

and that paragraph are sitting there in a major bill with basically no explanation or reason as to why they are there, there is one additional paragraph, and that is the first paragraph I put. It says why, why are we doing this? The reason, because we recognize, as a Legislature, that ultimately, the ultimate responsibility for finding a way to fund education is us. That is why. The second reason, and in doing that, in finding a funding system, we should not rely too heavily on property. So, if anything, it is more binding language and stronger, and clarifies why we put that in in the first place. The other thing in the amendment is the same as yesterday. I felt if a number of people had been here and able to vote, that might have passed yesterday. The other thing is 40 percent as opposed to 45 percent. Dollar difference? About \$50 million. So that means about \$50 million more would be taken off of property and come from other sources as opposed 45 percent to 40. But the most important thing, or certainly one of the heaviest things in there is moving it up. You would have three full legislative sessions before you would have to get this done. The current law or the current proposal has five full legislative sessions. You may remember yesterday I suggested in five full legislative sessions you are going to have less than half of the members, at least according to the statistics of recent years, less than half of the current membership who are involved in putting this together. When you string something out for five years it is unlikely, at least in my opinion, that you're going to get her done. Now I said yesterday I'm convinced this bill is going to pass, and I still am, more so today than I was yesterday, and I was certain yesterday. As long as it's going to pass, let's go ahead and do what for some reason none of us have been able to get done, force us into a refinancing of our educational system. That's what it does and it does it on a realistic time table, three full legislative sessions. If we can't, in that period of time, if we can't come up with about \$150 million, which is what we are talking about, under some program, whether it is sales, or whether it is a combination of sales and income, if you can't do her in three, I guess I don't think you're going to do her in five or fifty years. Three full legislative sessions is more than enough time. If the only objection Senator Vickers had, if his only objection is that he thought this was less binding, it is exactly the opposite. This is more binding. It tells the what, the where, the why and the how of what Senator Johnson, himself,