

Legislature is concerned, there has been more scandal with highway contractors, however, who might also be regulated under this kind of bill, than there has been with gambling interests. There were terrible problems with highway contractors in the mid-1980s involving bid rigging here in Nebraska, as I think many of you probably know. In any event, I think, I think this is a step in the right direction. I guess I am kind of amazed that Section 5 passed the constitutional test, but if it did, so much more power to the bill. To me, it does make some sense to talk about amounts of contributions, and I don't know, it seems to me the bill does not address that, but I think we would all agree there is certain minimal amounts that do not constitute and would probably not constitute, either in our minds or the minds of the public, as a corrupt kind of contribution, and that maybe some thought could be given to making some distinctions with regard to the types of contributions that are being made. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Warner. Senator, you are the last speaker, do you wish to use this as closing?

SENATOR WARNER: I guess, yes. Madam President, members of the Legislature, two or three things, reference has been made to the bid rigging that occurred with highway contracts. The difference was the rigging was not between public officials and bidders, the rigging was between the contractors who were making the bids. The state was not...the state was the victim, not, or state officials were not participants, and so it is significantly different. This is limited only to state-sponsored gambling, which, essentially, is restrictive without any question. It deals...it does not cover other areas where it's state regulated. Those who, and I am tempted to make a comment, having been through many of these arguments many times, those usually who make the argument that things are broader is, and historically want to get some amendments to make it broader, it's that old theory you love a bill to death, and generally my response is that if Senator Schellpeper believes a bill ought to be broader, why certainly there is an opportunity before the next election to introduce such a bill to do that. My interest was restrict...was limited. I believe there is historical precedent in other areas to do it. It has been tested constitutionally. The broader you would get it, the less likely, it would seem to me, it would be constitutional, but the courts have, apparently, determined that in this limited area