

well mean the difference between their continued existence and their going out of existence. Now if we accept the six percent levy at twenty, that will hold the state harmless. The state will have the same revenue and the smaller tracks will have at least a chance to stay alive. The seven percent and eight percent tax are not essential, but if this state is bound to dedicate itself to using the tracks to raise revenue, then certainly those two subsequent increases are in line, but by accepting if nothing more than the first increment of six percent, it will hurt no one. It may well be the salvation of the smaller tracks. I ask your adoption of this amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, members of the body, Senator Murphy has sure changed his tune from earlier this year in committee when he was opposed to any increase in additional cost or additional revenues raised in any way and Senator Murphy has been outspoken in the past in opposition to raising revenues on the pari-mutuel activities that go on in the state and really I guess I am not surprised that his amendment in fact probably isn't all that inconsistent, because what the amendment says is that Senator Murphy's track will not have to pay any additional cost but the remaining tracks will, and in order to sweeten the pie, he has made it very clear which the remaining tracks are. As I object to that, I think it is wrong, it is not well thought out, and it does not "fit the fairness factor" that Senator Murphy is talking about. It does fit take care of your neighborhood factor which is an important factor in this body and every place else but I think fairness is what we came to and I tried to get the monies distributed on the basis in part, only a small part on the basis of population. Senator Murphy was most opposed to that. Senator Murphy argued very strenuously and others did the same because they felt that even though large urban counties, like Douglas County, were not benefiting that really the idea was to help out local county 4-H projects and fairs and, consequently, there should be no population factor in there at all and so Senator Murphy strongly opposed that and Senator Sieck agreed and they took that out of the bill. I think we have worked through this and we have tried hard to come up with a reasonable approach. Ak-Sar-Ben will pay additional revenues. Ak-Sar-Ben will pay the bulk of those additional revenues and I think Senator Murphy's proposal is not only unfair but it really will create some tremendous problems down the road, and with that in mind, I urge you to oppose the Murphy amendment and this is neither the time nor the