

help, and I would hope that the body would be there as well. And I thank Mr. Speaker for the time.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, it's been said that we did this with the railroads and we do it all the time, therefore we ought to reimburse. And that is true, we've done it before and maybe we ought to do it, I don't know. Everything we do on this floor has an impact upon some subdivision of government. When we specify, by statute, the responsibilities of cities, counties, NRDs, any other entity, we place upon them a financial burden. We don't just hand out the money. I can remember when my county board members, all across the board, Mike Bartek and the whole gang came down and said, don't pass one more bill that costs the counties money unless you ship the money out with us, because we are tired of having to dig up the money for some grandiose scheme which you fellows are talking about. Right now comes to mind all of the interest we have in solid waste. We're telling the first...the second class cities, and we're going to tell the counties you better deal with solid waste. We're not telling them how to find the money for it. Yesterday we said we're going to put the counties and the cities under a lid by saying you cannot spend more than so much money. They already have restraints upon them. But we are then further saying that, because someone decided it was good to place the schools under a lid, we're going to extend it to cities and counties. Notwithstanding the fact, we say solid waste is a major problem, it's up to you to handle. We're not going to send the money out to you, but we're telling you, you've got to do it. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I see no difference, I see absolutely no difference because of actions or inactions by this legislative body. The courts have brought about a ruling, and therefore there are some losses to some areas, some losses in my area, I recognize that. What are you going to do if the balance of the 15 percent of the personal property taxpayers go to court and we have then the same situation next year? Are we going to do that also? I think not, I think not. Is it a question of only in a few instances, such as this, where the funds are of such a nature and such an amount that you can visibly see them and you say, well this is what it's going to cost us. It doesn't cost you. In a way, Senator Byars, look at the fact that Gage County, for many years, has been collecting \$894,000. That means that those taxpayers in Gage County have been having a lower property tax levy for umpteen years as a result of that.