

will range from 40 to 60% of the mil levy are for school purposes but the extreme represents from 7.58% to 80.19%. This is therefore an across the board assumption. On averages will not and does not actually reflect what would occur by the passage of this bill relative to individuals or to different types of property. The assumption was also made that property of a like nature was located in urban areas and of a like nature always in rural areas or outside incorporated limits. Obviously this ignores what we now know to be true so that there are a great many industrial sites located outside the corporate limits would appear from the conclusion of that state were used in this projection however thus fact was not recognized. And then fourth the assumption that there is nothing in here for renter. Obviously there is not in 472. We are not in germane to be there. However LB471 is on General File and was reported out of committee and is part of the interim study committee report and this will or does provide a means of insuring that the renter can also benefit from this reduction in property taxes through a reduction in his own property taxes. Now I would like to touch just briefly on the bill itself. The bill is a result of the interim study committee it is the result of contact with the committee that was appointed and had representatives from many, many state wide type organizations in order to have their input into what legislation could be developed. It was further refined by the education committee during the session and with some floor amendments which basically only reflected those changes which had occurred during the course of the session and the bill needed to be amended accordingly. The basis of the bill is a 50% support from state sources for local schools. This was a figure that was most frequently mentioned throughout the public hearing that we have held even though....those comments can be found frequently in the course of the study during the 1971 session. It seems to me that 472 is a reasonable compromise of the alternatives which have been discussed, and I think that it should be pointed out that when you read the section one of the bill it very clearly states the purpose of the act and its provided reduction and property taxes to provide limitations on total expenditures to provide a more equitable means for the support of education. The bill is designed so that it would be fully implemented over a two year period. Therefore providing a limited or minimum impact on the sales and income tax and a reasonable reduction in a period of time for property tax for the state as a whole. The bill recognizes the problems of school districts with adjusting enrollment and provides the necessary recognition of this type a problem. It continues to recognize the needs and the cost of transportation and those other kinds of expenditures such as culture or economically deprived that have an additional cost of schools and qualify for if they have that situation in existence. The bill has the strength that it will provide the revenue necessary to be appropriated by future sessions of the legislature. There is a compromise foundation equalization aid bill. It contains a percentage which has been frequently discussed on this floor as one that probably as desirable as could be accomplished and from that standpoint was also a reasonable basis from which to split the state support being 50% on foundation and 40% on equalization aid. Obviously you can point to one of the kinds of problems that there is and that is that there are those schools with high per pupil cost and high assessed evaluation and they do not receive as much help as they might. The reason of course being that the state support averages at roughly not to exceed \$750 per pupil including their local revenue. However the Burbach amendment which was added to the bill recognizes this kind of