

this is the last of my amendments...or attempted amendments on this bill. To refresh your memory again, this is the bill that would expand the use of industrial development bonds to commercial and retail type interests, and it is a proposed constitutional amendment so we are asking the people to vote on it. And this amendment has to do with the language that the people will see on the ballot when they go to vote. I think it is important that they understand a little better exactly what it is that they are voting on. Under the bill the way it is right now, the proposition would read to them as follows: Constitutional amendment to authorize the use of revenue bonds to develop substandard or blighted property. I don't think that that gives them clearly the idea that the public entities that the cities and counties are not dealing directly in this matter, it does not give them the correct impression which is that the money is going to be given primarily to private enterprises and public corporations, and that they will be the ones actually developing the blighted property. So what my amendment does is change that language to read as follows: Constitutional amendment to authorize the use of revenue bonds to assist private enterprises and public enterprises in developing blighted property. I simply think that that more fairly states the question and gives them a better impression of what they are voting on, and I would ask you to adopt this clarifying amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise to oppose the amendment by my good friend, Senator Beutler. In fact, I can appreciate his high purpose for proposing this, but again, I have to say that if I thought at any time that Senator Beutler was anxiously trying to assist me with this legislation, I would look more fondly towards his proposals. I think Senator Beutler has been very sincere and very honest that he is not trying to assist me with this legislation, and the clarification that he proposes is one that really ought to be done when we have the authorizing legislation if this constitutional amendment passes. Now the thing of it is is that it's if you propose it so tight in clarifying and so forth that I haven't had time to think about just what all this will do or how more limited this will make the proposal, but those kinds of limiting proposals really ought to be in the authorizing legislation. They should not be in the constitutional amendment, and for that reason I oppose it. Senator Beutler