

have brought us this bill, along with the Governor, for making the idea of property tax relief more than just an empty phrase that we have been passing around year after year. I think all parties have gone to making this a very serious discussion. Now let me tell you that I have got a choice between LB 809 and 84 and I also think the new compromise notion is worthy of our thoughts. Senator Byars, I know, as the chief proponent and priority of 809 as your bill, I want to tell you that, of the three, I'm not going to vote for it on this level and I will tell you, because it fails to give a second year of assurance of property tax relief, I think it's going to be tough for the public to understand why one year they would get one level and the next year they get another level and they don't know until November or sometimes after there because of this difficult phenomenon. I'd just as soon have a program that we have some confidence in, that if, in fact, we do it for one year, then we re-up it for the next year rather than we have this...this ever changing sort of steam valve approach. And, for that reason, I hold 89...809 one step below 84. This amendment goes a long way toward solving a problem that 84 has for me and that is that it recognizes we have got the money to do it this year and it saves for another day the question of re-upping the program with the appropriate funding. It doesn't get us in trouble next year. That is why this amendment is so important. In the past, I have had some difficulty because if 84 is a two-year program, it seems to me we haven't made appropriate acknowledgement for funding, this amendment does that and, for that purpose, I'm glad. But 84, itself, can be improved and I will tell you why and the new compromise discussion points it out. It really is a blending of two different programs, a rebate program and a homestead program and that makes it two levels of administration and pretty costly to do, pretty costly to do, might be some problems in the way that it gets carried out. But it's better than LB 809, in my sense, because it's more understandable, it's certain and it has elements of targeting that I like. Frankly, the discussion that's come up in the last couple of days in the compromise certainly has some virtues, easier administration, more understandable than either 809 or even the mixed formula of 84. The difficulty is there aren't any caps in it for me and I, too, am awaiting the Attorney General's notion. I, on the other hand, have suffered, as you have, from not being able to see the compromise language. I have asked for a copy of it. It's now up in the bill drafters. When it comes down I'm going to put it into the Journal, not on 84, not on LB 809; there is an insurance bill, LB 279, that everybody and their dog has put an