

amendment that we talked with earlier, it's not unusual when a plan is initially started, a new one, that for a period of time some schools are held harmless if they had a reduction. What we're talking about now are reductions that occur in the normal course of applying that formula to all the schools in the state. If we start saying that no one will, at any time, receive less, no school district will receive less than they did at one other time, just as well throw the formula away because, in effect, you will not have one. What was done this morning was based on need, the concept that was in 1059. The way it works out, the reduction in...for that last year, the reduction that OPS incurred is less a reduction than it would have been had they not had the growth and I would urge that you'd vote this amendment down because, in fact, there is no unfair treatment. It's, in fact, how the formula works and would work year in and year out.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Horgan.

**SENATOR HORGAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I would rise in support of Senator Lindsay's amendment. I think you need to look at the figures that were handed out this morning that we spent considerable amount of time addressing and recognizing that there, of all the school districts on this growth factor sheet, there are two districts in there that are experiencing growth and yet are receiving less dollars and that's the Kearney Public Schools and the Omaha Public Schools. They're growing. They're meeting the 1 percent growth factor and yet they're being damaged and losing money as a result of not being held harmless. And so it seems to me that if we've done that in 719, we've said those rural districts that are shrinking in size, we ought to hold them harmless for a period of time because they're going to be damaged by the lack of funds that are going to come to them, we've got two school districts here that are growing in size which means their need is greater, their needs have increased and yet they're taking heavy hits in their budget, so it's even worse because if dollars are equating to need then those school districts that are losing dollars because their student enrollment has gone down, if that is legitimate to say that because of our concern for those districts that, indeed, what we ought to do is we ought to hold them harmless for a period of time, then for those districts who are experiencing growth, for them to be damaged by this formula, and it seems to me that they're being trapped by a formula here, for us to say to them your need is greater but you're going to