

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Hall. Senator Schellpeper next.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President. Again, I rise to oppose Senator Warner's amendment to 525 and I do so based on some of the same arguments that have been offered here today and that being that we can't do it all. Senator Warner is very up front in his approach that it is an amendment that will cost probably capital construction more than any other portion of the bills that we have passed should it be adopted. It is very up front that the support for Commonwealth, State Securities and American Savings that was in LB 356 that I happen to be a co-sponsor of and I have been as supportive of paying back those depositors as any Lincoln senator that's served in the body since that tragedy took place, and I will continue to be. But I will do that on its face and not through this amendment. The issue here, I guess, is should we do this or should we do something else? And what's something else? LB 84 is meaningful property tax relief and to argue that you can't support it because it's not sustainable is like saying that, well, we're going to put this money away but we may have to use it. Well, okay, well, then why put it away, why not use it now? Why not just take care of property taxes by saying, local governments, that's your problem, we're not going to deal with it? But yet we, on the same side, on the same hand, say we want to give more state aid. Well, what's the difference? The difference is that property tax relief goes to the taxpayer and that's who ought to receive it in this case and that's what LB 84 does. It will be the first time that we have ever been able to get that accomplished and I think that should be done. Now putting \$40 million aside, although it would allow for, I guess, stability with regard to budgeting, it does not allow for stability with regard to revenue. And if you want to have stability with regard to revenue, the bill you ought to kill is LB 739, because it's got \$24 million in reduction of revenue in one fell swoop and that strikes at the stability with regard to revenue. You also, again, I get back to the issue of saying that revenues are not going to be addressed in the coming years and that we are not going to ever basically look at either exemptions, expansion of the base, rate or bracket increases, depending on which sales or income you're talking about. And I would argue, ladies and gentlemen, that we're going to have to do that. We're going to have to do that because cost to state government is going to continue to go up. It is not going to go down. It's not going to stay flat and we're going to have to