

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 23, 1999 LB 495

improve programs, enhance quality of programs, which is actually the same thing as why the Innovation Fund was set out to do. I believe it is in the area of school improvement, and we have limited the bill that these will be one-time grants. And so I think that is inconsistent to what we have done in the past as far as that area. Again, these are not...a one-time grant is not an entitlement, it is going to be used to enhance the quality of those programs. So thank you. And I do support your amendment, Senator Kiel. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Stuhr. Senator Chambers, you're recognized to speak, followed by Senator Bohlke. Senator Chambers waives off. Senator Bohlke, you are recognized.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes, Senator Cudaback. Senator Kiel, just so I understand what you're saying is that it will be fine to advertise, showing that the money is going to go to the environment in order to get people to gamble, but not to education. Would you please answer that question.

SENATOR KIEL: Am I on. Okay. Actually, if we could have done an amendment that said no advertising at all, that would have been fine, but I made the assumption that it would be found not germane to this particular bill.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Well, I think it raises the question as to we say that we're going to spend the lottery money, and we're not going to talk about how we're spending it for education. But we're going to allow ads to go, I assume the other part would be at least we would either have to be for addiction to gambling, or towards the environment. So if you believe in what Senator Kiel is saying and that we shouldn't use this as an inducement for gambling, then I think you should do what you said, Senator Kiel, and not allow any advertising. And let someone have a rule to see if it's germane or not. But it certainly doesn't make any sense to me that we're going to go ahead. We're going to spend money on the environment, spend money on education. We're going to use the environment to demonstrate where, why and how we're spending the money, but we aren't going to do that as far as education. I think you have to treat both of them the same. Otherwise, you know, it goes to the issue of, well, we know you're doing it, just don't talk about it. That goes back