

plan in the State of Nebraska. This is the year to do it. Not next year but this year. We're going to accomplish it. And you want to say this Legislature has accomplished anything this year, let's pass this bill. It's a good bill. It's a compromised bill, of course, as this issue must be. And this is the best bill we're going to get so I hope we'll vote to override the veto.

PRESIDENT: Senator Anderson.

SENATOR ANDERSON: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. Last year when we had our attempt to override LB472 on the last day of our session, I had some doubt about my vote against the override attempt. The more I looked at this thing, the more I feel sure that was one of the best votes that I made. I feel that to pass LB772 this year which is essentially the same bill would be a mistake, that we would regret. The basic philosophy of school aid is something that I do agree with. It's been proposed because the way that we pay for schools today is wrong in terms of providing equal opportunity for education to our children, it's wrong in terms of an inequit...placing an inequitable burden on tax payers. And it's been proposed because our present system places too great a burden on those people who are engaged in agriculture. First of all, in terms of LB772 addressing itself to the inequity of not providing equal support to all of the children in the State of Nebraska. I don't think LB772 corrects this problem at all because we have a situation in LB772 where a school district with an average family income of some \$15,000 would end up with 46% of its cost of education being provided by the state. While in my own legislative district, in Webster County, we have an average family income of some \$5,500 and of all of the school districts in that county, the state would only be providing between 16% and 35%. This is hardly a correction of that inequity. We've been told that LB772 would correct the unequal mill levies that we see around the state. And many of us hear people saying well why should the guy across the road from me be paying so much less than I am. I looked at a couple of examples in my own district and these are examples that I think that hold true in many areas of the state. The Kearney school district right now has a school mill levy of some 38 mills. The Minden school district which borders it in Kearney County has a mill levy of 30.2 which means that Kearney right now is paying 24% greater in terms of mill levy alone. Under LB772, this will be exactly reversed. The Kearney school district would end up with a 15 mill levy and Minden would end up with 26 mills which means that then the Minden school district would be paying a 42% greater mill levy. What this presumes then under the basic philosophy underlying LB772 is that the people in the Minden school district are 42% more able to pay for schools. Well, the truth is that there's very little difference in average income. Actually, the average income in the Kearney district is slightly higher. Well here is another situation. Between the Class 1 districts and the K-12 districts. I apply this to one example in my legislative district again between Superior and an or a neighboring Class 1 district. For the Superior district right now is paying 54 mills, the Class 1 district is paying 14 mills. Merely 300% greater. Under LB772, the difference would still be such that the Superior district would be paying more than 200% greater mill levy so it doesn't correct that in equity. So what I'm saying in this case is that instead of correcting the unequal mill levy situation that we are attempting to deal with, we are simply perpetuating some inequities and we are reversing some inequities, all