

collect, less valuation, their state aid is going to go up. That's the way it's supposed to happen. Some of you that hear nasty things about 1059 back in their districts, like the Speaker, I know, he's heard from former principal of mine, when I was teaching, who's the superintendent out there, that they lost state aid this year, they lost state aid because the one or two year bump, when we had ag land values up closer to market value was funneled into that particular year, and so they're getting less state aid. That's the way the program is supposed to work. All in all its impact is not that great. All in all, as I remember, the money doesn't flow to any particular category of schools. The argument Senator Haberman was using, I think he was confusing it with some of the things he had heard from constituents who were consolidated districts that don't like 1059 in a general sense. If you have valuation added, in a comparative sense, more so than other districts, you won't get as much. If you have valuation not as much added, you'll get more, but that's the way 1059 is supposed to flow, that's what it's supposed to do, and the impact is negligible, i.e., like Senator Haberman who visited with Mr. Kemper indicating that there's some questions have come up, and I've asked him to not only send over Senator Haberman the printout we had last summer, because that was based on a proposal that the 3-R Committee was looking at, 1063 has since been introduced and it's in different forms, and I've asked him to update that information. That will be available to anybody that has an interest, but I think you'll find that there is no real smoking gun contained within it.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Conway. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I want to make it clear that as the bill is drafted today any illusion that anyone on this floor or in the State of Nebraska might have that if we advance this bill, pass it into law, and if we follow up with a constitutional amendment, as proposed, that if there is any illusion that there is any opportunity to vote against personal property tax reimposition, that is wrong. One of two things will happen, either we will get the limited, very discretionary, discriminatory reimposition of certain types of personal property taxes upon those who have no one to speak for them, and I include the farmers among that, that group, or else we will get a total reimposition of the tax. Now my friends on the floor here, some of them rural, have said we do not dare vote against the constitutional amendment because that puts it all