January 2, 1992

ATTORNEY GENERAL OPINION NO. 92-1

The Honorable Edward F. Reilly, Jr.
State Senator, Third District
430 Delaware
Leavenworth, Kansas 66048-2733

Re: Constitution of the State of Kansas--Miscellaneous--Lotteries; Indian Gaming Regulatory Act

Synopsis: If the legislature and the electorate choose to remove the constitutional authority for a state-owned and operated lottery, the types of class III games Indian tribes could conduct in this state pursuant to a compact would be limited to on-track parimutuel wagering on horse and dog races, as this would be the only permissible class III gaming anywhere in the state. A tribe may not conduct simulcasting/wagering operations pursuant to a compact or otherwise since such conduct is currently prohibited by state law. Statutorily prohibiting certain specific class III games, if across the board (i.e. no one, including the state, may conduct or participate in it), would foreclose the ability to include those specific games in a compact. 25 U.S.C. § 2719(d) specifically makes provisions of the Internal Revenue Code concerning the reporting and withholding of taxes on winnings applicable to Indian gaming operations.

As long as the state owns the business and has ultimate and complete control of the operation, article 15, section 3c of the constitution does not require that the state actually own the building or equipment used in a lottery operation. Cited
Dear Senator Reilly:

You request our opinion regarding gambling in the state of Kansas. We address your questions about Indian gaming first.

"Does the constitutional provision allowing parimutuel wagering, like that allowing for a state lottery, result in the possibility that type III gambling (which includes a wide variety of gaming activities) can be conducted on reservations in Kansas? Would the Legislature be forced to propose amending the Constitution to remove or alter existing permissive language regarding both kinds of gambling in order to prohibit casino gambling in the state?"

The Kansas Supreme Court has held that parimutuel wagering on horse and dog races, if it includes the three elements of consideration, chance and prize, constitutes a lottery. State, ex rel., v. Bissing, 178 Kan. 111, 119 (1955). This is due to the broad definition attributed to the term "lottery" by our courts, see State, ex rel., v. Merchantile Assn., 45 Kan. 351, 353 (1891); State, ex rel, v. Fox Kansas Theater Co., 144 Kan. 687, 692 (1936), and the fact that the term has not been otherwise defined by the constitution. While parimutuel wagering has been held to be a form of lottery, we do not believe the courts would find in the reverse. Article 15, section 3b of the constitution is specific in terms of what it allows: "the operation or conduct . . . of horse and dog racing and parimutuel wagering thereon . . . [excluding off track betting]." Further, we do not interpret the Indian gaming regulatory act (IGRA) to open the door to all class III games solely because one particular class III game is permitted. See Mashantucket Pequot Tribe v. State of Conn., 737 F.Supp. 169, 176 (D.Conn. 1990) ("The type of gaming permitted is identified by the type of play permitted, not by bet, frequency, and prize limits."); U.S. v. Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, 897 F.2d 358, 365 (8th
Cir. 1990) ("we believe that the legislative history reveals that Congress intended to permit a particular gaming activity, even if conducted in a manner inconsistent with state law, if the state law merely regulated, as opposed to completely barred, that particular gaming activity."); Lac Du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians v. State of Wisconsin, F.Supp. , Op. No. 90-C-408-C, 18 (W.D. Wisc. 1991). Thus, if the legislature and the electorate choose to remove the constitutional authority for a state-owned and operated lottery, we believe the types of class III games Indian tribes could conduct in this state pursuant to a compact would be limited to on-track parimutuel wagering on horse and dog races, as this would be the only permissible class III gaming anywhere in the state.

"Since simulcasting of horse or dog races has not been authorized by statute, can parimutuel wagering on dog or horse races simulcast to American Indian gambling establishments be included among the array of gambling permitted by compacts with American Indian tribes? If so, would that constitute off-track betting which is banned by the Kansas constitution?"

The fact that simulcasting is not specifically authorized by statute or currently conducted in Kansas (see Attorney General Opinion No. 88-116) is of no consequence; what is important is whether the conduct is permitted, as opposed to prohibited. See Attorney General Opinion No. 91-119. Article 15, sections 3b and 3c together permit the state to conduct or provide for simulcasting. However, we have previously opined that Kansas statutes prohibit simulcasting. Attorney General Opinion No. 88-116. Thus, a tribe may not conduct simulcasting/wagering operations pursuant to a compact. Even if simulcasting was permissible, since off-track betting is constitutionally prohibited, Indian tribes could not simulcast horse and dog races for the purpose of betting thereon unless the wagers were placed at a racing facility (track).

"In the absence of a law permitting simulcasting in Kansas, could American Indian gambling establishments receive simulcast race signals from tracks
outside the state, whether or not betting is allowed on those simulcast races?"

See answer given above.

"Could specific kinds of gambling, e.g., casino gambling, sports book, betting on simulcast races, etc., be prohibited for all persons by statute as a means of limiting types of gambling allowed by a compact between the state and a tribe, notwithstanding existing constitutional provisions? That is, would such a prohibition need to be constitutional, or is a statutory prohibition sufficient?"

The IGRA does not specify how the state may prohibit or permit certain class III games. In other words, the federal law does not require the prohibition or permission of games be by constitutional provisions. Thus, in our opinion, statutorily prohibiting certain specific class III games, if across the board (i.e. no one, including the state, may conduct or participate in it), would foreclose the ability to include those specific games in a compact. Lac Du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, supra at 20. ([T]he state is required to negotiate with [tribes] over the inclusion in a tribal-state compact of any activity that includes the elements of prize, chance and consideration and that is not prohibited expressly by the Wisconsin constitution or state law). (Emphasis added).

"Finally, in regard to enforcement of existing, nongambling related laws on American Indian reservations: Would such gambling establishments have a responsibility to the state or to the federal Internal Revenue Service to report individuals' winnings in order to ensure those winnings are taxed? If not, how could the state ensure that winners pay applicable income tax on their winnings?"

25 U.S.C. § 2719(d) specifically makes provisions of the Internal Revenue Code concerning the reporting and withholding of taxes on winnings applicable to Indian gaming operations.
"What types of arrangements with regard to video lottery machines satisfy the constitutional requirement that the Kansas lottery be state-owned and operated?

"Presumably the requirement would be met if the Kansas Lottery owned or leased the machines and either placed and maintained the machines, or contracted with a private entity to place and maintain them. However, can the Kansas Lottery:

"-- contract with private entities to place and maintain privately-owned video lottery machines;

"-- issue licenses or certificates authorizing private entities to place and maintain privately-owned video lottery machines; and

"-- receive a set percentage of the income from privately owned, placed, and maintained video lottery machines, with the remainder of the income going to the private entity or entities owning, placing, and maintaining those machines?"

Article 15, § 3c of the Kansas constitution authorizes the legislature to "provide for a state-owned and operated lottery. . . ." This office has previously stated that this provision "does not necessarily require that the state own the actual structure in which the lottery is conducted, or the equipment which is used in the operation. [A]s long as the state owns the business and has ultimate and complete control of the operation, it is not necessary that the state actually own the building or the equipment used in the operation."

Letter to Senator Edward Reilly, dated February 15, 1991. It is our understanding that under the scenario you present, the state will, through legislation, rule and regulation and contract terms, determine and actively control the types of games to be allowed, the odds of winning, the stakes to be won, the amount of consideration required to play and the percentage of take for the state and others. The state will also determine where the machines will be placed as well as certifying such locations. These factors evidence state control.
Clearly, the more control the state retains, the easier it will be to determine that the operation is state-owned and operated. On the other hand, the fewer hands-on roles the state takes, the closer it comes to being state-regulated rather than state-owned and operated. In the example you present, if our understanding is correct, the state retains sufficient control and ownership to be constitutionally sound.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT T. STEPHAN
Attorney General of Kansas

Julene L. Miller
Deputy Attorney General