

open to much debate and criticism. For that reason we cannot afford a constitutional amendment that does this. It would be a political nightmare. It would be a constitutional nightmare. If we did put this to the voters and if the voters should approve such a proposal, what would happen here? It would simply mire government. It would mire government to a great extent and for that reason I offer this kill motion. We must kill this proposal. If we are going to do anything like this it has to be done legislatively. It cannot be constitutionally. I thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Dworak, do you wish to speak on the kill motion? The motion before the House is the motion to indefinitely postpone 324. The Chair recognizes Senator Dworak. We are speaking on the kill motion.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, I support the kill motion. I know the intent Senator Hefner has and I think it is an admirable attempt but I think we are going to get ourselves in a crack again where we are going to have the tail wagging the dog. In other words, the subdivisions of government are going to have the clout and the authority and the power over the state. We are absolutely not going to be able to say anything about it. Now we have done that with some specific pieces of legislation and we have regretted it, where we have agreed to pay 90% of all cost and not having any control on cost and this type of thing. I think there is a real danger of this happening and I think that if we are going to be responsible, if we are going to be accountable, if we are going to be the policy makers and the decision makers, if we are going to be the revenue raisers, we are going to have to be the determiners of how that revenue is spent. I think if we adopt this concept of Senator Hefner's we are losing that control that is rightfully ours. We are giving a responsibility away that we should not give away but really should stay within this here body. So I oppose this. I think we can do the same thing with still maintaining the control that is rightfully ours through specific legislation rather than a constitutional amendment. I think we play with that constitution in this state too frivolously. That constitution is a document that really should just be a skeleton of the legislation and the legislation is the meat and the muscle on that skeleton and I think this is a wrong place to put this type of legislation, this type of concept. We lose our flexibility. The constitution wasn't designed as that type of vehicle. That is why we have statutes. So for those two reasons, the fact that I think we lose our own control, the fact that I don't think it goes in the constitution, I support the kill motion.