

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

March 5, 2003

LR 11

am sorry we have our signals a little mixed here this morning and that's why I had my light on at different times. But I wanted the opportunity to, first of all, support the Beutler amendment and, secondly, to comment once again about a World-Herald editorial that ran this morning. That was one of the longest editorials that I have seen in the Omaha World-Herald for some time, and I keep asking myself why they're so incensed and so interested in this issue. But I would like to mention a few things that they mentioned this morning in their editorial. Speaking against the amendment that we did yesterday, they say, well, what about a hearing? Neither the earlier bill by Janssen or the one by Schimek got a hearing is what they're saying. Well, that's not unusual when you have an amendment to a bill, especially if that amendment incorporates parts of both bills. You don't send it back to committee for hearings. We'd be doing that ad infinitum in here if that were the case. The second thing they mention is that the bill's supporters are acting as if the proposal would settle everything and put an end to the Nebraska's gambling debate. Nobody has said that, but what we have said is, if we do not have it wide open in the constitution, then we have a better chance of controlling it if we stipulate in the constitution there shall be only so many casinos, et cetera. The third thing they say is that progambling senators claim this proposal may garner some votes from areas outside of Omaha where casinos may be located. Well, so what? What's wrong with that? That's the nature of the political process here is you have to have the 30 votes before you could get anything passed. Then they say at the bottom of the editorial, "Arching over all of that, though, is the fact that gambling backers in the Legislature owe it to the public to quit pretending that the issue of revenues for the public coffers doesn't exist or isn't important." We've never done that in here. I have passed out all kinds of information that I can go over with you in detail again about what expected revenues might be, and we've talked about various formulas or schemes that we might use to see those revenues go back into the local subdivisions, and that, of course, will be in the enabling legislation. That won't be in the constitution. You won't put that in the constitution. So why is the World-Herald editorializing day after day after day? I asked myself that, and I asked myself, could it have any connection with the fact