

day said, indeed you can. What I am telling you now is in my own humble opinion putting myself on the line and saying, the bill as proposed is constitutional for the following reasons. I will read you what I consider the critical paragraph out of the Attorney General's Opinion, and it says, and I quote, "The bill does not attempt to state the purpose which will be served by this formula for distribution". In other words, valuation. "Section 6 does mention some purposes of providing financial assistance to the political subdivisions but it is not clear whether that section pertains to the distributions we have been describing or only to such assistance after fiscal year 1982-'83. In any event, none of those itemized in Section 6 demonstrate a logical relationship between themselves and the distribution of the funds on the basis of valuations of taxable property". What I think the Attorney General was trying to tell us, rather than say the formula of itself is unconstitutional, I believe he was telling us and maybe I reluctantly have to admit quite properly so, maybe he was telling us, you haven't put enough information in the bill, you haven't given your findings, you haven't said your basis for this formula. Acting in accord with that and working....

PRESIDENT: Half a minute, Senator.

SENATOR DeCAMP: ...with Senator Lamb, with the Governor's office and people there, we put in detailed language of findings, legislative responsibility. You can read it in there, why there is the relationship, what the goals are, and I believe the relationship is ironclad. I believe any court in the land is going to have to say, yes, we may not necessarily agree that all these goals are accomplished but certainly the Legislature by a majority did, and, therefore, we are going to say it is constitutional. I submit to you that this gets the problem addressed now with the formula that the urbans overwhelmingly, overwhelmingly, accepted a few weeks ago. I would like to have the formula start out immediately. The closest I can come is the next couple of months after the matter is litigated, if there is even litigation, and I think the Attorney General when he reviews now will say we have done the right thing. But anyway, the past is the past. 1980 valuations I couldn't change anyway if I wanted. 1981 I couldn't change, so the earliest this would come into play would be when it would anyway, which is about 1982. I urge you to adopt the amendment. I don't claim it is a magic solution. I claim it is a middle of the road course that probably is reasonable, and