

March 4, 1981

LB 390

points have been fairly well made by my rural colleagues, but I would like to make one point that I don't think too many people have made here this morning. It has been discussed to some degree, the equalization or the state aid formula for the schools. And if you remember correctly, a year ago there was an increase in the amount of state aid. In order to get that increase in the amount of state aid, and in order to get some of the rural people, including myself, to be convinced that we should increase the amount of state aid, we reversed the percentages that had been going out on the equalization formula if you remember. There was also an amendment offered at that time to go strictly on a per pupil basis and it was soundly defeated. It was soundly defeated by the population centers of the State of Nebraska. It was soundly defeated by those people that represent areas that receive equalization dollars, and we had a hearing last night that deals with that exact problem. And once again, here we are those same people who said they didn't want to deal with population in that case, and the first year I was down here I had a bill to do exactly that, to go on a per pupil basis. But they don't want to deal with population in that case, but they are perfectly willing to use population in an attempt to reimburse the loss of personal properties. I believe somebody is not being too consistent. It seems to me that what we have going on right now is an issue that we have this teeter-totter, somebody has got to go up and somebody has got to go down, and it would appear from the number of signatures on this motion to pull this bill from the committee that the weight is going to be on one end and I think I have an idea though that in this instance those of us that don't have the weight are going to be the ones that are going to go down. We are going to defy the laws of gravity to some degree. I have some problems with the reimbursement of lost revenues for the property tax reimbursement to start with. I will admit to that. I am not sure that that \$70 million carrot that was hung out to get 518 passed is a good idea to continue. But for goodness sakes, if we are going to continue it, let's put it back on the original premise. I think Senator Lamb spoke to that very eloquently. The number of cattle taken off the property tax rolls has no relationship whatsoever to population. Now, obviously my district is going to lose if we start going by population. One other thing that it's been referred to some deals might have been cut in this body and I for the benefit of those of you that might not know better, I don't cut deals, and I think I have some other people in here that don't either,