

I don't think it's absolutely necessary. I think it could be handled in E & R but we might as well be safe. Then the next amendment will be my amendment that would delay it to '95-96, and if we do that, I think we can be settled with this issue. So I would urge you to support this amendment and the next two.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES: Mr. President and members of this body, this kind of changes the picture a little bit but I'm still going to oppose the amendment because in my district it will really affect it. And I wonder how the spending will happen after this. What if a school in town would want to build a...or not build but maybe put a computer system in? Will all the country schools have to chip in and pay for it? Or how much can they do? And I just don't understand how the financial part of it will work on that. And I understood when we passed LB 259 that we was going to leave the country schools, the one-classroom schools alone from then on, but now we're right back in the middle of it again. So I'm really opposed to this because I've got 77 of these Class I schools in my district and that's a lot of people to answer to when I go back home. So I...I just can't see going ahead with this. I sure hope you will go ahead and vote it down. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Jones. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. President. I will try to be brief because I think that we've in most part covered most of the grounds that logically we would have to cover in discussion of this issue. I'm a little bit interested in Senator Withem's amendment, not because I think it is something that I would consider to be a compromise offer, as a matter of fact, I was going to raise the question of whether or not the amendment could even be implemented in the form that it was presented to the body in, because it was supposed to be implemented in the school year '93-94. The bill had the emergency clause on it but, as you know, that takes 30 votes. I didn't know if he would have 30 votes for 839 if the common levy provision was included. Admittedly, some people would have been put in a very hard spot if it had also included the in lieu of tax, but if there weren't 30 votes, it couldn't have been implemented in any event. So I guess maybe we should be grateful for any proposal to delay what I view as a mistake. But I think there were two mistakes. Not only is the common levy a mistake, but the