

with the Governor's suggestion that we may need the money for prisons. Simple facts are that if we have to build prisons, particularly if it comes under a court order, that will be done. Won't make any difference. And I have no part of that argument. It's immaterial. What concerns me is that I voted not to override some vetoes tonight, operating money, that I didn't particularly want to do, but I did, and when I look at what is scheduled in 760, there's not one penny of appropriation for '91-92, zero. So there's not an urgency that we have to pass this bill tonight. In '92-93, there's only 429,000. Not a very big amount. What concerns me is when I look at the following biennium, '93-94, '94-95, 4.6 for '93-94, 6.1 for '94-95. The amount keeps going up the further out you go and the further out you go the more speculative is the ability to fund state government because you'll have contractual obligations that you'll have to comply with. You know, the cigarette tax, and I've heard the argument ever since we started cigarette tax and earmarked it for projects, as a matter of fact the reason that was always done that was the one way that you could get the votes to increase the cigarette tax and then turn around and earmark it for some project, which got everybody enthused. The statute, however, doesn't require that, never has. The statute says it puts it in the Nebraska Construction Fund, yes, and then it says though the Legislature can disburse from that fund from time to time as they see fit. There's absolutely no reason to continue to use the cigarette tax funds only for capital construction. I would have much preferred, and there wouldn't have been any money available this year anyway, but I would much prefer to have been able to have been supportive of some of those operating costs that were important programs tonight than I would have been for brick and mortar. I know there are a number of these projects that have been requested for a long time and, as a matter of fact, there's not a one that I would oppose because it's not needed. But I have been concerned for as long as I have been here when we start obligating ourselves far out into the future when we know we are in difficult economic times, and once a contract is signed for capital construction there's no way you can get out of it. You have to comply with it. When I first became chairman of Appropriations in '77, I walked in, which the Appropriations Committee and the Legislature over a period of years had developed a habit of doing exactly that and our long-term obligation was so bad those first three years I was in there on capital construction that we could not handle some necessary...