

pay, we recognize the contribution from agriculture, from production agriculture, and that is it. But we're going to soften the language which makes an appropriation an automatic situation to substitute intent language. If production agriculture has done all that it's going to do, then I assume that the additional money, if it's required, is going to have to come from other sources and so I guess I fail to recognize why we need to change that language. And the other thing that bothers me more than a little bit, I think we all know that LB 377, as we know it now before these amendments, was crafted and drafted while the Micron package was going through the Legislature. And while some of us were raising questions about the suitability of supporting Micron, this bill came out in its present form, not with intent language but with language that said there will be this money appropriated in such and such a year. Now that the dust has settled, the language is going to be changed and substituted with intent language and I have to go back and I have to answer to constituents that are calling me and sending me letters and I've had more phone calls today on this bill than any other bill for several days that tell me to flat out oppose 377. And so trying to be responsible to them, and also to the legislation that needs to be passed here, I'm really grasping at trying to find out why, Senator Bernard-Stevens, we need this amendment. And, frankly, as hard as I try, I can't find it in my heart to find any reason to support it. If we...if it's going to take this amendment to put more money in up front, more money up front in the first biennium or two, then I guess...I guess that's politics and we'd have to talk about it, but if we're going to put money up front and even this commitment out so we don't have this cliff in '97-98, then that's a done deal for the first couple of bienniums and I don't...I don't see why we need this amendment. I keep coming back to that. I have to try to justify it if I go back and answer these phone calls I've had today and these letters as to why we would do this. And I can't...I cannot find a reason. It is analogous to 775. It is an economic development project. It is something we need to fund in a responsible manner. I'm not sure there should be this additional checkoff. I'm not sure at all. But I guess...I guess we turn that corner a little bit and unless we want to...

SENATOR LINDSAY: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...refight that battle, unless we want to refight that battle, I guess I'm willing to leave the checkoff