

February 14, 1996 LB 1050

get more money into the equalization side of the formula, because I absolutely agree we have to do that. But also how we do that faithfully with what we have said to taxpayers. So I'm continuing to struggle and I think that we're all probably continuing to struggle as how best to do it. But I will be not voting on Senator Wickersham's amendment.

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

SENATOR ROBAK: Thank you, Madam Chairman, members of the body. I have a question for Senator Bohlke, please. I know we're on Wickersham's amendment, but, Senator Bohlke, could I ask you a question?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes.

SENATOR ROBAK: And I apologize for this because I have been out visiting with my school teachers here today, for a long time. They're here today to hear the Revenue Committee bill on the Governor's property tax. So they're concerned about that. So I apologize for not being here. We're doing a rebate cap, is that right...

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes.

SENATOR ROBAK: ...and capping the rebate? Can you tell me why you're doing this when everybody, on the floor yesterday, said that they supported the concept of income in the formula, and now you're taking away the only place that we do have income in the formula. Why are we capping this?

SENATOR BOHLKE: Senator Robak, the reason is that the way that we currently have income in the formula continues to be...

SENATOR ROBAK: Right.

SENATOR BOHLKE: ...be disequalizing. The formula that we have...

SENATOR ROBAK: (Inaudible question.)

SENATOR BOHLKE: It is disequalizing. The formula that we have,