

May 18, 1989

LB 289

other recourse. So I encourage you to discuss this issue, discuss it over lunch, if you don't want to ruin your lunch, come back after lunch and we'll discuss it some more. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Rogers.

SENATOR ROGERS: Mr. Speaker and members, I don't see how anyone could oppose the Warner amendment. It is a cash program, is this not right, Senator Warner?

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Yes, as it is proposed, it is a cash in the form, but nevertheless it's a tax added on to the price of fuel, so...but it is taxpayer paid for, or consumer actually...

SENATOR ROGERS: Right.

SENATOR WARNER: ...but it is not General Fund money.

SENATOR ROGERS: No, that's what I was referring to, I mean, we're all going to pay for it. You know we've talked about the liability and closing up the little stations and something, I haven't heard that many comments this morning. We talk about our underground water here, I think that's something that we should be very concerned about also. We're blessed, this is one of the best places in the whole nation. The consumer is going to pay for it, they talked about a veto, I don't see why the Governor would veto it. I mean, it isn't General Fund money. Like Senator Warner said, it's those of us that use it are the ones that are going to pay the bill. I can see no reason to wait. It's not only...we talk about the liability and closing my little filling station but I think a very important factor is to continue to do these things to keep our underground water as pure as we can and I'll give the rest of my time to Senator Warner.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, the only comment I would make, and maybe someone can check, the conversations, a great deal has been indicated that the Governor has said if this amendment adopted it will be vetoed, and that has not been my impression. My impression was that there was a concern about this because