

increase the property tax to refund the 120 million, or the 30, or 40, whatever it ends up. And those who are on the side of the little people better vote no on the amendment, because that is the only way you're going to help those who can't help themselves. I would urge that the amendment be rejected and the bill remain as it is.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, 55 years ago a new President, who later became revered, didn't like the decisions of the Supreme Court, so he said I'll fix those guys, I'll appoint some new members, and I will pack the court and I will get the decisions I want. This Legislature, not liking the decisions of the court, has said, well, we can't tell the court what to do, we don't like what they're doing to us so we'll take another step; we will deny the citizen access to the court. Pretty effective system. I heard Senator Warner, Senator Hannibal, Senator Scofield, Senator Moore, all my esteemed colleagues, all with a lot of experience, all members of the Committee on Appropriations, which, very frankly, hand out the money, I'm not saying that because they are members, have a kinship in a way with the subdivisions who stand to lose the money, but they recognize that certain functions have to be provided for, probably more so than I do. They recognize that there is usually a way to provide those functions. But what I'm telling you is this, Senator Warner says the little people are going to pay. Ladies and gentlemen, as has been explained before, the little people always pay. The little people always pay, and make no mistake about it, more so today than a year, five, ten years ago. The argument that if we vote for the Withem amendment that somehow or other the big guy is going to get out, the big guy is going to get out. We passed LB 775, and then we had a loophole in it so that people who laid off people could actually still qualify for the benefits, so we said we've got to plug that loophole, and so we did. Then a company, a local company, didn't lay anybody off, but they rolled back the salaries of some people from \$12 an hour to \$8.50, taking about \$21 million annually out of the pockets of certain employees. I want to emphasize I am not critical of that company. That management has to know what they have to do to survive in a competitive industry, and they did what they thought they had to do. But I would suggest they probably still qualify, Senator Wesely, you might check it out, for the benefits of 775. Didn't lay anybody off, but it is directly contrary to the arguments I