

the consideration for overriding the veto of LB772. I think that most of the members that are present and it is an issue that ought to be resolved one way or the other.

PRESIDENT: Any objection to that? Senator Warner, you may proceed.

CLERK: Mr. President, I move that LB772 be passed notwithstanding the actions of...the objections of the Governor, signed, Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I realize this is an issue which each of you no doubt have made up your minds on how you wish to vote. Because of that I think we ought resolve the formality of it now. I will briefly reply to the points in the Governor's letter relative to his veto. His first point suggests that which, of course, is true that the passage of this bill will change the sales and income tax. No one has ever indicated anything else. He does fail, however, to point out that the failure to pass this bill...

PRESIDENT: May we have a little decorum please? Senator Warner is talking on a very important piece of legislation.

SENATOR WARNER: Failure to pass this bill would no doubt increase the property tax collections, the dollars collected from property tax based upon the limitations which was enacted LB984 somewhere in the vicinity of 50% by 1977. There is some reference in his letter to rates relative to other budget matters which are not pertinent to LB772. His second point is that the more property someone has or owns, the more reduction. Obviously, our constitution requires uniformity of treatment and there is no method by which you could, under the present constitution, circumvent that point. Again the point of the renter is brought up. As I've said on a number of occasions, this is an issue which has been discussed many, many times over the last three years. There's no question but the cost of the landlord in terms of property taxes is going to be reflected in the rent that the renter pays. Obviously, if the property tax declines, part of the cost of owning an apartment house or home, competition itself is going to insure that that renter gets the benefit of the reduced property tax. The third point, he mentions that the bill will erode local control. There's absolutely nothing in LB772 that will erode local control. The local control was taken away, if any, during the session, would have been in LB984 with the limitation. LB772 does not add or subtract from that loss or continuance of local control. He points that the bill is unfair to some Class 1 schools. I'll remind you that not only do they share in the replacement of tax for the operation of the K-1 but under the bill, they also get a reduction in their non-resident tuition. Which is an aspect which they have not previously had. Five, the fifth point is, the Legislature is actually delegating the appropriating ability to the school district. Obviously that's not true. In no way is the Legislature doing that or could be. The last one is the mentioning of the Attorney General's opinion. Those of you who have had an opportunity to read it will see that the paragraph cord...clearly states that none of the provisions we have mentioned would in our opinion invalidate the entire act. And most of the points which are mentioned are not of