

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

March 5, 2003            LR 11

in support of this, and here's why. Personally, I am opposed to problem gaming. I think it's terrible. It destroys lives, certainly no less than alcohol, certainly no less than drugs or any other vices that we craft legislation in order to control. I believe that we have a responsibility to the other house of the Legislature, as Senator McDonald referred to last week. We are a Unicameral. We are not a bicameral like many other states...well, all the other states, 49 other states. They have two houses. It's a paternalistic form of representative government where the house and the senate make the decision for the people, and they abide by that. That's paternalistic. In Nebraska, we have a Unicameral. The other house is our people. Their watchfulness is the salvation of our state so, therefore, they have the initiative process, the only place in the United States where they have that. Last year, our people spoke to us through the initiative process and told us that they want gaming. But what did they give us? By the grace of God we didn't get it, but we would have slots virtually everywhere in every bar, every place, all over Nebraska. I don't believe that people like Lee and Sharon or any of the people that Marian has described or Phil Erdman or Adrian Smith or any of the other people who are ardently against gambling in any form, I can't blame you. We represent both of these people. Why did I give you this letter when I'm going to vote to let the people decide is because this is the kind of information that we will have time to distribute to people if we allow it to come through the Legislature. I think last year we saw proof that not all the information got out there that perhaps could have or should have. There are certain paradigms and we know that money buys paradigms and it buys a platform in order for ideas to be presented. But people like this, people like all of our constituents that we represent that have strong beliefs against problem gambling, they also can be heard if we allow it to go to a ballot. We need to be able to control it. We need to be able to set limits on it. We need to say where it goes and how it's carried out. I don't see us having that if we slip it back into the initiative process. I can only say that I do rise in support. I am going to vote for LR 11CA and also the amendment, and for the reasons that I've stated. And I give the rest of my time back to the Chair.