

in the process of building a sizeable addition to their school plan in order to take care of their growing student numbers. Without something, a provision like this, they will be in a very difficult position in order to even use those facilities, so I would urge your support of Senator Lamb's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Mr. President, members, I rise with some concerns with Senator Lamb's proposal in that those of us who fought hard for the passage of 1059 and those who opposed it said, you know what will happen, you'll come back and you'll find ways to get at that money and you'll find ways to spend it and you'll find ways for more exemptions. And those voices still ring in my ear and, as Senator Withem said, the opportunity was there at the time. As far as it being approved by a bond issue, we have a new building in our district that we built without a bond issue, so it really...it didn't have approval of the voters and now we would be allowing a way to increase the cost of staffing the maintenance staff of it. I haven't quite decided how I'm going to vote on this, but I think that those of us who heard people say to us, we know that you're going to eat away at that 1059 money, that we should consider carefully any amendments that allow us to do that. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. Speaker and members, I rise to support Senator Lamb's amendment to LB 1063. I think there's been a little bit of confusion. It's not like Senator Lamb's amendment would loosen up the 1059 lid. It would just rein...reinsert the 1059 portion of the lid as it applies to expansion and the maintenance in a building that's opened up, and so, I mean, I don't think some...a couple of people have made difference (sic) to the fact that if you adopt Senator Lamb's amendment, you'll be loosening the 1059 lid. That's not the case at all. LB 1063 constricts it in this area. Senator Lamb's amendment only reinstates 1059 language back in and so does not loosen it, does not tighten it. I mean, the bill as it now is tightens it. It only reinstates what was the original intent behind that bill and, for that reason, I rise to support it because a school district, for instance, a school district that's had a bond election to build a building, and there are several of them out there that are in the process of building a building and the people voted for that bond issue, they...obviously, there's the