

February 14, 1996 LB 1050

Schrock.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I support the Wickersham amendment. A lot of things have been talked about today. But I want to bring out something that's not been talked about. Since LB 1059 passed, I believe in 1990, and this formula has taken place, I think our school districts were promised they'd get their income tax back. I think that's something we should honor. One of the things they don't like in rural Nebraska is change. They said this was our money, it was promised to us. And I think that was part of the formula. One thing also we talk about equalization. Well, if we're going to talk about equality, what are we going to do about the \$340 million worth of personal property that's not on the tax rolls? You stop and look where that property is, it's not in rural areas, it doesn't benefit the rural taxpayers of this state. The \$340 million of personal property that is not on the tax rolls is LB 775 exemptions. Why should that be exempted from taxes? Why should that...why should that not be included in the formula? There's a lot of variables here, but one thing that was constant was that our school districts were going to get their income tax money back, and now we've changed the rules again, or want to change the rules again. So I think we need to think twice about this before we move this amendment. Without the Wickersham amendment, we should have the Wickersham amendment on there so the nonequalization schools do get something. With that, I would relinquish any time I have left to Senator Wickersham, if he desires to use it.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President, and thank you, Senator Schrock. I.... Earlier when I said I thought most of this debate was a tempest in a teapot, I meant it, and I think it is a fact. If you look at the numbers, the amount distributed or used in the 1995-1996 state aid calculations, and this is based on the '93-94 receipts, the amount, the amount of the income tax rebate, and, Senator Bohlke, the number that you gave earlier I think was wrong, about the amount that your proposal shifts into equalization, it can't shift that much into equalization because only \$13.7 million, \$13.7 million is all that was distributed to nonequalization districts in '93-94, \$13.7 million to nonequalization districts, and there were 357 of those districts. The notion that that is welfare as opposed