

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

February 19, 2002 LR 6

state...step will be in negotiating the compact. This is where all the fine tuning will occur.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. On with discussion, advancement. Senator Landis, followed by Senator Beutler and Schimek. Senator Landis.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I just thought I'd outline where I am at the moment and it has some flexibility into it, so as an introducer you'd probably want to know where people are. I'm a traditional opponent of the extension of gambling. I've voted against gambling at every opportunity with one exception and it was when we'd just gone through a really phony baloney lottery proposal or gambling proposal that was rife with the opportunity for mischief and for spending the money for bad purposes and with very little oversight, and it seemed to me that was the one place where I thought I'd step in and say, okay, pretty clearly people want to gamble and if we let this go we could take this opportunity and turn it into something that would have a lot of mischief. So I voted for some gambling in that one instance, but I've traditionally been an opponent. I did vote last year to pull this bill, or one like it, out of committee. Now, let me give you some of the pillars of my thought here. First, I don't support gambling as a mechanism for raising taxes. My belief is that only the tax system should be used for the purpose of supporting government or user fees rather than what I think most gambling is, where people vote for gambling so that other people will gamble, then will get the money, from the people who are foolish enough to gamble, to run government. It's why 65 percent of the public votes for gambling and only 30 percent of the public plays gambling. The other 35 percent are happy to shift their responsibility to pay for government to the 30 percent who actually play the games. I don't think you should freeload and that's what happens when people vote for gambling, so they can get other people to pay their taxes. So I don't support that notion. I also don't believe in the notion that says, look, people are going to gamble anyway and it's a fixed sum. You're just making it convenient rather than sending them other places. There are a number of sins and one of them is gambling in which the availability affects consumption. Studies