

equalization of foundation aid...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR WITHEM: ...and if we strike that portion out of the bill, this might as well just be another resolution stating our intent is we'd sure like to reduce property taxes. But we're not going to do much unless we bite the bullet at this point when it's before us and make the commitment that we're going to change. You know what happens, I guess, on the downside if we don't reach consensus and we don't reach agreement, the worst thing that happens, I think, will be that this will be reinstated...the current formula will be reinstated and we'll live with that again. But I think this body this year wants to make some changes and I think this particular proposal of Senator Moor's is a good one to lead us in the right direction toward making those changes. I oppose the Warner amendment.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, please, followed, by Senator Morrissey. Senator Morrissey, would you like to go until we find...oh, no, we found him. Thanks, Senator Morrissey.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body, just very briefly. Senator Warner, if I understand the reasoning, the rationale behind it, I think what you are saying is on LB 89 we tried to put a sunset equal to what was on 611 and we decided not to do that and so your amendment is to keep us consistent with what we decided yesterday. Is that...would that be reasonable to assume? Okay, yeah, that's the reason that you gave. Understood. I guess, it brought me to a point, I was going to say yesterday in the debate on 89, on Senator Haberman's amendment I believe that would have done so, but I refrained from doing such but you gave me an opportunity today to voice an opinion that I had yesterday. Senator Haberman was trying to get the body to agree to a sunset on LB 89 with the understanding that we have already done such...such a process on General File and now on Select File to LB 611. I always found that interesting that we would go ahead and say, listen, we're going to go ahead and since we did it on a bill that we haven't even passed yet, let's go ahead and do it on another bill that we haven't even passed yet. And so that logic really wasn't very good. If we had passed a bill setting a precedent, then we may want to go ahead and go it similarly with other bills in relationship to it. But to say that we