

March 11, 1982

LB 577

to try and increase the cigarette tax and other efforts to pay for these projects has always pretty well rejected that. When we tried to increase through our budget on the floor through sales and income taxes an amount to the water development fund, you will recall over the past three years every year we seem to have that issue come up, we tried to put in an extra million or so dollars every year to make sure we try and get at least a little bit of money into that, it always had a difficult time going in this Legislature. That is why I can't believe that the members of this body would be so quick and easy to pass this legislation which has an open door approach to the issuance of revenue bonds on water projects when this body has been so reluctant to in the past in a minimal way increase water development funds, and we have been very reluctant to increase the sales tax, to be up front in paying for these water projects with some of the bills that we have in committee. And I have been one of those that has been concerned and skeptical about some of these proposals because I don't want to move ahead and spend a whole lot of money when we are not sure of the direction we are taking or the approach that we are taking and I certainly want to encourage caution at this time before we spend a great deal of effort putting this issue on the ballot along with a whole range of other constitutional amendments to take up the voters' time if we are not certain that this is the direction this Legislature wants to follow. If this bill goes on the ballot, the people approve this amendment to the Constitution, then I think we are basically committed to the concept of coming back here and developing the legislation to implement it. I don't think any of us are going to deny the people if they should approve such an amendment the opportunity to implement that amendment. So let's talk about what will happen after the amendment passes. Has anybody discussed that? What is going to happen once the constitutional amendment passes? How will it be handled? How much money are we talking about? What are the projects that it will be targeted for? How is this money going to be spent? Have these questions been answered with LB 577? If they haven't been then I think they ought to be, and that is the purpose of the motion to kill. I think if the answers are there and if this is obviously the best route to take, then I don't have any problem with the bill, but let's get these questions answered. Let's understand where we are going with this legislation and let's not just rapidly push through a bill committing this state to increase debt for water projects if we are not absolutely sure that that is the approach we want to take and that is the direction we want to follow. So I am asking these questions. I ask you to ask some questions in your own mind about this bill and

8760