

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, Mr. President and members, the idea of a public hearing is, of course, a very laudable one and a very desirable one. I always support that idea. My concern is, as I have expressed earlier, that this will not, in fact, be a true public hearing. We will hear again from, number one, the cities, number two, the counties, number three, the school boards; number four, we are going to hear from Mr. John Boehm. I, myself, will be most interested, Senator Warner, listening to Mr. Boehm come in and testify in support of LB 7 this time because he testified against LB 497 when I introduced the bill during the regular session. And I recognize that conditions change, and I recognize that situations change, and, therefore, of course, we have to sometimes change our position, but I would want to just remind you that Senator Hall doesn't even have the proposed rewrite of LB 1. I would suggest how can the public possibly be prepared to testify on such a bill when they do not have it in their possession even a few hours prior to their coming to the legislative arena. In addition to that, I want to suggest to you that the entire public hearing process ought to be once in awhile for the benefit of the public, so that the citizen, the taxpayer, the individual who has to pay the bill can come in and sit down and tell the Revenue Committee why they want a bill, do not want it. We have many reasons why, of course, the cities and the counties and the schools need to maintain their cash flow. I do not in any way condemn those entities for their interest. They have an obligation and a responsibility to the entities they represent to do so in a manner which maintains to the best of their ability the cash flow necessary to sustain those subdivisions of government. At this point in time, we ought to be listening to the taxpayer to determine if the taxpayer believes that all of the expenditures we have been making and intend to make and will commit to make are necessary and, in fact, ought to be a part of the obligation of the taxpayer. I think we would find it to be substantially different. I would like to ask just in conclusion, how do you propose, how do you propose that western Nebraska, even central Nebraska, can possibly get here to testify on these bills, present their point of view, when they will not have that information before them tomorrow morning. It is not going to work. We are going to listen, we are going to all get together, the same little groups, the same little group of lobbyists, the same narrow point of views will get together in the hearing room, exchange ideas and conversation and quips and jokes, and we will recess. I would just want to suggest, I don't want anyone to take any offense by it, but it will be very, very