

anybody would pay attention. Well, no, it's almost with reluctance that I rise to speak on this bill because it's one of those things that I...on some occasion in the past I have voted to support and to fund. But I think today I certainly feel compelled to rise and make sure the body understands the situation fully, given the fact that I think 22 senators were not in the body back in '85, including myself, when the initial cut was made in this agency and at that time, I believe it was 1985, the Legislature made a cut and then it was Predator Control/Animal Damage control and at that time they cut about \$112,000 out of the budget. And, for those of you who were here, you remember that occasion very well, I'm sure. Since that time, the body has readdressed the issue a number of times, most recently, as Senator Rod Johnson mentioned, the last...in '89 we passed LB 162 and LB 162A, in 1990 we passed LB 855 and LB 855A to fund this project and to go forward with it. And it was one of those things and I don't remember the exact votes but usually it was one of those bills that the body tends to hesitate...we probably look at the fiscal note and if you're like me, particularly from a rural area, look at the very list of worthwhile supporters of that bill, you don't really like to vote no on it until eventually the Governor vetoes it and then we all run and hide and don't vote for it. And I think the body would be wise to think a little harder before we make decisions like that this year. If you look at this program, as you mentioned, it's always been said the best way not to start a program is to...the best way to keep a program from costing more money is to never fund it. And the second best way to keep a program is kind of like...is to refund a program but then you're committed to it. It's kind of like somebody that quits smoking for a while, once they start smoking again they even smoke twice as much and it's one of those things that, as we learned in the past, once you reinstate programs, obviously, at that point in time you've made a pretty firm commitment to continue them and they tend to cost even more. And I think I also should mention that in this issue, you know, five years, six years ago we cut a 100,000 and now the cost at the beginning is 324,000 or something like that. And so it's one of those things that, obviously, you do as you think, but if you really don't intend on funding this come veto override day, if you don't really intend on funding this come the end of May, then I would suggest you don't vote for it. I know Senator Johnson has always made the argument move it over to Final Reading. We hear that oftentimes. But this is one of those things where we've teased those people long enough. Either we're serious about it or