

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, and members I rise to oppose Senator Chambers' amendment, but, clearly, he makes some good points. The breakage issue is not something new or is not something that the committee amendments addresses or changes in any way from past experience. It has been that way for a number of years. I can't remember when it was put into place. It wasn't any time in the recent, at least the last 10 years, and I think it was sometime during Senator Schmit's tenure here because I think it might have been a Senator Schmit amendment that put the breakage provision into statute. What the breakage was last year was it was \$608,000; \$608,000, those pennies added up. Senator Chambers is clearly right. And that does flow back to the track, but only 50 percent of that flows back to the tracks, only 50 percent of that. So \$304,000 went back into purses so it did go back out to the bettors. Three hundred and four thousand was kept by the tracks, divide that amongst the tracks but I'm sure Ak-Sar-Ben kept the lion's share, probably two-thirds of that, because I think two-thirds of the wagering is done there. But the issue of breakage is not changed by these committee amendments at all. It is included in all the new language again but that we don't change the percentage at all, we don't round it differently than we have in the past. It is clearly an up or down issue. I'm not going to stand here and defend it because it's not easily defended other than it's the way things have been done. There was a policy decision made and folks came in and said, look, that breakage ought to go here, it ought to go to the track to a certain extent and a certain portion of it, 50/50 ought to be split with the bettors. I can tell you there are bettors in my district that would like to see the breakage go to the purses a 100 percent. That's what, basically, Senator Chambers' amendment would do. But we have done it that way in the past. Outside of historic precedent, I guess, there isn't a very good argument for it but then I guess the questions arises, why did we give it to the tracks in the first place? It makes little sense to me when you've got an industry that is on the road, so to speak, that you now go in and take away something that you have given them years past when they probably were in a much better condition than they are today. That purpose or the reasoning for that is before my time. But all you do with the breakage is you take half of what was raised and in 1989 that figure was \$608,000 across the state. Half of it goes to the purses, half of it goes to the tracks. If you adopt Senator Chambers' amendment, you do put that other half back in with the purses but I would argue that