

it makes a great effort to show me that the agricultural sector of this state receives assistance at the expense of residential sections of the state. And even though I represent one of those districts that has strictly residential people, I am prepared to do that. It seems odd, however, that I am supporting a bill that seems to hold a gun to Senator Schmit's and Senator Lamb's head and forces money into their pocket, all the time they're resisting and saying, oh, please don't, please don't give me this much money. No, please don't help my farmers this much; \$48 million, gosh, no, don't help me that much. It's an irony that I have yet to understand. On the other hand, with respect to the hold harmless, I will tell you there is, in football, you know, there is something called piling on. It's after you've been tackled and you're knocked down and just somebody comes on for one extra hit afterwards, you know. And, frankly, after I look through the Governor's book and I see that the residential districts move 48 million bucks out to the agricultural sector and I gulp and I say, well, that's probably better for a tax system in this state. It really is a fairer system of doing education, we ought to do it and, frankly, I know that means more taxes for my people, but if you've got a statewide obligation, let's make these schools better and the system fair for everyone, we can shoulder up and do that task. But, frankly, this is a late hit. This is a...this is a "piling on" amendment here, because, as Howard Lamb says, you know, hold harmless amendments mean that something is wrong. That was his word. I think his implication was that something was wrong with the way we were about to do something rather than of whether we were doing something wrong in the past. I would argue that hold harmless clauses do indicate that there is probably something wrong but that it's just as likely that the wrong was done in the past, which is what I think has happened here. Historically, we have given foundation aid to districts that were wealthy, districts that had ability to pay, but we gave our state aid without regard to need. We gave them the form of foundation. Now when you have a hold harmless system that's based on an aid formula that's not based on need and you move to need, you're right, there are going to be some dislocations and the better of the two systems is where the money is set out on need rather than an indifference to need, which is the old system. Yes, there is some change between what we're going to do and what we have done and it's for the better. It's for the better because the old system was flawed and we need not hold harmless for those old, irrational, unfair parts of the system which we are now seeing and remedying in 1059. Even having said