

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Hefner.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President, colleagues, I rise to support the Schmit amendment because I feel that it would be a little more fair to quite a few of us here in this body than the DeCamp amendment. I just figured up the 19th legislative district, this is the district that I represent and even with the Schmit amendment I drop approximately 17% from 882. I still believe that all of that personal property is still out there in that area but we still lose 17%. If we go with the DeCamp amendment, I lose over 20% and of course if we add some population, I lose more. I think that most of the rural areas do this. Only the urban areas gain if we use the other formula. Some senators and the press say that 284 with the Schmit amendment favors the rural areas. Well, it probably does favor us a little bit, but we are still the loser. Most of us still come up short and it seems to me like if I have got to represent my district, I have got to try and do the best job that I can and this is one of the reasons that I am standing up here and supporting this amendment. I believe that when we debate the state aid to school formula it seems like the urban areas get the advantage there too. So, I guess my question to this body is, why can't we at least try and favor some of the rural senators at this time? Some of them say that this is a compromise. It may be a compromise, but it certainly isn't a compromise to our liking. Earlier, I passed around an editorial that was written by KFTV Channel 7 from Omaha and in this editorial they are urging the Omaha senators to help the rural senators just a little bit and maybe then in turn we can help them. So I would strongly urge you to support the Schmit amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Kremer.

SENATOR KREMER: Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I appreciate the privilege of speaking for the first time on this issue that has become so controversial and watched so closely by our constituents both in the rural and in the urban areas. Many of you that are in the legislature today have not followed the process of eliminating and narrowing our tax base like some of us have that have been here for a long time. It has been said before and it needs to be said again. First thing we dealt with in narrowing the tax base we did away with what was known as a roll tax, or a head tax on everybody. We strongly felt through the years that everybody, everyone had a tax responsibility. That tax was eliminated. Then next comes a long a proposal to eliminate the household goods tax. Why? Well in most cases the household equipment was not worth too much, it was difficult to get a good assessment on it or evaluation of it and to ask the privilege to go into a private home and see what you had in the way of furniture and