

appropriation on state aid and come to some equitable solution. So for that reason, I am going to be supporting the two-year extension of the hold harmless amendment. Thank you.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Thank you, Senator Abboud. Before we proceed to the next speaker, I would like to introduce some guests of the Legislature. First of all, we have some guests of Senator Hillman, and they are in the south balcony. They are 17 eighth graders from the Cedar Canyon School in Gering, and their teacher. Would you folks please stand and be welcomed by the Legislature. Thank you for being with us. And also the doctor of the day, I would like to introduce the doctor of the day, and he is from Senator Kristensen's district from Kearney. He is Bill Lyons, and his son, Scott, is with him. They are under the north balcony. Would you please stand and be welcomed. Senator Landis, you are next.

**SENATOR LANDIS:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I don't support the hold harmless provision. At the time we talked about 1059, we had a motion to make the hold harmless perpetual. I rose and spoke against it then. When it was...when 1059 was being drafted and there were small groups being organized to discuss it, I made it very clear I wouldn't vote for the bill if it had a perpetual hold harmless in it. Why? Because 1059 represented a change of system from one system that we thought was reasonable or fair to a system that we felt was more reasonable and more fair. The difficulty of hold harmless is that it makes you maintain both systems at the same time. It expands the amount of money necessary to do the deal. Unfortunately, what it means is, look, we had an old system that we decided we needed to change because we felt we could do better, and we felt we could do it more fairly, but to get to the new system, which we believe is more fair, there will be some people that will have some kind of alteration. We have to live with whatever dislocation there was in the old system as part of the new system. It is how the federal government gets its budget expanded, by never injuring anyone, never taking a dollar away, never reallocating even though you have a new system that you think is fairer, more sensible, and, in this case, voted on by the people of the State of Nebraska. They have endorsed 1059 without this provision, and if we are incapable of reallocating money, we will never make budget cuts whatsoever because we will always have to pay off whoever is getting dollar one before we can ever get to the next dollar expenditure. When we make a "C" change like 1059, we should