

or three things you recall, this bill does limit itself only to contributions from those who would operate a state lottery where the state was directly involved. You recall I indicated that the concept came from one of the publications we all receive is "Midwest Council of State Governments". It is similar to what would have been done in Indiana and also I had reference to similar legislation in New Jersey which had been gone through their Supreme Court, State Supreme Court and had been appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, but they did not accept the case so there was an assumption on my part that at least this kind of a prohibition was within constitutional authority of a state to enact without becoming involved with some of the lawsuits that otherwise happened. It seems to me that there is a need for a compelling state interest, at least it has been indicated at least in some court action and otherwise that when it comes to gambling there is more of a compelling state interest than there may be in other areas. I could make an argument I suppose for this...for the amendment similar to what Senator Hall is offering as something that perhaps ought to be considered in the long run. I frankly do not know the full consequences to adopt it here on Select File. I assume that it would create some potential, not necessarily problems perhaps, but certainly considerations in the whole process that current used for issuing contracts. I assume there would be some cost, probably insignificant, but nevertheless, because I do not know the impact, I would oppose the amendment at this point. I would hope the bill could go forward as it is and I'd certainly be very willing to join with Senator Hall to introduce such a bill at a later session to do exactly this when we had more opportunity to make sure that there are not problems that would be created. I simply am not aware of at this time, so I would urge the body not to adopt the amendment and that LB 28 would go ahead. If you don't like LB 28 as it is, why I guess I'd suggest you should vote no on the bill, not vote yes on the amendment because I would be inclined not to proceed with the bill if the amendment is adopted solely because it may not be bad, I just don't know what the impact might be and because of that I'd urge the body not to accept the amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Is there any further discussion of the Hall amendment? Senator Hall, do you wish to close?

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, members. Again, the amendment merely takes the bill and expands it to any entity who