

about property tax and talking about the Syracuse Study that took place. One of the things that was very, very clear going out throughout the state was that there was an understanding that it was going to take a tremendous amount of money and a tremendous amount of effort to get truly significant property tax. It was abundantly clear that sales tax, though a short-term mechanism to help, is not the only thing that would...is not the only thing that would sustain a sincere substantial property tax reduction. We needed to go into the income area as well. It was abundantly clear that sales would increase approximately 3 percent growth, would not sustain property tax relief. Income at a better...6 percent, in some cases a little higher percent, would be able to do that. We went through the state and we knew it was going to be a concerted major effort if we were going to get property tax relief. Let me remind the body of a couple other things that have happened since then. Senator Withem, early, along with myself and others, asked that we bring out of the Appropriations Committee a bill that called for 50 million general revenue funds for property tax. That was rejected because 50 million was not enough for significant property tax. We then went to the Education Committee on LB 89 and within the Education Committee and within LB 89 was a section that called for \$50 million of property tax relief. The committee and the committee amendments that this body agreed to rejected that part because 50 million was not enough. The Governor had a proposal that would put monies back to counties for property tax relief and it looked as if there might be fifty or sixty so million dollars in there and people criticized that because they said that was not enough. If we agree to the Schmit amendment, and I'm not sure whether I'm going to be supporting it or not, to be quite honest with you, but if we agree to the Schmit amendment, we will end up back where we started from, \$50 million in property tax relief which is not enough. What I guess I am trying to say to the body is if we agree with the Schmit amendment, then we are opening ourselves up to the following areas, (a), we will have to find increased funding to make it substantial; (b), we're going to have to find a funding mechanism because there is no mechanism of distribution at this time within the property tax fund as the Schmit would have Section 8 included with the Withem amendment; (c), we're going to have to discuss how we're going to guarantee property tax relief. Is it going to be a lid on spending? Or are we going to count it as a receipt? What are we going to do? I am not opposed in doing that on this bill.