

whenever we, until we decide to stop it and there would be a lot more than \$2.9 million potentially. It could be a lot more than that. So I don't think we can sit here and say when the \$2.9 million is gone, that's it, because if the statute is still there you still will, by law, owe that school district the dollars that they would have lost if they are, in fact, adversely affected. So you know I want to make sure that we're clear that it's more than \$2.9 million and I think we should be looking at a sunset and I'll work with Senator Withem and Senator Bohlke as to see when the proper sunset is. Senator Schrock, I also want to ask you a question and I ask this in all sincerity. I was the only senator who voted against the bill in committee and I did so reluctantly because I agree with the concept of what we're trying to do. But the one thing, the question that keeps coming to my mind, whether it's in my district or your district or others, if, in fact, there is deep emotional arguments on whether they should or should not consolidate or merge or reorganize together, two or three different school districts, how does it help the argument when a group of people say why should we merge because if we merge we'll lose state aid, how does this bill help that because doesn't the argument just change to the point that if we consolidate and merge, we won't get hurt for the first year, but the second year we're going to get hurt a third, the third year we're going to get hurt two-thirds and then we're going to get hurt all of it, why should we reorganize when we are going to lose state aid, but we just delay the period of which we're going to lose it? How does that help the argument?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Schrock.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well I suppose the only way I can answer that is through first-hand experience with this new school district taking place in south central Nebraska. When they consolidate and are building new facilities, there's a tremendous amount of start-up charge. Lights...

SENATOR HALL: One minute.

SENATOR SCHROCK: ...for a football field can be tremendously expensive and so I think they incur a lot of start-up expenses that they won't have two and three years into their consolidation and, therefore, they can see that maybe two or three years from now they're going to be more efficient and in the long run they're going to be better as a consolidated