

regular school spending lids. So I would move for its adoption.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the adoption of the Fowler amendment to LB 765. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: Well, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, I guess the Revenue Committee has spent three-fourths of its time this year listening to requests for exemptions from the lid bill. Most of them are what you would call meritorious requests, but we have put a lid in place and if we are going to exempt everyone who moves, then we have no lid. If we are going to exempt anyone, then by all rights we should exempt everyone. We are just barely into this program that was supposed to cost almost nothing, and I think this year's budget is close to five million dollars. We prescribed that we would exempt the first year of any new program, that applies to everyone and if you are going to let down the bars now then I say, let's just repeal the lid and get it over with. We can't continue to exempt and exempt and exempt and still ask certain people to remain under that lid. If you are going to do this, it is not a lid and it becomes grossly unfair to those you do not exempt. I would have to oppose Senator Fowler's motion. He not only is asking for exemption now, but exemption forever, and quite frankly states and I compliment him for it, that within a year or two you are going to be funding this program totally. Federal tax dollars will still go to the federal government and will not come back to you so you will have to increase the local tax and you are removing it from any kind of constraint, and I think that is a mistake. I would oppose the Fowler motion.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Lamb, do you wish to speak now on the....

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members, Senator Fowler makes the argument that this is needed because eventually it will be funded by the state, and that could possibly happen. But the amendment is not needed at this time because this is completely federally funded. So it is not necessary at this point. I suggest to Senator Fowler that if it seems prudent that this amendment should be attached to the bill at the time that we do, in fact, use state dollars and it seems to me that if we have this amendment on the bill, it would be maybe a slight incentive for state dollars to go into this program rather than keeping it a hundred percent federally funded as it is now programmed to be.