

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 22, 1999

LB 495

the form that it came to us, and as it came to us in the terms of use of General Fund dollars, and I will tell you I don't have any objection to use of General Fund dollars for schools. In fact, I think some people here believe that I'm kind of overcommitted to that position. But I do believe in using General Fund dollars for schools. But my objections to the proposal that Senator Stuhr brought to us fell in a couple of different categories; one, the monies were going to be distributed outside the equalization fund. Senator Stuhr will point to other examples where we distribute funding outside the equalization fund, and she may want to talk about the rationale for distributing these particular dollars outside of the equalization fund. And, remember, we use the equalization fund to essentially provide that kids everywhere can have access to an adequate educational opportunity, at least when we combine the equalization funds with local resources. That's the result that we hope we will achieve. This proposal by Senator Stuhr is contrary, in my opinion, to that basic concept because, and this leads to my second objection, it simply says if you have this particular program we're going to be able to give you dollars on this basis. And I also have objections to funding particular programs, such as Senator Stuhr is proposing, categorically without taking into consideration whether or not we should specifically fund other very worthwhile programs in the schools. Should we also give special funding to college prep curriculum, for example? And that may be very expensive to deliver because it would require labs, for example. The other issue that I have with the proposal was that even though Senator Stuhr stated that there was supposed to be...that this was directed at funding a particular kind of a program, I am not sure that it really achieved the objective because it was based on per pupil expenditures or per pupil enrollment in programs and then beyond that an additional distribution. So whether it was ever aimed at funding the kind of expensive equipment that I think she spoke about was unclear to me. It seemed to not focus exactly on the problem that she described. Now that I see the amendment that Senator Stuhr has brought asking that we change the use of funds within the lottery fund that is devoted to education, I have a fourth reason for opposing her proposal, and that is an antipathy toward funding ongoing programs out of lottery. If you recall, one of the concerns we had early on with the use of lottery funds was that they would fluctuate over time and that