

PRESIDENT: Thank you. I have no lights on. Is there any further discussion? Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would rise to support Senator Haberman's motion. Actually, I rise to say something that I want to say that I assume if I don't do it now, I will never have a chance. A few weeks ago in this body we were discussing property tax issues and, as I recall the discussion, it was an excellent discussion and one which somehow or other seems to me some of the points that I recall numerous members mentioning not being so much a part of the discussion now. But it used to...as I recall, we talked about the ability to sustain, we talked about stability. We recognized and had discussion about the percentage increase that local government has been going up historically, which was about 6 percent, that there was a \$1,100,000,000 raised by property taxes and just to hold even. If property taxes wouldn't go up, it was going to take 50 or 60 million dollars a year increase in state support. If we enact LB 84 to take effect this year and next year, we'll have the 94 million plus 6 percent. To keep the same ratio would be a 100. I don't imagine that would be too big an issue. But by the next year when the property taxes would go up 50 or so million statewide, between 50 and 60, proportionately only 6 million would be picked up by state aid and we'll have the same old argument that increasing property tax relief does not reduce property taxes, that they still went up which, obviously, they will. We had a lot of talk about the need for a tax source that would grow at the same rate that the local budgets would grow so that, in fact, you could sustain a level of property tax that would not be greater than it was at the time that a major move was made. All of those arguments seem to be...which I thought were very sound, very sound and understanding, but all of those arguments seem to be waved aside. Now we want to do a series of temporary solutions, whether it's state aid by repealing the current act or this bill by making it one year. Senator Bernard-Stevens made an excellent, very good presentation an hour ago or so when he was talking about the realities of sustaining and substantial property tax relief which, you know, strangely enough, LB 84, as it now stands, doesn't fit any of those, those arguments that all of us, I think, in our heart, know that have to be considered if we're really going to do something that will sustain property tax relief as most people I think across the state who talk about it want to do. The other thing I hear people talk...as a matter of fact, I hear them talk about it