

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

March 4, 2003 LR 11

statewide. Now, those could be one big casino and seven little casinos, or it could be three big casinos and four little casinos. There could be all kinds of different ways of doing this. And I believe that we need some of the details of what all this would entail, in some kind of a trailer bill, before we ever go to a vote of the people. Another principle that it provides for, as Senator Janssen mentioned, I think, is legislative oversight over this whole process. That is critically important. Also important is that...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...the state has an opportunity to recoup some of the revenue from any gaming that...or gambling, however you want to refer to it, that goes on in this state. So we've met the broad language requirement, but we've also written enough in here that the general public will have some idea of how it's going to be structured and how it's going to be limited. I would suggest that we spend the interim, this summer and fall, talking about the particulars, and coming back with some kind of enabling legislation next year, so that we can work out some of those details before anything ever goes on the ballot. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm about out of time.

SENATOR CUDABACK: You are.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Your light is next, Senator Schimek, if you care to use it. Senator Schimek, you have...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. My good friend over here, Senator Johnson, has just posed the question to me, and I was remiss, probably, in not saying more about that, do Indian casinos count as part of the eight casinos? No, Senator Johnson, they do not. They would be separate. And we have not used some of the very specific language about where those casinos would be located in this amendment. However, many of those specifics are in federal law. And so it was finally agreed that we didn't need to reiterate