

PRESIDENT: Here is Senator Schmit, so why don't we take his up now?

CLERK: Senator, I had...I believe you gave me one yesterday, and you wanted to withdraw that one and/or gave me...the one you gave me this morning, offer that one.

SENATOR SCHMIT: That is right, that is right.

CLERK: Okay. Mr. President, Senator Schmit would move to amend. It is AM3118. (See pages 1539-43 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit, please.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, and members, there really isn't any difference in those two amendments except that one includes MUD, I believe, and one other political or entity. The amendment which you have before you and which is printed in the Journal, I think Pat could probably tell you what page it is on, is what is known as the Jaksha amendment. The reason that I have printed this and have offered it is because we have sort of agreed, I believe, that with the introduction of 1059 that a lid is necessary. That is sort of a new point of view, I believe, for many of the entities who are now supporting LB 1059. It is apparent to us that without some sort of lid there is not going to be any kind of restraint, or sufficient restraint, to stop the tax burden of the State of Nebraska relative to education. And so there is an attempt to put some kind of lid into 1059, albeit a rather holey lid, a lid with a lot of leaks in it, and not really a very serious attempt at limitations. But I thought you might want to take a look at this because this is probably what we are going to be living with. I may not like it, and it may be something which none of us want to live with. We probably will have serious difficulties, but I would predict, ladies and gentlemen, that this is what we will be living with, and I know that there are those today who say that the passage of 1059 will forestall Mr. Jaksha. Well, I was here, as were some of you, when we did that a few years ago, and we thought that by imposing a statutory lid that there would be no further attempts to bring about a constitutional lid. Well, we know what happened. We imposed a statutory lid. It actually became a floor, and everyone raised their spending to the maximum amount allowed, and it, in fact, became inflationary. I do not know how you can justify a lid, no matter how liberal it is, no