

certainly a vote of 21 votes is an ominous indication that Senator Johnson or Senator Landis might wisely, I suppose, attempt to accomplish their goals. Is that correct, Senator Johnson? Senator Johnson says that is correct. So I think we should kill the bill and remove the temptation from all of us to improperly alter history, history being the financing and the reorganization. Let each of us in his own way or her own way attempt next year and in future years to deal with those issues. I will attempt, for my part, probably independently to handle the reorganization issue in the court tests, maybe in other amendments to other bills, maybe in a separate bill next year. I repeat, that is a five-year thing and if anybody is foolish enough to believe that that issue was settled, when you string something out for five years, it wasn't. By the same token, Senator Johnson and others probably will attempt to repudiate and repeal the financing portion either in this bill or some other bill and so be it. They will be the ones then that will have the blood of the property tax victims on their hands. But at this point in time, probably the only wise course is a death knell to LB 505 because none of us is really willing to use it for the purposes originally intended. And, Senator Remmers, I realize this is your priority bill and it had noble intentions and noble goals. Those were aborted. Those were aborted when the original promise was repudiated, the promise and understanding made on the floor of this Legislature that 505 would be used strictly for implementation of formulas and financing of schools rather than repudiation of it. For that reason, I am going to support a kill motion and either offer one if somebody else doesn't.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Remmers, then Senator Hefner.

SENATOR REMMERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose the committee amendments. I introduced 505 in good faith. It wasn't exactly the way I wanted to go. I would much rather have preferred the income tax bill that Senator Sieck and I had last year and the one he has back on the floor, but I didn't think it had a chance. I did think some property tax relief was in order even though the school district that I happen to live in doesn't benefit much from the type of formulas we have. But I object to the amendments. I told the committee at the committee hearing that I was flexible. I realize that the cent and a half sales tax that I had in the bill was not