

have set up and until such time as that entire system is eliminated, with an elimination of reservations, with an elimination of separate Bureaus of Indian Affairs and all this mishmash, quit trying to have the in between system one way or the other. Give them the retrocession. Let develop what will develop and ultimately, I think whether it's 5, 10, 20 or 50 years, this whole concept of Indian reservations and separate Americans will have to disappear.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Hoagland, then Senator Chambers.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Let me just state briefly, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, as to why I hope that you will reject this particular amendment. I had difficulty following Senator DeCamp's argument and I have a feeling that if a number of us were arguing the other side, he'd be arguing the other side, that it really doesn't matter, you know, which side he is arguing for as long as it is against the side others of us are arguing. Let me try and give you the best reasons for rejecting this amendment. Now, these resolution terms that Senator Goll is suggesting we reject are put in entirely in good faith and they are put in in good faith because a number of Nebraskans that I've talked to about retrocession think that retrocession is going to grant the Winnebagoes special rights, special rights that residents of Bellevue don't have, special rights that residents of South Sioux City don't have, special rights to undertake certain kinds of gaming activities that other Nebraskans don't have, but the Winnebagoes would have if retrocession were to pass. And Nebraskans don't think it's fair to grant a monopoly on gaming operations to any group and they don't think it's fair that the Winnebagoes or the Omahas should have special privileges about gaming activities that the rest of us don't have by virtue of a retrocession resolution. Now, these WHEREAS paragraphs are put in to make it absolutely clear that retrocession won't do that under the state of the law as of January 16, 1986. Now, Senator Goll made a number of very good arguments about the changing nature and the ambiguity of law in this area, but one thing we are confident of, as Senator Johnson indicated, is that retrocession is not going to make any difference. It's not going to make any difference and that's what these WHEREAS paragraphs state, but they go further. They go one step further, and as Senator Johnson indicate, they put into the resolution itself a bargain that we've entered into. Now, a number of us are very hesitant about granting retrocession