

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 14, 2005 LB 126

leverage against de facto segregation than Class I schools. These are some issues that we're afraid to talk about. And we need to discuss these issue. We're afraid to talk about racism and issues associated with race because it's so highly charged. We need to talk about it. And I think that if we would sit down, both sides of the issue of LB 126, and maybe a third, fourth, or fifth point of view relating to Class I schools, we could do that, too. We could bring those folks in so that we can, hopefully off the floor of the Legislature, come up with a proposal that we can live with. From the beginning, I have said that I'm willing to compromise on the issue as it relates to effectiveness and efficiency. That's from the very beginning. I haven't been able to have the opportunity to serve on the Education Committee or be involved in some of the negotiations. And that's why I think we need to sit down, both sides, and air our concerns. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Smith. (Visitors introduced.) Senator Brown, on the McDonald amendment.

SENATOR BROWN: Mr. President, members, I have listened for the two and a half days that we've been talking about this bill, waiting to hear something that might cause me to change my position or to firmly decide what my position is, as Senator Landis talked about earlier. I've been waiting for some edification, and what I've mostly heard are examples--and some of them are very compelling examples--of what Class I schools are doing well. And I thought Senator Flood's examples were very compelling. But isn't that what we're supposed to expect--that our systems are organizing themselves in a way that they can provide quality education and a breadth of education to students? To me, this whole argument is about a statewide system, about the aid that comes from the state level, about whether the state and the locality--and I'm using "locality" in a broadly-defined way, because some of this discussion is about how you define locality--if the state and the locality must pay for not only the quality that may come from small size, but also for an absence of economy of scale. And it's about whether the state and the locality is going to pay for an absence of economy of scale. I've heard lots of red herring discussions. And I don't believe, from what I know about the bill, that it's about