

My name is Jack McGlynn. I am Legislative Counsel for the Wonderland Greyhound Owners Association, as well as the Association for the Protection of Working Animals and Handlers, Inc. I am here today to support Senator Mark Pacheco; Senator Tom Kennedy and Representative Jim Fagan's Bill to extend greyhound racing in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

My main purpose here today is to encourage each one of you to preserve the economic status of each one of the approximately 1,300 people who receive income from the greyhound racing industry, especially during this drastic economic time.

As you are all aware, Massachusetts, as well as the rest of the country, is suffering through the greatest recession since the Great Depression. Unemployment has skyrocketed in the last two (2) years, as can be seen by the chart I have brought with me today. One Hundred Fifty-three Thousand (153,000) people have lost their jobs since September of 2007 – two (2) short years ago.

Our state has been devastated, job wise, even in the in the face of "Economic Stimulus" and yet we sit here today with the possibility of another 1,300 suffering the loss of income because of a referendum that was passed by the discrimination of misleading information. On January 1, 2010, who is going to support those 1,300 people and their families (and that is only the direct loss – ancillary economic loss could result to thousands more). The answer is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts taxpayers who will have to pay for unemployment, welfare,

health care and untold psychological damage, which will result from this travesty.

I ask today that you save these people's dignity and allow them to keep working in a job they love and in an industry they support.

Each and every economic forecaster states that this recession will continue for at least the next eighteen (18) months to two (2) years. It would be extremely beneficial to the Commonwealth, the employees and the families employed in this industry if the Legislative and the Governor extended the jobs of these people while the state recovers from its economic problems.

Although I will let the industry people testify as to the misleading tactics used in this campaign, I would like you to know one aspect of the referendum process itself which basically allows promoters of a referendum to mislead the public and the state inadvertently condones such tactics. The following is stated on the ballot itself right next to the referendum question: "The Commonwealth of Massachusetts does not endorse these arguments, and **'DOES NOT CERTIFY THE TRUTH OR ACCURACY OF ANY STATEMENT MADE IN THESE ARGUMENTS.'** The names of the individuals and organizations who wrote each argument, and any written comments by others about each argument, are on file in the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth."

There were allegations of inhumane treatment of greyhounds used in the campaign.

This is absolutely untrue. There were allegations of abuse to the greyhounds.

Once again, totally untrue. We have the most highly regulated greyhound industry

in the country. There has never been a complaint for abuse against a racing greyhound in Massachusetts.

Further these animals are treated with the greatest of care and do not "endure lives of inhumane confinement," as alleged. If the proponents thought it was so inhumane to race then why did they allow racing to continue for fourteen (14) months after the passage of the question?

These parties promoted a cause, used information which had no relationship to the greyhound racing industry in Massachusetts, sought donations to support themselves and their cause by playing on people's emotional heart strings and will move on to spin their story in another locale. As one member of a supporting group stated "It's just a business." The true fact is the people promoting this question just wanted to put a notch in their belt so they could move on to another state and continue to attempt to devastate this industry.

When you analyze this ballot question it is very possible that this ballot question did not ban greyhound racing. The only act that appears to have been banned was betting on the greyhounds within the confines of the two (2) Massachusetts race tracks. The law doesn't stop the greyhounds from living in the kennels here in Massachusetts (the so called inhumane living conditions) and being shipped to other states to race, it only stops betting on the greyhounds at Wonderland and Raynham. This ballot question does nothing to prevent what they allege to prevent and refer to as cruel and inhumane treatment.

It would probably be enlightening for all of you to know that many of the people who supported this referendum sat on a committee which rewrote Chapter 205 of the Code of the Massachusetts Regulations Section 12:00 which is entitled "THE HUMANE HANDLING, CARE, TREATMENT and TRANSPORTATION OF RACING GREYHOUNDS." This Code is presently in effect and supervised by not only by The State Racing Commission but many other law enforcement agencies within the Commonwealth. Yet many of these same people are supporters of the referendum which the promoters referred to as "cruel and inhumane treatment of greyhounds.

I have included attached to my statement many financial and economic facts which were obtained from the Massachusetts State Racing Commission and both Wonderland and Raynham/Taunton Greyhound Tracks. The numbers are significant. According to the information received, money generated by the industry is in excess of Thirty Million (\$30,000,000.00) Dollars.

When I look at this Bill, I think who is prejudice by extending the greyhound racing for an additional two (2) years? Where is the common good in throwing these people to the curb and taking Thirty Million and 00/100 (\$30,000,000.00) Dollars out of circulation in this depressed economy? The argument most heard in opposition to the extension is that it is the will of the people. My question to you is what type of dilemma are we faced with when the will of the people does more harm than good. By not extending these dates there will certainly be an enormous

amount of harm generated but in effect no common good for the people of Massachusetts.

In recent years, the legislature has voted to effectively change the will of the people on at least four (4) separate ballot questions voted into law by the "will of the people." These ballot questions were overturned for what the legislature perceived as "a common good." Once in 1998, twice in 2000 and again in 2002 the legislature reversed the will of the people.

Additionally, in a recent poll conducted by Tom Kiley Associates, sixty-one (61%) percent of the people polled stated that they would not have voted for Question Three if they had any idea that the economy would be in such dire straits. Who could have anticipated that we all would be in the situation we now find ourselves. The common good would lead us to the conclusion that these dates should be extended.

Although John O'Donnell will address a number of issues, including the injury claim, I would just like to indicate the fact that injuries are a part of this sport, as they are in every sport. In this sport, the injuries ratio is less than one (1%) percent and many of these injuries are minor. Greyhound racing is a sport, the greyhounds are athletes and enjoy their life and live for racing. These so-called injuries pale in comparison to other professional sports. Yearly, professional football teams are decimated by injuries. Nobody is looking to do away with the NFL; and if we look at our World Championship Basketball Team when the "big three" were injured

last year, which comprised twenty-five (25%) percent of the team being injured, nobody was looking to close them down.

There are a number of legal issues which surround this ballot question and these will be addressed by Tom Kiley today and handled in a different forum at a later time but for now I ask you to give S 2041 a favorable vote so that these people can continue to work, continue to be self-supportive and so the implementation of this ballot question does not further the economic crisis that already exists in the Commonwealth.

Finally, I would like to leave you with one last thought. The supporters of this ballot question have been promoting the fact that there is plenty of money available to retrain the workers who loose their jobs. When asked who has the money, they say the legislature. As far as we've been able to find out, there is no money appropriated anywhere for retraining and if there were what jobs would be available!!!

Thank you.