

have, on 683 that on the substantive bill there is a number of policies which one could question, one of which, all of which have been mentioned before, one of which is a definition of infrastructure which is far more than just what is at least traditionally thought of as infrastructure. Another of course is the issue if it is infrastructure as traditionally thought of it does not take into account any way need base and that issue, amendment was raised and nearly adopted. But, at least that point was made. A more likely definition of the bill was rather than refer to it as infrastructure is to simply refer to it as another general form of state aid with one significant difference and that is because it could be used for bond guarantee as revenue why it is locked up to the next twenty years. Another thing is of course there is no flexibility, the state does use some of the cigarette tax as a reference for issuance of bonds but they are under the state control and changes can be made, legislation has been introduced to do that from time to time. But in this case that opportunity would not be there and then certainly it does establish a new precedent where a state revenue is utilized to or authorized rather for a governmental subdivision to use for bonding. I suspect that once that concept is established why it can only add to it. But there are three, four other points I would like to make. One of these I have mentioned also. We are dealing with a declining base in the form of a cigarette tax and some of the figures, at least those who do the bond counselling on the bonds that the state has issued and which very carefully follow the projected receipts over a period of time, their figures would indicate that in the next 12 years there would be approximately a one-third reduction in those receipts based upon current revenue and current tax rates rather at 27 cents per pack and obviously if some of the ads that we all read and see on counselling and help, and if some of us would take it to heart a little better, obviously that revenue would decline even more rapidly. But the other three points I haven't mentioned, one with the passage of LB 84, we have already in that bill for next year provided an eight and a half percent decrease in generally for property tax in the cities plus whatever additional reduction there would be because of the homestead exemption which exactly how that would fall across the state, I do not know, but there would be something greater than eight and a half percent I would anticipate in the property tax liability at least in the next year. My main concern however falls at the fact that this 4.5 million per year, anyway you cut it, is going to be 9 million more vetoes. If enacted and signed, 9 million vetoes