

believe, in part on planning, in part perhaps, on other aspects of the future development of a convention center. We will be, in my view, inevitably asked to help fund the continuation of the project which is only originated in this bill. I don't know who will be in this body when those decisions come to it. Some of you here today will be, despite Senator Chambers' gloomy prediction. I want you to remember that this vote today should not bind you to those future proposals either in terms of the ultimate development of the convention center or in terms of the state's share in the development of that convention center. The other concern I have is one that was raised by Senator Kristensen. In base I do think that this bill has serious constitutional problems, based not only on the wide variety of subject matters that are contained in it, but also from the standpoint that one element, the cigarette tax, was not before this body for five days. Having said that, I think the constitutional problems are curable and I would expect us to cure them quickly next session and to, in effect, ratify our decision here today and I do expect passage of the bill and I will indeed vote for passage of the bill because on balance it does more good than what I think it may eventually do as harm. We always have to make those balances and I am simply choosing to vote for the bill because on balance I believe it does more good than harm.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Crosby.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Madam President and members. Thank you, Senator Wesely, for bringing this motion to give us one more chance to talk about a bill that I think we're going to regret, tomorrow probably we're going to regret having passed this bill. I know it's on a fast track, it's going to go, but I was thinking yesterday when Senator Kristensen was talking about the Final Reading thing that he thought, well, maybe in the rules eventually we would have a time limit where you would have an opportunity to come to the floor and vote as they do in Congress and what we could add to that is a tolling of the bell for bills like this because there is a feeling of doom behind this bill for me. But the second thing I want to say is this. There were eight legislators who voted no on the mainline budget and then they turn right around and vote for LB 961. For me that is not consistent. I don't think some of you understand that the Governor originates the budget and the Appropriations Committee comes in and tries to refine it. A high percentage of