

Lamb is in and his frustration over the fact that the \$20 fee as (inaudible) the bill passed two years ago, and that was what supposedly this body promised, and I understand his desire to hold to that promise, as it is mine. I think the committee amendments strike a reasonable balance to allow, if the fund...if the fee is legitimately an issue for somebody, they want to get it at \$20 this first time around, they will have the ability to do that. I think, I guess I am comfortable that the word of state government has been kept, particularly with the committee amendments. One of the lessons maybe all of us can learn from this whole situation is that oftentimes what is done when we are debating bills in this body, we try and do all we can to low...get the A bills as minimal as we can, get the fees down as low as we can, and, obviously, that is something we all want to do. And I don't know if this is the case where maybe a couple of years ago we were just not realistic enough on all sides of things to get a legitimate fund source to operate this program, I don't know. One of the reasons, there was a mistake, and I think maybe somebody may want me to bring it up is that initially it was thought there was more federal funds could be used to implement this program, and those federal funds, unfortunately, a chunk of those federal funds were used to apply towards a cost on the computer system, a cost overrun, that cost more money that they wanted it to because there was a variety of things that happened there. And possibly had all those federal funds would have been gone towards this, you may not have needed to raise this fee quite as much. But, nevertheless, we are in a situation where talk about confidence in state government is certainly my concern, and I believe it was the Appropriations Committee's concern. Unless there is some additional funds in this program, Senator Nelson talked about the problems in Grand Island and I think we all have got a call or two during our tenures from people that were miffed about the driver's license examining process. It is certainly not our intent to jeopardize that further because none of us like to get those phone calls. I think to prevent us from getting those phone calls, we need to do something, and I think the bill as it now stands is that something that we can all live with. And I simply would ask the body to move LB 854, and I think Senator Lamb has made his point perfectly clear. He is not happy about changing this. I understand that, but I think this is something we all need to do to keep government and this whole driver's license examining process running smoothly.

SPEAKER BAACK PRESIDING