

the ones that probably need it worse, that, secondly, we have...the other subdivisions of government should get some money. And that, of course, would not only be...that would be all over the state, that would be urban, that would be rural, that would be wherever. So I know this is confusing, it is not easy to explain, but I certainly would try to answer any questions there are about this.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion on the Lamb amendment to the Warner amendment? Senator Scofield, followed by Senator Moore.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Lamb has done a good job of explaining the difference between the two amendments. But, as he has pointed out, this isn't easy to follow. If you're not a big fan of numbers, that sheet that he's given you probably isn't going to help you much either. Let me reiterate the main difference between the two amendments. The main difference between the Lamb amendment and the Scofield-Bernard-Stevens amendment is where you put the little guy. Under the Lamb amendment, if you make the assumption there might only be 4.2 million there, the little guys come in last, they are not covered. Under our amendment, we move the little guys up and give them first-tier protection, if you want to call it that, with the big five. And that, consequently, dilutes the amount of money, obviously, that is available to the big five on that amendment. If you move up to the next level then you cover not only the big five at over 1 percent, but also the little guys. We are offering our amendment. We hope you will reject the Lamb amendment so that we, in fact, guarantee equal priority to all of those smaller subdivisions. I think the assumption there that Senator Lamb may be making, I think he said he was making, is that the big five need it most. I don't argue they need it, but I'm suggesting that a taxpayer is a taxpayer and they all will be affected by this. If you don't also guarantee that we look out for those small subdivisions, it is still going to show up in people's property tax bills and that is our main concern right now. So I think our amendment guarantees that we not only take care of the big five, but that we include those smaller groups, the ESUs, the fire districts, the ag societies and historical societies and whoever. So we are asking that you put them up there and it gives them equal treatment. I will explain that further if there are questions. But the other point I would make is this allows us some flexibility in here. I think the body has agreed that we're not going to the