

sure, and perhaps Senator Withem might address that at some point in time, and I don't think that it's really altogether that important at this point in time is how the reapplication of the 1059 budget growth limitations fit in with the requirements of 1114, beginning with the fiscal year that would be...would...the budget would be developed for, that is the January 1st, '99, midpoint of that fiscal year and how that would fit with the maximum statutory levy, plus the opportunity for the citizens to exceed the statutory levy and how a budget expenditure might fit within that. But that's something certainly that we can address in other times. And by putting this proposal in 299 it indicates that the body of the Legislature intends, I think, to require a degree of fiscal restraint on the parts of all units of government, including schools. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Senator Schimek, to speak to the Withem amendment. Senator Warner, to speak to the Withem amendment. Senator Warner, do you wish to speak to the Withem amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, just briefly to support the amendment. As Senator Withem has pointed out, I think the concept of unused budget authority we had talked about in committee, but actually as drafted the amendment only dealt between the two years. I know...I'm sure there are entities who had been setting funds aside for some particular project, perhaps, and the restriction, as it was when it was tied to receipts, could have perhaps happened in some cases. If the funds were for capital improvements it would have been okay, but it could have been for other areas as well. So I think that's a good concept that Senator Vrtiska had offered in the way of an amendment. Again, same holds true with special ed, it will be out, both on the expenditure side, as well as the old expenditure...out of the base, as well as what might be increase. That reflects Senator McKenzie's amendment. I believe that, too, is a good and appropriate approach. The change in the expansion of the levy authority, the percentage growth on what will eventually become restricted revenue funds is a little more leeway than what we came out with in committee, but it does have two important concepts, I believe, and one is that the first year it's not quite as tight as the second year. But we'll begin to encourage looking at ways to be more cost-effective. And, of course, the second year is more