SPEAKER BARRETT: Time has expired. Thank you. Senator Hefner.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President, members of the body, I rise to support this bill. I think it's very important, especially in our agriculture areas in Nebraska. I know that in northeast Nebraska we have a lot of predators and we haven't been getting too good a coverage in the last few years, in fact, not si. 1985 when we cut out some state funding. Like Senator Rod Johnson says, there is many of the states that are surrounding us that do appropriate quite a little money. I think the funding in this bill now, with the A bill, would be a little over 300,000. I think this is reasonable and I realize that it would have to go along with the rest of the A bills and maybe we wouldn't be able to, in the end, fund it that much but I think that at least we ought to advance the bill at this time. I know that we need it in northeast Nebraska as well as all across the state and so I would urge you to support this bill at this time.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did find the information I was actually looking for, in questioning Senator Johnson, and that was the level of state funding prior to the elimination of the program and the level of state funding now being proposed under the program, and, for your information, the funding state level did discontinue in '87-88 but it was 47,000, as Senator Johnson mentioned in '86, 120,000 in '85; 112,000, '84; 112,000; '83; and something similar to that in the past although it was as high as 165,000. The only question I'm raising, we've compared our state commitment to other states and I think that's legitimate and what you are saying, I think, Senator Johnson, is that level would say we're not overfunding, the 300,000 that would be comparable to these other states. I was only raising the question about when it ended and now when it's starting up again that we're really tripling or maybe doubling at least the state involvement in this area and the question I have is, you know, what do we get back for that additional commitment? Is that additional federal funding? Why do we need the additional money and the additional...has the problem gotten worse? Does the federal money bring in additional staff that we need? I guess I wasn't quite sure about that. And, in addition, I was going to ask in terms of the language that we have in the bill, is this exactly the language that we had when the program was repealed in 1985 or