

only the last \$70,000,000 that has not been distributed. That \$70,000,000 would be distributed under this amendment and this amendment, as I have pointed out, fulfills the commitment that the money would be returned as nearly as possible to the amount of revenue lost. Now I fully recognize that Senator Fenger was not a part of this body when that commitment was made. There is no reason for him to be concerned or to be felt bound by it because that is not his responsibility. It is, however, a responsibility of those of us who were here who made a solemn pledge that we would not adversely impact those local subdivisions and for Senator Fenger to imply or to state or to attempt to gloss over some of those inequities is not fitting of him. He will find as time goes on that advantages taken unfairly are advantages that come back to haunt and the reason that I am here today attempting to resolve the issue is because I am frankly a part of the problem and I freely concede that. This body, following the advice of the electorate many years ago, accepted the premise that certain classes of personal property should be exempted from taxation. We did that. We chose at that time to return to local subdivisions the monies that were lost and that is what we promised to do. When the Supreme Court found that the most recent formula was not constitutional there were many avenues we could have followed. We chose and the Revenue Committee determined to try to make a deliberate effort to resolve the issue. I have proposed for several years a system of revenue sharing which is embodied in this bill and which is a part of it and which will hopefully some day resolve some of the inequities which have been present in the present time. But that will be left up to the Revenue Committee to resolve. It is not a simple problem, Senator Fenger. If it were it would have been resolved a long time ago. It is a complex problem and it is interwoven with many other issues in this Legislature and it will continue to be so as it has been for a long time but this is as fair a method of the distribution of the \$70,000,000 or the 72.5 as you can find and I challenge you to prove otherwise and you cannot do otherwise because the fairness is built into it as nearly as we can do so. I would hope that the body would support the amendment. As I have said earlier, I will look at anything else on Select File that will seek to further minimize the impact upon any single subdivision or county. I have followed that premise for the twelve years I have been a member of this body and I do not see any reason to depart from it at this time. I ask you to support the amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Koch. Senator DeCamp, do you want to talk? Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. President, I move the previous question.