

above what the school, in itself, was losing, the school district itself was losing. And that was in effect from '57 on into 1979, and it was legislation which I had introduced which really did not affect the in lieu of tax itself, but it was the bill that had an effective date of a couple years later, three years later, I think, which changed from 35 percent of actual value for tax purposes to 100 percent of actual value and cents on the dollars instead of mill levies. In that process, because of the way the in lieu of tax works, that amount of money going to schools was affected. So, in '82 there was a bill enacted...introduced and enacted which was meant initially to be hold harmless for one more year the schools that were going to have a substantial reduction because of the other legislation. It was interesting to me in the statement of intent on that bill in 1982, says traditionally the percentage for in lieu of tax payments have been set at a slightly higher rate than for property taxes. This compensates for the lack of revenue received by the other, in effect, local governmental subdivisions from school land in the form of taxes. Now, obviously, there may even be justification for that. But then when I was listening to the discussion on I believe it was an Attorney General's opinion or two that was suggesting that the whole concept might be unconstitutional, then as I recall there maybe was a subsequent amendment...request rather for an opinion which I believe maybe indicated that in lieu might not be unconstitutional. But I rather suspect that paying a school district more than the actual value, as current law probably does probably clearly is some constitutional question, and perhaps the courts will determine that. It's kind of interesting, we did some calculations, I just saw these. Obviously...I have two amendments up there, one strikes the bill and inserts this material, and the other one just adds a new section, they're identical otherwise. But if either of these amendments were adopted and we turned to what was most likely a constitutional in lieu for school purposes, it comes out something like 43 counties would probably have less revenue coming in. By the same token, if the land was sold and you had constitutional amendment number 2 was adopted, this is broad numbers estimates, of course, probably about 25 counties would have less receipts, and if you use market value and the higher level maybe 17 counties would actually have less receipts, if the property was sold, than they are receiving now. I do have some of this in chart form, but since I do not particularly intend to pursue it today, other than to just discuss it so that the body is aware that there is such a possibility to be