

The Attorney General has indicated this is not the only state in the Union as the Attorney General provided that information for the Revenue Committee last year saying that most other states in the Union have some sort of basis for the distribution of dollars, tax effort, need, not population. And so here we have Senator DeCamp arguing this point. He is saying, if you adopt this bill, it is entirely on population. What has population got to do with anything? Well frankly, I think Senator DeCamp knows better than that but I expect it does play well, probably does play well in Neligh, Nebraska, and I can appreciate that. But you know, in the end this formula says, for the distribution of \$40 million the money is distributed on the basis of head count per student, not on the traditional formula which has equalization and incentive aid, but basically only on head count and why? Because that was the most rural oriented way we could distribute the money under the formula and still have a rational reason for doing it. That is not pure population. That is basically what rural senators have fought for for years and years and years. I remember the debate on school aid when we used to think we could raise the sales and income tax where we thought we had extra money that we could provide some property tax relief and the debate was always urban-rural. There is too much equalization in this formula. We need it based on one student, one dollar, or two dollars or three dollars but that is the way it ought to be distributed. That is what has been argued in the past. Now it is being distributed that way but it is a change from the old formula that was even better. And why was it better? Senator DeCamp argues that point. He says, look, this money came to replace the personal property taxes that were lost, the piggies. Remember the piggies? And the tractors. Those were exempted. Now I want to remind this Legislature and I suppose that you all will remember it wasn't me asking that the piggies be exempted. It wasn't me asking that the tractors be exempted. Heck, I didn't even want the inventories for the businesses exempted. It was those same senators that are arguing now the inequity of this formula that wanted that exempted. They got it exempted and they wanted to use sales and income tax dollars which basically come from other areas of the state to go and replace the lost taxes that they asked for, the tax exemptions that they asked for. Now I don't want to fight that old question of whether those should have been exempted or not but Senator DeCamp brings these issues up and I can't let them go without responding. Those are lost issues. The exemptions are in place. Those are lost issues. We have to find a constitutional way, a reasonable way of distributing the \$70 million and a reasonable way to distribute the 12.4. This is the most favorable formula to rural areas that can be devised that is based on need. We're not