

April 2, 1992

LB 719, 1001

SENATOR LAMB: It will not flow from anyone actually because we have the hold harmless now, so...

SENATOR HALL: Right, but it's going to continue to flow, Senator, and it's going to have to flow from...

SENATOR LAMB: That's right.

SENATOR HALL: ...someone's pocket to another district's pocket, and I would like to see those numbers before we vote on extending a three and a half million dollar program for two additional years, not knowing who is going to be paying for it. Thank you. I rise again to oppose the motion to suspend the rules. It is a \$7 million amendment, ladies and gentlemen, that we are being asked to suspend the rules. We don't know who is going to pay for it. We don't know where the money is going to go. All we know is that it is holding someone harmless. I think it would be...we'd be better off if we were very harmless to this rule suspension and voted it down.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. And, again, I guess I am rising at this point to oppose the suspension of the rules, even though I am very much supportive of the hold harmless extension for another two years. And if for some reason this does not go, the suspension of the rules is not agreed to, I would hope Senator Lamb might be able to come back with that portion of it on another bill, possibly LB 1001, as other education amendments will be. Senator Hall, you are absolutely correct except I think you have underestimated it just a little bit. The sheet I have in front of me now looks at the 13 districts with increases of 50 or more students and 2 percent or more, and if...and, again, it is rough calculations but we are certainly looking at somewhere between 5 and 10 million dollars in that area. If you then take it to where the bill is and double that because you go down to 25 from 50 and from 2 percent down to 1 percent, we are talking much more than a \$7 million shift. We are talking somewhere between 10, 15, 20, possibly as high as 30, and that is where I haven't been able to get the number pinned down at some point. My argument is that, listen, we put in the 1059 formula, that if there is rapid growth, there was going to be a compensation for that. The difficulty is, and quite honestly I understand the