

May 2, 1985

LB 204A

SENATOR WARNER: Because it authorizes the construction all the way through 1991 so if this is passed and the federal funds become available it would be a reaffirmation next year and would be considered a project underway, but what I do...I don't know if you need all of that for the federal funds. My impression was that they did need \$100 to \$200,000 this year and perhaps for next year to assure likelihood of retention of that federal authorization.

SENATOR CARSTEN: That I guess was the basis for my question was whether we were going to need it all to get any assurance at all from the federal level. Thank you, Mr. President, thank you, Senator Warner.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Lamb is next and then Senator Vard Johnson, but may I introduce some guests please in the north balcony. They are special guests of Senator Abboud this morning inasmuch as this is Senator Abboud's alma mater and there are 40 fourth graders from Seymour Elementary School in Ralston, Nebraska, and two teachers. Will all of you just please stand and be recognized by the Legislature. Thank you, and if you study hard you might wind up in Senator Abboud's place. Thank you for visiting the Legislature. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President, members I rise to oppose the kill motion. I guess I'm a bit confused. Senator Vickers is supporting the bill, but opposing the funding. It really doesn't make too much sense to me. Of course he has had a long history of opposing the original proposal which of course was much more expensive than this one and so it seems to me that it only makes good sense to support the A bill. How you can support the bill and not support the A bill is beyond me. It has been explained that this funding for this year is probably necessary in order to secure the federal funds. So if we're interested in saving money on the state level we certainly will be interested in funding this with this small amount this year to do what we can to secure the federal funds which is about half the construction cost. This is the argument. This is the argument in support of the A bill. It has been cut down from the original proposal. I thought there was almost unanimous support for this proposal. If you'll look at the committee statement it compares favorably with committee statements of the previous proposals when we had opposition, no opposition, no