

February 14, 1996 LB 1050

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...because the fact that you're able to organize some tiers and create some equalization within those tiers does not equate with a district that I'm familiar with paying well in excess of \$1.50 and has some very, very modest, meager essential programs. And I look at another district which has a much lower levy, slightly over a dollar, that has much greater offerings, and the size of the districts aren't all that much different. So there are some peaks, and valleys, and bubbles and aberrations that I don't understand. And that's one of the things that I hope to gain from all this discussion on 1050 was an understanding of why we have these aberrations that seem to pop up here and there and...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR BROMM: ...a little bit better idea of the entire big picture. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Bohlke, to speak to the motion to bracket.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Madam President, members, I rise to oppose the bracket. I think that all of us, before we came down to this session, numbers of surveys, numbers of things that different individual senators indicated was a top priority this session certainly was school finance. And looking at it, and you can't look at property tax relief and not look at school finance. It's a huge issue this session, it's a difficult issue. But because it's a difficult issue is not a reason to put it off until next year. I think that by bracketing it to next year would be unconscionable, it would be unconscionable to the children of this state, and would also be unconscionable to the taxpayers, therefore I oppose the bracket.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Question.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Question has been called. Do I see five hands? I see five hands. The question before you is, shall