

February 20, 1996 LB 1050

to be are low property valuation. Rural districts are the ones that tend to benefit better in a percentage fashion, at least on any printouts I've seen of any other proposals that we've had before us. I would have liked to...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SPEAKER WITHEM: ...have had, as I said, much more in this bill. I would have liked to seen the rebate abolished and said that was an experiment that we tried and it just hasn't worked. I would have liked to have seen us eliminate option hold-harmless. We not only didn't do that in the original version of 1050, we've also made pretty significant advancements in the General File debate, I shouldn't say advancements, retreats is the word I should use. For those of you opposing more money in the equalization, though, we've made a number of advancements for your cause with this bill. I really do think it's time to say at least fo General File we've made the proper adjustments on the bill. Let's advance the bill over to Select File. Let's look at this printout when it comes, let's...may need to make some more adjustments, let's look at those. I may be one of them offering amendments to move in the other direction from where we've gone on General File, but we've done a good job on this bill on General File. We need to advance it.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Senator Crosby. Following up on some of the discussion that was earlier with Senator Wehrbein, Senator Bohlke, could I ask you a couple of questions.

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes.

SENATOR VRTISKA: As most of us realize, equalization is...the determination, as I understand it, is based on property and wealth doesn't have anything to do with it, basically.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Needs are a great portion of that.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Okay, but just let me ask you this, and because I try to look at all of us are, obviously, somewhat parochial in determining how we want to vote on various bills