

inherent assumption that you're obviously going to have additional maintenance requirements to upkeep in that building, and I think if you voted for the bond issue, you're willing to pay for those things. When the 1059 lid was drafted, it was, albeit there was many things in that lid that were looser than I liked them to be, it tried to allow for some reasonable growth in a school district. I think Senator Lamb's amendment would reinstate some reasonable language to that lid and I guess my suggestion is to the administration and the supporters of 1063, if you want to have a tighter lid, I would simply encourage you to lower the number, lower the overall base number which the lid is based on. These particular things like this were written in there for specific reason to allow for some reasonable growth and so school districts would not be encouraged to the use it or lose it mentality. I think when you...amendments...1063, as it is now drafted, certainly penalizes those schools that adhere to the philosophy that we ought to, instead of just using our maximum allowable growth, we're going to move forward in a reasonable manner. As much as I think Senator Lamb's amendment is in order, it does not deviate from the lid in 1059, it simply only reinstates that language. There is an amendment that is coming up that I'll serve notice on that if you look on page 250 of the bill, there is some language which would allow allowable growth to kick in at 25 students instead of 1 percent for a school district of 10,000 or more. Now, that is a drastic change in the 1059 lid. That is a marginal, more than a marginal difference as to what school districts should be allowed to use that allowable growth. I don't know why that's in the bill. Not only does it affect the lid, it will also affect the formula requirements. And I think if you're worried about changing the spirit of the 1059 lid, there's some other language in this bill that inserts that 25 students and above, which is a much more dramatic impact than Senator Lamb's amendment is, and at least Senator Lamb's amendment would simply restore to the bill the original 1059 language. And, with that, I'd ask for the support of Senator Lamb's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Mr. President, just briefly. After consulting with my good, liberal friend, Senator Lamb, on this issue, and getting it straightened out, and hearing Senator Moore, I understand that it does just restore. And I will support Senator Lamb's amendment. Thank you for the clarification.