

same thing. Now I just can't understand that rationale and I would like to have the people who want to do this explain it to me. Well, you haven't done so so far, Senator Schmit. Oh, I've been listening to what you're saying and you're saying about robbery, thievery, it's a crime, we did this and we did that and we're going to make you pay the money back. Oh, it's terrible, all these things. But that isn't the issue this morning. The issue is to pull a bill back, put it on the floor, take it away from the committee when we have a bill that does the same thing. That hasn't been addressed. And I defy you to show me and if you can show me where I'm wrong, that 807 doesn't do the same thing, then I will get up here and I will admit it and then we'll debate what you want to debate. But I'm willing to wait and debate selling the school land when the proper issue is before us. We're not discussing that issue. We have a bill where we can discuss that issue. So I ask this body that if you do not believe what I say, look in your bill book, look at the committee amendments and read what it says. That's all I ask you to do. One senator did not do that and he looked in his bill book and he says, well, gosh, you're right, it does do the same thing. So I just don't understand why we're taking this time, why we're debating this issue when we don't have to do it. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Warner, Senator Withem next.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, as I am reading these two opinions and perhaps I'm not reading them correctly, but the one indicates that we could not have in lieu of tax going to a noneducational entity, as I understand it, county government which I don't think there is any question about that. I'm sure that's true. But I don't see where that has anything to do with the in lieu of tax issue that's being discussed here. The second opinion, as I read the last sentence, it says, as noted in your inquiry some school districts do not receive funds pursuant to equalization portion and, therefore, would be...that bill or that amendment would be unconstitutional. What that says, to me, is that you cannot have a distribution formula that excludes some school districts from even qualifying. That's all it says, as I read it. Maybe it says something more. But if we do not have an opinion specifically to in lieu, it's doubtful in my mind, at least, whether or not that is the problem. Perhaps it is. The other thing that keeps coming across my mind, if the rule is...or if