

SPEAKER BAACK: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. We will now vote on ceasing debate. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BAACK: Debate has ceased. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker and members, there is no reason to talk very long. We all probably know how we'll vote on this. A couple of things, Senator Abboud mentioned 309, and I concur that that is literally one of the most...probably the most wisest investment we can make in the State of Nebraska of I would hope the entire body because we are educated on that program, it is money well spent. The committee did appropriate \$2 million for that for each year of the biennium. That is certainly below what it was this year, but given the times, that is one of those things that has always been a boom and bust, and a bust year it is down to \$2 million, and I hope that in future years we will, indeed, increase that. Now Senator Warner obviously makes some strong points and you could hear him loud and clear, and I, obviously, respect his opinion. His opinion, and probably because of my respect for his opinion is the reason LB 760 came into being in its present form. I can understand that the 4 cents that we are talking about the lapses in the second year of the biennium, that lapses after a 10-year commitment made in the early 1980s. LB 842, that lapses next biennium, was a 10-year commitment. LB 218 was a 10-year commitment and, obviously, I have no idea of whether or not Senator Warner supported any of those but the one commitment that is for 20 years I know he opposed vociferously was the MIRE commitment. Senator Warner, I agree with you. We can't make those long-term commitments. I think 10 years is too long. I do not think 3 years, given the entire amount that lapses after that, is too long. I don't think it is imprudent. I think LB 760 in its present form, in its present form, in a very tight budget year, used some upcoming lapses to do some capital construction, and the total of \$20 million in LB 760, the total of over \$11 million in this veto issue are far, far less the amount of money we spent on capital construction last biennium, about \$35 million in General Funds alone. I do not think LB 760 is imprudent for this body. As a matter of fact, I think in its present form we got it to the point where it did make sense, and in tight times, cigarette tax dollars make sense to