

but I do need to make some remarks and relative to Senator Newell's proposal. As we were looking at some type of formula that we needed to pass this year, our office and our staff did many approaches with different types of formulas and one of which was the use of our present distribution formulas to various governmental subdivisions, and it was an interesting result, looked to me to be workable, constitutional, and perhaps one that we should look favorable on. In doing that, as the latter part of Senator Newell's proposal does, I found very little support for that and could not believe that it was worth pursuing any further. I do think it has some merits and in the interim work that our Revenue Committee anticipates on doing along with others, we may very well be examining this kind of an approach on the long term solution. However, I think that we must keep in mind and I think this body should keep in mind that at this point and with 22 days left, we need to have 33 votes here with whatever goes out to be sure that the \$70 million move as quickly as we get it implemented. I do think there is merits in both of these proposals and I guess I think that one other point that I need to make and that relates to the foundation portion of the third year that Senator Newell is proposing. I do have some questions of what that will do to those schools that do depend on the formula that we now use on 60-40 foundation and equalization, and what it would do to those schools and how many that might be affected with the equalization portion. I would hope that somewhere along this discussion we may have that answer given to us, Senator Newell. I cannot say that it is an appropriate approach. If Senator DeCamp is around, I do have one question that I would like to ask him. Senator DeCamp, I have one question relative to the proposal that you do have coming up and your intent, and I am sure that you understand that a portion of your proposal is questionable even though the first part is acceptable. Is it your intent, or your expectation, that by the time we need to have a permanent solution to our distribution process that we will have a directive from the court telling us what is and what is not acceptable? Is that the intent of your amendment eventually?

SENATOR DeCAMP: That is the intent, Senator Carsten. Additionally, language that you have developed, Senator Lamb, and I think maybe portions of the Attorney General's office may even make it a moot question and we may have corrected the problems they have raised already and we may have an Attorney General's Opinion eventually that says, no, it is okay now, you addressed the technicalities.