

I would hope the bill could stay as it is if you are opposed to the bill as in its form certainly one could vote against it. But I would strongly object to this particular amendment which I think is overly broad and certainly goes far beyond what I think you could argue is a compelling state interest, to the extent that you can make that argument, or at least it has been successfully made in a judicial setting in other states. So I'd urge the body to reject the amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I rise to support the Hall amendment. I think it's a very fair amendment. It treats everyone equal, and that's what I was very much opposed to the other day when we were just trying to say that the people involved with lotteries are the only ones that can give to any campaign. I think this one doesn't single out any one. It treats everyone the same. I think the \$100,000 is a...is probably a high enough figure. And I think whenever you start down a street where you're going to say we're only going to take care of one entity is all, that's not, in my opinion, very good legislation. I think this is a lot better bill if this amendment is attached, because everybody is on the same playing field, whether it's gambling, or liquor, or it's roads, or whoever that it is. I think it's a lot better way to go than...and you don't have to worry about any court case because everybody is on the same level playing field. So I think Senator Hall has a good amendment here and I will support it. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Hall, on your amendment. By the way, Senator Hall, there are no other lights on. I would allow you either to speak in your order or to close.

SENATOR HALL: I'll take the former, if that would be all right.

SPEAKER WITHEM: You're speaking in your order, that's fine.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, members. Again I rise in support and offer the amendment. The argument that Senator Warner makes with regard to the New Jersey case is one that the court upheld and the Supreme Court did not accept (inaudible). And it means that basically in that jurisdiction is the law. And it says that in effect there was a compelling state interest