

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

March 1, 2000

LR 289

into this without understanding that what we are doing is promoting gambling as a way to address the ills of society, and I don't think that that is a very good way to address the ills of society. We talk about economic development and things that we can do for young people on reservations. What about these young people who we know that we would not want to see drinking who are now drinking because they are...because the casino lowered the drinking...the age at which they could enter and gamble, not out of anything good for them but out of a sense of wanting to have better attendance? I think that we have to keep gambling in mind as we move forward on this...on the vote on this issue. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Brown. (Visitors introduced.) Further debate on the motion to place LB (sic--LR) 289CA on General File, Senator Jensen.

SENATOR JENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of the body. This is a gambling issue, pure and simple. It's not a sovereignty issue. It's not a Native American issue. It is a gambling issue. And if you, in your minds, feel that this is the way that Nebraskans should go, that we should expand gambling, then you should vote for this bill. But if you think that this is going to be only confined to the Indian reservations you need to then take a look at the Indian gaming laws that was passed in '88 that say that it can be expanded beyond the reservation ground. Matter of fact, how many people here know that the tribe owns land between the Omaha municipal airport and downtown Omaha, matter of fact, very, very close to the new convention site? And even newly acquired land could be construed as being available for an Indian Casino operation. It was interesting that Senator Brown mentioned what had happened over at the WinnaVegas Casino in that, because that their competition and their proceeds and their revenue and the individuals coming in to their casino were down, they opened it up to 18-year-olds. They could open it up to 16-year-olds. Remember, sovereignty that many of you have talked about, they set the rules. They set the rules and they can determine at what age an individual should gamble. I think that's a very, very dangerous situation. Also, even the Santee, who I've got compassion for and on the Health and Human Services Committee we have tried to help them with some dollars to eliminate the