

discussion on it, Senator Warner?

SENATOR WARNER: Well, if there was someone who wished to address the issue, I didn't want to preclude that opportunity.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Yes, yes, thank you. I misunderstood you. There are lights on. This might be an appropriate point in time for the Chair to suggest that this is the last amendment on this bill today. It would be my hope that we could dispose of this particular amendment one way or the other and the bill then would rest on Final Reading again. There is an A bill which, with your permission, I would like to address yet this afternoon and then perhaps recess for the weekend. The timetable for Monday morning would be nine o'clock convening time, 9:00 a.m. We will be on senator priority bills Monday morning and committee priority bills if time permits. We will be on the budget in the afternoon, in the p.m. on Monday. Discussion on the amendment now offered by Senator Warner. I have lights from Senator Lamb, Senator Crosby, Senator Wesely and Senator Schimek. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Well, yes, Mr. President, I would make a few comments. What Senator Warner, of course, is proposing is a scaled-down version and I assume that he would like to scale down the percentage reduction in valuations so, and also the homestead, so that it strikes somewhat closely the balance that we have now and he is suggesting 5 percent reduction for agriculture and commercial and personal property and then he doesn't have the number, the comparable number worked out for residential which would balance the equation. And, of course, that is a possibility. We could do that, we could do that. Now when the Governor first introduced her bill, the thinking was as I remember, that there would be, and I think Senator Warner was supportive of that introduction and that bill when it was introduced, it would use the money but the difference between the forecast in last October and the actual receipts January 30 of 1989 and early in the session that was estimated to be, I believe, about \$35 million. Then as the receipts continued to roll in faster than expected, then I think at the next forecasting board meeting it was like about \$50 million and then more recently it has gone up to \$85 million. And so it seems to me that that proposal had some support in this body because it was, in essence, using what could be called the excess, the excess money, the extra money. And so if you scale it back as severely as Senator Warner is saying, I don't know where you're