

March 5, 1974

of dollars that are returned to your district based on foundation, based on equalization, based on where you set the assumed needs, all of those parlay the dollar figure that's going to your district. Now, as far as the amount of money of that fund that your school district has to use, that depends on inflation, that depends on what your school wants to do in terms of new programs, existing programs, obviously that's very flexible and obviously it ends up as responsibility of the local board. And, if you want to do that, you know, if you really want to limit it, let's go to specific programs that the school has to do. Let's not tell the school system they have to furnish transportation, let's not tell them you have to have a counselor for every 1,200, let's not tell them that you've got to fly a flag, that you have to illuminate which costs \$1,200, let's not let them be subject to the fire marshall where you have to put in \$5,000.....

PRESIDENT: Now, is there some way I can bring the discussion back to the Frank Lewis amendment that we're discussing?

SENATOR FRANK LEWIS: I was simply giving him a bit of advice.

SENATOR DE CAMP: Okay, thank you. Mr. President, can I get back to the one question? I've tried to get a straight answer out of here for close to five minutes. If the spending limitation is eliminated as your amendment tries to do, is there any specific written spelled out thing, Senator Lewis, that guarantees a property tax reduction and I would like a yes or no answer.

SENATOR FRANK LEWIS: Jeez, I feel like I'm right on the trial scene, John. I'll give you an absolute answer. Absolutely not.

SENATOR DE CAMP: That's up to your....Thank you.

SENATOR FRANK LEWIS: That's up to your local people.

PRESIDENT: Do you have further questions, Senator DeCamp. All right, next to speak then is Senator Warner. We're still speaking on the Lewis amendment to LB984 on General File.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. Just briefly because I think most members know what they're going to do. Much of the discussion is in reference to expanded state aid and obviously an appropriate limitation is significant to whether additional state aid is enacted. But it seems to me there's only one question this morning and that is, the question is to whether or not the present \$55 million is to be continued or as the Governor indicated in his message to the Legislature, he would veto the \$20 million... line item the \$20 million that was appropriated last time, drop us back \$35 million and this Body, if you feel that there are 30 votes, to continue the \$55 million, well and good. It would not necessarily be stricken but I think the odds are that it would. And I think the only decision we're making this morning essentially is the continuation of the present \$55 million. Because to not do so, if you're going to add \$20 million of property tax because of the reduced state aid next year, you can add another \$15 or \$20 million to that of inflationary cost. You are then talking about somewhere between