

SENATOR MCKENZIE: I believe that's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. That's all I wanted to ask you to be sure I understood it. Members of the Legislature, I'm still smarting in the sense of feeling irritation and aggravation because of the welfare bill, LB 455. We were tricked into passing some things last session by being assured that work was going to be done on employment programs, the kind of jobs available, work incentives. We come back this year and LB 455 not only is a bill where that work has not been done, that language is to be stricken from the statute by LB 455. That is some of this preliminary work that was to be done before we implemented so called reform. That work was not done and the language calling for it is going to be stricken from the statute. A similar tactic is being used here saying that there are problems that are clear, they ought to be addressed. But the fact is they don't have to be addressed. These are the kind of things that are said to take the sting out of some of these provisions that maybe ought not be put into law. But by saying there are certain provisions of the law which are going to take effect and be law, those are not to be touched. But we put a lot of fluff in it which says, well, yeah, we ought to discuss these things in advance, but if they're not discussed that failure to discuss does not prevent these other provisions from taking effect. Senator Maurstad had raised a question about increases in the amount spent for special education, and I think his discussion was significant, and it probably is an area that requires and justifies additional discussion because we have to look at the point from which these children start. If we're talking about traditional or regular or general education for those students who don't have handicaps, physical or mental, it may take a lesser amount of money...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...to raise them to another level or to just hold them even with where they are if that becomes the policy of the state. Somebody who starts with a handicap may require a greater expenditure to just hold them harmless or even with where they are, or to move them a comparable level with these other general education students. So I'm opposed to a formula that says we're going to reach a point where special education expenditures cannot increase at a faster or greater rate than expenditures for general education. The two are not the same. The two are never going to achieve the same results, and it is