

unfortunate that the numbers did not go the way that the supporters of the bill would like. These numbers weren't provided in Committee in Education. They didn't bring in a packet and saying, this is how much money you're going to get and this is how much money you're going to lose. It may not have advanced out of committee. And the only reason they brought these numbers forward, I believe, is because of all the pressure that was brought to bear during General File.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Time. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. President. I am rising in support of Senator Abboud's amendment. I think it's appropriate to phrase in the impacts that he's described to you because, in truth in fact, those impacts are only going to be felt by a select group of schools in the state of Nebraska, and those are the nonequalization schools. The nonequalization schools are those who do not otherwise receive state aid, or at least what is characterized by the supporters of 1050 as state aid. The income tax rebate, when it was initiated, and we've discussed this before, was not aid in a sense, it was a new resource for school districts. We're now taking that away from a small.. from a group of districts that do not receive equalization aid. We are simply removing a resource. It will have a significant impact on property taxes in those districts. I suppose that the response of the supporters of 1050 is that that's exactly what it's intended to do, that is exactly what is fair, that is exactly what is appropriate because those people should pay more property taxes if they want to have those schools. They don't pay enough property taxes now. Well, that doesn't quite wash because that wasn't the original argument for the income tax rebate at all. It was a resource to be provided regardless of the level of property taxes that were paid in your school district. Now I understand that we can break promises, we can change our mind, we can say that, as Senator McKenzie suggested, that the dual promises of providing an additional resource and at the same time providing equalization aid are competing objectives and we can decide which one is more important now and we can emphasize one over the other. Okay. You can make those arguments. And you can raise the banner of equalization as high as you want, but it will not do, in many respects, what is being sold to you by the supporters of this change. Equalization does not assure that a child in Harrison receives the same education as a child in Lincoln. And, in