

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 2
PERMANENT FUND FROM NON-RENEWABLE RESOURCES REVENUE
Constitutional Amendment

(SCS CSSS House Joint Resolution No. 39 [Resources] am S)

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the amendment.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the amendment.

FOR ()
AGAINST ()

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 9TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>18</u>	Nays <u>1</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>1</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>36</u>	Nays <u>1</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>3</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would amend the Constitution of the State of Alaska by amending Article IX, Section 7 (Dedicated Funds) and adding a new Section to Article IX (Section 15, Alaska Permanent Fund). It would establish a constitutional permanent fund into which at least 25 percent of all mineral lease rentals, royalties, royalty sale proceeds, federal mineral revenue sharing payments and bonuses received by the State would be paid. The principal of the fund would be used only for income-producing investments permitted by law and the income from the fund would be deposited in the general fund of the State and be available to be appropriated for expenditure by the State unless otherwise provided by law.

- - Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency
as required by law

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION NO. 2

Alaskans Should Strongly Support the Establishment of a "Permanent Fund"

Just as a wise and prudent family sets aside money in a savings account for the future, so should Alaska's state government set aside a rainy day fund to benefit this and future generations of Alaskans. In a "Permanent Fund", you - the voter - can prevent a major source of income from being doled out for day-to-day needs or desires of state government by placing up to 25% of all revenue generated from non-renewable resources such as mineral leases, rentals, royalties and federal mineral revenue sharing payments and bonuses into such a fund.

In recent years the state legislature has been spending \$2.00 for every \$1.00 taken in. Authorities estimate that if the present rate of spending continues, Alaska will require a budget in excess of one billion dollars by or before 1980. Establishment of this "Permanent Fund" will provide for the use of the principal for *income-producing investments only* and provide a businesslike approach of permitting the State to meet countless community needs.

Today, as the result of anticipated oil and gas revenues, Alaska stands on the brink of unprecedented prosperity. No one, but no one, argues that these non-renewable resources will last but for a few decades. Similarly, no one should fail to recognize that in those years ahead the cost of state government will continue to spiral upwards. Now is the time to ask ourselves the question: "When the oil and gas is depleted, where will the funds to feed our giant government come from?" The answer is: the "Permanent Fund".

While it is to be hoped that such a fund may contribute to cutting cost or, at least, holding the line on state spending, its major

value would be that it would require our elected officials to pause, reflect and research any proposal before blindly authorizing expenditure of taxpayers' monies. This would provide needed time for the press and the public to also be aware of the pending project and its merit, instead of being out of public view and hidden in the spending pattern of normal day-to-day operations. Projects invested in with sources from the "Permanent Fund" could help broaden Alaska's narrow based economy and bring more stability to our State.

We would caution the public that while a "Permanent Fund" could provide a tool for accomplishing real needs for community improvements, it will, in the final analysis, not replace our collective responsibility to elect state administrators and legislators who will use the same reason and restraint in spending the public money as they would their own funds.

Establishment of a "Permanent Fund" is an exciting concept and when approved and properly used can serve long and well the best public interest of Alaskans.

VOTE "FOR"

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A "PERMANENT FUND"

-- Alaska State Chamber of Commerce

STATEMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION NO. 2

The drafters of the Alaska Constitution wisely prohibited the dedication of state moneys based on the experience of other states of our nation.

This is being sold on the basis that it will cut back expenditures of state government. Such is a worthy goal but a permanent fund will not obtain that result. Those who would spend large sums of money are well aware of methods of increasing taxes. In 1975 when the state apparently ran out of money, it imposed a new oil and gas reserve tax amounting to over \$200 million a year. If this amendment passes and large sums go into the fund, the legislature and administration will impose additional taxes. The only restraint that we'll ever have on the growth of the state budget will be to elect fiscally responsible people.

Various federal government revenue sharing programs must be considered. Since the federal government takes such a large share of the taxes, each state must, by necessity, look to revenue sharing to get part of that money back. If Alaska establishes a multi-billion dollar permanent fund, you can be assured that Congress will change revenue sharing formulas so that Alaska will be cut back. Congress will say other states and municipalities are having a very difficult time raising funds to meet the necessities of government while Alaska has a large permanent fund.

It is axiomatic that government should never have more money than it needs to meet its immediate requirements. Alaska ought not to have funds excess to its needs for current operating budgets and an adequate reserve for income fluctuations.

The State of Alaska will not have a surplus until about 1979. At that time we should invest our large sums in the following manner:

1. Build all new capital improvements, i.e. roads, bridges, schools and harbors with cash rather than incurring additional bonded indebtedness.
2. Pay off our existing bonded indebtedness.
3. Increase revenue sharing to local government.
4. Reduce state taxes.

The argument that we should set some money aside from non-renewable income for future generations sounds well and even has merit. I suggest that it would be more meritorious, however, to give future generations adequate school buildings, adequate roads, adequate docks and not give them a huge pile of cash and an onerous bonded indebtedness.

The supporters of this amendment have also dangled in front of the public the idea that the money will be used to make credit available for such things as home mortgages. This is a worthy goal but does not follow from the creation of a permanent fund. The drafters of this amendment had the opportunity to include language that the fund be used for credit. They chose not to include such language. Further, the State can make money available for home mortgages without the need of any permanent fund. A good example is the current Veterans Loan Program.

The public rightly is concerned about very large government expenditures. A permanent fund will not reduce them. Only a fiscally responsible governor and legislature can do that.

-- Tom Fink, C.L.U.
Former Member of Alaska
House of Representatives

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.