

education statutes. And so, for that reason, I think it is perfectly appropriate that it would go to the Education Committee, because really it is a mistake as to which statute was amended, and I think the Executive Board assigned it to the Urban Affairs Committee just looking at the section of statute it was in rather than dealing with the subject matter of the bill. So, for that reason, I would respectfully ask that you rereference it, just as you did rereference Senator Pirsch's bill the other day. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion on Senator McFarland's motion to rerefer LB 225. Senator Hartnett, followed by Senator Withem.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, do we in this body go on the intent of a resolution or a bill? I agree with Senator McFarland if it is going to be education, it should be in Section 79. It should have been drafted that way. The person, the senator carrying it should have, you know, saw that it was that way, and I think it deals with...it is in Section...Chapter 15. This is dealing with city issues, the primary city issues, and I think that you are talking about jurisdictions of the zoning of cities. We heard in the Urban Affairs Committee a bill the other day dealing with surface water. That could have been in Senator Schmit's thing, in his committee, or it could have been in the Urban Affairs Committee, and it was simply assigned to my committee simply because it dealt with the zoning jurisdiction. And so I think bills dealing with that, we are familiar with that, for the couple last year. We have had an interim study on annexation. A few of the people that Senator McFarland are talking about that appeared at Education Committee also appeared at an interim study this summer dealing with annexation and there is some concern. But I think that it if...as the bill is drafted now, and I suggested to Senator McFarland that he could in the Education Committee ask, as Senator Warner does just the opposite of Senator McFarland, is simply ask that it be...the education people look at it differently, but I think it deals with Chapter 15, and I am concerned about the precedent that we are going to say, well, it was an intent that it should go to this committee or that committee rather than what the thrust of the bill, and the thrust of the bill is to change jurisdictions, zoning jurisdictions of a primary city, which is simply Lincoln, and that is my concern that we are going to go on intent because many times the subjects overlap. Thank you.