

November 15, 1989 LB 6, 7

and fund future spending, which this appears to do, by justifying those future programs and funding them on their own merits with tax increases. I say we should defeat this amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner, please, followed by Senator Crosby.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I voted no on the amendment. I will vote no on this proposal as well. My reason, I want to certainly acknowledge that I appreciate Senator Landis' attitude that he would not want to see this amendment stay on the bill. There are a couple of things I think should be repeated or corrected, rather, that have been repeated on the floor. The passage of LB 7 does not cause a \$12 million loss, that is gone, based on the court decision. As a matter of fact, if the agreement that apparently is being resolved between the litigants, the loss is 8.7 million, I believe, rather than 12. And, if you assume that that will carry on the next two years, that is the number. What really is at stake in LB 7 is whether you want to make that maybe 42 million, or if the class action, 120 million of lost funds. That's what it's designed to try and prevent from happening. The letter from the Attorney General indicated, and I planned to introduce this bill in the regular session, but the letter indicated concurrence with the concept, at least he could defend it. But, secondly, to have any impact upon the 243 cases it needed to be enacted this calendar year, and that is why it's there. Yes, I am concerned that maybe the amendment wouldn't get off, or something could happen. Now in good faith I did file a motion, last Monday, to place LB 6 on General File notwithstanding committee action. And that also was in good faith, and it was good faith the concept that if, in fact, the majority of the Legislature wanted to move in this area that that was a vehicle that could be used without jeopardizing the contents of LB 7. And that option is still there. I have not attempted to have that not come up. Senator Haberman's bill. He withdrew the amendments this morning on the committee amendments to LB 7 that were the same as LB 6. I don't know what his attitude is about using it for something else. But it seems to me that that would be the proper route if you wish to have a... "test" the vote, I guess, use that bill, because in the event that it would some how be enacted it doesn't jeopardize anything. I would hope that LB 7 does not become the vehicle. I think it is too much at stake and too significant to chance that kind of reaction by the Supreme Court or some bright