

there is something in 742 that would incur more lawsuits and I disagree with that. Right now in 742 we're talking about funding, but the funding we can always come back and change. It's not like we go away from here for any length of time. We'll be back next January. You can always come back and if there's any problems, we can change that. But what we're really getting at is the task force formation and just asking those individuals to look at this area that has seen tremendous growth in the last few years and see if there are any areas where we can cut back on some of the costs that we are incurring in these areas right now. That's all we've done right now. We haven't imposed any spending limits that really can't be changed. We haven't affected any policy changes that would incur, in my opinion, any liabilities to the state. Most of the liability has been incurred by federal law, actually, that was passed long time ago and made the school districts responsible for providing these programs, and that's what usually gets people in court. And it's school districts defending themselves, usually, successfully defending themselves in those areas. And all this says to me is that the cost that those school districts, and I asked Senator Pedersen to check how many lawsuits he had had in his district and I don't believe it was very many, it's not too many in mine, but it is an expense to the school districts, that this amendment would give them an opportunity to push up to the state level. I know that there has been some property tax relief ideas with having the state incur some of the expenses, but those are all ideas that went through hearings that people talked about that came forward and were really straightforward about that being the case here. Now we come in at the ninth hour here and go on 742, this idea that we're going to incur these costs at the state level for these litigations and inferring somehow that some of it may be tied to what we're doing in 742. That is absolutely not true. I know it says 1997 on this, so that's another reason to say why would it be necessary to do that now? Why couldn't you come back next year, maybe after we have some really valid, solid policy changes if we have any at all. If we find that we cannot save money in these areas, that what we're doing is absolutely necessary that has to be funded to its fullest level, then that's what we'll do. That's what we'll do at the state level, but if we find that there are areas where we can at least control some of the cost in these areas then that's what we'll do. If at that time we see that there might be some problems with some of the opportunities for lawsuits then we can talk about this type of an amendment, but there is absolutely no reason tonight to adopt