

not say that Senator Warner was shortsighted. Senator Warner is wily as a fox, and I know what he's doing here, at least I have an idea of what he's doing here. Senator Warner believes that state government should, and I'll let him speak for himself and he'll clearly correct me if I'm wrong, which he's done in the past, but he believes that government should spend tax dollars for certain things. Government should spend tax dollars for...to provide roads. Government should spend tax dollars to provide education. Government should provide tax dollars, to a certain extent, to take care of the social needs that are out there, and we should make sure that we have a legitimate court system that's in place that we adequately fund. It's all that other ancillary stuff that gets tossed into the budget that muddles things up from time to time and eats up those tax dollars. And I was sitting here just kind of laughing. The more I thought about it the more, I could be off base, but the more I thought about this is just very neat and clean, and it does do what somebody who would want to see those priorities of state government, and I clearly believe that I would concur, that those are priorities of state government, to a certain extent, be protected to be insured to receive as adequate a funding base as possible. The problem is it doesn't allow for much flexibility; it does, as Senator Wickersham pointed out and Senator Warner very honestly stated, not bind us into the future, as long as you can get two acts passed in the same session to change a provision. I mean the problem is we...if on a Friday afternoon during the budget process on an appropriations bill you can get one passed you're real damn lucky. I mean I've never seen anybody asleep at the wheel, in my short tenure here, when we're dealing with the budget bills. And I mean to have two of them that have to go through that tunnel in order to come out into the light and be adopted would, I think, pose a real significant hurdle for somebody to overcome. So I mean I just again state that I think it's a measure that would allow for priorities to be set, but I think it is a mistake, long range, for those people. And frankly it's kind of ironic because when you look at the committee statement, and you look at the proponents, the proponents represent the education industry. They threw in the Nebraska Farm Bureau for, I guess, just good balance, at least they showed up and testified instead of offering a letter. But anyway, it is a, I think, a proposal that, as Senator Moore said, you need to look long and hard on. I'm not willing to jump in and hold my nose. I'm going to stay out of the puddle and see what happens. But I clearly believe that there are more long range implications