

amendment was improperly drafted and I don't think it could have been implemented in any event. And I want to raise that point because of the process that we're using today to consider this amendment. We're on Final Reading with a very, very controversial proposal. We cannot amend what we have before us to correct errors, as I pointed out earlier in the in lieu of tax provision. We could not bring an amendment directly to change the years in which the bill would be effective. If, in fact, that would not work, we have to go through a cumbersome procedure of bringing it back from Final Reading. We can't divide the question. We cannot deal with this very, very controversial issue in the same way that we would have dealt with it on General File and on Select File. Now you can accuse me of trying to throw out a red herring and argue whether or not what I'm talking about really has any merit as far as the issue is concerned. But I think that when we have a very, very controversial issue like this and it is bound up in a procedural manner so that we cannot debate it and consider it fully, that is something important for us to consider. Quite frankly, if this issue had come up on LB 348, there would have been amendments to it, perhaps more amendments. I had amendments filed that I think would have put in place elements that, if we're going to have a common levy, I believe would be desirable. You can read those amendments on page 2606 of the Journal. One of those amendments would have attempted to address the question that I think is a very real question and that is how do you control the spending of the Class Is once you go to a common levy. It would have started to address that question and I think that's a very, very real question, notwithstanding Senator Withem's assurances that somehow the lid is to take care of it. Anybody who is halfway clever and has a bunch of built-up budget authority in a Class I, the lid will not solve that problem and the lid can be worked around if you're dedicated enough and smart enough. The lid is not the total answer to the question about what you do to control spending in a Class I in a common levy situation. It simply is not the total answer, maybe an answer for those who aren't clever enough, who aren't dedicated enough...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: ...or frugal enough, but it is not the total answer. I still ask the body to reject the Withem amendment. I know we've taken a great deal of time on this. Maybe we would have even gotten to LB 348 if we hadn't have all