

really feel good? Is it really something equitable? Is it something that we as state senators would, must do on an equity basis? Is the harm of scaling back this program much greater than the benefit that the state derives from it? Is there irreparable harm? Is this an arbitrary and capricious act? Those are the kinds of standards that I think need to be applied after we go through the economic value criteria in trying to establish do we need to keep this program at the over \$5 million level?

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR ASHFORD: And my answer to that is just, no, just no. That the harm, and here the burden shifts. The burden is not on me or on you, the burden is on the school districts to prove to you that the harm that will be derived from cutting back this program exceeds...is so great, is so great that it is something that we cannot do. The burden shifts. It's not my burden to prove that to you, it's for those agencies that receive the money to prove that to you. So when we use that harm, benefit equitable, criteria, even when we've done everything else that comes down to it, no. This program does not justify a \$5 million appropriation. Albeit, maybe it does justify a \$3 million appropriation or a \$3.5 million appropriation and I would suggest that this program can well fit in that appropriation and maybe we need to look at some statutory changes to make the program work as Senator Robinson may want it to work within a...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...lower budget, within a \$3 million budget. It does not need a \$5 million budget.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Ashford. Mr. Clerk, amendments on the desk.

CLERK: Madam President, the first amendment I have to the bill is by Senators Bernard-Stevenson, Bernard-Stevens, excuse me, Senator, Senator Rasmussen, Senator Crosby. (Amendment appears on pages 1472-73 of the Legislative Journal.)