

this amendment and I think I need to explain my reasons for supporting the amendment and the conditions that exist for allowing me to vote for this specific amendment. I have always indicated that if there was going to be state aid to education two things had to happen and one thing was that it had to provide some property tax relief and in order for it to provide property tax relief there needed to be a lid in existence and there is a lid in existence. The schools are precluded from spending more than \$32,000,000 and that is the amount of money they can generate off of property tax increase and stay within their 7% lid. So that one condition has been met. The second thing that has always bothered me about state aid to education was the distribution formula especially in the area of equalization where we are trying to equalize ability to pay, equalize educational opportunity and all these fine arguments. It never did make any sense to me to give \$340 a youngster in one part of the state and in another part of the state say that this youngster is worth only \$30 or \$90. I could never quite put that into perspective and then when I put the quality of education onto that and try to justify that in equalizing educational opportunity, the reverse was always true. Now that has been met with this particular amendment because this money is distributed on a ADM basis, average daily membership. Each youngster across the state gets the same amount and that makes sense. I can understand that. I don't look at Platte County getting \$120 and Sarpy County getting \$300 and I understand how that happens in the formula and I am not arguing that right now but that problem has been solved. Another thing about this, as far as the projections of the economy that Senator Schmit has raised very justifiable and very grave concerns about, we are working under the assumption that the money is available and of course when you start predicting the future that is anybody's guess but I think we have used extremely conservative estimates, credible as credible of an estimate as there is, I don't know of anything more credible than the Chase Econometric model and we are using national estimates which generally when we get into a recession or a depression or a recession depression, the nation suffers more than we do in Nebraska both in intensity and duration in timing. So with those factors in mind I think this is a prudent approach. I think this is a way to get effective property tax relief. I think the distribution is solid and I also think our projections are prudent. Now the Attorney General's opinion is a problem but we will have time to adjust that if that comes out adversely. This bill could be amended yet if we get a very negative Attorney General's opinion. It also could be adjusted and reworded maybe with the direction of the Attorney General to overcome those