

statute provisions with regard to the SSIG monies, the funding formula that I think was the original intent of that program when it was established in law 11 years ago. The first or the division with regard to two separate programs, two separate funding formula, has always been the crux to the issue. I am willing to let that work and to see how that operates for a couple of years, and if, at some point down the road, that that does not work in a fair and open manner, I think it will, but if it doesn't, then I guess I will be back and try to address it at that time, but I think now it is time to put this issue behind us, adopt this amendment that allows for a shift, and a shift to a great extent, virtually half of the \$250,000 of additional monies will flow into the independents. I think it is due them based on the Attorney General's opinion that was rendered in relation to the way the commission had been handling this issue, and I think what we do is we resolve this issue for today, and should it be necessary to take it up in the future, fine, we will always be around to do that, I guess, someone will. But at this point in time, I think that this is a compromise that both sides should live with. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Warner, your light is on, followed by Senators Moore, Hall, and Nelson.

SENATOR WARNER: Yeah, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, a thought occurred to me. There is one other point that would not be shown on the handout. This only deals with the General Fund distribution. All of the federal funds would be distributed under the program that is I guess described more favorable for the independents. So, they also would have additional federal funds than what they currently have if this amendment is adopted, but the General Fund distribution, which is the only thing the state would have any control over, is as portrayed on the sheets here.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members, like I said yesterday, you know, in this business, nobody gets everything, nobody gets nothing. Eventually, everybody gets something. In this case, that is finally what we have agreed on here and I compliment Senators Hall, Withem and Warner for coming to the table because, obviously, if you'd have passed LB 651, in the public sector's mind, they would have got nothing. If you'd have passed LB 468 in its pure form, the private sector would