

I think with a pretty negative attitude towards the state aid formula adjustments that were being proposed in LB 33. I had heard many times, and still hear, that the effect of the bill would be largely to benefit the metropolitan counties. I checked the adjustments in formula, both at \$55 million and \$75 million, and I find that only two of the significant sized districts in those three counties would be benefited by it percentage wise, and they are Valley and Malcolm, incidentally. The big districts, the Bellevue, the Omaha, the Lancaster County, the big district of Lincoln, these particular school districts do not receive an absolute increase in state aid on a percentage basis. On the other hand, I looked at some of the districts that were receiving a major increase percentage wise in state aid. I noticed among them a great many of the districts that are noted across the state as having extreme financial problems not related to management, but simply relating to their own tax base and the students that they have to support with educational services. I found that those schools, those schools like Plattsmouth, were making out pretty well under the formula. This bill will bring new dollars into the 24th Legislative District that I represent. We do not fare well under it. I knew that would be the case. But we do not fare very badly either. It seems to me that, in representing my constituents, I have the responsibility not only to ensure that they are getting more money under the state aid formula, that is not the primary focus. I have to be concerned that they're not being hurt, then I have the responsibility at the state level, it seems to me, to ensure that we are paying for the education at the state level for those children that happen to be residing in the less fortunate districts of the state. I know full well that the sales and income tax paid by every citizen in my district, or almost every citizen, is going to be greater than the property tax relief we're receiving. Yet, I think we do have a responsibility to some limited extent. All of you are going to have to be the judge of what that extent is to provide some property tax relief and, therefore, some better educational services to those students that live in the less fortunate parts of the state. In short, I find that this is not a metropolitan oriented formula, despite what I thought originally. I am supporting the formula. I think it makes some adjustments that are beneficial, helping those districts that really do have substantial problems. The only question, it seems to me, deals not with the matter of the formula itself, or whether it's going to bring property tax relief, it's a matter of whether you think it brings enough property tax relief, given the additional sales and income tax cost that it will have. I think it does. Therefore, I am in support of this bill at this point. I hope that some of the formula arguments that you've heard in the past will not be a consideration in voting against it. The only question, it seems to me, is the amount of money that we're adding to it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: I would speak to just one issue relative to school boards and the inference that the local school boards have the authority and the power to prohibit the cost of education increasing. I would ask if someone in this body, who has better access than I, would tell this group exactly what the fiscal impact of Rule 14, which was