

revenue for the state to pay the bill in this biennium. So because of about that I hesitate because I know there is...this is an amendment we've seen before but I still think if you keep coming back to it, is the best way to solve the problem, one, because of the cash flow, and two, because if you're indeed talking about a temporary tax, which I do or do not know whether or not this will be temporary, it doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me to impose a variety of new sort of taxing schemes that are only there for 12 months because I'm sure they will continue on above that and if that's what the body wants to do, that's fine. But if you really have an intent of making it temporary, it makes more sense to go with a straight income tax increase and those of you that don't like...didn't like LB 773, I will admit that this kind of scraps LB 773 and returns some progressivity to our overall tax system which I've always wanted to when I opposed that bill in 1987. And there's a variety of reasons why you may not want to do that, as Senator Schmit well knows, on both sides, but I guess I've always been of the opinion that it's something we ought to do. And one of the problems, if you argue that the upper bracket, the \$90,000 and above bracket certainly is not exactly the same people that you would argue you're trying to get with a corporate income tax increase. It...I would argue this is better in lieu of a corporate income tax increase because you can collect the money in a given year, whereas if you deal with the corporate side, you know, the tax liability occurs one year, it's due the next year and oftentimes it's not paid till the third year. And that third year is the next biennium and therein lies our cash flow problem. I don't need to spend a whole lot of time explaining this. I think that's...for a variety of reasons, I still think it's something that the body ought to return to, to look at solving this problem, because if we don't, and if we do not adopt some pro-rata amendment later on today, we are going to have a funding gap that will have to be dealt with somehow in the remaining three days, and if that is what we want to do, that is fine with me. But I think if we are going to pass LB 829 and call it dollar for dollar for this year, we need to generate the money to do so. And with that, I would ask for the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Moore. The speaking order now is Senator Hall, Schmit, and Hefner. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise in opposition to Senator Moore's amendment. I don't know what