

forces that. If we decide next year that we want to put another 20 million dollars in this, or another 30 million dollars in this, or another 50 million dollars in this we can do that. This amendment also provides for the same distribution of the 70 million dollars that we have right now. So, there is no need for a hold harmless. There is no need to worry about somebody losing or somebody gaining because the existing distribution of the 70 million dollars whether this amendment is successful or not. It doesn't make any difference if the amendment is successful or not the initial 70 million dollars is going to be distributed the same way. All this does is strike out that portion of distribution or acceleration in excess of 70 million dollars. Now this is not a harassing amendment, this is a sincere amendment. I think that it is only prudent that this Legislature keep control and keep ahold of the spending authority and the taxing authority in the State of Nebraska. Now we are not losing any taxing authority with LB 882 unamended. We are still going to have the power to go out and raise the taxes. The only problem if LB 882 isn't amended with this type of an amendment, and specifically this amendment, then we are going to lose the control over how much money is being spent, because that will be in the hands of the County Assessor. We will have no control at all. So, I urge you to very seriously, a lot of these amendments before we have turned down, but they have been sort of drastic amendments and they have been amendments that have changed the whole direction, the whole course of the bill. This amendment is compatible with the bill, with the direction the bill is going, and it just strikes what in my opinion is the most irresponsible type of legislation that we can pass and that is that automatic escalator clause.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: . . . the Legislature, I know that Senator Dworak is legitimately concerned about this issue. I appreciate what he is trying to tell us here and, is my mike turned on, Mr. President? I know that there are those who would say that we have a clause here which is going to create a raid on the treasury, but on the other hand, we heard continually and consistently from the subdivisions of government who protested that they had lost revenue as a result of the actions of LB 518, because it did not provide for inflation, did not provide for growth. I was perfectly happy with the 70 million. But there were those who came to us and pointed out some of the problems that existed with local subdivisions. To a certain extent we have had the same problem that Senator Lewis tried to point out a little bit ago, when we were talking about property tax