

hospital or whether he has returned home. So, do what you think you want to on that. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, some new bills.

CLERK: Mr. President, new bills. (Read LB 463-472 by title for the first time. See pages 242-44 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, new A bills. (Read LB 303A, and LB 309A by title for the first time. See pages 244-45 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, in conjunction with that, I have a motion from the Speaker. Mr. President, the motion offered by the Speaker relates to LB 309A and 303A. It moves to suspend Rule 5, Section 6(f) to refer those two A bills to the Appropriations Committee.

FRESIDENT: (Gavel.) If I could have your attention a moment, please, we're going to our Speaker for a special motion. Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. President, members. The motion which I have offered is essentially to suspend Rule 5, Section C, subsection (f) which indicates that each appropriations bill is to be placed on General File and considered as introduced by the introducer of the original bill or by the committee which offered the amendments creating the expenditure. The purpose of the motion is to suggest that these two appropriations bills, which are aligned with 303A...or 303 and 309, the salary bill and the health insurance bill, go to the Appropriations Committee as opposed to being referenced directly to General File. The A bills have come over from the Governor's office for the first time, at least in my memory, as A bills, and it seems only practical that the A bills go along with the policy statement in 303 and 309, let the Appropriations Committee handle them, amend or change, if necessary, and come back with the main line bill. That is essentially it, Mr. President. I would move for the adoption of the motion to suspend the rules.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Barrett. The question is the suspension of the rules, and at the same time you are voting on sending these two bills to the Appropriations Committee. So it will be one vote, requires 30 votes. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

March 21, 1989

LB 77, 228A, 258, 456, 468, 587, 597
683

CLERK: (Read record vote. See pages 1252-53 of the Legislative Journal.) 28 ayes, 11 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to raise the bill.

PRESIDENT: The motion passes. Anything for the record about now, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: Yes, sir, I do. Your Committee on Appropriations, whose Chair is Senator Warner, reports LB 258 to General File, and LB 468 to General File with amendments, signed by Senator Warner. Health and Human Services Committee reports LB 456 to General File with amendments. That is signed by Senator Wesely. Senator Haberman has amendments to LB 587 to be printed; Senator Abboud to LB 597. (See pages 1253-56 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, a new A bill, LB 228A. (Read for the first time by title. See page 1257 of the Legislative Journal.) That is all that I have, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: We move on then to LB 77.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 77 is a bill introduced by Senator Warner. (Read title.) The bill was introduced on January 5. It was referred to the Banking, Commerce, and Insurance Committee for public hearing. The bill was advanced to General File and I do have committee amendments pending by the Banking, Commerce, and Insurance Committee, Mr. President. (See page 679 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Landis, are you going to handle the amendment? Senator Conway, are you prepared to handle that as Vice-Chairman of the committee?

SENATOR CONWAY: Mr. President and members, speaking on behalf of the committee, the committee amendments that were applied to LB 77 were purely technical. The committee amendments would insert and amend Section 81-8,239.01 to give the State Risk Manager the authority to carry out the duties prescribed by the bill as introduced, purely technical, but giving authority to the State Risk Manager.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Hannibal, did you wish to speak about the committee amendments. I don't see Senator Hannibal

April 5, 1989

LB 468, 651

financial aid. With that, I hope the committee amendments themselves are not controversial. If anybody has any questions or comments on the committee amendments, I'd be happy to have Senator Hall respond.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Warner, did you wish to speak about the committee amendments?

SENATOR WARNER: Just briefly, and this will be on the bill as well. Senator Withem indicated there is, as we all know, some area of disagreement I guess on how these funds are to be distributed. There is another bill which takes a somewhat different approach, actually it establishes a second distribution formula, LB 468, which is also a committee priority bill and, obviously, the option would be to argue on this one but I'm willing to assume that we'll get to 468 at a later time. I do...I may ask, I don't know if I should ask Senator Withem or Senator Hall, but with the committee amendments after they are adopted, and based upon the current level of appropriation, do you have an idea of what the percentage or dollar shift that would be likely to occur between the various sectors by virtue of this bill?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Warner, it is my understanding with the committee amendments, that basically there won't be a shift, that the privates will continue to I think receive approximately 40 percent that they currently do of the funds that are available.

SENATOR WARNER: And there would be no reduction in the four-year public institutions?

SENATOR HALL: Not...it's my understanding that there would not be.

SENATOR WARNER: Okay. Well, we can probably see how it comes out later, but I have no objection at the moment to adoption or advancing the bill but obviously if 468 is, for some reason or another, not able to come up, why then we can bring the issue up again, but it is my understanding, at least, that there probably is, as a practical matter, some significant shift from some of the current sectors to different sectors, as it is written with the committee amendment, but we can check that out later.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Hall, please.

the aid materially affects the choice of institution or can for the simple fact that need is based on tuition. So, yes, the aid is for students but, no, there is not a neutral impact depending on formula as to how the funds are distributed in the sense of what sector the individual might go to. So I don't want to get in the argument of between those two things, but there is a significant difference in how you determine need. But in any event, I appreciate the comment that there is no change in the distribution between sectors, or the eligibility of students to go to different sectors if that is a more accurate way to say it, although I have a strong suspicion that the bill as amended will...may have a material impact as to the distribution of those funds. So I just wanted to say that and, Senator Hall, you probably are correct. I don't particularly care to attempt to amend 651, but obviously if LB 468 is not reached too, we, as you indicated, will have the argument at some future date, so...

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Wesely, please, then Senator Elmer.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. President, members, I have reservations about the bill. Senator Hall has indicated it doesn't make a shift, it's a clarification. Of course, if that's the case, I'm not sure we need to proceed with the legislation, but I have suspicions that it is more than that, but I guess we have to have that confirmed. Let me get down to the basics once again on what we're dealing with here because it will come up with the tuition tax credit issue and I think we're going to have to debate this eventually. We talked with the Jefferson-Hamilton people once again, but this is a basic fundamental question, been around a long time about the role private education and the government and what interaction there ought to be between the two. And I have long felt and held to this view that private education is free to do what they want to do and ought to be able to proceed with as little interference from the government as possible, but at the same time, we're seeing in recent years the desire in private education to get public funds involved. And as a result, they have come in for different efforts to bring in more public money, more public money into private education. I think they do so at their own peril as Jefferson would have said, that anytime you go into the government and ask for money there are strings attached and there is potential for developments that they can't even foresee at this time, that I don't think they really want to see happen, don't expect to happen but could happen down the road. And I

April 5, 1989

LB 84, 95, 468, 651

PRESIDENT: Senator Abboud.

SENATOR ABOUD: Question

PRESIDENT: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? Yup, sure do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, to cease debate.

PRESIDENT: Debate has ceased. Senator Hall, would you like to close on the advancement?

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, just briefly, LB 651 in my opinion is a clarification of the statutes. With the committee amendments, it protects all those involved but the bill as well as the statutes deal with aid to students. Whether those be students in a public or a private institution, they are students. They are students that are looking for an education and the ability to achieve some financial support in that process. It is not a threat to anyone and it's not a threat to anyone I guess unless they think that education in one institution is a threat to students who choose to seek their education in a different institution. I don't think education is a threat to anyone. I would urge the body to advance LB 651 to Select File, knowing full well that should LB 468 not come up on General File discussion, that we will fully discuss the merits of both sides of this issue on Select File at that time. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. The question is the advancement of the bill. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the advancement of LB 651.

PRESIDENT: The bill is advanced. Mr. Clerk, something for the record.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senators Hall, Chizok and Moore have amendments to be printed to LB 84, and Senator Landis, amendments to LB 95. (See page 1540 of the Legislative Journal.) That is all that I have, Mr. President.

allows for figuring in the cost of the institution in determining whether a student is needy or not needy. Nebraska, we piggyback on the Pell Grant program which does not figure in cost of the institution. LB 65...last summer an Attorney General's Opinion came down indicating that that method of distribution is incorrect, that we must distribute dollars with a factor determining the cost of the institution. LB 651, which is an Education Committee priority bill brought to us by Senator Hall, in effect restates existing statute, clarifying legislative intent that we want a formula that will take into account the cost of the institution, the cost of attending the institution. LB 468, which is a bill that was referred to the Appropriations Committee, has a committee amendment and if that committee amendment is adopted, it will create a new scholarship program. It will leave the SSIG program with a paltry sum of money in it, the bare minimum we need to receive the federal match, that will be distributed based on the cost of institution and will create a new program, create a new program that we can distribute the money any way we want to with, I think, the intent being that it will be distributed, as it has historically been distributed, with a bias to students that attend public institutions. The amendment to LB 812, as I best understand it, the Section 11 of LB 812 is designed to be a retroactive appropriation. It's a design to reappropriate dollars that have already been spent, to put them into a program that does not yet exist. Now why would we be doing that? Again, as near as I can figure out, it is because the federal government has what they call a maintenance of effort requirement. In order to qualify for your matching dollars for this program that goes to aid needy students, you must maintain a level of appropriation. You cannot deviate below, I believe it is your three-year average. Last year this Legislature did appropriate an overmatch, \$750,000 more than we had in any previous year to this particular program. If that is maintained, if we continue to count that as dollars that went into the SSIG program, we will not be able to lower our appropriation if it goes into the SSIG program. In other words, we won't be able to fund this new program, LB 468, with existing dollars, we'll have to create and put new dollars in and the dollars we do have will then have to go into a program that is less advantageous to students that attend public schools. So what, again, supposition, what I am assuming that this bill is doing, it's attempting to go back to satisfy the federal government, make an accounting change to correct the appropriation we made last year to make it appear as though the dollars didn't really go to this SSIG program, they

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wehrbein is announcing some guests in our north balcony, seven members of the Cottage Homemakers Group from Elmwood, Nebraska. Would you ladies please stand and be recognized. Thank you. We're glad you could be with us. Also, Senator Moore has some guests under the south balcony, Don and Cybil Beller from Omaha. Would you folks please take a bow. Thank you for visiting. Senator Hannibal, discussion on the Withem amendment, followed by Senators Scofield and Withem.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Mr. Speaker and members, I rise to oppose the amendment and I have no quarrel with what has been said at all by any of the speakers before me. Senator Hall, Senator Warner and Senator Withem, I think they have all made very true and accurate statements. I think it's important that you understand that this amendment precludes us from making a policy decision later and I think that all three have admitted that that is correct and what Senator Warner has said is correct that it precludes us from making a statement, a policy decision later. All we are doing with this particular program is allowing us to have two separate areas so we can continue as a body to make a policy statement and that statement may come down in the form of LB 468 or in the form of LB 651 or in the form of no action whatsoever, in which case I believe it's accurate to say that 651 will essentially be the policy that we will have. I'm going to take it one step further and say that maybe it is time to make a policy decision on this issue because it will be a signal as to whether we do want to have our emphasis on scholarships to go towards...more towards private institutions or more towards public institutions. I have made that decision and I do recognize, I recognize all the good arguments that the private institutions do make and they make some excellent arguments and the fact that the private institutions play a vital role in our state higher education system is not insignificant. It is very significant. As a matter of fact, Mr. Oberg argues at length about the...about the fact that what if we didn't have our independence? Our state institutions, the university, state colleges and the technical community colleges would...the enrollment would vastly increase, I assume. And if it did so because every student that we have in our institution is subsidized by taxpayers' dollars, then our taxpayers' dollars would go much more towards our public institutions. So the private institutions do honestly play a very valuable role in our taxpayers' decisions, not just the role of education but in the taxpayers' decisions as well. However, on the other side of the coin, we are making a significant effort to educate

that is traditionally used in the Appropriations Committee, and that is Senator Withem was concerned about the possible creation of a new program which, in fact, would require statutory authority and sometimes when you get to talking appropriations jargon it doesn't come across perhaps as clearly as it should. All that's being done in the section that Senator Withem is concerned about is it uses program as an accounting convention and it gives us maximum flexibility in this state then to make whatever choice, whatever policy choice you as individual senators would choose to make either on LB 468 or LB 651. So...in fact, the actual effect of striking this language would mean that then we would need to go in and recalculate that maintenance of effort figure and would raise that maintenance of effort level. Now that may not seem all that serious until you realize the implications of this which Senator Hannibal has started to discuss, and the implications of that are that we're going to effect then a major shift of our state's resources to public institutions. Now I'm perfectly willing to support a program that gives some help to students at...I'm sorry, that will make a major shift to private institutions and I'm perfectly willing to comply with federal law and to support at some level students going to private institutions, but my philosophy is our first obligation is to the poorest students in this state. And I want to maintain maximum flexibility as an individual senator then to allocate whatever money we decide to put out there as a body towards scholarship funds. I want to make sure that I am indeed helping the poorest students in the state and I don't want my hands tied by federal maintenance of effort language. Maintenance of effort language is a custom that has come down from us with the blessings of Washington and a lot of areas and it really limits the kinds of flexibility that we have in this state and that's always a consideration. It doesn't matter what area it is. If you have a maintenance of effort level to take care of, you've always got to continue that level. That is what maintenance of effort means. That ties your hands in terms of making the kinds of shifts in these, whatever additional funds we might want to eventually allocate for purposes of scholarships, depending on the choice you make on this particular bill here. And let me just throw out a couple of figures here that I think illustrates the real problem here and why we have to be so sensitive about this. Right now, total public sector of SSIG awards of income levels, in '86-87 in public institutions 76 percent of those students who got assistance came from a family with income under 20,000. Only 6 percent had an income over 30,000, contrasted with private

colleges and universities where 54 percent of those students came from a family of under 20,000 but 18 percent had over 30,000. Figuring in the need factors into this, if you define need as how much it costs to go to a particular institution, then that is, obviously, going to skew where the distribution of these funds go. My preference is to send, to help as many students as possible in this state and to certainly help the students who need the help most and I think we need to be very cautious as we make these decisions because you could unwittingly I think end up making a shift that none of us, and I suspect Senator Withem would not with his history of support for public education, while he is probably as willing as I am to do something for private institutions I would guess that his priority is public education.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: And we will make those decisions under LB 468 and LB 651, one or the other, but I want to maintain a maximum flexibility here to make sure the money goes to that poorest group of students. So the issue, Senator Hall, isn't, in fact, do we follow the statutes or change them? The issue is who do you want to emphasize and do you really want to help the poorest students? As I said, those policy choices will actually be made in either LB 651 or LB 468, and the decision being made here is whether you're going to strike that maintenance of...what are you going to do with that maintenance effort language? Are you going to tie your hands as a legislator then to make choices about where you want to direct the funds? So I would urge you to recognize that the use of the term program in here is, in fact, an accounting convention that gives directions to DAS, gives us maximum flexibility as a body then to decide where you want to put it. If you want to put the majority of the funds to private institutions, you have that option on whatever bill we deal on. I will not do that. I will choose to try to strike some kind of equitable balance between private and public institutions and so...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: ...I would urge you to reject the amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Withem, followed by Senator Schmit.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, there's two or three points I would like to make and I would appreciate it maybe if Senator Warner or Senator Hannibal or somebody else that has their light on to speak...excuse me, Senator Hannibal, you don't and that's fine, just leave your light off, that would be fine too. If anybody else is going to be speaking on this though with some degree of knowledge, I would appreciate it if they would address a couple of points when they get up. I've got other points to make so I'm not going to share my time with these. But it is my understanding...I will make the assertion and somebody else can challenge it if they care to, that the language in an appropriations bill must have a statutory change to accompany it. You cannot make a substantive change in the way a state program...and I'm using the term "program", not as an accounting term but as an activity of state government that has been authorized by the Legislature, and that you cannot make this change into this new program that it's an accounting function unless the Legislature passes substantive legislation. In other words, if LB 468 or legislation like it does not pass that gives the statutory authorization to create this new program, what we say in our appropriations bill about transferring money is relatively meaningless and I think that...I hope that's the way the system operates and I think it does challenge that assertion if it is different. The second thing that I just don't understand how we can do this and this is a major reason why I'm proposing this amendment, we have already spent this money. This money has now been translated into books, into tuition, into room and board and, hopefully, into positive sorts of things by young people, by young people who are in the universities and colleges of our state. They have already spent it. We are not appropriating new dollars. What we're doing is going back in an attempt to fool the federal government, and I use that term recognizing it's a harsh term, to fool the federal government that we didn't really mean what we did, we're redefining how we spent the money. And I think that's bad policy. I think it's bad procedure and I would be interested in knowing, number one, when we've done this in the past, and, secondly, maybe more importantly when it's worked, when the federal government has believed us when we said, hey, we didn't really mean to spend that \$750,000, we were just kidding about that last year when we spent it. What we really meant to do was put it into this new program even though this new program doesn't exist. I don't think we can do that. I don't think you can fool the federal government by

asking you to vote on. Section 11 of the bill is, in my opinion, an attempt to reappropriate dollars that have already been spent by students attending colleges and universities in our state. A bookkeeping reappropriation to a new program that the Legislature has not yet authorized, has not yet created, will create when and if LB 468 passes, which I, frankly, hope it does not, but the sole purpose of this amendment is to convince somehow the federal government when they look at maintenance of effort that we didn't really spend this money the way we did. And I still have not heard where that's ever worked before, where we have been able to tell the federal government that we didn't really mean to spend those dollars that way, kind of a king's X to them that we didn't really mean to do that. Beyond that is the larger policy question and that policy question is that the dollars that we appropriate to help students, that we help students go to the universities and colleges in this state, whether students that choose to attend private institutions...keep in mind these aren't all wealthy kids that attend private institutions, but students that attend private institutions, whether they ought to be able to compete for those scholarship dollars on an equitable sort of basis. Also, keep in mind that LB 651, Senator Hall's bill, the Education Committee amendments have...give the Secondary Coordinating Commission an opportunity to cap, based on student resources, so the students...the wealthy students wouldn't qualify for this particular program. So we're not talking about giving dollars just to wealthy students as opposed to poor students, we're talking about students that attend those institutions that the state doesn't spend a quarter of a billion dollars a year in operating ought to have the same opportunity to qualify for those dollars. If you amend LB 812 by striking this language, you will be going a long way toward accomplishing that objective. For that reason, I urge you to adopt the Withem amendment to LB 812 which will strike Section 11 from the bill.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. And the question is the adoption of the Withem amendment to LB 812. Those in favor please vote aye, opposed nay. Voting on the Withem amendment. Have you all voted? Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes let's do a call of the house and a roll call vote, please.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Clear the board, Mr. Clerk. Members will vote on placing themselves under call. Shall the house go under

May 9, 1989

LB 468, 651, 812

with educational telecommunications funding of \$70,000 of General Funds, \$210,000 worth of Cash Funds that will allow us to go into a contractual arrangement to purchase a transponder for telelearning, that will put us into the satellite communications program and this program, we feel, needs to go on very quickly as well. Back to the pharmacy school, if the pharmacy school program does not start until the first of August, then those that want it not to go ahead, those that want it to be delayed will be successful and that's fine if that is your goal. But to not have the emergency clause on it will be the same thing as just voting against it, in my estimation. Now I...I don't know exactly what contractual things could happen there but I believe that's the case and I think we ought to be up front about that. There are two other sections in here. I don't know that they would be...well, even the SSIG funds, the program that Senator Withem was concerned with and I believe that there is agreement now that what we are trying to do is do a budgetary accounting process. It needs to be done before the end of the fiscal year so that we don't lock ourselves into an inflexible position with regards matching of federal funds or having, once you put funds into a program that you are bound by that program to keep those funds there, a maintenance of effort situation, that if we can move the funds and put them in two different programs, it gives us the flexibility to be able to make the policy decisions that the body wants to make. I believe that all the parties that are part of that that have been on both sides realize that we are not trying to establish a policy position with 812, merely leaving us in a position to establish a policy position whether it be with LB 468, LB 651, or with no passage of any...with passage of no law at all and have the current law stay in effect. For those reasons, if...if you can...if you are trying to voice a frustration for this process, you don't have to feel alone. We are all having frustrations with it. But to not...not vote for the E clause would be seriously damaging not only the pharmacy school but several other programs that I would hope you would reconsider.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Hall, please, followed by Senator Withem and Senator Moore.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, and members, I rise in opposition to the reconsideration motion. I appreciate Senator Hannibal's concern to have this issue behind us as soon as possible but the fact of the matter is that there really is no good reason to rush into any of these things. And I think what

sides, but I think this set of amendments do a couple of things that I think are very worthwhile. Number one, it tends to answer most of the concerns of most people on both sides. Senator Warner had a very real legitimate concern about maintenance of effort, and by creating the two programs, we are able then to deal with the maintenance of effort approach. There were some concerns that if we had two different programs, then the Legislature through the Appropriations Committee would simply recommend funding for one program that is favorable to the publics over the one that is favorable to the privates, and we have a provision here indicating that, in Section 30 of the bill, that the two programs will be funded substantially equal amounts, and it otherwise would then become a violation of the statute, and I would not just say it is not intent language, it goes into the statute. What we are doing is the program that many of you maybe were lobbied on in LB 468 that set up the separate program, and the way 468 was originally written, the lion's share of the dollars would be appropriated to that fund and, frankly, they would be appropriated in a manner probably preferable to...favorable to the public schools. That portion of the bill is put in; also some changes in 651 to lock into the statute a distribution formula that was proposed, substantially proposed by the independent schools. I think it is a good way of resolving this issue. It is one that takes an inordinate amount of legislative time, particularly when you look at the total numbers of dollars involved with this, so I think it is a good idea, and I would urge you to adopt this. Being this is Senator Hall's original time, I would cede back any time that he may...to him more time than he may wish to use.

SPEAKER BARRETT: About 3 1/2 minutes, Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President and members. The amendment before you as has been stated by both Senator Withem and Senator Warner is a compromise proposal that the three of us agreed on. Now you may be lobbied by the independents who I brought LB 651 to the body for, and they are not very happy with the proposal that is before you, but at this point in time, I am willing to support this amendment that Senator Withem, Senator Warner, and myself have come to terms on because of, specifically, the things that both of those gentlemen have pointed out. The increased funding does hold the individuals harmless with regard to the public institutions. There is an influx of an additional \$117,000, roughly, a little over that, into the private independent sector, and there is put into

statute provisions with regard to the SSIG monies, the funding formula that I think was the original intent of that program when it was established in law 11 years ago. The first or the division with regard to two separate programs, two separate funding formula, has always been the crux to the issue. I am willing to let that work and to see how that operates for a couple of years, and if, at some point down the road, that that does not work in a fair and open manner, I think it will, but if it doesn't, then I guess I will be back and try to address it at that time, but I think now it is time to put this issue behind us, adopt this amendment that allows for a shift, and a shift to a great extent, virtually half of the \$250,000 of additional monies will flow into the independents. I think it is due them based on the Attorney General's opinion that was rendered in relation to the way the commission had been handling this issue, and I think what we do is we resolve this issue for today, and should it be necessary to take it up in the future, fine, we will always be around to do that, I guess, someone will. But at this point in time, I think that this is a compromise that both sides should live with. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Warner, your light is on, followed by Senators Moore, Hall, and Nelson.

SENATOR WARNER: Yeah, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, a thought occurred to me. There is one other point that would not be shown on the handout. This only deals with the General Fund distribution. All of the federal funds would be distributed under the program that is I guess described more favorable for the independents. So, they also would have additional federal funds than what they currently have if this amendment is adopted, but the General Fund distribution, which is the only thing the state would have any control over, is as portrayed on the sheets here.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members, like I said yesterday, you know, in this business, nobody gets everything, nobody gets nothing. Eventually, everybody gets something. In this case, that is finally what we have agreed on here and I compliment Senators Hall, Withem and Warner for coming to the table because, obviously, if you'd have passed LB 651, in the public sector's mind, they would have got nothing. If you'd have passed LB 468 in its pure form, the private sector would