

February 13, 1996 LB 349, 1050

CLERK: Madam President, I have a motion, priority motion. Senator Wickersham would move to reconsider the vote on Senator Robak's amendment to the committee amendments that was offered yesterday, offered and considered yesterday.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The Chair recognizes Senator Wickersham to open on his motion.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President and members of the body. I am apologetic for not being here yesterday when debate was taken up on Senator Robak's amendment to the committee amendments. Had I been here I would have been able to tell you that I agreed with her proposal because the section of the committee amendments that Senator Robak sought to strike was a proposal that I had originally submitted to the Education Committee concerning the income tax rebate. Now the proposal that is contained in the amendment is one which limits the income tax rebate in school districts if their income tax rebate plus their local effort yield will equal more than 65 percent of their needs. This year the committee, as you will find once we get to LB 1050, the bill that's following LB 349 in the agenda this morning, you will find that the committee has advanced quite a different proposal dealing with the income tax rebate. That proposal is to cap the income tax rebate at about \$83 million. I expect that there will be a spirited discussion of that proposal this year from the committee. And being ever mindful that last year's position is not necessarily this year's position and recognizing a change in what is effect committee amendments, I am willing and believe it is appropriate to put off the debate on the income tax rebate until we get to 1050. And adopting Senator Robak's amendment to the committee amendments will do just that, leaving the bill essentially as she introduced it except that the committee amendments do add a definition which is appropriate and necessary, at least in my view. Maybe Senator Robak has another view of that, she'll perhaps tell us later whether she thinks the balance of the committee amendment is appropriate. But, at any rate, I believe it is appropriate to strike Section 4 of the committee amendment. That leaves Section 6 of the committee amendments, which is not in proper form because the repealer clause would not be appropriate. But I think that bill drafters can remedy that and perhaps Senator Robak has indeed remedied that in her amendment. I'm...I'll have to confess I have not seen it. I