

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

February 24, 2000 LB 659

followed all the other discussion.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD PRESIDING

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Lynch, would you yield?

SENATOR LYNCH: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Lynch, is there only one company that would make the kinds of machines that this bill will deal with?

SENATOR LYNCH: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Members of the Legislature, what becomes of competition? If Senator Landis makes these machines and I'd make these machines, and I put an arrangement in my contracts that you don't like, then why don't you deal with Senator Landis? Why do we have to put this in here unless it's one specific operation that is somehow trying to corner a market of some kind or other for itself? They're saying freeze out these people because they want exclusivity in their agreement to lease, rent or sell, and I want you to freeze them out so that I can have a leg up on everybody in the way I want to conduct my gambling. What is being offered by this amendment is the prospect of telling me, as one of these operators, that if Senator Bourne has a certain agreement in his sale contract I can't deal with him even if I want to. I cannot. The statute tells me I cannot get that machine from him. That's what this amendment says. I cannot rent it from him and he cannot rent it to me.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me ask Senator Quandahl a question, if I may. Well, here, let me make an observation because I don't see him. If it's not going to be a crime for this to be done, then the remedy is that any agreement of this kind is made void by the statute itself. So our agreement is void. Suppose I tell him, well, you're not going to get this machine back; you got my money. He says, well, I'm not going to give you your money back. So then I got to go to court to get my money from somebody that I want to deal with anyway. And why does it become an