

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I have been sitting here quietly for the last several days, haven't participated in the debate much, been allowing things to roll along very steadily through consent calendar, through the other debates on some of the major bills, quietly throwing up my greens or reds as the case may be and now it is time for me to take stock of what has been happening here today and to raise a quick objection. I think Maurice Kremer made an excellent argument in favor of the appropriation of 4 million dollars on behalf of the resource development fund. I supported that measure through a green light and there were twenty-five of us, twenty-six actually. I was the twenty-fourth vote and then I saw Howard Lamb change his vote from red to green and he was the twenty-fifth. So I have some reason to suspicion that provided that the twenty-fourth vote was a meaningful vote cast in that voting, shortly thereafter we had the ADC vote and it came up short. So I understand the argument, at least the argument against the resource development fund appropriation. We are talking about an increase in income taxes. We are talking about breaking the bank, increasing the load. This was the step that had to be taken in the event we were going to break the 7% budget and we were also probably going to cause, at least by our existing revenue expectations, the need for some kind of tax increase. If there is to be an income tax increase, that increase will fund not only the 4 million dollars of that resource development fund increase, it will also easily swallow up the needs that were outlined by Senator Chambers' increase in ADC and yet this body, having broken the barrier, having increased the tax standard, having opened up the potential for revenue would not then take the next step following the 4 million dollar appropriation and spend a million seven on the needy children of this state. Now I think Maurice Kremer made an excellent argument on behalf of those 4 million dollars and I supported him but I think Senator Chambers and Senators Labeledz and Goodrich and others made an equally strong argument on behalf of that one million seven for the needy children of this state and it seems to me that before we can get to that rosy future, that utilization of our resources that Maurice Kremer talked about, the need for that 4 million dollars, before we can get to the future we have to pass through the present and it is a matter of record, it is a matter of the present tense, not some future pay-off, that we have needy children in this state whose support has dried up and dwindled because of inflation, whose support from the state for food and clothing and housing and the essentials of life has been dwindled away by the operation of our economy and the ravages of inflation and it seems to me that that is a future that we can't delay and put off and guarantee at a later time and make provisions for because the lakes that we are going to build for recreation and the soil that we are going to save to grow crops and the like, putting off for this two thousand and after period of time, really are