

bill itself, whether it plays around with Class I's this way or that way or this or that. This is the bill. This is what it is all about. You can find nowhere in Nebraska law by example or anything else where we say the state has the responsibility for developing the system for financing education and financing it. What have we always done? It is purely local and in one district you might have incredibly high property taxes, in another almost none. State aid is merely, so to speak, a gift or a grant to ease the burden, equalization, these kind of things. But with this what have you said? You have said, no more can come from property tax which is your local system of financing. By implication what have you said? The rest has to come from somewhere else, sales and income tax. Who does that? That is state. You have effectively said the state now is directly taking over the financing of education. We are going to get it completed by 1989. But I think that gives me my equal protection case in 1986 to say, why should, if it is a state responsibility for financing education, why should, why should John Smith in his house pay 3 percent of actual value for a state financing system for education and Joe Blow pay 1 percent of actual value on his house or his property? Since it is a state responsibility for financing education why should one citizen be treated different than another? As it is now, it is defensible because it is strictly a local financing system on property tax. And even though you will still rely heavily on property tax, it is a shift from one system to another, from a local system to a state system with the state deciding where the money comes from, how it comes. I am for that and if this is the way to force it, this amendment and this provision in the law I believe becomes far more significant than LB 662 itself in its other what I consider minor goals. So I am supporting the amendment but I am also wanting it a matter of record as to what the amendment really does in terms of its total impact upon education and the amendment and the Schmit system become really the essence of 662 for the future.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Schmit, then Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I guess I am a little surprised and somewhat pleased that Senator DeCamp will at least support this much of the attempt to move the cost of schools from property to some other form of funding, but I am not sure, Senator DeCamp, that I agree with you all the way. I want to point