

an incentive if, in fact, people are operating at a level that we hope they would achieve via this technique. So that is why I am opposing Senator Haberman's concept simply so that we don't have to revisit it if it needs to be done again at a future date.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Moore, please, followed by Senator Lamb and then Senator Rod Johnson.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. President and members, I rise to support Senator Haberman's amendment, and the reason I do so is quite simple, and I probably need just a 30-second lesson for those that don't understand the total state aid to education. Give you an example, '86-87, the state distributed \$228 million in state aid to education; 122 of which approximately was foundation, equalization. The other 106 was categorical aid. So the question is, do you want to call money through this new funding formula, do you want to compare it to foundation, equalization or do you want to compare it to the categorical aid like special ed and transportation and items like that? I guess I, myself, prefer, because the form that LB 89 is really in is it is a form of state aid with some incentive there for school districts to get their teachers' salaries at a given level, and I think LB 89 is going to be a significant chunk of money that I think should be considered with foundation and equalization aid when we ultimately discuss the overall restructuring of our tax system. And if we have to revisit the issue of teachers' salaries, then so be it, but I think when we are talking about upsetting the apple cart in a lot of ways in dealing with restructuring the tax system in the State of Nebraska, it is important that the proteacher forces are very, very interested that we do a good job of that. But, obviously, my concern is if you do not do Senator Haberman's amendment, obviously, there may very well be some people that are fighting any sort of change, or if not fighting any sort of change, certainly not working towards any sort of change like I feel is ultimately necessary in LB 611. So I actually think the body would be wise to treat funding through the new H.E.L.P. program just like it does foundation, equalization, and if you buy into the process, if you buy into the cause of LB 611, I think you need to include the funding of this bill and the hammer to make sure that we revisit the total issue in the next year or two to come. And so with that reasons, I wholeheartedly support Senator Haberman's amendment and urge the body to do so as well.