New Jersey had a similar type of legislation, and looking at, at that time looking at the New Jersey situation, they obviously had a broader gambling authorization than we currently have in Nebraska, but, in any event, they had a commission that was established that reviewed this whole entire area and they came up with the recommendation that this type...a campaign contribution would be prohibited from any of the casinos, in their case, that was licensed to be operated by the state, in which the state was a participant in the operation as far as granting, determining who was to have the license and its function. Subsequently that law was appealed to the Supreme Court in New Jersey, which upheld the restriction. It was further appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, which declined to accept the appeal. But, as a result, I assume at least, that's an indication the court did not find this a violation of the provisions of the Federal Constitution of free speech which we otherwise frequently run into. I want to indicate, and I know these are always sensitive, sometimes when we talk about campaign restrictions, limitations, I recall a hearing, I think it was George Will either read it or heard it, talking about the problems, not the problems, but the situation that exists when you put campaign limitations. Most of us in public office tend to react negatively, and there is kind of an assumption that we are being accused of something inappropriate, and we don't like that. That's not the case here. I think it is probably a prudent, in this particular area where the issuing