

very often have we applied the brakes in any kind of an entity, on an entity of government. We said, we need the money, let's go. Local subdivisions, counties have had to do it, cities have had to do it, schools, very frankly, have not had to do it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR SCHMIT: And each time that we have increased the amount of state support, the budgets have gone up locally. I don't like to do it, but, Senator Hefner, I may give you a vote on your lid.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Smith, would you care to discuss the Hefner amendment? Thank you. Senator Hall, on the Hefner amendment.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President and members, I rise to support Senator Hefner's amendment to the bill and strange as it may seem, I even agree a little bit with what Senator Schmit had to say. The issue before us is one that the Revenue Committee dealt with in a number of bills that came before it. There were a number of bills that we looked at that were brought to the body that dealt with the issue of whether or not there should be some form of a lid that was put in place to limit local subdivisions. In this case, the Hefner amendment would limit local subdivisions only those being the school boards, school districts, in terms of their spending. Other measures that we had addressed the overall issue of spending at the local level. Many of them dealt with the issue as it was laid out through the property tax relief bill that was passed last year and the fact that not much of it was felt to be relief because of the spending that took place at the local level. Much of it exceeded the 4 percent that the Hefner amendment or the bill, 1059, would have as a ceiling. I'm looking at drafting an amendment that would make the proposal that Senator Hefner has offered one that would stay in statute unless there was an affirmative act by the Legislature to change that lid, that percentage, and we'll probably take a look at that should the Hefner amendment be adopted. I am not one who is fond of lids either, Senator Schmit, but I do think that the area that we're dealing with here in terms of the funding of education at the local level had no choice but to rely on property taxes. What we do in 1059 is simply this. We redistribute the money so that it is fairly applied across the state so that each child has the same opportunity for educational costs and then the state begins