

on the part of the State of New Jersey for the limitation that they placed in the area of campaign contributions for gambling interests. I would argue that there clearly is a compelling state interest in Nebraska, and that this is a narrow enough scope in terms of the limitation, so that you don't jeopardize the First Amendment argument that campaign contributions basically fall under, and that is that when we allow for contracts to be let that we don't want to show, we want to make sure that it's clear that there is not undue influence or in effect priority given to those individuals who have made campaign contributions. If we limit campaign contributions by those individuals, their persons, their representatives, whatever, who hold contracts with the state, limit them to \$1,000 or less so that the appearance is not there that individuals have somehow been awarded contracts because of the campaign contribution they have made. What we have done is said that we want it to be clear that two things happen. One, that the individuals who receive contracts, receive them on their merits, that they receive them because they are either the lowest and best bid or just the best bid, whatever the case may be. And we also want to protect those individuals in terms of their right to participate in campaigns. They have the ability, to a certain extent, to voice, through a campaign contribution, how they feel about the candidates. So they are protected on both fronts, we draw a line at the level of \$1,000, but they do have the ability to speak. And I think any court would rule that that \$1,000 figure, that was not pulled out of thin air, is one where it is more than an average contribution. It would allow for an individual to express their desire in terms of the campaign, so it would not thwart their ability to participate, but at the same time it would recognize the state's interest in making sure that there is not a problem in terms of the awarding of state contracts. And I clearly think that there would not be a constitutional problem with regard to a proposal structured in this manner. I think that what it does is, in effect, protects both entities, the state on the one hand with regard to the limitations for those individuals who choose to bid on state contracts, and the individual who would be involved with the state contract, and at the same time would want to make a campaign contribution to an individual who very likely would have no impact, no input, no decision-making involvement at all with the award of that same state contract. They would not have their hands tied for purposes of exercising their right to participate in that campaign. So, in essence, I think it gives us the best of both worlds. It erases any perception...