

the funds are there through '82, well if he can guarantee those he is very fortunate because there have been some strange things happening in Washington the last ninety days. I would guarantee that there will be some additional costs come out of that city before another ninety days roll by. When you have been relying upon the federal revenue for 80% of the funds to build these overpasses and those funds are gone, that means that you are left with 20%. That means that the local subdivision is going to have to pick up the difference, if you want to have an overpass. Now we refer to the negotiation between the individual cities and the railroads. I support the amendment. I think that it is fine that that should be back in there. But I want to call your attention once again to the small community, for example, of Schuyler, Nebraska sitting down to negotiate a railroad crossing with the railroad. Not a very equal match. I think that you will agree. I think that you can be assured of another thing when you are assessing a charge upon a train, regardless of load, regardless of length, you can be assured the length of the train will increase, which is going to add further to the causes of the problems that exist within the communities. I think that it is interesting, of course, that we find ourselves in a situation here where we say we are going to get a few bucks for the railroads, they won't contest this, they said that this is fine. I'm not one of those who says time after time after time that the railroads can handle the load, handle the tax load that is. I recognize the problems that all businesses have. But the principle outcry that you have today from the local subdivisions is the property tax. If the local subdivision is called upon to bear more than they are the present time, they are having to negotiate 30-40-50% of the cost of building an overpass, that is going to be a cost assessed against the homeowner. Now you might say that this is the best deal that you can get, but it a heck of a note ladies and gentlemen when the railroads through threat of litigation can cause this legislature to cower to the extent that they refuse to buy the proposal which is most beneficial to the public as a whole. There is no reason why the homeowner in Columbus, Nebraska should have to subsidize the homeowner in Arkansas, Ohio, or any of those other states where this coal goes to. It causes problems for the local homeowner and it causes problems for the businessmen and it causes problems for the community. The railroads recognize their responsibility to relieve that and a part of that cost should be assessed not only to the coal but to the grain that is moved. I can assure you that the small portion that it would cost me, the producer of grain. . . .

SPEAKER MARVEL: One minute.