

certainly would...neither would I want to argue with a law firm of such eminence as the firm that he quoted from, although I do believe that the bill says, it provides that the allocations, appropriations by the Legislature, to the MIRF shall not be reduced until all contracts and securities are completed or paid. Now it is true that every time we have issued any bonds, whether the state did it or otherwise, that they always have the limitation of subject to an appropriation because that is a basic constitutional provision, that one Legislature cannot obligate another, and I don't deny that. But as a practical matter, it doesn't work that way and I cannot ever think of a time when we did not do that, and as a matter of fact, I can think of one time when there were some bonds that were in jeopardy at a state institution that were not General Fund, but they were not able to meet them and we turned around and picked those up, too, or at least found a way to accomplish it. And to suggest that you are not tying up these appropriations, this designated revenue 4.5 million, for at least the 20 years, and I would still argue as the bill is drafted, conceivably beyond that, I think is not being realistic, and to say the words provide an out, but as a practical matter, you know that is not going to occur. But most of the talk has been on need. There is a need, and I wouldn't disagree for a moment. As I recall, we advanced a bill just the other day which dealt with secondary sewage treatment which becomes a revolving fund, a loan that the city has to pay back. Now I would suggest if you wanted to be helpful, then we ought to establish a similar kind of a criteria that secondary sewage treatment has, we identify need, the state assists if it chooses, and it use to, a portion of this 4.5 million over the next 20 years to assist those small communities in order to provide the kind of secondary sewage treatment that they need, but, no, we are not doing that. I believe Senator Landis has a bill which permits them to borrow the money and then pay it back over a period of time, make far more sense. Utilize this money in that area where we know under the environmental controls that are coming down are going to have to be done, and, again, here Omaha has an immense need in this area as does many of our small communities across the state. Talk about \$4 per person, I don't know how much, you know, in a town of 4,000 or 1,000 people, that is \$4,000 a year, not a great deal of money that is going to accomplish the kinds of things that people are thinking in terms of traditional infrastructure types of activity. So I would urge that you do not place the bill on General File, that you establish...stay with the traditional method of working this through an