

SENATOR COPE: The next question then, will it add the \$7½ million...will it add anything to next years appropriation?

SENATOR F. LEWIS: No, no, no, absolutely not.

SENATOR DeCAMP: It's a separate issue. This is to address the immediate crisis. Senator Lewis' amendment addresses let's say the long term problems in education, state aid.

PRESIDENT: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President, colleagues, I think some of you greater Nebraska Senators better take a pretty strong, close look at this distribution. We've got a situation in the State of Nebraska where we have an awful lot of schools losing because of the heavy funding of equalization. We all remember now that the problems arise when we start talking about equalization, it's because of the assumptions. It assumes that the only index of wealth is assessed property. That is the only index of wealth. Because of that assumption, and because of the amount of money that we're distributing in that equalization formula, we have an awful lot of school districts losing. In fact, out of 1100 school districts in the State of Nebraska, only 240 receive some equalization. Now we're going to take \$7½ million and distribute it on a per pupil basis, or on an ADM basis, and we're not going to do anything to try to bring this discrepancy into order. So those losing are still going to lose. Those gaining, through the unequal equalization formula, are going to gain equally with those that lost. That is what we're doing. That is what we're doing. So the problem with LB 33, basically, was the equalization formula itself. That was, basically, the problem. To say, across this state, that the only index of wealth is equalization is absolutely ludicrous. To say that assessed value indicates, or gives you an ability to pay taxes is absolutely ridiculous. Everybody on this floor knows it. Your house taxes don't mean a darn thing, or absolutely do not help you, or give you the money to pay those taxes. It is the same thing with agricultural land. Because that land has high assessed values does not mean that farmer has the ability to pay taxes. He can dry out, he can get hailed out, he can have low commodity prices, but that assessed value stays high. We're not doing enough with this amendment to correct the discrepancy that exists. This got buried under a little bit, under LB 33 because we papered it over with another \$60 million, 20, 40 and 60. We're not doing anything with this amendment but to make those who gained, or got windfalls, to continue to get more windfalls, and those that were short we're not trying to do anything to try to equalize it. You've all seen the print-outs on the distribution of the \$49 million. You all know what happened to your districts back home on that kind of distribution. You know. They got shorted. That is what happened. This amendment does not try to correct that inequity. We're taking the \$7½ million and instead of trying to correct that inequity, we're only keeping the poor poor and the wealthy districts wealthy. The definition, again you'll recall, of poor and wealthy is totally assessed value of property. So if you think you've solved the problem with this amendment, if you think you're representing your people with this amendment, especially you greater Nebraska Senators, you're not doing it. This amendment does not do it.