

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

February 4, 2004 LR 14

saying that you had to provide for eight casino locations. But Senator Erdman, I'm thinking about what we're doing here. What we're doing is amending the part in the constitution that says there won't be any gambling in Nebraska, basically. And that, as you know, has been amended over the years. There's been an amendment about horse racing, for instance. That was the first exception. And we started off there by saying, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the enactment of laws providing for the licensing and regulation of wagering on the results of horse races, et cetera. And I think what we're doing here in my amendment is following that trend, if you will, that way of expressing ourselves as...we're saying, yes, the constitution prohibits, but nothing in this section that we're adding shall be construed to prohibit or restrict casino gaming. And I don't think what you're trying to do is contrary to what this says. But I'm just...I'm not sure I see the need for it either. So I don't care particularly one way or the other. There are two other people who are signed on to the amendment with me, and I guess I would maybe ask them to respond on this issue as well. And Senator Janssen, I know you have some time coming up, so I think I'll ask Senator Beutler to respond regarding this language.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler, would you like to respond?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Schimek, thank you for the time. I had my light on, but I'd be glad to put in my two cents' worth, which basically comes down to this; there's absolutely no need for this amendment. There's nothing wrong with the language that we have. And, in fact, I think it's a little bit clearer and a little bit superior to what Senator Erdman is suggesting. I don't know what his intent is with this amendment, and I may ask him when I get more time of my own. But if the intent is simply to clean up the language, it doesn't improve upon what we already have and, in fact, contains a couple of somewhat mild ambiguities that I suppose can be cleared up by an exchange on the floor. And maybe we should take the time to do that when there's a little more time. But he basically drops out the whole sentence indicating clearly that the constitution shall not be construed to prohibit or restrict casino gaming as authorized by the Legislature at up to eight casino locations.