

February 15, 1996 LB 1050

said, it has sparsity as a factor. But you can do those things, and that's where it gets the most difficult, where do you stop? I mean, how many things do you allow as a factor? And that's what we're looking at, other...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Okay.

SENATOR BOHLKE: ...states, like Colorado and, you know, and continually adding factors. You can add gifted as a factor, you can do a number of things, but it takes the...it's a major piece and a major, different direction, but it still has equity in mind, which also, I think, LB 1050 addresses.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: All right, thank you. I'm going to quit at this point. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. There's no further lights. Senator Wickersham, you are recognized to close on your amendment.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President. Very simply, the amendment that I am offering I think is a valid alternative to the proposal in the committee amendments because it will allow school districts to continue to access, in a meaningful way, the wealth base that was a part of the consideration of 1059 as it was originally enacted. Keeps faith with the voters who ratified 1059 in a much more significant way than the committee proposal. It allows the amount that the school districts are going to be accessing in the future to continue to grow, although at a slower rate than it currently grows. And it also allows us to say that we are going to at least mitigate or slow down substantially any erosive effect that the income tax rebate has on the equalization side of the formula. I have said before, I will say once again, I do not wish to have the income tax rebate destroy the equalization effort. I think my amendment is consistent with that objective. I think it is consistent with keeping faith with the people of the state of Nebraska who voted to ratify 1059. I do not think the committee amendment is consistent with either of those objectives for reasons that we have now discussed at some length. It is a choice between being consistent with the voters and being consistent with the objectives of LB 1059 or being arbitrary, in my view, and sending dollars to those who have the votes.