

that loss of state aid which is really what we're talking about here. We're talking about \$97 million in state aid that shows up in LB 1 that we are offsetting to local subdivisions. And if you remember back to earlier debates on this issue of how do we refund monies and, you know, one of the biggest arguments was over do we refund monies? Is this something that we should do? And, I mean, that was the other option, let's just let the local subdivisions, in essence, pick up the slack here and as a state we're not going to worry about this \$100 million figure, we're going to let it be borne at the local level, in essence, through real estate taxes. We chose not to do that. We all recognize that real estate taxes are extremely high in this state, that one of the reasons we're in here is because the Governor recognizes that as well and says that LB 1 is a way to relieve that burden. It's also monies that are gone. The only way we could basically pull those back is to cut back in the next budget cycle in state aid to local subdivisions in the dollar figure that would represent the \$97 million that's in question right now. But, clearly, there is a connection, there is a nexus, if you will, to the issue of state aid and local property taxes...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...and LB 1 and any amendment that would come in to strip some of the funding out of LB 1, there has to be an offset at some point, otherwise the ledger just doesn't balance. And I would...again, I appreciate the question by Senator Elmer and hope that I have explained it so that folks can get a grasp on just what the impact is of any amendment that comes to LB 1 and pulls funding out of it. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Hefner, followed by Senators Elmer and Coordsen.

SENATOR HEFNER: Madam President and members of the body, I want to approach LB 1 from a different area and this is on the corporate occupation tax fee schedule and I just passed those out to you. Now I realize that most of these or probably all of these have been collected already so it won't be an additional fee next year. But I had a lot of people call me on this. Here we raised the minimum, a \$13 fee, to 163. In fact, we added \$150 on each fee, and that's 1154 percent increase. So I ask you this question, do you think this is fair? I had a couple of small store operators that just incorporated to protect