

suddenly took those funds away from them. If you will check the record, you will note that the counties that I represent under the distribution formula that I propose for the 70 million dollars would receive substantially less revenue than they would under the 284 formula. I did it knowingly and it was kind of a joke around the Legislature for a time because some of the staff, I am told, said that poor old farmer is getting more senile than he appears to be, he doesn't even know what his own bill does. But to those of you who are on the Revenue Committee, Senator Carsten and I, Kahle, Peterson, Hefner, Senator Burrows, all of you, I outline I think very clearly what we were doing. I recognized that we were never going to be able to return those revenues as exactly as we had wanted to. That was out the window. So I proposed a revenue sharing proposal, which I felt was equitable. And, it was weighted and it still is if you want to use it, towards population, because I recognize the old system is gone. That population is going to be a major factor and there are some justifiable reasons for it. Now, why then do I oppose the DeCamp amendments and support my own? For the same reasons that Senator DeCamp gave several days ago. These subdivisions have come to expect a certain amount of revenue as a result of the distribution of the 70 million dollars. These subdivisions have waited for a long while. My proposal handicaps fewer subdivisions than any other formula that we could put together. Senator Newell asked me a question this morning. I told him that I would prefer his formula to the DeCamp proposal because if you give the subdivisions even one year warning they can take some kind of measure to compensate. But without any warning whatsoever various subdivisions are going to find themselves in a problem. The proposal that Senator DeCamp offers to you this morning or this afternoon will cause about 35 counties to suffer a severe drop in revenue. The proposal that I offer you will allow about seven counties to suffer a severe loss and there is no way imaginable that anyone that I know of can find out how in the world you can mitigate the losses to those counties by any formula. I think that the members of this body, if it were constitutional, would be willing to put together a fund if Senator DeCamp proposed it one time to prevent that loss to those subdivisions, but we have been told that we can't do it. Therefore, the proposal that I am offering is, I believe, preferable because it will cause the least amount of problems to the majority of the subdivisions the first time out.

SPEAKER MAPVEL: Your time is up.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I ask that you not support the DeCamp proposal.

SPEAKER MAPVEL: Senator Kahle.