

there's all this antagonism at this point because we got together and we agreed on some language. And the language that we agreed...and was drafted by the Department of Revenue. There was some other language that was drafted by Congressman Hoagland's office that was rejected by the Department of Revenue. But that, that language that I, is now in the bill, at least is, if not word for word, is close to what the Department of Revenue drafted. And I remember, I had put some addit...some other language up, and Ken Winston had suggested that that was not the Department of Revenue language, and so we put the Department of Revenue language up. But that's some what begs the question. I, I'm...very hard for me to understand what, what the argument is. If enunciating the public policy of the state is, creates a bad faith bargaining, as Senator Hohenstein argues, grant, I will grant him that argument, give him...assume that for the moment, and that we would be in federal court because we would be engaged in bad faith bargaining. We're going to be engaging in bad faith bargaining anyway if the Governor does not bargain those types of gaming that are prohibited under state law. I don't think we're going to be in court under either scenario because I think there's a, there's a considerable amount of leeway to bargaining in good faith under what's permitted under Nebraska law anyway. The bottom line point is this, and so I get back to what Senator Chambers said because that's really the critical point here. The federal government literally abrogated their responsibility, as it relates to Indian economic development, by giving to the states the authority to negotiate compacts. What are the states to do? Are the states to negotiate a compact that provides for gambling beyond those areas permitted by state law? And if, if they do not do that, if they do not go beyond their legislative prerogative, if they don't go beyond that, they're, in effect, eng...under the, under Senator Hohenstein's theory, they're engaging in bad faith bargaining. That's...that's a conv...some what of a convoluted argument, or a circular argument, that get's us back to the same point, and that is that as a state...I think the better argument is, that as a state, we should have the authority and the responsibility to bargain within the law that we have established in the area of gaming. That if we go beyond that into areas that are not permitted by state law, that that is something the federal government is going to have to tell us to bargain because we cannot do it, we are not permitted under our own law to do it. It's not the issue of economic development. I agree with Senator Hohenstein that economic development is needed in northeast Nebraska. I absolutely agree