

LB 1059 is inaccurate. It's wholly inaccurate. It does not make a comparison. The two aren't the same. You have one that is a state aid bill that deals with restructuring the financing of education from now and into the future. LB 866 is a continuation of LB 84. It is another one-year proposal that I would not support even if we did not do LB 1059. If there were not the votes there to do LB 1059, I would not do LB 866 or any form like it. Because I said last year LB 84 should be a one term...a one-year proposal, and we made some mistakes in there. If I could have pulled that back and put a cap on, as Senator Warner rightly chastised me for earlier this session, I would have done that. I learned a lesson there. And I also learned that it probably does not make any sense to do a one-year proposal that does not tie in things like a cap, does not look at a total restructuring additional aid from the state to our educational system. That's what LB 1059 does. That's why I support it. It is a very large spending measure. It is not attractive to my district. They will pay more money in my district with the passage of LB 1059 than they currently do through sales and income, because there's very little benefit in terms of the property tax side. The only attractive thing in LB 1059 for my folks is the cap on spending. The issue as to whether or not LB 866 has been dealt with fairly or unfairly, ladies and gentlemen, I would argue that it's been dealt with very fairly, at least from the standpoint of the Revenue Committee, and I appreciate Senator Hefner's comments on that earlier. Look at your agenda on General File. There are a number of bills that have yet to be heard. Do they then also deserve the same fair treatment that LB 866 and Senator Lamb purports that it deserves? What about LB 854, Senator Lindsay's bill, Senator Lynch's LB 1062, or Senator Morrissey's LB 1151 dealing with the liability act for radioactive waste disposal, Senator Wesely's health data center for health care costs, or Senator Schmit's ethanol proposal? That we're going to deal with I guess here. Senator Lamb's LB 866 happens to be at the bottom of the list and he purports that he's been unjustly dealt with. I would argue, Senator Lamb, that is not the case. The fact of the matter is, yes, it's down at the bottom of the barrel. The fact of the matter is, is that I had a priority bill that was dealt with, it was not advanced so it falls to the bottom of General File, never to see the light of day again. The fact of the matter is, is that these bills are brought out in order; they're dealt with in order. If the proposal merits special order, I guess then that's the Speaker's prerogative. In this case, LB 866 I don't think deserves to be set upon the