

state bonding functions that are using the same source. It doesn't put it in a more difficult position than what it would be without it, but does give all of these equal status, the state purposes an equal status, along with the provisions of LB 683, and I don't know if the introducers are bothered by this amendment. They should not be but maybe they haven't had a chance to review it

SPEAKER BARRETT: Discussion of the Warner amendment? Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, Senator Warner, I have got on my desk an explanation of the amendment. It says Warner amendment, AM. I don't have the language. Will the language be distributed to the body?

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Landis, the amendment just came to me and I just sent it up there, so I don't have any copies.

SENATOR LANDIS: All right. Senator Scofield I think was good enough to inform the body of her intentions, and since Final Reading is certainly available for amendment, at the end of my time perhaps you would consider withdrawing the amendment for today and allowing us to renew the discussion. I will tell you why. It is entirely possible it is satisfactory if I had a copy.

SENATOR WARNER: My guess is, Senator Landis, it probably is but really (interruption)...

SENATOR LANDIS: Let me, since it is my time, let me ask a question here and then I will turn it over to you.

SENATOR WARNER: (Interruption) yield your time.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Warner, let me ask you a specific question. I am looking at this, it says that you are going to make, basically, a \$13.5 million fund for bonds. If there was another bond next year along the lines of a state bond, what specific amount of money would be available for that new bond if not to share in the existing \$13.5 million pool you create with this amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: That pool will change based on the amount of debt service that each enabling legislation has.