

logistical problems with delaying the implementation that I'm not aware of, I'm willing to talk to Senator Bohlke or any others who are interested in working out those logistical problems. Perhaps there are some dates that can't be...that cannot be delayed for some reason that I'm not aware of. I'm open to discussion on that. But I am serious about this policy of waiting with this bill, in terms of the full effect, until we see what happens out of this body in the next 14 legislative days and the fall elections that will perhaps have some serious school finance effects as a result of the petition drives. And I think we could all go back to our constituents and say we have done the right thing if we do it in that fashion. Now, if we...if we go ahead and we see fit to leave the current implementation dates in this bill, I think we are subject to criticism legitimately for having rushed something this major through this body in this short session without knowing what's going to happen even in the year that we have awaiting us with all the proposals that will be on the ballot. I ask you to seriously consider this. I would like to have a good debate on this issue and, as a result of that, I hope that you'll see fit to seriously consider some modest delay of the implementation dates of 1050. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

SENATOR CROSBY PRESIDING

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Bromm. For discussion on the Bromm amendment, Senator Withem, followed by Abboud, Bohlke, Beutler, Bernard-Stevens, Stuhr, and Schrock. Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, Madam President, members of the body, I will not be voting for the Bromm amendment. I understand why it's being offered and I understand why it might have some appeal, but, again, I would like to put these things in perspective somewhat in terms of a time line. I did that with the Wickersham amendment in terms of just this session. This one I'm going to be a little broader. When I first came into the Legislature in 1983, we had a state aid to education formula that provided around 20 percent, I think, of the cost of education in the state and the money was basically, all but a pittance of it, was distributed under a head count basis. From '83 until about 1987, we tried different tactics to try to get attention to moving toward an equalization-based formula. Finally, in the property tax debate, in discussion of the late 1980's, I don't remember what year it was particularly, '88,