

to appropriate the money, and we do, I mean if you read the language of the bill it says, it is hereby appropriated, and what you have to do is not reaffirm but come back in and try to pull it out again, if you don't approve of it. I think that we should take it a step at a time. What the amendment would do is allow for that, allow for the study to take place. And then I guess at that point in time next year come back in and have the proponents reaffirm the support and the appropriation for the project. I would urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Warner, please, followed by Senator Korshoj, and then Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I had my button on to talk before this amendment, but I will go ahead and speak anyway. I would oppose the amendment, and perhaps what I was planning to talk about, in any event, is appropriate with the amendment. Actually what I wanted to address, Senator Korshoj, was your original question, looking into the appropriation for the following biennium, which, if you look on the green sheet where LB 814 is shown there in the amount that would be authorized but would obviously have to be reaffirmed in the 1991 session of the Legislature. The thing I wanted to point out was that if you look across that line you'll see approximately \$29 million of construction each of the years, each of the two fiscal years, and then it drops to ten and down to as little as a million six the last one. There are a variety of reasons for doing that, but one of the main reasons is, if we are going to run into financial difficulty out into the future, then you do not want a bunch of contractual relationships that you have to meet. One of the frustrating problems, the first year I came on appropriations, was the fact that, as I recall, there was some 30 million of obligations out in future years on capital construction already under contract, and had we been in a difficult position, there was nothing we could do about them. This planning here authorizes some construction at this point when the reserves are up. But there is very minimal commitment on into the following biennium, and that is just simple, good money management not to make those buy now, pay later, but buy now, pay now, making a great deal more sense. There are a number of reasons why you would plug in money, as is proposed here. The one that is, to me, the most justified is that when these funds are put in it still has to be reaffirmed in the 1991 session. But it also puts parameters on the amount of expense