

February 13, 1996 LB 349, 1050

impact of the Robak amendment would be to, to eliminate any cap on rebate and simply then allow the LB 349 to move forward, which there would be no cap on the rebate plus then we'd another income factor to the bill. And that's something I can't support. I voted no on adoption of the Robak amendment yesterday because I think if we're going to keep a bill that adds an income factor to the state aid formula, we should, at the very least, put some sort of cap on the existing provision that we have that puts income into the formula. And that's the reason I voted no on the Robak amendment yesterday. I think we should have had more debate on it because it was kind of a very quick, the amendment was offered, nobody turned their light on to debate it, and then we just simply did not adopt Senator Robak's amendment. And I think the record needs to indicate why we didn't. That's the reason I voted against it yesterday. I plan to continue to oppose the amendment. I will vote no on the Wickersham motion to reconsider and would suggest that the rest of the membership do also.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Robak.

SENATOR ROBAK: Thank you, Madam Chairman and members of the body. I support the Wickersham amendment (sic). I think that if we're going to fight the cap on the income tax rebate or discuss the cap on income tax rebate we do have LB 1050 immediately following LB 349, that's the place that it really should be, so if there is...it's in that bill too, that's the way it should be. The intent of LB 349 is to include income as a determine of wealth in the school aid formula. At this point in time they do not include income as a determinant of wealth. The only thing they include for wealth is property. That puts a disproportionate share of property in the formula. That's all it does. If the body insists on limiting income tax rebates, it's all the more critical that we may recognize the ability of the school district to pay. And that's what my bill does in 349. I say this is not the place to do it, let's do it in 1050. Since it's included in 1050 anyway we'd have to go through it twice. I think...another comment, Senator Wickersham, page 5, line 18, it's fine that we keep that in the bill. It's in the committee amendments. It was originally intended to be in my 349 as drafted, it was inadvertently omitted. It's fine to leave that in there. I support that. I would be happy to answer any questions if there are any. Thank you.