

I'd like to make a few points. Point number one, Senator McKenzie characterized this amendment as removing any lid from school districts. This amendment does not do that. What this amendment does is it strikes the school portion from this bill which means the current statute will stay in effect and schools will continue to live under...under the lid. One of the most misunderstood things about LB 1059 I think is by among some people that supported it was that the lid in LB 1059 on school districts was meant to be a temporary lid. Never was. Never was meant to be temporary. That was one of the first stare downs we did when we started making compromises to put 1059 together was that there would be a limitation on school districts in perpetuity. One of the commitments we made was, on an annual basis, we would review that lid. That we haven't done. Would also like to point out though that before I'd ran out of time before, Senator Bernard-Stevens indicated I was going to make reference to the lower portion of this sheet, which I find very interesting that our Governor has not done and this isn't one I can say, nor has any other Governor, although that'd be an accurate state, there hasn't been any other Governor since LB 1059 has been in effect than our current one, indicates that the Governor shall, on an annual basis, provide data or the Governor shall prepare necessary legislation for appropriating 45 percent of the cost of public education for the ensuing school year. The Governor shall, on an annual basis, estab...prepare legislation that establishes and implements a basic allowable growth rate and that's supposed to be the Governor shall. The Governor shall submit such legislation along with any modifications made by the Governor as part of his or her annual budget request to the Legislature. Governor hasn't done that. Consequently and because of the inactivity of the Legislature and the inactivity of the Governor, we have ended up with 1059, which again was supposed to have been a breathing, living document, it's going stagnant. A number of issues in that, it was supposed to promote equalization and we found each year since it passed we've moved further and further from the concept of equalization. The first year in place was...was the high water mark in terms of equalization. The tiers that we always have debates in the Rotunda and inside the Education Committee were supposed to have been, I think, just kind of an arbitrary way of starting out with how we characterize school districts. Somehow those have been enshrined in statute and we can't touch those despite the strong efforts of our friends from Lincoln, among others, to do that. The growth in the income, the income factor was placed in the