

smattering. We will get some revenue, but compared to the profits that will go elsewhere it is a minuscule amount of money. For the jobs that will be created there will be jobs lost. One of the things we need to do in this state is to attract a greater labor force, more population, so that we have more workers for perspective industries that might consider locating here. And in order to do that, we need to say Nebraska is different. Nebraska stands out in the country and in the Midwest as a state that does things the Nebraska way, and not necessarily because Iowa does it or Minnesota does it, or South Dakota does it, or Colorado does it do we do it. We do it if we think its the right thing to do and the best thing to do. Now if we are going to attract people to come to this state, what we have going for us are our great climate, a great environment, a great water supply, a clean state, hardworking people, excellent work ethic, good values. Our crime problems are there but they are manageable. We can get our hands around them and solve them, I believe. We can create one of the best environments, and do have one of the best environments for families in the entire country. Now, it isn't consistent with improving that or maintaining that environment to go into a wholesale expansion with the gambling industry. Let Nevada have it. If Iowa wants to continue on the course, or Minnesota, let them continue on the course. Yes, we are going to have some spin-off problems with gambling addicts that we will have to handle on the social front, but I suggest they won't be as great as they would be if we had casinos throughout the state, or slot machines on every corner. It's just not as accessible as it would be if we chose to expand it, and where would we stop? When we have the casinos, if things go flat, and we need more revenue, and we think there is another game out there, or another activity that will bring us money, where...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...where will we stop? You know, it's the kind of thing where you've got to draw the line somewhere. I am not extremely happy with the lottery, but I guess that's a fair place to draw the line, and that's where I choose to do it. If an election could be held, and if we could put an amendment on this bill that would say, the opponents and the proponents, neither one can spend over \$250,000 or \$100,000, I would be a lot more inclined to support the measure. As a matter of fact, it will not happen. The proponents will greatly outspend the