

problem. And Senator Schmit and Senator Rogers recognize that and bring forth the amendment. Well, there's a flip side to that argument, I think, that has to be made because many of the same people who will call you up and say, do away with property taxes are the same people that will scream at the top of their lungs about maintaining local control. We do not want state interven. on in our decision making. We do not want the state running our schools. We don't want Senator Hall telling us, you know, how many kids we can have. We don't want Senator Lynch telling us how many kids we have in our schools. We sure don't want Senator Withem telling us how to operate our schools and things like that. You know, so the very people that say we don't want to pay property taxes but we don't want any state control. Now I've introduced bills in the past in front of the Revenue Committee, predecessors of 1059 that were...certainly wasn't my idea, predates me, and probably Senator Schmit could probably tell you who the true initial introducer of the bill was. You know, Harold Sieck and Wiley Remmers, back in the lobby, introduced bills that would have created half of the cost of education to be paid for by income taxes and I supported those. But the problem always came back to this. The state's going to start paying all the bills, the state's going to start making all the rules. And, as I have said, you know, Senator Schmit and Senator Rogers and though philosophically from the tax side of things I agree with them, that's my preferred method of taxation, and on the other hand, the price we pay for high property tax in this state is a high degree of local control. And some, many, many will say...I'm not one of them that's going to say it, many will say we have a high degree of local control and a high degree of inefficiency the way we operate things. And I guess if you would really carry...if you really wanted to adopt Senator Rogers' and Senator Schmit's amendment, you have to understand, on the other side, well, the old adage is true. He or she who has the gold makes the rules and if the state is going to pay for the cost of counties, there's not going to be 93 of them. There could maybe be 10, all radiating out from the fish hook. If the state is going to pay for the cost of education, there's not going to be 900 school districts. There may be three, Omaha, Lincoln and the rest of the state. That's the way it's probably going to be and Senator Will would love that. If he's paying the bill, unfortunately, he has the right to kind of say that, unfortunately. And my only concern with Senator Rogers' and Senator Schmit's bill, though I agree with it from the taxation perspective, the problem happens of what actually happens. And I think it's imperative upon many of us