

past, we're going to throw more millions, continue to do so but \$10,000 is not significant. What is significant is the issue. The issue is whether or not valuation has any rightful place in the distribution formula back to the subdivisions. I think you will find that those of us in the rural areas think it does. Those of you from the urban areas think it does not, not unless it favors your position of course. But if anyone has any illusions, if you have been able to sustain any illusions throughout this debate that there will be any great wisdom forthcoming in another legislative session it will be directly proportional to where the votes lie. It will make a difference whether Senator Schmit is back here, Senator DeCamp is back here, Senator Nichol is back here, whether Senator Newell is holding forth in Omaha or whether he is back here. That is what is going to make the decision as to whether or not one formula is more equitable than another. But if you have any illusions that men of good faith and women are going to sit down, once you've got yourself a little bit better or a larger share of the pie and voluntarily surrender it, I think you will find out that it is not going to happen. The reason that I have fought so hard for four years for a revenue sharing bill and a bill that was eminently fair to the urban areas was for the simple reasons I told the Revenue Committee many times, the day will come when the rurals will be outvoted and before that time comes I wanted to establish in law some type of a distribution formula that would be equitable across the board and I left the distribution up to the Revenue Committee. I said, play with the figures, do what you think is necessary but establish some kind of formula which you can go back home and tell your people, demonstrate some solid sensible attempt by the Legislature to distribute state revenue sharing funds. It may well be, and I'm sure this has crossed the minds of those who have been here longer than I, that revenue sharing in itself is no longer possible but again I would suggest that so long as a majority of the members have it within their ability to portion those funds in a manner which is favorable to their districts, that revenue sharing in the state...

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute left.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...it is not revenue sharing really, it is revenue apportionment. Again I would want to say this, the DeCamp proposal is one which you cannot argue if you are sincere in trying to find new avenues or better avenues for distribution of funds. I do not expect it to be adopted.

SENATOR CLARK: I would like to introduce former Senator Nelson Merz under the south balcony there. Would you stand and be recognized, please, Nelson? Welcome back. The next speaker we have is Senator Carsten.