

February 25, 1992 LB 1120

my point of view, since we have adopted the philosophy of having to try to replace revenue loss at local levels, I would support the amendment if that provision were in there and I would hope that I can support the amendment that Senator Hall is talking about, and Senator Lynch, and I'm sure he will agree to replace that local revenue, then I would support his amendment. Senator Lynch, do you believe it is necessary to replace the local revenue or do you just think that we should tell the local government to either root hog and die and do without it? What do you think we should do?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Lynch, would you respond, please?

SENATOR LYNCH: I think so. I'm not sure what root hog and die means, but I think it's bad whatever it is, I'm not sure. But I'd have to defer to Senator Schmit because he was a senator in 1976 that offered the bill that provided total exemptions without a replacement at the time. So maybe, or did you offer a replacement at the time?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Oh, yes, glad you brought it up, Senator.

SENATOR LYNCH: Oh, yes, 70 million, but the problem is it never got funded. That's right. There was some little crick there I remember. We said it would take 70 million to replace it, but we never approved or supported the \$70 million.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Correction.

SENATOR LYNCH: So there was...was that true or not? Okay.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator, we did...

SENATOR LYNCH: I'm sorry. I'd answer your question, Loran.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Okay.

SENATOR LYNCH: But I agree with you, seriously, I agree with you.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Let me touch upon the 70 million. We did provide that money for replacement. Unfortunately, the court said that we could not make a dollar for dollar replacement, and so in later years a new formula was used which was a population formula which shifted \$12 million from rural areas to urban