

specific tax, as I understood it to fund it to provide growth. There is no way when I really look at the figures that representing my district that I could support 882 under its current formula. I think that what Senator Carsten is offering is reasonable, what I really like about it also it provides for growth but doesn't bind future legislatures to that growth, as I understand Senator Carsten's amendment. What it does mean is the Department of Revenue would certify an amount necessary reflecting the growth the Legislature then could appropriate or could consideration appropriations just like we do any other program for growth. It seems to me to be a far more appropriate way to go about it. Certainly those who have argued the question of constitutionality apparently this proposal would have no problem whatsoever, while it does result in some adjustment, from county to county it seems to me that it is a reasonable route, it is one that no one is probably totally happy with, but I think it would resolve the issue and I would urge the body to support Senator Carsten.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Murphy. Senator J. R. Murphy, John Robert.

SENATOR MURPHY: Well I had the . . . a complete inability to consider what we are doing because I have nothing before me. We are completely reversing this bill without benefit of facts, figures, verbage and as near as I can tell the only thing to speak in favor of it is my friend Senator Johnson insisting that it is my last chance to issue a noble vote and vote with him, and that in itself is frightening enough, but I would very much like to see what it is I'm supposed to be voting on. Because I think, I have no idea of the impact, the fiscal impact, I have no idea really of what is happening. A page and a half was read to me, and I'm a terribly slow learner and I'm going to have to look at it. So at this time, I can not support any such motion.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. Speaker, members, I know that you are all familiar with the handout. I would like to have you consider LB 691 without the six million or whatever is supposed to come from the corporate tax, which I believe Senator Carsten has taken out of it now. If you think that you are going to fair so well under that, without that six million in there, you had better look again, because you are a lot better off with 882 under any conditin than you are going to be under 691. I personally just can not accept the population formula. It has nothing to do with