

they would deny the waiver. If the waiver works...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...I think they'll approve it for each district that applies for that particular waiver if it's workable for them. I don't see...you know, they'd have a hard time justifying treating different districts differently.

SENATOR STUHR: So you don't see any liability involved in this waiver process?

SENATOR BROMM: I don't see that it increases the risks of the liabilities at this point in time, I don't, as long as the services are delivered. The waivers are intended to allow services to be delivered more efficiently and more economically. It isn't a matter of not delivering the service, it's allowing it for more flexibility in delivering the services. If it eliminates services, I think you're exposing yourself to liability.

SENATOR STUHR: Well...and I guess that's the concern in eliminating costs.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR STUHR: That, you know, that might be the problem.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Stuhr. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Madam Speaker, members, I'm going to be brief. I have been uncertain as to what to do, but I like what Senator Bromm and Senator McKenzie had to say. I respect what Senator Withem had to say, but I, at this point, am not as familiar with the issue and I sense that the body isn't as familiar with as the Education Committee. I'm a little concerned about the responsibility of the state. I'm not certain as what lawsuits are going to do. I have a sense that it may deepen the pocket because the state is involved. There is just enough uncertainty in my mind that I'm going to oppose this amendment. I, as I said, Senator Withem said he's had it for four or five years. I'm not that familiar with it and I would like to be at this point. I'm uncertain as to the responsibility will ultimately beat the state and ultimately the cost and that to me is the bottom line so I'm going to oppose