

especially in light of the fact that we have now made some major changes in the way our...of the structure of our system is also logical and correct. And as painful as it is to me, as I know it is to Senator Remmers, because Senator Remmers and I, although we may not always be on the same side on particular issues, we tend to go the same directions when it comes to how we try to fund education. That is the reason our two names are on this bill. But I do not believe the bill needs to be here. The decision was made in this body that, no, we are not going to change the mechanism in 662, the language that is in there, in spite of the fact that the Governor asked for it, suggested it, but I would suggest to this body and others that it is not totally necessary to have 505 as a vehicle. It is not totally necessary since that particular sections of 662 are not going to take effect anyhow, and those arguments were made this morning and they are valid arguments. If we come in this fall and we are committed, then we are committed to coming up with a logical mechanism to supply the funds for education be it based on property tax relief, be it based on philosophy or whatever, then we certainly do not need 505 to do it. And I think that it is going to be a waste of the Legislature's time to spend hour after hour after hour talking about property tax relief in the remaining 23 days of this session when, in fact, we all know we are coming back in August or September to do it again and to undo and redo what we are attempting to do now. And as I said earlier, I know it is painful for Senator Remmers and it is painful for me, but I am going to support the motion to indefinitely postpone 505.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Miller, then Senator Beutler.

SENATOR MILLER: Mr. President, I am not in favor of killing this bill. I don't think this body should be either. We have had...my constituents in the 37th District have told me they want property tax relief. We have looked at several ways to give property tax relief. We have looked at Howard Lamb's to give a direct check rebate back. We have looked at Vard Johnson's 712 to give a larger homestead exemption. None of those two seemed palatable. This one may not be palatable and it won't be palatable unless we can decide how to share the monies back. I think that is why Senator Remmers wants to kill it. He is not in favor of the Revenue Committee's formula. I think it would be much more intelligent to rather than kill the bill, to decide if that