

about reviewing those programs, reviewing rules and regulations. In the absence of the language I would assume notwithstanding the fine efforts that will be made in an interim study, I would assume there would be no change for '86-87 by the mere fact that nothing will have happened that will affect next year's budget and you will at best wait till '87-88. Obviously anything that is going to be done has to be done prior to September of this year that's going to affect next year's cost and to the extent that this language would support the Department of Education to be able to make some revisions. I think it would be beneficial and would head them in the right direction, certainly call attention to the fact that there is concern about this expansion and the result, it seems to me, can be one of a positive note rather than a negative note inasmuch that it is, as Senator Lamb points out, not an absolute binding appropriation for next time. We did not appropriate the money, merely indicated it was the intent to try and put some caps on which I think this language provides the encouragement necessary to get that accomplished and that was the purpose of the language.

SPEAKER NICHOL PRESIDING

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Vickers, would you like to close, please.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, members, it appears to me that both the proponents and the opponents of this amendment of mine are saying the same thing because we do want to try to get to some solution to a growing problem that we have and that is the cost of special education. And I suppose it depends on whether you believe that an interim study can be more productive and that you can have people appearing before that interim study with some well thought out solutions a little better if you have some mechanism to hold their feet to the fire. Well I think LB 714 being alive in committee is a logical vehicle to do that, to achieve that if that's your goal and that's not all bad, it's not all bad. It's a lot easier many times to get people to talk about an issue if there is some threat that their issue may be changed, but as Senator Warner has just pointed out and Senator Lamb pointed out earlier, that this is intent language. It's not binding. Well I would suggest to you that that would be looked at from those people who, if this is the intent is to hold their feet to the fire, they are