

September 30, 1992 LB 9

SENATOR WARNER: Okay.

SENATOR MOORE: Okay.

SENATOR WARNER: Actually, as I indicated, that accelerates it over what 760 did.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, accelerates...

SENATOR WARNER: So I...

SENATOR MOORE: ...accelerates it over 760, it would keep on the same time frame as LB 9 in its original form?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, at first glance, I think Senator Warner's amendment, I would prefer it over Senator Beutler's. You save...the difference between short term and long term and I guess as I talk I don't know what I am going to do, but on the upside, you are saving a million, two in interest, that's real dollars. The problem I have is that you...is your \$2.3 million for the biennium and I guess it is slightly under a hundred, or right at a hundred, I think it is about 97.8 for the special session, but still, nevertheless, you are saving \$1.2 million and I guess at this point in time I'd support Senator Warner's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Schmit. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I just rise to support the Warner amendment. I think it is a good middle ground. It accomplishes what I think the Appropriations wanted to do by advancing LB 9 in its present form, and yet it also recognizes the long-term difficulties of incurring debt. I do want to emphasize only for the record, I suspect, that what it will do is I think lower the short-term fiscal on the status sheet about I would guess approximately, ball park, 2.2, 2.3 million. In the long term, we would then save 1, 1.2 or so million dollars plus what we would save also is inflation that might go up if we delay in the increased construction costs. So over the long term, it may, in fact, almost be a wash and I think it is a good amendment and