

here a long time and probably too long, I am getting grayer in the mustache as we go, and things just happen, and we all adapt, and I will adapt just fine. We all do what we have to do. I am going to speak on the bill in general. On the first division it talks about the cap so that people know about the cap, and I do have a couple of questions just of how that...that cap is, and I will get to that in a minute. But one of the concerns I have is this flippant, and I will use the word "flippant" because that is the only word that comes to my mind that adequately describes what I am hearing, regard to rules and regs and staffing, all of these things can be done, I don't buy any of that. It is a crock, and I will give you an example. We have senators saying, don't worry, they can attack the staffing. Well, look at it, maybe I am reading the bill wrong, but the cap, the overall cap with no growth, that Senator Bromm and Bohlke want to do, it takes effect in '96-97. Now we are always a year in arrears on special ed, so that means that if we are going to deal with staffing, we have got to deal with what the schools are doing in staffing now. Now contracts, for the most part, will go out April 15th or so to staff people in the schools. They will decide whether they are coming back or not. They will be accepted by May 1st. I am not sure, but I think this is May 22nd. I am not sure, but by the time we get through our eight days, those school districts aren't going to know anything that is going to go on. They will still hire the people because they don't know whether they should or not. So don't tell me it is not going to affect staff people, it is going to affect staff people. Don't tell me school districts are going to have a chance to respond to it, they are not going to have a chance to respond to it. They will have to, if we do this, they will have to, and the results will be on our shoulders of what's going to happen. There is no theory about...well, let me rephrase that. The original theory that this bill, even as it was amendment, and one of the reasons I even supported that out of committee was the fact that at the time we were still going to send a message in cap, we weren't going to try to just do a sledgehammer, and just say no growth whatsoever, a point that even Senator McKenzie at the Education hearing said she didn't even support the bill as introduced. We didn't want to do the sledgehammer. What we wanted to do is to have a strong message, put a cap, allow a little growth, and in the meantime, what was going to happen? In the meantime, you had four groups, the School Finance Committee, the Department of Education, the Education Committee, and some other group called the Special Education Task Force. All of them were going to jointly work