

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Senate Legislative Record
One Hundred and Twenty-Sixth Legislature
State of Maine

Daily Edition

Second Regular Session
beginning January 8, 2014

beginning at Page 1544

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is the motion by the Senator from Waldo, Senator Thibodeau to Indefinitely Postpone the Bill and accompanying papers. A Roll Call has been ordered. Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#466)

YEAS: Senators: BOYLE, BURNS, CAIN, CLEVELAND, COLLINS, CRAVEN, CUSHING, FLOOD, GERZOFKY, GRATWICK, HAMPER, HASKELL, JOHNSON, KATZ, LANGLEY, MASON, MAZUREK, MILLETT, PATRICK, PLUMMER, SHERMAN, THIBODEAU, THOMAS, VALENTINO, VITELLI, WHITTEMORE, WOODBURY, YOUNGBLOOD, THE PRESIDENT - JUSTIN L. ALFOND

NAYS: Senators: DUTREMBLE, HILL, LACHOWICZ, SAVIELLO, TUTTLE

EXCUSED: Senator: JACKSON

29 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 5 Senators having voted in the negative, with 1 Senator being excused, the motion by Senator **THIBODEAU** of Waldo to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** the Bill and accompanying papers, **PREVAILED**.

Sent down for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later Assigned (3/18/14) matter:

HOUSE REPORTS - from the Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act To Allow Maine's Harness Racing Industry To Compete with Casino Gaming"
H.P. 780 L.D. 1111

Majority - **Ought Not to Pass** (7 members)

Minority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-628)** (5 members)

Tabled - March 18, 2014, by Senator **TUTTLE** of York

Pending - motion by same Senator to **ACCEPT** the Minority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report, in concurrence

(In House, March 12, 2014, the Minority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-628) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" (H-671)** thereto.)

(In Senate, March 18, 2014, Reports **READ**.)

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Valentino.

Senator **VALENTINO:** Thank you very much Mr. President. One clarification. Has a roll call been asked for on this at the present time?

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair would advise the member no.

Senator **VALENTINO:** Thank you. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I want to read to you something from the Sun Journal. The editorial board that was on March 14, 2014. "Maine missed its opportunity a decade ago to take a rational approach to casino gambling. We could have done as Massachusetts has done: authorize three casinos and decide upon general locations that best served the state. Instead, we took a hands-off, piecemeal approach that allowed the casino investors to largely call the shots so long as they obtained statewide and local community approval of their plans." I can't begin to count how many people have stopped me in the halls during the last week to say that they wished that they had supported my previous attempts to have a comprehensive gaming plan in Maine. I'm not here to tell you I told you so. That is not productive. Instead I am here to say that it is not too late to cobble together a comprehensive plan based on what is existing and what is being proposed this year this session. I have been dealing with the casino issue for the entire ten years that I have been in the Legislature. The article talks about how Maine should model after Massachusetts. Well years before Massachusetts ever had a zone competitive bid statute Kansas had one. Fifteen years ago Kansas was one of the first to enact this method. I proposed the Kansas model for years while I served on VLA, but we always had citizen initiatives in front of the committee. We could not put out any bills that would not be considered competing measures with the citizen initiatives. When we finally got a break from initiatives in 2011 I submitted L.D. 227, which was based after Kansas, calling for four zones in Maine, competitive bids, \$250,000 privilege fees, and \$5 million license fee. The Legislature did not follow this path, but convened another study committee, which I was a member. This committee reported out a bill that I sponsored for competitive bidding that went back to VLA. I thought we were finally going to do something, but by the time this bill was finished it was so watered down I did not support my own bill. In 2013 VLA created the Competitive Bidding Commission with 20 members. They were supposed to meet six times, but after the third meeting they knew that they could never agree and issued a divided report. No wonder. The committee was made up of 20 members with only four legislators and the rest were members of the gaming industry, plus someone who opposed gambling. This reminds me of the time I served on the first Governor's Taskforce in 2006 to look at money from the casino cascade. Again, this taskforce was a dismal failure because the majority of the taskforce was there to promote their own self interests. Our Minority Report of Ought Not to Pass consisted of only two members of that committee and was reported to VLA. The Majority Report was totally rejected by VLA.

Why is this important? Because I am here to say we don't need another taskforce. We don't need another Blue Ribbon Committee. We don't need another study group to address this issue. We need to take action and we need to fix this bill and another bill on gambling. If not this issue will be here again next year and the year after and the year after. I cannot vote for L.D. 1111 in its current form, but I am willing to work on amendments

to this bill based on my experience in VLA over the last ten years. If we can get an amendment together then I can vote for L.D. 1111. Why? Because the drafters of L.D. 1111 have listened to my concerns over the years. They have a competitive bid. The slots will be at the race tracks. They have a privilege fee and they have a very sizeable license fee.

You may ask, why don't I have these amendments ready today? Well, for one, this bill was reported out of committee Ought Not to Pass. It is not just this bill that was voted out of committee Ought Not to Pass. All the gaming bills were and the bills were all flipped by wide margins in the House. Some members told me in the House that they voted to pass the bill because they agreed with the premise of the bill, but were not fully committed to the contents and would be open to an amendment. Others said they voted to pass them because they were just sick and tired of voting on these bills year after year. This told me that the time to do something was now. I have asked two other members of this Body to work with me on these amendments and we are planning on meeting this Friday. One has more institutional knowledge of about the subject than I do. We all oppose the current draft of the bill, but we are all willing to sit down with the analyst and see what we can do to craft something. If not this bill will just be back before us next year. I cannot emphasize enough that we do not need another study committee. We have studied this to death. We know what we have to do. We just haven't had the courage to do it. I will be voting no because I do neither support or approve the current language, but I certainly want an opportunity to craft an amendment which will enable me to vote for this bill if the legislative process allows me to do so. Please, I ask you, do not move to Indefinitely Postpone. If this bill is voted down, if you want to be on the record, that's one thing. I'm not going to vote for it, but if it is voted down, I'm going to wear everything on my sleeve and tell you exactly what I'm going to do, I'm going to stand back up and I'm going to move to Reconsider and then I'm going to move to table and then I'm going to keep my Friday meeting and we're going to work on an amendment and we're going to get this back here so that we don't have it year after year after year. We have everything we need to look at what has passed, what is existing, and what is in the future. I'm just asking you to give us an opportunity to do this and I hope we do not Indefinitely Postpone this bill. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Cushing.

Senator **CUSHING:** Thank you Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I could not have more eloquently shared some of my feelings regarding this issue as the good Senator from York did. In being consistent with the concerns I have, Mr. President, I do ask that we Indefinitely Postpone L.D. 1111.

Senator **CUSHING** of Penobscot moved to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** the Bill and accompanying papers, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

On motion by Senator **TUTTLE** of York, supported by a Division of one-fifth of the members present and voting, a Roll Call was ordered.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Tuttle.

Senator **TUTTLE:** Thank you Mr. President. Members of the Senate, this is sort of a personal issue for me. My family has been in harness racing for generations. My grandfather used to joke that he raised his horses more for their disposition than he did for their speed. It's not a winning proposition. If you have 25 horses you are lucky if one makes money. It's the love of the industry. I strongly feel that unless we do something harness racing, as we know it in the state of Maine, will be no more. You'll have Scarborough that closes and then Bangor will close and every state fair in the state will no longer have harness racing, which historically has been the agricultural tradition for the state of Maine. This is simply a reauthorization of a facility that voters approved years ago as a commercial race track. It was never built. It is a sensible way to build a Southern Maine facility that provides significant, up front, and ongoing revenue to the state. This will produce \$50 million up front, something that should have been done with every other facility. I always say that this reminds me of the liquor deal that we did ten years ago that was a very, very bad deal for the State of Maine, which we have corrected in this Legislature. We need to get the summer people who come to my area of the state and have a facility like most other states do. I talked with the good Senator Woodbury who said that he was on a plane flight and he said he looked at the magazine in the airplane and every other page talked about a resort casino, making millions and millions of dollars for that state. I think, in hindsight, Maine, for some reason, either we don't get on board or we get on too late with all the revenue going this way. The average citizen will complain when he goes to town hall and he has to pay \$5, but if he goes to a facility and he has a good time that's okay. I think we have to be realistic of where we are now. I think that gaming in Maine is here to stay. Let's do the right thing. I think we need to let the market dictate where these facilities are going to be. We never did that. If I would have been chair over the last few years we would have done that. As Senator Valentino said, we have a mechanism to do the right thing. I'm just asking that you do that. I think that by not letting this go through, and not having the facility in Southern Maine, is a slap in the face of every taxpayer in this state.

I guess in closing, Maine horse breeders are hardworking Mainers who love their animals 24 hours 7 days a week and also love their livelihood. Unfortunately, they are not able to pay for high powered lobbyists to represent their interests here at the State House, but that doesn't mean their cause is any less worthy and deserving. Horsemen and women have watched their industry suffer at the hands of out-of-state corporations who have no interest in their plight. The Legislature has somehow lost its focus on this part of our agricultural heritage. We should be working together to benefit the entire industry that could jump start the whole section of our economy. Other states have done this; Ohio, New York. They are doing things the right way. I think Maine's agriculture should be preserved. Horse-people provide jobs for thousands of Mainers either directly or indirectly. They invest in equipment. They employ veterinarians. They buy lots of hay and oats. They support countless other businesses. They provide and protect open spaces that we all consider dear. I call that the Maine way to do things. L.D. 1111 is an opportunity to revitalize the long-standing tradition of harness racing in Maine. As I mentioned, many states are doing it the right way. Presently Maine is not. This legislation is fair to the people of Maine. It is

similar, as I mentioned before, to what we did with the liquor industry and that we finally corrected it. There are countless words spoken and hours spent trying to lure large national corporations and others into Maine. How about doing something to assist the large group of small businesses who, for the most part, are Maine family farms that are already here? We wonder why our young people are compelled to leave our state. The fact is that L.D. 1111, as amended, would be an opportunity to right a couple of wrongs that have stifled an integral part of Maine's economy. It provides for millions of dollars of new capital investment, hundreds of new jobs, millions of dollars to the General Fund, and at the same time the promise of a future for a segment of our economy that certainly deserves it and it doesn't raise taxes. I would ask that you vote against the pending motion and allow the money to preserve our agriculture for the people of Maine. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Valentino.

Senator **VALENTINO:** Thank you Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, I rise because I'm not sure. I know the good Senator from across the aisle complimented me, but I don't think he heard when I said to please don't make a motion to Indefinitely Postpone. I wanted to just get that out there and say that again in case he didn't hear it. I really hope people will vote against this. I think this is an opportunity that we have on this bill and on another bill to address a comprehensive gaming model going forward. This bill, if it dies today, will come back again and again and again. Why not just take the time to take a second look at it? Nobody's guaranteeing that the bill is going to go through if it's amended. All we're saying is give us time. Just give us a little bit of time to work this bill. A few people who are not on the committee, or haven't been on the committee, are all opposed to the bill in its present form, all we need is a little bit of time to work this bill and try to get something before this Body that we can all vote on going forward. This bill and other bills are going to come back. Now is the time to do it. I firmly believe we can do. I've studied this for ten years. I've spoken with all of you. I've urged you to do a comprehensive plan and now is the time to do it. We need a couple of vehicles to do it with and I really urge you not to just vote Ought Not to Pass on this when I think we have an opportunity right here before us to address this issue once and for all going forward so that we're not back here again next year or the year after or the year after. I may not be here, I don't know, but somebody is going to be here and I guarantee you they are going to be dealing with this issue. Why not let those of us who have been dealing with this for the past ten or twelve years, who have a lot of institutional knowledge, try and work together and do something? I just urge you not to Indefinitely Postpone. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oxford, Senator Patrick.

Senator **PATRICK:** Thank you Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, colleagues and friends, I want to thank my colleague from York as I agree with almost everything she said. However, there is one alternative to this bill. The Commission on Competitive Gaming is allowed to report out a bill of its own volition, of its own merits, to handle this issue if the committee decides to do it. I would recommend that we do do

that. I do recommend that the committee does it on its own because I think that's the only way to do it. When you have stakeholders who have a financial bearing on it, the pressure is just intense. This bill, on its own, I will say I disagree with the bill. I think it's a bad bill. We're not just talking about farms and harness racing and the whole thing. We're talking about gaming, the gaming industry, and the whole life. I will say publicly I don't really care all that much about Penn National. I don't care all that much about Churchill Downs. They happen to be the gaming industry here in Maine. I do game, but I also know the good side and the bad side of gaming. What this bill does, this bill is actually, in my mind, an insult to the committee on itself. Everyone says that each entity wants to protect its own interest, yet in this bill what they wanted to do was throw out the carrot of the \$50 million license fee, but if someone else opened up another joint down the road we had to pay them back. That's a claw back and, to me, that was actually insulting. You take a look at Shawn Scott, who got the first racino bill passed that encompassed both raceways in the state of Maine. It cost him, I think, about \$7 million. In turn he sold that license for \$61 million or \$62 million in a closed market in Bangor. If you take a look at the logistics, in 100 mile radius there might be 1,500 to 2,000 people within that gaming area. That was worth \$62 million for a gaming outfit that has an awful lot of knowledge. Here we are talking of putting one in Southern Maine, which I would say, if you look at the logistics and the amount of population within that area, we're probably looking at five to ten times as much with a low ball \$50 million bid. Yes, there is the possibility of having a competitive bid, but would it be with Penn National, the other raceway? That's not a competitive bid.

What have we done so far with the monies we had? Eighty million dollars has gone to the harness racing in the state of Maine. What has that done to shore up anything? Ten million dollars went to Scarborough Downs. What has that actually done? Not much. We talk about one industry versus another. Where were all of the people here years ago? What happened to our tanneries, our canneries, our dowel mills, our shoe shops, our bag mills, our paper mills? How are we going to bail them out? How are we going to get them back? Are we going to give them huge subsidized? I don't know. I don't know if I necessarily want to go there. We're talking about casino money. We're talking about what do the voters actually want? What did the voters want in the past and what is the latest trend on the voters? The last poll, I believe, in 2012 87% of Mainers said they wanted it to go back out to the people. I don't know if I necessarily think that's the best idea, but in a lot of ways the people know. They've actually rejected the casinos on several occasions. They rejected the one for Biddeford and Washington County. They rejected the one for Lewiston with huge numbers. If we're going to support this or not support this, there is an avenue to get to where we want and I think my colleague from York is 100% right. This is the time, this is the place, but to have the ability to have a bill that one entity would possibly benefit without the ability to have that competitive bid process I'm not willing to go there, but I am hoping that the chair of the committee and the committee members will take it upon itself to sit down in the remaining days of the session and vote out a bill and get the policy there that we're going to need going forward. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Mason.

Senator **MASON**: Thank you Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, first of all I want to say to the Senator from York, Senator Valentino, I respect her thoughts immensely and she has spent a lot of time on this issue. When she served in the other Body she served on VLA. I respect her knowledge on the subject immensely. I do agree with the Senator from Oxford, Senator Patrick. We do have another vehicle to deal with this issue.

I'd like to expand on the theme that I've been talking about all night. Our state has no gaming policy. I mentioned before that we have no central authority for any of our gaming operations in the state of Maine. It is done piecemeal. I know most of you had the chance to hear from our analyst from the VLA Committee who talked a lot about how we got to where we are and what we have in front of us. One of the things that she pointed out to me today, and I'd never seen it in this form before, was all of the different types of wagering that we have and who administers it. When you look at the lottery. The lottery is administered by BABLO, Bureau of Alcoholic Beverages and Lottery Operations. Non-profit charitable gaming is administered by the Chief of the State Police, Special Investigations Unit. High stakes beano is done by the same unit. Harness racing is directed by the Department of Agriculture and Rural Resources Harness Racing Commission. Racinos and casinos are both governed by the Gambling Control Board. As we move forward where are we going to put a casino like this? Who is going to look at it? Who is going to govern that? Isn't it time that we centralized all of this regulation under one body? I think that it is. We also have multiple cascades. Both of the casinos that we have in the state of Maine right now each have a cascade that was used in a campaign. We have the Bangor cascade, which dedicates revenue from their table games and slot machines to the Agricultural Fair Support Fund, to the Sire Stakes Trust Account, to harness racing purses, to the City of Bangor, to the Community College System, and that list keeps going on. When you go over to Oxford, they too support the agricultural fairs. They do scholarships through the University of Maine System and Maine Maritime scholarships. They also give money to the Town of Oxford. They sent about almost \$15 million last year to K-12 education. When you go back over the lottery, they have \$54.8 million of undedicated General Fund revenue. The list goes on and on. We have no way of sending all of this money to either the General Fund or adjusting the cascade so that they are fair for not only the current casinos but any casinos that come to the future. That is a problem. We also have no policy, as of right now, to get the most out of our gaming environment. Right now it's just whatever gets approved on the ballot or whatever anybody can get approved in the Legislature. We are not looking at how to, if we are going to have gambling in Maine and if we're going to have wagering of any kind in Maine, get the most jobs and how to maximize our revenue to either the General Fund or to other programs that I've just talked about before.

As the Senator from Oxford and Senator from York mentioned, we did have an opportunity to do that. We had the commission to develop a competitive bidding process for gaming. That process was, in my opinion, hijacked. It was completely taken advantage of and we were not able to report out a report that truly studied how to do everything I talked about before and how to stay on top of the game. In case anybody was wondering, we are the most eastern state in the United States. People don't drive through Maine, most of the time. They do drive through Massachusetts and New Hampshire. Those two states have done competitive analyses of their gaming environment. They

have a plan. They have a way to go forward before they get into the mess that Maine is in right now. I think that the Senator from York, Senator Valentino, is correct. We know what we need to do for the most part. We can fix some of this, but this bill will not fix it. It will add to the confusion.

In the Veterans and Legal Affairs Committee we've done a great job of working together. We rewrote a liquor bill that we realized had substantial flaws from the first time that we issued it. I believe that with the expertise that we have in this Body and in the other one and with the vehicle that we have in the commission process that we can work on something that would help fix some of the mess that we are in in the state of Maine in regards to our gaming environment. Mr. President and men and women of the Senate, I would ask you to support the Indefinite Postponement and allow those of us who have time and experience in this situation the time to work on a gaming policy for the state. Thank you.

Senator **TUTTLE** of York moved the Bill and accompanying papers be **COMMITTED** to the Governor's Desk.

Senate at Ease.

Senate called to order by the President.

Senator **TUTTLE** of York requested and received leave of the Senate to withdraw his motion to **COMMIT** the Bill and accompanying papers to the Governor's Desk.

Same Senator moved the Bill and accompanying papers be **TABLED** until Later in Today's Session, pending the motion by Senator **CUSHING** of Penobscot to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** the Bill and accompanying papers, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

On motion by Senator **THIBODEAU** of Waldo, supported by a Division of one-fifth of the members present and voting, a Roll Call was ordered.

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#467)

YEAS: Senators: BOYLE, CAIN, CRAVEN, DUTREMBLE, GERZOFSKY, HASKELL, HILL, JOHNSON, KATZ, MILLETT, PLUMMER, SAVIELLO, TUTTLE, VALENTINO, THE PRESIDENT - JUSTIN L. ALFOND

NAYS: Senators: BURNS, CLEVELAND, COLLINS, CUSHING, FLOOD, GRATWICK, HAMPER, LACHOWICZ, LANGLEY, MASON, MAZUREK, PATRICK, SHERMAN, THIBODEAU, THOMAS, VITELLI, WHITTEMORE, WOODBURY, YOUNGBLOOD

EXCUSED: Senator: JACKSON

15 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 19 Senators having voted in the negative, with 1 Senator being excused, the motion by Senator **TUTTLE** of York to **TABLE** until Later in Today's Session pending the motion by Senator **CUSHING** of Penobscot to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** the Bill and accompanying papers, in **NON-CONCURRENCE, FAILED**.

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is the motion by the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Cushing to Indefinitely Postpone the Bill and accompanying papers, in Non-Concurrence. A Roll Call has been ordered. Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#468)

YEAS: Senators: BURNS, CAIN, CLEVELAND, COLLINS, CUSHING, GRATWICK, HAMPER, LANGLEY, MASON, MAZUREK, MILLETT, PATRICK, SHERMAN, THIBODEAU, THOMAS, VITELLI, WHITTEMORE, WOODBURY, YOUNGBLOOD, THE PRESIDENT - JUSTIN L. ALFOND

NAYS: Senators: BOYLE, CRAVEN, DUTREMBLE, FLOOD, GERZOFOSKY, HASKELL, HILL, JOHNSON, KATZ, LACHOWICZ, PLUMMER, SAVIELLO, TUTTLE, VALENTINO

EXCUSED: Senator: JACKSON

20 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 14 Senators having voted in the negative, with 1 Senator being excused, the motion by Senator **CUSHING** of Penobscot to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** the Bill and accompanying papers, in **NON-CONCURRENCE, PREVAILED**.

Sent down for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later Assigned (3/11/14) matter:

HOUSE REPORTS - from the Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act To Authorize the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians To Operate a Casino in Aroostook County"
H.P. 925 L.D. 1298

Majority - **Ought Not to Pass** (7 members)

Minority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-629)** (5 members)

Tabled - March 11, 2014, by Senator **HASKELL** of Cumberland

Pending - **ACCEPTANCE OF EITHER REPORT**

(In House, March 6, 2014, the Minority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-629)**.)

(In Senate, March 11, 2014, Reports **READ**.)

Senator **TUTTLE** of York moved the Senate **ACCEPT** the Minority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report, in concurrence.

Senator **CUSHING** of Penobscot moved to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** the Bill and accompanying papers, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

On motion by Senator **TUTTLE** of York, supported by a Division of one-fifth of the members present and voting, a Roll Call was ordered.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Craven.

Senator **CRAVEN:** Thank you Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, I stand in opposition to the pending motion. I must admit I don't know anything about gambling, but I do know about poverty and I know about living in a rural area where it is very very difficult to be employed. I'm speaking tonight at the request of my very dear friend, Representative John Henry Bear, on behalf of his tribe. It has to be frustrating for the Maliseets and other tribes to have to depend on the Legislature or to have to depend on the largest population when they want to move forward with some kind of a development. They continue to struggle with unemployment and poverty. This development would create at least 800 jobs. This casino would also be within the 100 parameter of any other casino. It would bring a 45% tax to the coffers of the state of Maine. I think that I, personally, would never vote against the tribes because they are independent nations, because they should have the opportunity and the freedom to develop as they want to, and we certainly have overshadowed them long enough. It doesn't seem to matter what it is that they want to create, the larger community wants to step on their developments. Mr. President and members of the Senate, please do not cast a vote against the Maliseet Indians. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oxford, Senator Patrick.

Senator **PATRICK:** Thank you Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, colleagues and friends, I stand before you here semi-hypocritical in the fact that I am not going to necessarily speak in favor of this. As I told Representative Bear, I will say a couple of comments in regards to this and the next casino. I won't talk about the next casino, but my comments are somewhat the same, and is within the scope of what we're looking at doing here. I'm not in full support of how the bill is written and everything about it. I will say that, at least from the standpoint of what limited policy that we do have, we do have a 100 mile limit and this tribal casino would be beyond the 100 mile limit. We've had several studies done by a gaming expert and that gaming expert actually said that within the entities that are already existing businesses this one and another one that maybe