

mentioned that you were going to state it so that it referenced other state restrictions of similar types of gaming. Do you do that in your amendment?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, no, and, Senator Hall, what I'd...what I had, as Senator Schimek had asked me, would I accept such a type of thing.

SENATOR HALL: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then I just made a general statement and asked, would that be all right. And then Senator Hohenstein and I engaged in discussion and arrived at the determination that it would be better to make a specific reference to the federal law that all of this is based on and say that the provisions of that law would govern here, which would be the case anyway.

SENATOR HALL: And, and I don't have a problem with that except that, if the federal law in turn refers to the state regulation, and, other words, it's basically you go in a circle and you're back to no reference of this portion of the, as it relates to negotiating a compact, to state law. If there's no mention of that in the, in the statutory language with regard to LB 231, are we back to, I guess, nothing for purposes of, or are we strictly relying on the, the federal statute at that point?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, we're relying on the federal statute. And, Senator Hall, if you look at 231, and I say they should have let it alone and I wouldn't of read it carefully, all that's being stated in the part that I was dealing with is a policy and not any prohibitions to which would attach a penalty, so I'd say they're just like legislative findings. So instead of selecting here and there, and the ones they selected I found offensive, it would be the law whether we stated or not. But so that those who would be comfortable in having some reference to those things...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...in that federal statute, the sentence, as drafted, would make that reference back.

SENATOR HALL: So it would make the reference back to the federal language or to...