

funds will be cut, and if they keep Title I...in fact, a superintendent said in a meeting we may have to cut Title I reading and I asked the superintendent what's more important, football or Title I? He said, Title I. Are you really going to cut it? He says, we'll do everything we can not to, but there are pressures out there. Shoot, in North Platte the pressure...you know what the pressure was the last couple years? Schools, cut spending, we're mad.

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: But they wanted the school board to add girls' softball and they did. So the only place the school districts will get that money is by cutting core curriculum and I look at my sons and it scares me to death. And that's fine for now, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise once again to support the reconsideration motion. There was a question asked to me off to the side that I want to...I want to address because there was concern relative to the wording of the amendment that that might affect those projects that cities or villages would engage in where a vote of the people is not necessary, street improvement or what, and I think that you have to take the subsection in context with the...with Section 4 that says a political subdivision may hold a special election. You would not hold a special election, obviously, for any bonded indebtedness dealing with a capital improvement project if it wasn't required to be so by law. And so it would seem to me that the concern that was brought to my attention would not apply because if a city has the authority or a village has the authority to provide for improvements without having to go to a vote of the people this section wouldn't apply, wouldn't apply at all. With that, Senator, I would yield the balance of my time, Mr. President, to Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Three and a half minutes, Senator.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Withem. Thank you, Senator Maurstad. One of the other...and, again, the Maurstad amendment, to review, this is a motion to reconsider the vote on the Maurstad amendment. It does allow for Senator Cudaback's