

February 13, 1996 LB 349, 1050

tax rebate, and therefore we do not feel it needs to be discussed or debated twice, probably. I don't know if that answers your concerns or not. Thank you.

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

SENATOR BROMM: Madam President and colleagues, I stand once again to support the amendment that we are now reconsidering. And, again, I think the primary reason to support this amendment is to remove from the mix right now, from the pot, if you will, the complicated provisions that are contained on page 9 of the amendment, AM1024, subsection (5). I have read through it. I don't completely understand it, although I've heard a reasonably good explanation, I think, from Senator Wickersham and Senator Robak, but I believe there are many of us that do not fully understand the effect of subsection (5). And for that reason, at this point, I think it would be best for this body to remove that section. I think that section goes into the, definitely goes into the intricacies of the rebate formula. And it has, it has affects that probably we don't understand, I think many of us do not. I think if we go back and deal with the concept of Senator Robak's bill, and again, that being the proposition that, that income should be considered in our ability to support our school districts in our given areas, that that is the proper, proper way to proceed with this discussion. If on Select File or at a later point in time after we discuss 1050 we wish to fine-tune or change the rebate provisions and allocations, perhaps that would be the proper time to do so. But I would, I would encourage the body to support this amendment. Let's get this bill down to its basic question, should income be a factor in determining the wealth of a district, and take an up or down vote on that issue. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President. I am sorry that I took up almost all of Senator Wehrbein's time trying to respond to his question. Senator Wehrbein, if you want to use some of my time I will yield that to you. Apparently, since he's waiving off, he was adequately confused by my explanation of Section 4 and now will vote to keep it in the bill, I'm assuming, because if you're adequately confused about something and it's been in the bill, I'm assuming the presumption is it's