

SENATOR ROGERS: That's fine. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, if you look on page 169 in your Journal, the amendment I offered is on lines 9 and 10, the words were added, "hereby appropriated all money." I'll go ahead and read the amendment as amended. "An amount equal to twenty-five percent of the one percent of the receipts received from the income tax rate imposed for taxable years beginning or deemed to begin on or after January 1, 1985, and on or before December 31, 1985, pursuant to Section 77-2715.01 shall be deposited in the Political Subdivision Aid Fund, which is hereby created for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1986. There is hereby appropriated all money held in such fund which shall be distributed equally to counties pursuant to Section 77-27,137, and municipalities pursuant to Section 77-27,137.01. Any money in the Political Subdivision Aid Fund available for investment shall be invested by the state investment officer pursuant to Sections 72-1237..." We've had a lot of comments, since I've been down here, to try to relieve property taxes one way or the other. I think this is a very simple amendment. If the income tax, the one percent increase, does pass 25 percent of this would go back to counties and cities with the same formula that is now used. With the figures that have been provided to me this could amount to maybe between an eight and a nine percent increase to state aid back to cities and counties, something that we've heard a lot about since we are down here to try to help the property tax back home a little. I'm sure we've heard some comments that maybe they haven't cut their budget this much, but we also have put some programs back to the counties and the cities that they have had to fund that were not funded before. I think...thank you, that's all I have to say right now, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Wesely, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. Speaker, members, in all respect to Senator Rogers, I would oppose this amendment. I'm not quite sure exactly the basis of the amendment or where it is coming from, or what have you. Evidently the intent is to provide more return to the cities and counties. It is in a sense circumventing the appropriations bill that we have by amending the tax increase bill. I think we've dealt with this in the appropriations bill. That is a proper place to consider the question. We've debated the issue of state aid