

Nebraska?

SENATOR JENSEN: Scaling back?

SENATOR WILL: Yes.

SENATOR JENSEN: I am not...I am not for that. These dollars that are being received right now, certainly let the people decide if they want to continue to play those games, and, certainly, the keno parlors are putting some of their money to community betterment.

SENATOR WILL: So people can decide if they want to play keno, but they can't decide if they want to play different types of games, is that what you are saying?

SENATOR JENSEN: No, the...can they decide? They are deciding what games that they want to play.

SENATOR WILL: And they are deciding to play those games and we are getting none of the revenue from it is my point.

SENATOR JENSEN: Well, we are not getting some of the revenue, we are not also getting some of the costs.

SENATOR WILL: Okay, thank you, Senator Jensen. I think herein lies the fallacy in the argument. It is easy to stand up and say, yes, we are opposed to gambling, here are all the evils that can occur because of it, but, at the same time, we have gambling right now in this state. We have, Senator Jensen has indicated that he probably would not support scaling back, such as making something like keno illegal. So I think here we are, we are at a state where we have...we have the people of this state spending money on various forms of gambling that is legal in the state, and also spending a substantial amount of money on forms that are illegal in the state, and we are trying to make some sort of a distinction here that I am not sure I understand because I don't think there is one. I think any distinction you make there is artificial. The fact is if we put a constitutional amendment, such as LR 43, before the people, we are allowing the people of this state to decide if these are options that they might want to see down the line, just as we've given them the option to bet on horse races, to bet on keno, to play bingo for charity, to play pickle cards for charity, things