

presence. Those not in the Chamber, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. Please record your presence. Senator Hannibal, Senator Lowell Johnson, Senator Scofield, Senator Kristensen, Senator Moore, please. Senator Weihing, please. Senator Labeledz, please. Now we're looking for only Senator Landis. And Senator Landis is here. And the question is, shall the Chair be overruled? A roll call vote has been requested. Senator Haberman, would you like to return to your seat, please. Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See page 1913 of the Legislative Journal.) 24 ayes, 20 nays, Mr. President, to overrule the Chair.

PRESIDENT: The Chair is overruled and we are now on the Haberman amendment. I have many lights on. You're going to have to tell me if you wish to speak on it. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. President and members, I rise, I guess, to oppose Senator Haberman's amendment because I think in many ways Senator Haberman has mentioned before, yes, the possibility exists you do this for two years. But I'm of the opinion if you want to do this for two years, you can't expect to do it without some sort of tax increase. Simple as that, in my opinion. Now that can be some other sort of tax increase but I think it's just impossible to sit here and say, we can provide a \$100 million worth of property tax relief for two years without raising taxes. Now Senator Haberman says, if we don't do all the other things, we could do it. Well, Senator Haberman, you file the amendments on the appropriations bill and see how many votes you get to do it. I don't think you're being reasonable. And, for that reason, I think if you want the bill, if you want it for two years, then make sure you can pay for it. I think some sort of tax increase well into the next session when you come back and decide whether or not you need it, that's the prudent thing to do. I think, you know, the original amendment we adopted earlier today was simple as this. We have said...there's a lot of people here that say, you can do this for two years without raising taxes. I'm not one of them. And if you're not going to raise taxes, then you should make it one year. But I think Senator Bernard-Stevens has offered a good amendment. Simply makes it very clear and it's an amendment I'm going to vote for, Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment, because if you want to do this for the second year, you're going to have to be up front to the voters of the state and say, if you're