

March 7, 1973

real surprised that he would even suggest that those cars are not driven any mileage. Maybe we should get into the allocation of highway funds, if this is what he really believes. I certainly would think that his amendment should be turned down and the Resolution passed.

SPEAKER: The chair next recognizes Senator Kremer, excuse... yes, Kremer.

SENATOR KREMER: Mr. Chairman, I am going to have speak against the Syas amendment and I am going to point out why. Now, I want to say that I am sympathetic with Senator Syas and his problem with a metropolitan city, but the testimony given before the committee was this, that if this mass transit system were to come into being, the eastern cities were going to, by a priority system, get the funds long before Nebraska would be able to get any because we would have to prove that we have a necessity here that we cannot prove like some of the eastern cities have. Now, let's remember, we are talking about, if I remember correctly, thirty million dollars and if we lose these funds that are generated to the highway user, it's going to greatly cripple our building and maintenance program for our roads and highways in Nebraska. I am aware that we are not now getting back dollar for dollar, and by losing this thirty million, the Department of Roads made it real clear before the Committee that it was going to be a real hindrance and a real problem for us to continue with the finishing of the interstate, as well as the building and maintaining some of our other critical highways that are in bad shape in the state of Nebraska. Now again, we support the mass transit systems but we think the funds ought to come from someplace else other than being paid for by those that contribute to a fund through the purchase of gasoline, licenses, etc.

SPEAKER: Senator Whitne, are you passing? Very good. We will move on to Senator Stahmer, then again. This is your second time for you to speak on the amendment, Senator Stahmer.

SENATOR STAHMER: Well, Senator Kremer, I would just like to point out when we speak of eastern cities, Omaha is an eastern city in this state and we have, perhaps, 40% of the gasoline consumption of the state and 40% of the gas taxes, but what good is all this going to do us, either in Omaha and or out-state, when we are confronted with these acres of concrete and no gasoline. If we want to reject this amendment, I would like to offer another amendment that we divert 1% of the gasoline funds in the development of electric cars because without electric cars our concrete ribbons are going to stand idle.

SPEAKER: Now, Senator Stahmer, I heard you make mention of a motion here now. You're not making a motion, are you? You are talking in the abstract. All right. Thank you. Senator Frank Lewis is next. Then Senator Hasebrook, we will come back to you on the original Resolution here. Senator Lewis.

SENATOR LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I think there are several overriding concerns in regard to the Resolution at hand. Certainly, Senator Kremer is absolutely correct with the necessity of releasing this money and releasing it right away. The problem that concerns me right now is in regard to mass transit and, in my judgment on my limited knowledge of reading, mass transit is not going to be designed primarily for intercity use. The primary thrust of mass transit systems now is to buy transportation from the suburbs into huge cities. You are talking about the complex along the eastern seaboard where they are talking about mass transit for fifty or sixty miles with that entire metropolitan area running from huge distances. In my judgment, if money is diverted from the highway fund into mass transit the urban cities of the midwest will not fit the criteria and the guidelines to receive those funds because I think the first priority is going