

school as well. Apparently in the process when LB 358 was enacted, when it was put into the statutes a portion of it was left out because of the previous, or because of the Supreme Court action that was thought to be unconstitutional. Subsequently there have been cases filed that indicated that that particular statute needed to be reinstated. The amendment I am offering, because the issue is again to go before the Supreme Court, originally there was discussion of repealing the act in its entirety, but what the amendment now does, it would reverse the action so that no local school district is liable for furnishing those textbooks unless there has been money appropriated by the state for that purpose. There is an A bill amendment for \$100 to 757A as well, which will provide the funding and would then allow the case to proceed. If we do not amend the current law, then, and it's held constitutional, then it would be very likely that next session, assuming the Supreme Court case determine the current statute to be constitutional, that then we could have another one of these situations where local governments were to be reimbursed after the fact and we incur a 3 to 3 1/2 million dollar cost for those textbooks because that was the way the statute reads. So that the amendment proposes, it still permits the action to take place as far as the court proceedings are concerned, but it reverses it so that no school district has an obligation to do it unless the state has appropriated the money first. Where the way it is now, we could incur a deficiency of up to \$3 million. So I would encourage you to adopt the amendment. To my knowledge, all sides that were interested in this legislation concur in this approach. They understand the problems we've gotten into in the past with reimbursement after the fact appropriations and that these kind of issues should be either funded up front or not funded at all and under the provisions of this approach with that minimal appropriation of \$100 it permits the court test, but in return for that we also know that we will not be requested through a deficiency bill, statewide, something in excess of \$3 million. So I would move that the bill be returned for the specific amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Goll, please.

SENATOR GOLL: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I had this simple little bill, LB 757, which doesn't do a whole lot, it isn't a very important piece of legislation, but it does answer and provides an opportunity for one of my constituents to a little change in the law. Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is no opposition to this amendment, number one. I understand, I