

would want a cap put in place if we didn't do anything else. That's what you're saying, isn't it, that the capping would have to occur?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: I think that's the first initial step that has to occur for all the other steps to follow.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now isn't that what the bill originally was intended to do, to create a cap?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: No, the bill...yes, the bill originally just put a flat cap in, no growth, no looking at what it's going to do to other school districts, no attempt to look at other funding mechanisms like this bill is, no attempt to looking at block grants, no attempt to even giving the Legislature the right, which this bill does, to appropriate an amount that we wish to appropriate. It's simply an unequivocally set cap.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Before I run out of time, and you're willing to go back to that idea of just a flat cap...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Tied in with growth.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...if that's all we can get.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: No, no, tied in with growth.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay...

SENATOR WESELY: Time is up.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and my time is up...okay.

SENATOR WESELY: Senator Chambers, yours was the last light, so if you'd like to close on your amendment or would you wish to...okay, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I want to ask Senator Bernard-Stevens if he really understands what I was asking. My question, Senator Bernard-Stevens, was this. If each and every one of these items listed in subsection (3) is not addressed in the manner that the subsection says they should be addressed, would you be in agreement with the idea that no part of the bill would take