

it may very well indeed do that, if you don't do something else. I think that's a mistake. But I think it's important that for the time being at least we're agreeing to do this for two years. After that two year...during that two year period we're going to work on doing something more significant. For two years we're saying to the property taxpayers of the state, we're going to lower your property tax burden about \$95 million. That's \$95 million in tax relief, tax shift, however you choose to word it. We're saying we're going to reduce the property tax burden by that much and shift it onto the state responsibility. Well I don't think that is a...should be intended to be a long-term solution to our property tax problem, because in my opinion it's not. I think for the next two years we ought to work on something more significant. I think LB 84, as amended, is in order. And some people ask what is the difference between this bill and the other proposals before the body, more specifically of 809, which I am too a co-sponsor on, and I have said well my scenario is for me myself that I want to restructure the tax system in Nebraska. While I'm restructuring that I want to get the most tax relief I can for the property taxpayer. LB 84, this amendment is about a \$95 million shot in the arm to the property taxpayer. And as long as we all understand it's short-term and two years I'm for it and I'm in support of it. I urge adoption of the Chizek-Moore and would have been Lamb amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Before proceeding to the next speaker, Senator Rod Johnson has some guests in the north balcony, 33 fourth and sixth graders from Marquette School with their teacher. Would you people please stand and be recognized. Thank you, thank you for coming. Senator Landis, followed by Senators Schellpeper, Hefner and Crosby. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Looks like we've got a new name for our amending process, going to require a whole lot more lights up here when we have the Chizek-Moore and would have been Lamb amendment that is under consideration now. On 361, when I was up here, I think Howard Lamb was on the seat asking me if it was a permanent solution and then asking Tim Hall if it was a permanent solution, and pointing the finger back and forth. I don't care if it's a permanent or temporary solution. It's a good solution for the time and I'm ready to vote for it. More important than this temporary adjustment is the structural adjustment of adding income to the designation of wealth in determining how we're going to tax schools. But this is a good