

Senator Haberman is utilizing Rule...Section...Rule 5, Section 6, paragraph (f), which pretty clearly states that there will be a separate appropriation bill following along with a bill. LB 744A is not needed because the appropriation is already in the bill. I am going to support the motion to indefinitely postpone 744A, because the appropriation is already there. I think he raises a good point. It's one that...it appears to me, in reading the rules, that this is a rule we violate with some degree of frequency. As a matter of fact Senator Scofield just had a bill passed on Final Reading that I was asking her how much she was going to pay me if I didn't bring up the fact that there was no separate A bill with it. And I won't quote the amount that she indicated here on the floor. It's probably something that the Rules Committee needs to take a look at, whether we need to be more consistent in enforcing the rule, or whether we need to change this rule to comply with what it is we do. Now Senator Haberman's concern is probably a legitimate one. As a member of a body wishing to pay some attention to the A bills, there was no A bill on this one, so was a particular spending measure, more difficult for him to deal with. One the other side of the issue I might point out that as far as the process goes, and making the process open, having the appropriation appear specifically in the bill itself allows that public that comes down to testify on behalf of a bill, or in opposition to a bill, to know how many dollars will be spent. They can read it in the bill, it's out there for the whole public to see, everybody knows. So I think it's probably, in some cases, a good practice to follow. I think, what I hope the membership would do would be to, first of all, be pleased Senator Haberman brought up the inconsistency here. I'd be a lot more pleased if it had been on somebody else's bill that he'd have brought up the inconsistency on; have this be one of many things the Rules Committee will need to be dealing with here this summer. But I would hope we would, rather than mucking up the process here with advancing an A bill that has identical language to language that is already contained within the bill, I would prefer that we follow the course of action of IPPing 744A, recognizing that the appropriation is already there on 744, but use this as an instructional sort of time so that we can try to reconcile our practice with the rules, or our rules with our practice, whichever the case may be. I appreciate Senator Haberman's filing the IPP motion on this bill, and I will be supporting it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Haberman, you still have five, six minutes.