

April 9, 1974

offered. It merely states, that in a bond issue the size of this one, the people have a right to vote on it. They will be given a right to vote on it. Since the mics are on and this is going into the record, not into many minds. There is another point I would like to add for future reference. And as Senator Carpenter, pointed out, astutely, political purposes. A clever amendment was drafted by those who are lobbying this bill. It creates the impression that there is to be a vote of the people. But that impression is false. What this amendment does that was added to the bill, and which wiped out of lot of your opposition does, is to say that after an ordinance has been passed by the city, and after the bonds have been sold, then the people can strive to get it together enough signatures to have a referendum to present it. They might have about 15 days, in some cases to get as many as 10,000 signatures to have enough valid signatures. That is to use that familiar term, that's been around here recently. A shell game on the people. It shifts the burden, and the responsibility from the city or the county to the people. If they don't like the bond issue, they have a very few number of days to try to get enough signatures to put it to a referendum. But I think that when the contract is signed and validated, there can be nothing that could happen after that contract to invalidate it. So if the city and the county council and the mayor, and everybody else involved were very cunning. They could make an agreement with whoever was going to purchase the bonds, so that as soon as the ordinance was passed, and enough days to make the ordinance valid, had elapsed then the bonds would be immediately purchased and there would be no time for a referendum. I voted in the Government Committee to put this bill on the floor to give it what I thought would be a fighting chance. I was opposed to it's concept. It would not have been on the floor had I not voted to put it out here. I stated at the time of that vote that I was opposed to the bill and what it stands for. That I would oppose it. This is the principal which was felt to be necessary. One of the city council members from Lincoln, testified for this bill. Said he would not object to a vote of the people. Senator Barnett, who introduced it for them was very concerned at one time about the denying the people the right to vote. So in view of the explanation I've given. In veiw of the concerns I've expressed. In view of the fact that this bill is going to be in operation longer than today, and that some people's anger will be gone after today. But the action will be taken which cannot be undone. I think this bill ought to be returned. The amendment say, that when a city is going to float these kind of bonds, and pledge their highway funds, and put the city in a place to tax all taxable property in the county to retire those bonds, there must first be a vote of the people. If the people vote on it, they will have it explained to them not only the bond issue itself, and what it is for, but they ought to be told what the consequences can be if the project does not retire the bond. The highway funds go, and a tax on all taxable property must be levied to retire those bonds.

CLERK: Mr. President, I move the previous question, signed Senator Luedtke.

PRESIDENT: The previous question has been moved. Does the Chair see 5 hands. The Chair does not see 5 hands. Thank you. The question is, shall the debate now close. All those in