

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

April 2, 2003

LR 11

made the correction to my tally sheet. If you're scoring at home, Senator Chambers is now on the "bad guys" side. There's 26. Still need four more before the voters have a say. So just, if you're scoring at home. I guess I'd like to just stand and ask the obvious question, Senator Stuthman. Why do you think the voters that you hear from want to vote on this? It's the obvious question, because obviously there's got to be some value, perceived or real, in putting this before the voters. Now, Senator Janssen actually reinforces my point, to an extent. The voters in Iowa said, yes, we want casinos, and we want them in this form and we want them in this location. And they've got them. And so Pottawattamie County, which is where Council Bluffs resides, sees the increase in the retail sales. And that's fantastic. So if you see the 11 percent increase in the retail sales, that means there's more revenue being generated in that economy. That means there should be more jobs, more economic development, more growth. Valuations were probably increasing for the community as far as the buildings, the businesses, the homes. The income is increasing, as Senator Janssen reported. And so then why do you think the mayor is reported...is requesting another property tax increase? Doesn't make sense. You know, if the idea that casinos are great and they're good, and that's what the general public seems to think, then why is it that with all the additional revenue that's coming in for whatever you want to call it, tourism, gambling, whatever, why do you think it is that they're also raising property taxes there? Interesting question. I don't know the answer. Either it's mismanagement, poor management, lack of leadership, or it's the idea that there might be bigger problems than most people will admit. Senator Jensen also pointed out something I think needs to be a part of this discussion. The amount of money that's being spent, based on a sheet that I had passed out to you, for problem gamblers in the state, would need to equal about, if nothing was done, \$212 million. Now, for every dollar you spend, about \$7 of problem gambling comes off that. So if you use the bare minimum, that we have 41,610 problem gamblers, and they cost about \$5,000 in social costs, that's where you get this \$212 million. Now again, the number of dollars that you place then reduces the social cost by about four to seven dollars. But that's assuming that none of those 41,000 people in the state of Nebraska have a major problem.