

forthcoming. I think you need to understand that really, the way the bill is drafted, it's hard to put a price tag on it, but that's just it. If you want to do something, you need to put a price tag on it, decide how much you want to spend, then be willing to fund it. If you look at the fiscal note, you know, you can spend anywhere from 100,000 to half a million. Obviously, environment...environmental issues we can spend...after you spend from 100,000 to a million, 10 million, or a billion, I mean you can really do, and the need is there, but this bill itself, I guess, it fails in my account of a bill that's necessary. I don't think you need to pass the bill. If you...funding is the issue, well there will be other bills that actually have some other substantial language to them, we can do funding in there. Obviously we can amend Department of Environmental Control's budget in the budget process, and you don't need this bill to do that, if that's what you want to do. The bill by itself is, one, I question whether you need it at all. Two, if you do think you need it, the only reason you would need it would be for the funding attached to it. And that, like I said, that can mean 100,000 to a half million dollars, whatever you want to put in there, or even more. And so given the fact that particularly it's going to need an A bill if it moves, and more importantly I don't think the bill is necessary at all because it is just simply intent language. And you do not need to change statutory authority to give more money to the Department of Environmental Control. For those reasons I rise to oppose the advancement of LB 661.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Yeah, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd rise to oppose the bill as well, essentially on the same basis, which has been identified by Senator Moore. But obviously there is no new substantive program included and the legislation is...it's merely intent, intent is not binding. What will happen, of course, is that the agencies, if we do make a practice of this, the agency will come in, at some later date, and say, well the Legislature said the intent was to be funded, therefore it should be funded, and yet it's not binding. And certainly if expansion is necessary in a particular agency in the way of personnel, it ought to go through the normal process of the Appropriation Committee, number one. And, in any event, no one on the floor has given any shortcomings for that process, because you have the same opportunity to make the motion in a regular...this year it would be a deficit appropriation bill, if