

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 28, 2003 LR 11

was right. Part of the problem is we have some neighbors that have not been very neighborly. I resent what Iowa has done. I resent what South Dakota has done. They are preying on our citizens and have brought an undesirable activity to our state. Whether they are in our state or not, we have that element. Most of the citizens of this state are within an hour's drive of a casino. That's not true where I'm from, but I think our casinos should be destination casinos. The number should be limited, and I know that the Legislature in the future is going to have control if this passes. But I have a lot of constituents that don't trust me, let alone you, and they may not trust what this body will do in the future. Senator Janssen, I understand what you're trying to do, and I understand you may try and limit it. But unless you can narrow the focus of this constitutional amendment down, I'm very skeptical, and I don't think I can be there on Final Reading when you need 30.

PRESIDENT HEINEMAN: Thank you, Senator Schrock. The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of the Legislature, you wouldn't...it's not going to surprise you to hear me indicate that with respect to the broadness of this proposal that it's much too broad for my taste. It would, in fact, allow the Legislature to expand gambling anywhere, video gambling even anywhere and everywhere in the state. But that's not what I want to ask you to focus on in the short term here. I know this is hard for...language is a hard thing for...constitutional language is a hard thing for nonlawyers to get involved in, but I'm going to ask you to get involved in it this morning. Because sometimes, and this is the case this time, in my opinion, sometimes when we seek simplicity we end up with vagueness and lack of clarity and conflicts with other provisions of the constitution. And in my opinion, this particular committee amendment is very poorly worded, doesn't fit in this article of the constitution, conflicts with other parts of that article of the constitution, and is not something that you should put into the constitution. It will not only be a lobbyist's dream but it will be a lawyer's dream. Having given you my conclusions, let me ask you to follow with me, if you would, through this amendment. First of all, it says that