

SENATOR ROBINSON: You talked enough. I guess my que...the problem I have, and I'm...I like parts of what I'm reading. But I haven't heard, I got nine schools. I haven't heard from them. I don't know if this like this...and you can...and I know I'm going to say...

SENATOR BOHLKE: On a printout?

SENATOR ROBINSON: ...P-O, P-O, I know what (inaudible). But I think the members of the Legislature should be informed. And I don't think they're being informed on this soon enough. Now give us some more time, maybe we can find out about it. I have a question for Senator Schimek. Okay, in a tier, I have a tier with...Senator Schimek, are you listening? I have a tier with three...

SENATOR COORDSEN: Senator Schimek, question, please.

SENATOR ROBINSON: ...equalized school districts, and then I have a tier with a nonequalized school district. Now the three equalized school districts, let's say one of them, equalized number one district has a lot of special education, equalized two and three districts do not have much costs in special education, but nonequalized school district does have a lot of special education. Okay, see if I'm right. The nonequalized school district would not lose any money. But the one that had a lot of...those two that did not have very much special ed costs would lose some money, while the one that had a lot of special education would gain from it. Is that a correct assumption?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: You could put it this way, Senator, they're not losing money, they're having...I mean they're not having their needs inflated.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yeah, but that will eventually lead to that, won't it?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yeah, that would eventually...because the tier costs are going to change. So they're going to lose...I mean the amount of money they're going to lose in equal aid...but would not affect the nonequalized district because