

don't reject the Beutler amendment, we're going to be in federal court. There is absolutely no...I mean, all you have to do is read the cases and you will see that there is a great deal of dispute even with the Eighth Circuit as to what is or is not good faith. What we've already done today is we took out an amendment that we put in which talked about the public policy of the state prohibiting gambling that is not permitted under state law. We've taken that out. And by taking that out we've done that because supposedly we're going to be in federal court if we don't take it out. And I can find absolutely no precedence anywhere for suggesting that it's bad faith for a state to state its public policy. But we have done that and by doing that I think we've in effect stated our public policy, and by this debate here today, quite clearly and that is that we really don't have any. We're not bothered particularly as a body. We may be individually bothered, but as a body we're not bothered by going beyond the types of gambling that are permitted under state law and we're going to accept negotiation in areas beyond what is permitted under state law. It's just hard for me to understand that. We've stripped out of the bill those substantive areas that are there to protect the interests of the state and we've given the Governor more authority than he had before we started the debate. We had, I think it was 41 to nothing votes in favor of the amendment that we took out before because it has been suggested that the federal court will be in federal court. That just isn't the case, that just isn't the case. That's not what is going to happen. What is going to happen is there will be a negotiation process. Quite frankly, I wish we'd put the amendment back in that we had because it would be a clear statement of public policy and it would establish the parameters of negotiation but that's out. Now we'll have a negotiation process as long as the parties are negotiating and they come to some kind of a conclusion that is not bad faith bargaining. The Legislature will then approve or not approve. If the Legislature does not approve there will then be mediation at which point there will be a subsequent agreement reached, entered into and it will come back for ratification. That's how the process will work. There is nothing in any of the case law to suggest that the Indian tribe or anybody else could walk into federal court, file a petition tomorrow because the Legislature wants to ratify what the Governor does in this case. There's just absolutely no precedent in the law, the case law, or in the statute to require that. And I wish someone could point to me that because we're talking in generalities here. We're not pointing to specifics. In the Wisconsin case again, that has