

SPEAKER NICHOL: I'm going to rule that it is not germane. Well, I might say that yes, we are talking about tax money, and we are talking about education money to a degree. But 126 is strictly with weatherization and severance tax, and 662 I don't recall has anything to do with severance tax. So I would rule it not germane. Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: I am trying to sever a portion of 662 from it, and it taxes me a great deal to get this job done. But I think what I will do, with your indulgence, is I won't move to overrule the Chair. I will move to suspend the rules, which will require 30 votes, to permit this amendment to be discussed with respect to this bill.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Okay, thank you for that. So your motion is to suspend the rules.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes.

SPEAKER NICHOL: All right. Is there any discussion on suspension of the rules? Wait a minute. Senator Wesely was up. Did you wish to speak on the suspension of the rules? Your light was on ahead.

SENATOR WESELY: Yes. Mr. Speaker, Senator DeCamp and I differ on this amendment, although we agree on the bill. It is a nice bill. We worked it out with Senator Remmers. Everybody likes this little bill now. It is all set to go and be passed. But Senator Vard comes along last night and says, I've got a little amendment, just a little amendment, would you be inclined to help me with it. Of course, he picked out one amendment that I strongly supported and have tried to get adopted over the years to a bill that I've strongly supported and wanted to see adopted this session, so I'm in a dilemma. Senator DeCamp, on the other hand, likes this bill and doesn't like the amendment. So it is clear where John will be. I think I'm going to go ahead and support Vard's motion to...not to overrule but to suspend the rules. It obviously isn't germane. But I do think the effort to try and remove those financing provisions of LB 662 take precedent over most anything else we will be discussing. To me they are so onerous and so poorly for our future in terms of our financial priority setting in the budget process that I'd be willing to do most anything to see that they are repealed, even so far as to jeopardize