

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I oppose the amendment and I don't oppose it just because I have an alternate amendment, because it is Davey Newell offering it, because there is a suspicion it is urban or rural or whatever. I oppose it for the following several reasons. Number one, it is absolutely and unequivocally the worst formula that has been offered thus far and I personally, Senator Newell, would support population 100 percent over this formula. I would support the Schmit formula forever, though I opposed it and beat it once over this formula. I would support almost anything including the old conversation about the counting of birds over this particular formula. I think it is the worst formula for the following reasons. It has the grab-bag theory. There is no relationship to anything. Grab a number out of the air, throw the money in a particular direction, grab another few dollars out of the air, throw it at another direction. \$40 million thrown, state air formula that is in existence or something; \$20 million thrown in this direction. Thus it solves no problems and guarantees this that every week, month and day of the year in the future I, Von Minden, you, Jerry Warner, are all going to be figuring how we can come back the next year and simply change a number, change 40 to 20, change 20 somewhere else to 40, so that we get more benefit. It takes all the problems we have experienced in state aid and multiplies them by ten. It doesn't address anything other than to say we grab money and throw it, and that is the danger of such a theory. It starts out with the "Schmit formula" on the theory that, well we got told that was constitutional for a little while. I also, with the formula that I and 23 or 4 or 5 others are offering, start out with the Schmit formula but we have a goal and a reason, and there is where you have to contrast the two. We accept that for a year, a year we can't change anyway, with the intent to get to something stable and that will accomplish something in the future. We intend, with the amendment offered as an alternative to this one, to be fair to the urbans and basically fair to the rurals because both of them in the past have voted strongly and overwhelmingly for the valuation. It is the technicality of the Attorney General's Opinion that has tied up the valuation issue, something you strongly and others strongly defended before, and something that will accomplish the equalization and better functioning of our property tax system. So the Schmit formula for a year or two until we get to that is a noble goal, whereas simply using the Schmit formula to go to nowhere in the future is not effective or noble. So I oppose the amendment. I submit