

short, again at that time, of seeing that issue resolved. Well, being undaunted, I came back again this year with a version of that compromise and LB 432 was introduced and heard by the Government Committee. LB 432 attempts to recognize again what Senator Johnson and I did last year, to balance the right of the corporations that apply for and receive benefits under LB 775 with the public's right to know what they are getting for their money under that piece of legislation. It does provide for aggregates of 10, at least, so that no individual corporation would have all of its information released. It attempts to still, though, identify for the public who is winning and who is losing, who is gaining and who is not under that piece of legislation. Well, the hearing, I thought, went very well and I commend the Government Committee for what I thought was one of the best public hearings this Legislature has had. The Revenue Department came in, and the Chamber of Commerce came in and they said, you can't figure this stuff out, they can play with the numbers, we will, we will. And, of course, the Government Committee said, what, what are you talking about here? And, of course, there was quite a challenge of the Government Committee and the Revenue Department in the chamber about the unsubjective figures that were being released by the Revenue Department. I thought the committee challenged the executive branch and the private sector quite well on that, and I was quite confident the bill would come out of committee. I planned on picking it as a priority bill. Unfortunately, some problems got into the way, and the committee eventually killed the bill a couple of weeks ago. Why they killed the bill and the circumstances of it are why I'm discussing it with you right now. I'm very concerned about the way this issue was handled and I do not plan to let it die. The bill was killed after we had a good, solid four votes in the committee, when I talked to one of the members of the committee that had been there and then not been there on the issue, and he indicated to me that he did not want to vote for the bill because of concerns that, if it came to the floor, I would use it to attack the Governor and use it on a partisan basis. And I indicated at that time that, if it was my intent to do that with this piece of legislation, I'd have done it much longer ago than any time it had come to the floor, that I had a report that had been completed in early January I had not released, that I had not tried to make it a battle between the Governor and myself, not tried to make it a partisan issue, and that I was not going to do that, that I wanted to see this policy enacted. It was important to me, personally, it was my own priority and that I made that commitment. Nevertheless,