

February 12, 1996 LB 349

SENATOR COORDSEN: One minute.

SENATOR ROBAK: Thank you. My district, some of my people told me their taxes, 1059 simply didn't work. This is the missing link in the 1059 formula. Simply, 1059 simply didn't work. It was meant to be a property tax relief bill. Property taxes have continued to climb almost to the confiscatory level. Although we are talking about two levels here, there are schools that will gain, schools that will lose, but property taxes will continue to climb, and this is one effort that I believe we can make to control property taxes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Bohlke (sic). I would like to pause here for a moment and introduce several sets of guests of members of the Legislature. First, Senator Wehrbein would like to announce he has 25 college students from SCC, with their instructor, and they are seated in the north balcony. Please rise and let us express our appreciation for your being here today. Thank you. Then, secondly, Senator John Hilgert would introduce, he has two guests, Al Rodriguez and Virgil Armendariz. They are seated under the south balcony. Would you two gentlemen please rise. It's good to have you with us today. The first speaker that I have on the committee amendments is Senator Robak. Oh, Mr. Clerk, amendments.

CLERK: Senator. Senator Schimek has the first amendment to the committee amendments, Mr. President. AM2944, Senator.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you. Mr. President and members of the body, I stand to offer this amendment because I think that there are some provisions in this bill that, well, that I'd like to see changed, obviously. And I think that Senator Withem spoke to the fact that this bill was designed after the legislation in Missouri, but that our formulas have been structured differently, and so I think that you might get into a bit of a problem doing it. But the effect of my amendment is simply to change the language of the bill, and I am not going to go into it in detail because I am going to have to pass over this in a minute, but I just want you to be aware of what I see as a problem. It changes the language so that it is not just residents of a district whose income tax returns are used in figuring this formula, but it's other entities in the district