

in the past. I think that we have to remember again that the issue that we are discussing here today is one of an attempt to try to satisfy constitutional requirements. It is an attempt to be equitable between rural and urban, although it may not solve all of the problems of the urban people I think that it does solve some of them. Bearing in mind again, I want to remind you, that there are other funds which are distributed back to local subdivisions which allocate monies from the state on a basis which is more generous to urban areas than this particular bill. When you look at the problem of allocation of funds back to local government we should look at the total picture. I think that perhaps some day we will look at the entire picture but in the interim period I feel that LB 882 is a fair and equitable method of addressing that issue. Mr. President, I would of course want to close on the bill, be willing to answer any questions that you might have, but at this time I would like to hear from the other supporters of the bill, my co-introducers.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. President and members, I think that too this has been discussed a great deal. We have worked hard at it. It is a very difficult situation, we know that. Attorneys have been working on it, tax experts have been working on both bills. The Revenue Committee has almost torn their hair out trying to come up with something that would work and be somewhere near fair. I would like to speak a little bit about the 90-10 formula that has been mentioned before. I as a tax payer in my own county, I'm not going to sit by and watch the taxes be raised and I pay 90% of it and the state is supposed to pick up 10. That is not the kind of formula that I like to work with. So, I'm sure that we are going to be very careful that that appraisal out there is correct. Now it may well make that appraisal better, because we will be very interested in having that appraisal even and right with other counties or we won't get our share of the funding. I think that it has that aspect. I believe that is one of the better parts of the bill, so that it will have some room for growth or perhaps there won't be growth, maybe we will go the other way. So then this would cut down on the funding that goes to the counties and the subdivisions of government. I don't want to take up more time, I think that we pretty well discussed the bill. There are certainly some questions about it that I'm sure some will want to ask. I think that it is fair, the money is going back on a tax collected basis, that is where it was lost, if it was lost in personal property, some argue that it was never lost because we didn't have it in the