

course, to pass one and not the other. It is possible to pass either one without passing the other, but if your vision is we enact some temporary property tax relief with the 90 to 100 million dollar figure that is in LB 84, and then two years down the road sunset that, you have to have something else to take its place, and what is envisioned is that this bill will be ready at that point. I hate to see us delay things. We can always delay things when it is absolutely necessary, but I hate to see us delay things when we are taking our first step and say that this journey of 1,000 miles that we have envisioned taking place over a two-year period, before we take our first step, we are going to give us three years to get that far. We have been on this property tax debate for well over 20 years in this state, and if we are serious about resolving it, I think we need to get at it. So for that reason, I am not going to be supporting the Haberman amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President. I, again, rise in opposition to Rex's amendment even though I do believe that it is probably well-intended on his part. The issue, though, is one that is I guess like when we talk about studying things, we study, study, and then we find out that we really knew what we were talking about in the first place, in many cases. In other cases, we find out that we were way wrong and that the situation is probably worse than we originally thought. Here, with regard to property taxes, I don't think there is any of us that don't actually believe we are an expert or want to believe we are an expert, and, clearly, the folks back at home in our districts tell us that we had better become experts, and that we should deal with this issue. The original committee amendment draft actually had a July 1 of 1991 date. We tied it into the fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year and it would have provided that information that Senator Warner alluded to in his comments. The fact of the matter is we are traditionally and always dealing with information that is at least one to two, and many times, three to four years old. When you look at any study that comes out, the biggest rap against them if you don't like them is that it is information that is outdated. Well, that is because in order to get accurate and complete information you have to...you are clearly usually about two years behind in order to compile that. I guess if that is an argument or a position we are going to take, we should take that on every issue, and that we should probably hold back on everything, take