

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

March 24, 2004 LR 209

we have determined we are going to talk about the constitution and about gambling in the constitution, and since this is the subject matter that's before us, I thought that it would be a really good opportunity to talk about casino gambling again. And this amendment provides for two casinos, only one in a county of the metropolitan class, and the reason that the amendment is worded such is that that's the way we talk about cities of the metropolitan class, cities of the primary class. For right now the only county that would be impacted would be Douglas County, but because it would allow for the growth of other cities into that metropolitan class, it is not a closed class. And it provides for a local option vote which I think is very important for those individuals. We have a situation where a reputable market research group came back and said that 91 percent of the people wanted to vote on casino gambling. But the next question, how many of them would vote for it? It was in the low 50 percent. That's a significant difference in numbers and I think it reflects that the pressure, and I don't think that we automatically have to bow to that pressure. But I think that the pressure from the electorate is being shown in their ability previously to get the signatures and in the future I believe that they probably can get signatures for much more expansive kinds of gambling. But that does not necessarily mean that they will vote for it. So for those individuals who have a problem with gambling, not only do they have the opportunity to vote on the constitutional amendment, but they also have the opportunity to vote on the...at the local level as to whether they want that in their community. It gives them two bites of the apple, and I think that if the numbers that are reflected in that survey are accurate, there is a demand to vote. That demand is something that they want from us, and it's a demand that's also going to cause them to possibly be willing to sign petitions, but that does not necessarily mean that they want it. So my proposal gives the lowest amount, the lowest number, keeps as much control as possible within this body but also gives the electorate, who might be opposed to any kind of expanded gambling, the opportunity to stop it at the ballot box at the state, or at the ballot box in their local community. So I think it has as many protections as possible. We are within that section of the constitution that deals with gaming and so I think that it is an okay place to have another conversation