

that we should sit here and because a few county officials shook the cobwebs out of their minds and the dust off their feet and hiked their way down here to the Legislature one day to try to destroy a piece of work that they have had no input into although they had every opportunity, we should not give in to that. I hope you will defeat Senator Kahle's amendment and any others that are similar to it, in fact, any others altogether.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, I rise to oppose Senator Kahle's motion. The argument of local control flows back and forth depending on the bill and the individual, and at different times it is convenient to call for local control and other times it is convenient to call for state mandate. I expect that there is a bill coming dealing with fringe benefits and the question of what should be in health insurance policies both at the state and local level, and I will be interested in seeing how the advocates of local control feel then when the state is dictating by state law what counties and school districts and so on should pay and shouldn't pay on their health insurance. I think we all know that that argument can be conveniently used and conveniently dropped. Now in the past when we tried to address what is the real issue, the sheriffs' bounty, we were told by county officials and sheriffs, well that is a supplement to the salary, you shouldn't take that away. So it seems to me that the counties have always been spending this money, that Senator Chambers' bill should be of no extra cost to the county, because they always told us they were letting sheriffs take that money under the table. It was always kind of understood and, golly gee, we didn't want to interrupt that, and somehow suddenly now they are saying, well, this is going to cost us money. But they have been spending the money all the time and they have been forcing sheriffs to be essentially dishonest, which I think is very very strange that we have to ask our law enforcement people to be dishonest, but that has been the situation. Now Senator Chambers here is trying to change that bounty system and suddenly all the people that in previous years told us, oh, you shouldn't change that, are saying, well, we have no problem with changing that...abolish the bounty system, it's a bad system, and all this. They have conceded that point. But now what they want to do is not only deny the sheriff the bounty but they want to take away the money they have been letting them collect under the table and deny them a decent salary. Now I don't think you can have it both ways. I think if we are going to abolish the bounty, I think