

have not seen it, although we do have some printed material which outlines what the amendment would do. But then we did decide that...to go ahead with 84 because we did not have any reason not to go ahead with it. But that does not preclude the Governor's bill, the Governor's amendment that she's promoting, or the original version of LB 809, and I can live with that. I don't know if this body will go with that. So, at this point, I have no alternative except to pursue LB 84 in its present form; that's what is before you today. I hope you'll advance it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, followed by Senator Elmer.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I, too, want to join Senator Landis in saying my appreciation for the four members of our body who have worked diligently through this session to come up with what we have in LB 84. I did want to make just a couple of comments on the amendment that we just agreed to, however. I just want to kind of, I guess, make myself feel a little better about it. I sometimes hesitate, being a member who hasn't been here that long, to try to remind those of you who have been here longer of some certain elements that we tend to forget because of the political nature that the Legislature tends to get into the last 19 days or so. But I don't think anyone in the body ever believed that we could do substantial property tax for a long period of time without an adjustment on sales or income or both. I don't think there is a member of the body who ever believed that you could do substantial, for a long period of time, without such an adjustment. Now, if the body wants to buy the argument that we only have enough money to fund it for one year, please note you've already forgot the first rule, you can't do substantial property tax relief for a long period of time if you haven't adjusted the tax rates accordingly. If you're just going to spend available money, then I think you should tell the people of the State of Nebraska we're not going to make any sacrifices, we're not going to follow the rules knowing that we have to broaden the tax bases elsewhere, we're not going to do that, if we have some money available, then we'll do it, and then we'll come back in an election year, next year, and talk about increased funding on sales and income taxes. I don't know who the body is trying to kid, I think we're trying to kid ourselves. I think we're trying to kid ourselves. At this point we're saying, let's go with 84, and I intend to advance 84, and then we'll wait and see what happens with the Attorney