



April 6, 2018

Open Letter to Mr. Marc Dunbar
Gambling Lobbyist

Dear Marc,

I appreciate hearing from you, but take exception to your attempts to exaggerate the impact of Amendment 3 on current gambling operations in the state. It's also most ironic that anyone who would pass off barrel racing as meeting the legislative intent of pari-mutuel horse racing would suggest that others lack candor, or need to be more open and honest.

As we mentioned in the analysis we provided to legislative leaders entitled "**Background Analysis: Why Amendment 3 would likely de-authorize any attempt by the Legislature to expand gambling during a contemplated special session,**" you have probably made the most vocal assertions about the possibility that Amendment 3 could have a de-authorizing effect. As we pointed out in this analysis, your statements to the Florida Supreme Court were greatly exaggerated – to the point that one justice implored you to "calm down." But the argument you made to the court is a direct contradiction to the claims gambling lobbyists are now making as they urge legislators to convene a special session to massively expand gambling now – before voters take control. Based on your arguments to the court, I assume that you agree that it would be misleading for gambling lobbyists to tell legislators that casino gambling they authorize now is immune to Amendment 3.

Contrary to the assertions in your letter, we've been open and honest about the effects and intent of Amendment 3 from the beginning. In fact, you quoted the statements I made, and the written information we provided to state economists in your brief and oral arguments before the Florida Supreme Court, during your unsuccessful attempt to have the court deny voters the opportunity to decide this issue. Your exaggerated characterizations did not work before the court, and they likewise will not fool Florida voters.

As we stated in the aforementioned analysis, "*Amendment 3 was written to discourage 'buzzer beater' legislation designed to expand gambling before the voters have their say.*" Given what gambling lobbyists are pressuring legislators to do at this moment, I'd say our concerns were well founded.

And despite your asteroid-hits-earth claims, as we have consistently stated, any de-authorizing effect Amendment 3 may have is largely non-disruptive of the status quo, except closing loopholes that have been the source of much litigation over the years, litigation with which I believe you are intimately familiar. To be clear, it's the intent of this amendment to protect the voice of the people as Article X, Section 7 intended.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John Sowinski". The signature is stylized and cursive.

John Sowinski
President, No Casinos