

court judge said that formula is unconstitutional. Wait a minute. That was the whole basis of adopting it at the time. We knew the Attorney General was questioning it. We knew he had a different philosophy on whether you could tie it to valuation and we knew, we absolutely knew we were going to get a district court decision saying it was either constitutional or unconstitutional, one way or the other, and it would be appealed to the Supreme Court and the whole purpose was we would delay implementation until this next year so that we would get that court test. Now we're ready for the court test and you want to act like there is a big, new shock. We knew this. This was the whole purpose of adopting it. The record is replete with it. That was the idea of using that Schmit formula for two years. The next myth I want to get cleared up. The figures that you have gotten so far compare the Schmit formula and the dollars there with the 816 formula but the 816 formula should be compared, if anything, with the formula here, what the law is, what it is going to be July 1, 1982. That is what you haven't seen. That is what I hope to get to you here in the next five or ten minutes. And under that, as I say, Omaha gets dramatic increases. Bellevue almost doubles but there is a point where you can't push too far and ask for too much. You can't just take everything. Now what does the amendment do, so you do understand it. Very simply this, it says we go ahead exactly as we agreed, exactly as we agreed last year. We finish the court test and if it is constitutional, we go ahead with valuation distribution. Okay? And if it is unconstitutional, if a court says it is unconstitutional, the amendment simply does this. It says, okay, go on to 816 so we don't have special session, so we don't have this, so we don't have that. All the amendment does in essence is say, live up to the agreement we had a year ago to go ahead and test valuation in the courts so we'll know it for this and a number of other purposes in the future on all our laws and if we are wrong, then we take our lumps after we've completed the agreement.

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute left, Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Now I did talk to the Chief Justice about the problems of getting a decision down. The case is already before the Supreme Court. In fact, they held up filing a brief to wait and see what we do. He told me, and he said I could say this on the record, that the court understands the issue and the problem, that about eight to ten weeks after the arguments there will be a decision down. That would mean you would get your decision at the latest, by my calculations and he agreed with me, by the latest, by about September and if they went ahead and completed the briefs immediately, probably by July because they are going