

to have...fund the bill at a lesser amount than to have that income tax increase go into effect January 1 of this year, therefore generating more money than necessary to fund the bill for the first year. So I would oppose the Warner amendment. And I think...I've tried to answer your question, Senator Warner. If I haven't, I'm sure you'll ask them...ask them to me again.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Before recognizing Senator Withem for further discussion, the Chair is pleased to announce that Senator Dierks has a special guest under our north balcony. Mr. Mike Hannon from O'Neill, Nebraska. Mr. Hannon, would you please stand and be recognized. Thank you, we're glad to have you. Senator Withem, please, followed by Senators Warner and Hall.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. President, members of the body, the Warner amendment, as I understand it, is the show card amendment, I guess, on what we do about the fact that the revenue projections, on which this bill was originally based, have been revised in a negative sense. And there is not the money here to fund this, in its current form, in its first year. Senator Moore has spoken on his preferences on the bill. And his preference, as I understand it, is to...his preferences are...his preference is to allow the bill to be phased in in a two-year basis, and not bring the income tax into effect January 1 of 1990. To do January 1 of 1990 would, in fact, result in double withholding of the income tax increase in the first year. A number of people, I think, think that that is a problem. Not doing this, though, would result in the effects of the property tax decrease not being felt in their totality until the second year, and you would not have the dramatic type of decrease that you would have...that you would have otherwise. So, that's your choice, I guess, as a Legislature. And I think it's one where I'm probably going to go along with the Warner amendment, but that's a personal preference. If your preference is to see it all go into effect in one year, then you vote for the Warner amendment and it goes on, and you'll have double withholding the first year. One the other hand, if you're comfortable letting the effects of the property tax reductions on individuals come in a two-step phase as opposed to a single phase, then you ought to vote against the Warner amendment. If the Warner amendment doesn't go on, we'll make adjustments in the A bill to appropriate the sums of money that will be available, it will be in a two-year process. Senator Moore has