

there has to be a good reason for it and outside of, I guess, you know, fair play or making the odds better for the gambler, I don't see it. It's not easy to defend but I'm going to oppose it anyway. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Schmit, would you care to discuss the Chambers amendment? Senator Nelson, on the Chambers amendment. Senator Hefner. Senator Peterson and Senator Labedz, on the amendments. Thank you. Senator Chambers, would you like to close?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes. Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I'm just trying to seek some basic equity for those people who do go to the track and gamble. The only way you could describe them as a single constituency is by virtue of their making wagers at the track. Other than that, there might be disenchanted, irritated members of the public who make these wagers who are offended at this breakage that the track is allowed to keep. The track should not be allowed to keep that. The track should not rely on it. And if half of it goes to the track and the other half to the purses, it's just like rolling over your money and saying, now we have got something for you to bet on which is made up of that which was yours in the first place. There are other people who are not even aware that such a thing is what we're talking about occurs. And I don't think that while the Legislature is on the verge of increasing the amount that the tracks can take from the pot and thereby diminishing what is available for the bettors to get back, I don't think we ought to do this in addition. And by "do this in addition" I'm talking about let the track keep this breakage. If my amendment is adopted, the amount of money that the track will not get is not large enough to hurt the track in any manner. There are people who earlier today, when we were talking about the bingo and the pickle tax, had said that the amount of money that the cities will lose is not that great. The amount proportionate to the total taken by the track is even less than that if you adopt my amendment. So if when we're talking about the pickles and the bingo we're going to lower the tax, because the total amount that the cities lose is not that great, at least the amount that the cities were taking was based on a legitimate exercise of a legitimate governmental function which is that of taxation. This that we're talking about is something that should not be a part of wagering. When you bet a certain amount such as on a sporting event you know what your chances are of winning because you bet 11 to win 10. But when