

going to cut first, where you're going to cut last. So in terms of it makes it better and from that point of view I'll probably support it. My only concern is the last words here that says it affects classroom expenses as a last resort. I'm not sure I know what "last resort" is. Does that mean that you have to cut everything first before you can cut classrooms? If that's true, that's got some pretty inflexible things to it. If that means that classroom expenses have a priority, in other words, those are some of the last things that you cut and there's sort of a presumption that classrooms have a higher priority, that I agree with. The words "last resort" may mean that you're going to have to cut all the extracurriculars first before you go to the classrooms. I'm going to support this because I think it's better than what's in there right now, but I guess at this point I, from the introducers at least, Senator Bohlke and Senator Will, is it your intent, Senator Will.... Could I just, please...

SENATOR WILL: Yes, Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you. When we use the words "as a last resort" do you mean that to be that you've got to cut all other expenditures before you touch any classroom expenditure?

SENATOR WILL: No, Senator Kristensen, what I would interpret this language as meaning is that the Legislature is emphatic in its statement of intent, which is what this amendment is.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Right, we...

SENATOR WILL: (inaudible).

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: ..we understand that intent language is just that, but...

SENATOR WILL: And to answer your questions, no, because obviously you couldn't cut every last administrator before you began to explore cuts in some other area, you know.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Well, or...and since we're taking out administrators, for example, do you have to cut all music programs, like the marching band? Maybe that's a classroom expenditure, I don't know. Let me try to think of something else. Do you cut the junior-senior prom before you have to