

SENATOR LANDIS: Would the Chair (inaudible) interesting problem with the rules. Would you interpret the rules? The body having previously suspended the rules and taken up the vote and have moved as a body, is it in order for the Chair to entertain a motion to so bracket a bill that's been given that kind of treatment by the floor? I don't know, but I think it's fair for the Chair to rule on that question.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, and you do bring up a very interesting point. The Chair is of the opinion that it is not necessarily inconsistent with the suspension motion earlier that did prevail on LB 84. It would be possible to do the same thing, then on LB 739. I would rule the motion to be in order. And the issue before the body is then the motion to bracket the bill until LB 739 has been read. That is the issue before the body. Who would care to discuss the motion? Senator Warner, would you open? Now, at this point, I'm removing light again and then please reissue the lights as you care to speak. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you, Mr. President. The issue that I hear being discussed is the return of some tax collections to taxpayers. The concept in LB 84 I suppose in a sense is an income redistribution, but it would seem to me that the provisions of LB 739, which return 48.2 million over the biennium, is more directly related in part to the funds being returned to those who contributed to the surplus because of the structure of LB 773, and that ought to be the first priority for returning funds. I have a suspicion and we certainly all have been involved in discussions that, well, LB 739 wouldn't have to pass, and I would repeat the same thing I suggested earlier. The combination of removing or reducing, rather, the deduction of property tax to some people together with the inability to deduct the state income tax if they do not itemize, which is the substantial number of people, I have a suspicion that there's going to be a great many people who net very little if not a negative figure, and they are going to be a whole...they're not going to be the high income people. They're the ones that do itemize. They're the ones that do have, most likely, substantial property holdings in a home, if nothing else. And it would seem to me that the first priority of the availability of \$98 million of taxed revenue then ought to go to those income tax people as I have a suspicion there are several who would like to continue that tax, not put in place deduction or the decrease, and I think that's the wrong public policy. We had