

May 10, 1979

LB 152

you worked in a large office up in Omaha, and as you were going to the races that afternoon and all your buddies says here is \$25, here is \$50, will you put it on so-and-so and so-and-so for me and say it amounted to \$1050. He didn't even count it before he went out there. Now is he a criminal?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Now, Senator Duis, he personally would not be profiting from this scheme, is that right? He is just carrying the money for his friend.

SENATOR DUIS: Well, suppose they bought him a beer.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Well, I really doubt that a beer would be sufficient (interruption).

SENATOR DUIS: You know what I am getting at. I am trying to get yours in perspective just exactly like Senator Dworak says.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Let me clarify one thing, Senator Duis, these gambling in the first degree provisions apply only to the bookmakers themselves, they are only to the casino operators themselves. They do not apply to people that are placing bets with them.

SENATOR DUIS: All right, now what you are saying is your amendment and the bill definitely says that you have to do this for financial gain?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Yes, for personal profit, right, and you have to be the recipient (interruption).

SENATOR DUIS: Now, wait a minute, that is different. Personal profit is different than organized profit and I think Senator Chambers will agree with me here and this is where I think you have got your problem. That is what I am trying to bring out. You say personal but I don't think it is the personal profit that you are interested in as much as it is an organized profit, am I correct, Senator Chambers? Am I getting to the point? I will shut off there and let you think about that a bit.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Senator Duis, I suggest on page 1462 of the Journal, why we have got printed the definition of first degree gambling. I suggest you read that because it might clarify some of your questions.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Keyes.

5079