

our rural colleagues will likewise try to understand the overall advantage to the state for some of these changes. It's a hard thing to do. As we represent our districts, we have to keep in mind impacts on our districts, on our hometowns, and when they are hurt by different funding formulas, by different fiscal implications, when they're laid out for our home people to take a look at, it's not easy to come back and say, I'm sorry you lost money on something. That's not an easy thing to do, and the public is usually not very forgiving. But I think Senator Warner always tries to appeal to the higher causes that we have, to better policy and programs in the state, and I try to listen to that. I think we all do, and I think that's what I'm trying to suggest here as well. I'm very concerned about the loss of revenue, but I'm also cognizant of the fact that there are other issues at stake here, so I would definitely be interested in hearing from Senator Warner on the background of the bill in a little more detail, and I appreciate the desire to make some of these changes despite some of the concerns I have. With that, I look forward to the discussion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER WITHEM PRESIDING

SPEAKER WITHEM: To discuss the Wesely motion, Senator Warner, followed by Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I appreciate Senator Wesely's comments over the general purpose of the bill and raising some questions. Certainly the issue of balancing a variety of state support to local governments or authorization of the use of state revenue for local government is an issue that frequently has come up over the years and not improperly so, and the desire to look for a balance of benefits certainly is one that we will always have a concern with. You know, we could make the same argument on a bill that's coming up here a little bit later, 1039, that deals with homestead exemption. Both Lincoln and Omaha in that case far exceed the benefit from that in the way of state money compared to anywhere...any other area, and so those...that's a balancing factor. It also would be accurate to say that, at least in my own mind, 1059 or something like it, and I gather from Senator Wesely's letter that he passed out to us a couple of days ago that issue will come back over the next two years and, of course, this bill doesn't take effect for two years. And those two then will become a balancing factor. The reason I think