

that money should be left on the table and let us see us what the Legislature wants to do with that money. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Withem, followed by Senators Ashford, Schimek, Warner and Hall.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I rise in opposition to the Warner amendment. Been doing just a little bit of research back here in the Journal. I know that this time of year we tend to not want to make either/or types of decisions. So far, we have done a pretty good job of not doing that. We...as we usually do in here when spending proposals come before us, we tend to shrug our shoulders and say, well, I won't make my priorities today, this one sounds good. We put it in the budget and we're going to make our final determination, prioritization after the Governor has exhausted her supply of red pencils we all read that she has ordered and sends the bills back to us. So there is a tendency to vote in favor of lots of different spending proposals. This is one you can't have both ways though, I don't think. I've done some research, as I have said. On May 5th, Legislature advanced LB 84 back from Final Reading with 37 members voting in support of it. Thirty-seven members. A pretty strong majority. On May 10th, 23 members of this body voted in support of the Warner amendment at that time at \$50 million, to put \$50 million aside. One had \$98 million, on the other hand, \$50 million, and you get into those levels of spending you can't have both. You have got to make a choice. I did the research, as I said, 17 members of the body, and I'm not going to embarrass people by reading the names, but 17 members of this body voted for both of those propositions. You can't send it back in property tax relief and still have it in a rainy day fund. You can't do both. You have got to choose one or the other. My arguments and my beliefs are that spending it in property tax relief is the preferable way to go. We have spent all of my brief time here in the Legislature with the issue of property tax relief top on the agenda of so many different state senators when they're back in their districts talking to people but when it comes down to the nitty gritty, when the rubber hits the road, as they say, nothing seems to happen for the property taxpayer. If you put \$40 million into a rainy day fund, a rainy, rainy day fund, I guess we already have a rainy day fund, the property taxpayers are not going to see that. This is not one of those where you can blissfully push your green button on this proposal and on other proposals and just assume it will all work its way out in a few days when the veto messages come