

an amendment. The substance of the amendment I think at this point is irrelevant because it's a motion to kill and let's look at it for what it is. Senator Wickersham's amendment is just that, to kill the bill. The reason for doing this, of course, the reason for doing this ostensibly is earmarking funds, that that's not a good thing. Well I suggest if we're going to be consistent about that, then let's take a look at the cigarette tax, \$35 million that's earmarked. Let's look at the Highway Trust Fund, 270 million. Let's look at any of the cash funds and we have an entire book full of cash funds that are basically earmarked taxes. If we really believe that earmarking is not a good thing, let's be consistent about it and let's get rid of our pet projects. Let's go through here and pull out the Athletic Commission, the Insurance Department has quite a few of them. It's simply not a valid argument. We use earmarking on a regular basis. We just simply do that and to come up on a Final Reading amendment and say this isn't good policy for earmarking of funds which would constitute, if included in the budget, four one-hundredths of 1 percent is absolutely absurd. The...if we look to the substance of the amendment, what it seeks to do is create an exemption. I don't need to remind people how much time we spent trying to correct the problems that resulted last time we started down the old exemption trail. I don't think it is something we ought to be looking at now. I just...I'm not a big fan of trying to, especially when it's my own bill, but trying to return something on the last day when we had ample opportunity to argue this at the other two stages of debate. It was a priority bill on General File that was debated in the middle of the afternoon so it wasn't like it snuck up on anybody late at night or anything like that. At Select File it was advanced at 11:00 a.m. so it didn't sneak up on anybody then. It simply had the opportunity to be debated at that time and to bring up a motion like this at this time I think is a...I don't think is a fair tactic especially when the reasoning I think is so flawed that there is no attempts to take shots at any other earmarks funds we have and everybody in this body has their pet projects with earmarked funds and if we look, for example, at the cigarette tax to answer another part of Senator Wickersham's argument that we have to tie this into the, somehow into the use of the funds with the source of the funds. How much connection is there with cigarette tax, people smoking cigarettes and buildings being built at Chadron State College or the University of Nebraska? The Bob Devaney Sports Center, how much connection is there with that and cigarettes? It simply is not a rationale we have ever used. It's a rationale that we...I would hope we