

been more than adequate discussion on the property tax issue that we've had this year. But the point I want to raise is that, according to our rules, we have a situation where our bills that we pass with appropriations should be passed by the 80th day. As far as I'm concerned, we're behind schedule. We should be moving on bills that are priorities; bills that do establish the parameters that we want to become involved with, and I think property tax relief is one major priority that all others should follow after.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. Just a couple of minutes. Then I'm going to give Senator Scofield the rest of my time. We've talked about this as a tax relief bill. It's really a revenue reduction bill. It's a one-time effort to try and reduce revenues and the way we're choosing to reduce them is through what we call property tax relief. But, as Senator Chambers and myself and others have pointed out, how much relief will really be seen by the typical homeowner or taxpayer in the state? And we've talked also, as Senator Lamb says, this is not a spending bill. In my estimation, it is very arguable that this is as much a spending bill as state aid to education or a service bill or any other item that we look at that we consider spending bills, because what you're doing is you're taking money from income and sales taxpayers of this state, mostly those who are middle income individuals with the higher taxes that came out of LB 773, and the money comes into the coffers. We're turning around and we're deciding to spend that money down by giving it back to property tax owners, and those are not always the same people. You're taking money from renters, for instance, that pay sales and income tax and that money goes into our coffers and they don't see the money go back in property tax relief. You're spending money to reduce the taxes of property owners. You're spending money to take that step. Now I think it's just as arguable that this is as much a spending measure as something else to those renters and those other people that won't see the kind of relief that we're talking about under this piece of legislation; that you're taking from some and giving them to others. It's a redistribution of the money, the revenue, the resources. And so the question is, is that the best way to go? Is that the best route that we can take? And I argue it isn't. There are better ideas; other alternatives. And so I would just want to say, again, that Senator Chambers is right. We ought not to suspend