be, . . .

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time has expired.

SENATOR HALL: ... I need to do that.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore, please, followed by Senators Chambers, Hefner, and Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. Speaker and members, as often, Senator Withem has brought us a proposal which at first glance is very appealing, very good, seems he says it very fair, and he says, and Senator Scofield and others said, how possibly can you argue fairness in the other way. And we all know that fairness is in the mind of the beholder in this body, and you can't argue it the other way, you can't argue it since Senator Chambers said we're a bunch of dumbbells, is that the right word?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's one of them.

SENATOR MOORE: One of the right words, us dumbbells resort back to very elementary nursery rhymes. The Little Red Hen asked people to help her out, mix the flour, beat the chaff, got the bread made, everyone wanted to come join in. The Little Red Hen said, up yours, basically, you're not going to do it. And that was, to me, as a little kid, a basic, was a very basic issue of fairness, don't expect to reap the profits if you're not willing to do the work. Now, granted, that may be stretching that nursery rhyme a little bit, but yet it's still there. It's a good stab at trying to argue the fairness and I will stand by it. But as Senator Landis has said, much more eloquently than I can hope to, the fact of the matter is, what is the prudent thing to do in the state? What is the prudent management of state dollars, local dollars? I mean, it sounds very fair, but you're putting a risk, you're increasing what is at risk by about four-fold, from 30 to 120 million dollars, and what are you going to do about it? I can...you know, it's very tempting to grab onto Senator Withem's amendment. But I firmly believe the prudent and wiser management will be to oppose it, because once we, hopefully, whether at some point in time we adopt Senator Owen Elmer's amendment, or Senator Schmit's amendment, we're going to fix the problem. But is it fair to go back, because...go back and refund everybody's money all the way back? That's a tremendous burden on localities and governments all across the state. So I urge that...to ignore that first glance