

had plenty of debate. We had a three day recess where it was more fully debated by the Appropriations Committee. I guess I think at this point we had better just fish or cut bait. We had better advance that bill as it is, do what we need to do, painful as it may be for many of us, painful as it is, we have to do it, let's do it. Let's not return this bill.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner. (GAVEL) Quiet please to hear the speaker. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, and members of the Legislature, this item was included in the original suggestion for several reasons. It got on the list first because of one of the criteria that was the most significant if you want to have some control over the growth of government. This is one of those areas in which we are not now funding. We are not now funding at the full statutory possibility, about 2.2 million less. So there is real growth there. Plus the way the formula works and the federal funds decline, then the state becomes, under the formula, subject to even a greater request. So in terms of a provision that has great potential for increasing the cost of government, state government, this fits that role perfectly. What about the harm to those who receive the funds? You have been told a lot of things. I'll try to take them separately. In the case of Lincoln, which I represent part of Lincoln in case anybody...in the case of Lincoln their loss, as I understand it, is in the vicinity of \$450,000. It is also my understanding that Lincoln's gain by taking over the muni courts together with the estimate of what they can anticipate not for the new half percent sales tax, but what they can anticipate from their current sales tax along with the additional, but because of the passage of 273 and 715, between those two, they should generate roughly another \$400,000. So in their case they are gaining out of this session not because of anything they have done, but because of things we have done. They will be gaining an excess of \$1,100,000 of freed up receipts or new receipts to offset the \$450,000 reduction. Now MAT. Now that is a little different. That is correct. It is not operated by the city government of Omaha. They have contracts with other municipalities. But is there a net loss or can it not be done? Senator Chizek, at some point I don't think you will tell me, or you will not tell this body that Omaha does not have the authority to appropriate funds