

is, is the one that I had mentioned before, in fact I had it on General File and Senator Warner explained to me very diplomatically that it was too soon, and he was right. This may too soon as well, but it is Select File and I'm not sure if it's...I assu...I think this might be the right time. But what I talked about earlier was on the green sheet we were estimating a savings of the special ed bill to be at \$6 million, 6 million plus, some odd thousand dollars and that was at a 5 percent growth. Obviously now we're at a 2.5 percent growth. So the savings is going to be more than that, and in fact the savings that we will see would be about 9.2 million. What this amendment does is it trans...it's the intent language that simply says, it is the intent of the Legislature that any General Funds saved as a result of appropriating less than the 127,357...a million, 357 of General Funds for special education reimbursement shall be transferred to the Cash Reserve Fund. In other words, if you agree with this amendment, we'll still have the \$6 million savings showing on the green sheet, but anything that we create above that, which would be about \$3,032,333 more than that, would be transferred into the Cash Reserve Fund. That transfer would coincide with LB 392 and we would change the A bill to show that transfer date to be June 16th of 1997. That's the nature of the amendment. We talked about it last night and prior to that and I would urge the adoption of the body.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Madam President, members. I don't have any particular stand on the amendment. I know it was \$127 million figure, something, but I find it interesting that we spent the last hour, little over an hour on this issue, at \$127 million. The welfare bill, which we spent 8 hours plus and additional time, is about a \$22 million bill. This is a \$100 million difference. It's kind of interesting how we spend our time on certain things. And this issue is going to get a lot of attention, it's had a lot of attention. But in terms of the public grabbing hold and showing an interest it's been interesting how they will focus so much on welfare and what a high profile that has. And yet in terms of relative impact on the budget it is not a big part of the budget as opposed to this. And I just raise that point and find it interesting as we work through issues which capture the public imagination and which don't, and which capture the time on the floor and which