

Dracula. Anyway, the reason...one of the reasons I don't like these kind of gambling bills or any of the others is that the only kind of gambling which will be legalized is that which I call stupid gambling, where large numbers have to lose in order for one person or a few people to win. You need to consider sports betting if you're interested in legalizing a form of gambling, and the state should have no part to play. The state should not be the bookie, the state should not be the house. When the state is involved you erect a house of cards in which to play cards and it comes crashing down. That is not good. The way the sports betting would operate would be to have the bookies license and you would tax the gambling activity, but the state would not play a part in it. I've had bills to do that. One came close, within one or two votes of being adopted. The reason I think you ought to consider it if you want to gamble at all is because without knowing anything the odds are 50-50. You have as good a chance of winning as of losing, that's not the case with horse racing, lotteries or anything else. To think you can pick six numbers out of 1,000 which you have to pick to get Powerball, which is foolishness, people stand in line from here to Council Bluffs to give that money away thinking they can pick six numbers, insane. But the state encourages it. The state gives the impression to people that somehow all of their financial problems are going to be solved by participating in state run gambling. That is one of the worst things that could be done, that is worse than placing slot machines in these private businesses. The slot machines are bad, all of that kind of gambling where you don't have as good a chance to win as of losing, all of that is bad. But the state being involved is evil, it is wicked, Senator "Wicked", (laugh) I mean Senator Witek, and we should not have it. I am opposed to the amendment...to the motion and I'm not going to draw out the discussion so this one time is the only time that I'll speak on the motion itself.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I think we need to bear in mind, as we discuss other issues, that there are relationships. I drew a parallel, last week, between another bill regarding border bleeding and this bill, and I think the impact that the border bleeding has in this area dwarfs that in a lot of other areas that we talk about. And I would...Senator Chambers at least is consistent. He doesn't buy the border bleeding argument in that case, and he doesn't buy it