

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

February 5, 2004 LR 14

reactive might be the biggest mistake that we make. We are not going to stop people from voting on gambling. If we think that we're all that powerful, we're not. If there is going to be something on the ballot, it could be there whether it has our blessing or not. And I think that's what we have to deal with because if something does pass without our blessing, then we're forced to live with the outcome. The issue being is that if people want gambling, they are going to get it regardless of whether we support it or not. And I know there are many people here that do not support gambling, but the people are going to have their wishes. They voted for term limits. Many people on the floor of this body do not like term limits, but the people have spoken and that's their choice. It didn't pass the first time. I don't think it passed the second time. But the third time it did pass. People will not let this issue die without the opportunity to vote on it. And if it dies the first year, that doesn't mean it won't come back the next year until the people get what they want. And if they get what they want, the best thing for the state of Nebraska is for us, in the Legislature, to be able to control that, make sure that it is the type of expanded gambling that we have the oversight of putting those casinos in strategic locations. To say that we'll have eight, I would guess that we probably wouldn't have more than three or four. Eight is a lot. I don't know that our communities nor our financial wherewithal of our state can afford more than two or three. But the people will get what they want whether they have our blessing or not. And we will be reactive in all of this and it will be too late. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator McDonald. Senator Erdman.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, it won't be that painful, Senator Stuhr, so I will try to be lighthearted. I'm reading the Rule Book, page 54, Rule 7, Section 11, and it says "Motions and Amendments for Dilatory Purposes." And I noticed that there are two amendments filed to the bill or to the amendment and the principal introducer has the opportunity to raise the point of order stating that he or she believes the amendments and/or motions are being used for dilatory purposes. They are, but I'm pretty sure Senator Schimek is not going to stand up and ask the