

amendment. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Well, Mr. President, I will leave my light on for the bill.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, would you care to discuss the Lamb amendment? Senator Nelson, on deck.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the body, just briefly, I rise in opposition to the Lamb amendment. There are a lot of things I could say but I think it's just very simple what we're trying to do with LB 89 and the differences between what Senator Lamb is trying to do and what the concept is of LB 89. Senator Lamb simply is saying, let's go ahead and increase state aid by \$20 million, use the existing formula and let this local control...let the local areas do what they need to do. I think most of you understand, going back through the history of the state, when state aid to education has been increased most of us in the body, I assume, have been disappointed sometimes in a couple of areas. Number one, where the money has been spent, in many cases, and, number two, that the money hasn't been used to actually lower property taxes. Money has been given to relieve property tax and yet at the same time when money is increased and given property taxes haven't lowered and I understand those arguments and those are legitimate arguments, has nothing to do with LB 89. LB 89 is simply saying regardless of our problems of school financing, regardless of the problems that we have in can we get rid of teachers that we perceive not to be of value, regardless of how the property valuations and tax levies are, regardless of those areas, what do we need to do to try to get the best, most qualified instructors who can influence our children and who can have a dynamic effect, as I stated yesterday, a magical effect on our children? That's what 89 is all about. Senator Lamb's amendment would simply say we're going to abandon that, we're simply going to increase more money. It will be spent by school districts to their whim, at their local control, giving them local control but we, in this body, know that the majority of those funds would not be used for enhancement of teachers' salaries. LB 89 is not setting a dangerous precedent. We have accepted federal grants, categorical grants for years in education; categorical grants, which says to education and school districts if you apply, if you have a plan, we will give you this money to be used in this category only, and we have accepted that policy. We have accepted that line and we have