

or certainly not very kind comments on how general state aid just kind of gets unidentified. Well, the state, if it wants to provide aid, there are...I can subscribe to the concept, I haven't really bought it yet, but I can subscribe to the concept that you direct where the state money goes. As I indicated a long time ago on this bill on General File, the precedent is there. Up until 1903 that is exactly what we had in the way of state aid, it was a two mill levy that went to local school districts to pay teacher salaries, it was categorical aid. Here is the concept to return to categorical aid. As I understand the bill, and I may be in error but I don't think so, any amount of money can be distributed under the formula. We've set \$20 million, but you could...or at least that appears to be the level. But as the bill is drafted I think you can distribute whatever amount that one would want to distribute. I believe the bill is going to pass, with or without this amendment. I don't think the bill is jeopardized. My support for it is not jeopardized. But I do believe it's much better policy. And I can guarantee you, if we do not put a sunset on this one, then I hope we can find the support to take the sunset on foundation and equalization out of LB 611, if there is time, because that...there is a need, if the theory is you are creating a crisis, there is a need to treat them both the same. It's just that simple. Finally, I would suggest this, there was some reference I believe on the previous amendment of who got what and who lost what. Well, folks, I'll tell you where the money goes is where the votes go. And if distributing 153 million will benefit 25 districts better than under this, LB 89, than they do with LB ...or with the current state aid formula, don't count on the sunset on foundation-equalization going away, it won't very often happen. We argue equity, and we argue what is fair. Well, when it comes to aid distribution we tend to come down on the side...which distribution formula is most beneficial to the area we represent in total, that's just simply how it works. It's worked that way since 1967, and I'm sure it will work for the next 22 years in the same fashion. So I would just suggest that to adopt this amendment conceivably could hurt the bill, I suspect that's possible, but I don't think...I think the votes are there, I've thought so for at least the last three or four weeks, and I've seen nothing to change my mind. I think it will be signed, I don't think it's a veto...a vetoed bill, or will be a vetoed bill. So I would urge for consistency to adopt the amendment...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.