

that 70 million. Is that a fair statement for you to make, I mean for me to make?

SENATOR WARNER: I am not sure that you have to justify it to me, Senator Carsten. I think it would be appropriate if there is a figure for the body to know the accumulative interest that, in fact, governmental subdivisions have had to pay on warrants drawn for our consideration, not necessarily because of me.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Thank you, Senator Warner. If I may, Mr. President, thank you. If I may, I think it was the general feeling of the committee and not contradicting you, Senator Warner as chairman of the Appropriations, nor the Appropriations Committee, but we did feel that this interest was directly related to governmental subdivisions because of the inability of them to receive this money on time when they had expected it. I know this is a very difficult question to answer but it is a solution that we need to face. It has been prolonged for a longer period of time than I felt we needed and nevertheless, we have to face it. I do support the committee amendments and if it is desirable that we delete the interest portion of it with Senator DeCamp's approval or disapproval, whatever, perhaps that is the best way to go. Thank you, that is all my comments at the moment, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think it is a fair statement to say we all know that this is one of the major issues the session is going to revolve around and how we settle it and it will probably affect a lot of other things and I think we all know that it requires, for effectiveness, about thirty-three votes and that means nobody can be too unreasonable one way or another. What we have pretty well agreed on as I understand it from previous debate on it, is that we are pretty much going to stick with valuation as our concept for distribution of some money to resolve the personal property tax question and maybe hopefully put this in a one major issue to rest at least for a couple of years, I would hope. Now that decision is our basis or our foundation. We have about three or four other questions. Number one, is the number \$70,000,000? Is it \$72.5 million? Number two, when we determine we are going to hang on valuation, are we going to hang on valuation with emphasis on one particular type of real estate which tends to give one community maybe a little more and another community a little less? Or are we going to stick with the bill in its pure form the way it is now? I can live with either form. I think either form will satisfy the needs of most Nebraskans. Finally, are