

live with the consequences of moving from one system of fairness to another to the extent that there is a reallocation. Now maybe the system is not sensitive enough to certain kind of schools. Fair enough, let's identify them and make 1059 sensitive, but a hold harmless does nothing other than say, look, you used to get money, so you get money in the future. It has nothing to do with pupil load. It has nothing to do with the nature of expenditures. It has nothing to do with the strength of the district's ability to support the schools; not the kinds of things that a school's financing system ought to have. Those kind of systems and changes we should continue to make, but one that says you used to get money, therefore, you still get money is not related to educational opportunity or educational effort in any way. That kind of a change is simply one that says we do not and will not reallocate money. That is a bad message to send. Reallocations should be made when you have a system that is more sensitive and fairer and that is what 1059 is compared to the old system. Secondly, I am not saying that you have to do 1059 in stone, but when you make a change in 1059, it should be for the purpose of achieving some kind of fairness by making the system better. This is simply saying, look, without regard to what is fair or not, who has the most deserving claim on the dollar, you simply have to make sure everybody has the same old dollars they used to have. I oppose the extension of the hold harmless provision, as I did at the time of 1059, at a time of voting on it, at the time of floor amendments that do the same thing here in this kind of setting when we were under consideration of 1059.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I rise to oppose the motion to suspend the rules as offered by Senator Lamb. To echo some of the comments that Senator Landis made with regard to what the purpose and intent of 1059 was, in terms of putting it in place and, specifically, both parts of the amendment, that being the extension of the hold harmless clause would basically amount to a doubling of it, if you will, in terms of the additional two full school years, one which has yet to begin, so it would be virtually a double doubling of that provision that has been allowed under the 1059 contract. And then, secondly, the calculations that are on 1793 of the Journal, in terms of the number of students and the shift necessary so that there wouldn't be any, I guess, specific impact, that is fine. The problem here is that we don't have