

funding for the second year for it. Maybe if we do that, we can appease some people and work with some people and work out a compromise so we can forge ahead on this issue. I think you have all listened to what has happened over the weekend and over the last couple of days, a variety of things have happened. But with the amendment we have before us now, we're right back to where we were Friday morning. And I think, as it was wise on Friday morning, I think this amendment is wise today because the fact of the matter is unless you're willing to vote for an amendment like Senator Landis has offered to raise taxes the second year, you don't have a way to fund the second year of the bill. And if you're not willing to do that, then I think you're wise to make it a one-year bill and say, we're going to put this program into effect, next we're going to come back, we're going to debate this and if we want a second year of it, we're going to pay for it probably with the...if we need to, with a direct tax increase and a direct tax shift, a tax shift to a program that the people of the state will be able to understand because they will be in the middle of experiencing it. And I also want to remember that it's at least my intention and, you know, my...my support for LB 84 lies in the fact or the hope, I guess, that 84...LB 84 is indeed a stopgap measure for one or two years that leads us into a restructuring of the tax system. Hopefully, like that it's laid out in the intent language in LB 611. Now maybe that's if there's...there's a lot of ifs in there, I'm the first to understand that but I think it's important that LB 84 in concert with 611 is giving the property taxpayer of the state relief for the short term while we work on the overall problem. I think that's good. So I'm honestly supporting the amendment. But I also want to point out a few more things in relation to the compromise proposal that at least some of us were exposed to yesterday and I stand here and applaud the Governor for trying to work with us on it. Unfortunately, we've just not come to an agreement. The fact of the matter is there is more than just the cap problem Senator Landis talks about. That's just...of the \$23 million increase in the bill the Governor proposed, the cap is only about \$6 million, another \$10 million came with a concern the Governor had about homestead exemption, the way the bill is right now, but remember that's abruptly \$10 million. They're saying you've got to give people an option of a \$1,600 homestead exemption or 10 percent, whichever is greater. They said there was constitutional problems there. The Governor's office also mentioned that you had to include personal property to pass constitutional muster. Well, the fact of the matter is that