

infrastructure. Third, Senator Warner called this a state aid form that allowed for a guaranteed income stream to support a bond and I'd accept that definition quite adequately. I think that is a very fair characterization, it also contains the virtue of the bill. And, when he points out that the cost of this bill then is some flexibility in state funding, I, too, would say fair characterization. That is true. We lose some of our flexibility in order to turn around and give this tool to cities. That is part of the price tag of what we do. We do it every time we budget and make those kinds of choices and I hope that we will stick to the course in this situation. Yes, the cigarette tax is a declining revenue when you take into account only the consumption pattern of the future. Senator Warner did indicate that the caveat here, is that we keep our revenue base the same. I think that is unlikely, but there is no likelihood even with the one-third reduction given the fact that we are retiring state obligations one by one against it, that we have any cash flow problem in the cigarette fund that I know of. If there is, this body has not been apprised of a cash flow difficulty on any obligation that we either now have or would be creating through 683. With respect to the \$9 million in vetoes, Senator Warner again is absolutely true, and it is for this body to decide. His argument, I think essentially however could be made not only to this bill but to any other bill before us. Money that we spend in this form, given the fact that we have over spent, will require a veto someplace else. That could be said of every bill on the table that spends money. We do not know which of those bills comport with the Governor's wishes, which of those bills do not. And since that is the case, every bill runs the chance of being one of the ones that creates vetoes either in LB 813 or LB 814 or in any other of a host of very meritorious options. Frankly that difficulty has been our own creation of the last ten days or so. But there is no reason why this bill is, in some measure, some special malafactor towards that effect. It is true that Senator Warner does not see it as a priority. It is for each of us to determine whether it is a priority for ourselves but the phenomenon that Senator Warner accurately projects is as equally true, I think, of any other measure that we pass at this moment. It is a choice of the body to make and I have had fair chance to defend the merits of 683. I appreciate Senator Warner making sure that that happened and if there...I'll renew my light should discussion continue, otherwise we can proceed to reading the bill.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Warner please.