

clearly a matter that one should vote on in an objective sense. And after we vote on this, I'm sure there will probably be another printout, I suppose, and we can see what happened. But I suggest to you that it's philosophy that's paramount, and how you think kids are best helped that is paramount, and that that's what we ought to base our decision on today. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Abboud, followed by Senators Wickersham, Robinson, and Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR ABOUD: Thank you, Mr. President. You know, it's interesting this...we had a debate on the floor earlier about a bill that was killed, Senator Stuhr's bill, and we had a great deal of discussion about the committee process, and when a committee makes a decision whether or not we should stand by that decision of the committee. And it's my understanding, in the discussion that we've had here, that this...this philosophy, or this major change that we are talking about in this amendment was brought forward in a bill, LB 1145. Is that...well, I won't ask the question, but the language that's a part of this section came out of that particular bill. Now this bill was killed by the Education Committee for whatever reason. I think it was pretty much unanimous, 5 to 1. Senator Beutler I see voted against it, but it was...it had 5 votes to kill, and now we are resurrecting this particular philosophical change, and this is not to be taken lightly. When we're talking about special education, we're talking about a separate issue than transportation costs, or the cost of a new building, or labor costs for our teachers. We're talking about a change of philosophy by tying it into the funding formula. In the past, we've had numerous debates over this issue. Every year we had a mandate to increase our amount of state aid because it was a separate funding issue. We had to provide the educational opportunities to all special education students. Regardless of what shape their school district was in, we provided funding for those students. Now we are changing the philosophy and we are saying, no, we are going to tie it into the equalization formula, and I guess that's why I have a problem in the philosophical approach to this particular amendment. I tend to agree I guess with the Education Committee when they killed the bill. My belief is that when you are dealing with education, it should be a separate issue. It should be an issue in which we are focusing in on the needs of those students and not have it as part of a large equalization formula. Does this impact my