

SENATOR JENSEN: ...of the citizens of Nebraska. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Schrock.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, Senator Schellpeper, would you avail yourself to some questions?

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Yes.

SENATOR SCHROCK: I'm concerned that the constitutional amendment does not really define what type of gambling is going to take place, and where it's going to take place, and the number of sites. Obviously, Iowa has created a problem, we probably wouldn't be talking about this if it wasn't for Iowa and South Dakota. I think our voters need to know what they're voting on. And I heard someone else express that concern this morning also. Can you tell me how many sites in Iowa have slot machines?

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: About 14.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Okay, considering that the population of Nebraska is smaller than the state of Iowa, if we're going to have casino type gambling in this state it would appear to me that it would be appropriate that we have fewer sites than Iowa.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: I agree.

SENATOR SCHROCK: And is there any way in this constitutional amendment that it could be defined so that we had just a few, select sites in the state? I think the people in the state of Nebraska, a lot of them in small town Nebraska really don't want gambling in their hometown, but they recognize that people are crossing the borders and doing a lot of gambling out of state, and they think the revenue should stay in this state. So if they had the opportunity to drive down the road and go to a casino, and they made a conscientious effort to do that, I don't think most people in rural Nebraska would object too much to that. But if they see that every bowling alley, and restaurant, and tavern in their small town is going to have a few slot machines, and I know there's people that disagree with me on this issue, are going to have gambling, I don't think the people want that in this state.