

SENATOR WARNER: And they would be funded solely with the provisions of 525 and the cap would be reduced from 7.4 or 5 to 6. I would be very hesitant to put that on the A bill by itself. It's the same issue...the issue wouldn't be changed in constitutionality, if there is one, with my amendment, because the damage, if there is any, would already be done. But so that you know, if you do adopt this, it would be my intent to follow with an amendment which would take the medical out and adopt, in addition to that, a cap of only 6 million which is all that would be required to fund the hospital side only.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. Speaker and members, I also rise in opposition to the amendment. In listening to Senator Warner, I agree...I, too, have some concerns about the actual vehicle they're attempting to use. But regar...I think for that reason alone the body should think very seriously about supporting this amendment. Secondly, I don't know, maybe it's just me, but I'm a little dense in...I don't know what exactly it is all we're trying to do. And I've looked at the amendment and looked at some things, and basically I think, as Senator Warner so aptly described, you took the best of LB 525 and 187 and rolled them together. So, instead of injecting \$12 million into the health industry, you're injecting \$19 million. I guess that's similar to the compromise Senator Withem and Senator Kristensen reached, the compromises always seem to jack the ante up, and we're doing it once again here. It's no secret that I'm opposed to LB 187 for a variety of reasons. I, myself, am supporting the provisions in LB 525, and the very simple reason for me is that it took less state dollars to generate about the same amount of money for the health care industry, not the same exact people but the industry in total. And I prefer to do it that way, \$4 million of General Funds and \$8 million of federal matching funds. You're not helping quite the same people, but, yes, in some ways you kind of are. And that is...I, personally, prefer LB 525 in its pure form over 187. And, obviously, the reason I like that is it would save me \$8 million in General Funds. Obviously, the supporters of this measure figured that out and said, yeah, we can still spend \$12 million if we can get the federal match. So I applaud them for being creative, but yet we're defeating the purpose of trying to save \$8 million. So, for that reason as well, I oppose the amendment. But, more importantly, I think there is a serious question on whether or