

was slightly under \$20 million. Obviously, since that time, the Beadle Center is under construction. That money has basically been expended. The other things that were forced out because at that point in time we chose to go as a pay-as-you-go basis with cigarette tax funds. There is a variety of other proposals of which construction has not commenced on, will be completed next year, and the next biennium. Obviously, the Appropriations Committee felt that a commitment was made back then to the entirety of LB 760. You remember at that point in time that the Governor opposed this portion and vetoed this portion of LB 760 on these projects. The Legislature soundly overrode that veto. I guess the question that the body has to make now is, are we committed to these projects? And I guess the Appropriations Committee, that was the first hurdle, that we said, yes, we feel that we should move forward because under the Governor's proposal by delaying them, I mean if you delay them, you should just say no to them, and I guess my idea is I'd rather just say no to them than delay them two more years, and that is probably editorializing on myself there. But the committee, basically what LB 9 does, instead of expending, effective '93-94, \$5.8 million, in '94-95 \$7.2 million, that was the way 760, present law, says we are going to build UNO, UNK, the Institute, and Wayne State College facilities with that amount of money appropriated each of the next biennium, instead of doing that, we are going to earmark cigarette tax, as we often do in the state, as we've done with other things at UNO and Kearney, around the State of Nebraska, we, basically what we are going to do, instead of now there is a 5.8 and \$7.2 million commitment for each year in the next biennium, we are going to back that down to a \$2.9 million commitment for each year in the next biennium, and basically free up about \$7 million to address our General Fund, what was the terminology we agreed to use, I forget what it is, to free up money from this cigarette tax to flow towards the General Fund to solve part of our General Fund imbalance. So that is what this bill would do. And basically what it does, instead of paying these things on a pay-as-you-go basis, the next two years we are going to earmark and bond these and pay for these things over the next six years, a \$2.9 million a year is the estimated payment. So instead of paying out \$13 million next biennium, we are only going to pay out about six. So you understand the difference is you are going to pay \$2.9 million in each of the next four years after that, so you are bonding these proposals. Now the one thought is now why on earth would you do something like that. Well, it is just one of those things. Obviously, as many of you are well aware of,