

I give the numbers, but I think out of the 32 senators that voted ultimately to override Governor Orr's veto of LB 1059 there were 32 senators who did and I believe there are 14 currently serving in the body. Of those senators that voted no on it, which would have been about 17 senators, I believe there are only 6 of those senators left. What we had when we passed LB 1059 was an attempt by those of us that supported it to have a living and a breathing document that would respond on an annual basis, if needed. It was recognized to be an unfinished work. It was recognized as one that would need annual looks at annual adjustments. Because of that we put some provisions in the statute. We established the School Finance Review Commission to make annual recommendations to us. We provided a number of other things. I would have to admit that as much as anybody else on the floor I'm probably to blame for the fact that it has not been a living, breathing document. We've had a School Finance Review Committee that's been working. We've had outside consultants. I hope that doesn't get Senator Chambers up to the floor here when I use that terminology, but we did have outside consultants take a look at LB 1059 and whether it's working or it's not working. They made a general conclusion that it was generally meeting the objectives we needed, but they suggested that we needed to...needed to take some...some proactive actions to make sure though that it does not fall behind in meeting the goals that were set out. Let me get now then to what this amendment does and why I'm offering this amendment at this point and then I'll probably sit down and be quiet for awhile to see what comments other people may wish to make. One of the things that this Legislature was supposed to do was, on an annual basis, on an annual basis we were supposed to look at this range of spending limitations. We put the lid in LB 1059 to accomplish basically three purposes. Number one, we had an immediate goal and that was everybody told us when we raised sales and income tax that the Legisla...that local schools would not use that money to lower property taxes. They would simply spend that money on new programs. We listened to that argument. We said you're...you might be correct, for that reason we will put a spending limitation into the bill. Secondly, the Legislature committed itself to trying to maintain 45 percent state funding and we said to those local school districts we can't do that. If you have the entire prerogative to raise spending on your own to any level you may wish to, we cannot commit to a 45 percent funding level. Therefore, we're going to put a budget limitation in place. Let me comment on that 45 percent level. We had assumed, as a Legislature, that