

think we could legitimately say, look, we just had a lot of serious questions, we weren't sure what the feds meant by it, we weren't sure, we were given indications, we're willing to work with you at the federal level, we'd like to have a waiver until our next session of the Legislature, and I'm comfortable that would happen. I don't know...I don't know why the Department of Education at the federal level would say no, no, we know you're out of session, we know your law substantially, pretty much complied, but we're going to take away the monies from the special education and the Title I areas. I don't believe that will happen. I think they'd say, we understand, we want to work with you, when you're in session we expect...

SENATOR HALL: Time.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: ...this to happen, if not, then the dollars would go away. So I appreciate Senator Bohlke's willingness to work with us on the issue.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. The lights I have in order to speak to the Withem amendment to the bracket motion are Senator Wickersham, Bromm, Fisher, Chambers, Pirsch and Bohlke. Senator Wickersham, do you care to speak to the amendment?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Yes, Mr. President. And I will try to be brief because this is probably the only opportunity I'll have to speak on this issue, unless we do bracket it until Wednesday, and I'm not sure that I'm in favor of doing that. I don't know what's going to come out of discussions that we haven't already heard. We've already read the text of the federal law, we've seen the proposed amendment. If there are any changes to be made in the proposed amendment, I think we're now familiar enough with it to go forward and debate that and clean it up, if that's necessary, and work on it. I do not understand the arguments that have been advanced by those who say this is not something we need to do. What are you thinking about? All you have to do is recall the public comments made by the administration in Washington about guns, gun control, the NRA, all of those processes, and then delude yourself into believing that a bureaucracy that is also reading the newspapers is going to allow a greater degree of flexibility in administering a law that was passed in 1994 than they need to. The argument that they will somehow let us go because we aren't in session on October 1st of 1995, I'm afraid, doesn't give me a great deal of