

agreement with a private operator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would the contract be subject to the terms of this law?

SENATOR WILL: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: According to the terms of this law, they get their pay from either the admissions or the pot, but not both. So, how could they draw up a contract that conflicted with the terms of the law? They can't, can they?

SENATOR WILL: Certainly not.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, then if neither by itself provides an amount equal to what they contracted to receive, they don't have access to any other means of getting the money they wanted to be paid, do they?

SENATOR WILL: Except that this portion of the bill is permissive, it says that the county may enter into a contract that would provide that the individual be compensated in such a manner.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Where does it say that they may be contract...compensated in any other manner?

SENATOR WILL: It does not, to my knowledge.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. That helped me to get into the record what the bill actually says. And a principle of construction of every statute is when you begin to list out things, that which is not listed is not included. So, when you state that the way by which they are to be compensated is in this way or that way, those are the only two ways, when a contract for compensation is entered into, that they may receive their compensation. So, if they don't see enough money coming from the admissions, and they don't see enough money in the pot, then maybe it's poetic justice. They're going to get stuck by taking this gamble on the horses, just like the dumb \$2 bettor who thinks he or she is going to make rent money by betting on this nag. I think this bill was drafted with one or two purposes in mind, but the details were not considered very carefully. And I'm going by the way the language of the bill reads to me. Some of you, especially Senator Morrissey, should