

Kristensen and other members of the body raise some questions about LB 829 that certainly are not to be dismissed lightly. I think that we're dealing with a bill that is not a perfect solution, it's something that has undergone a number of changes. But I think we have reached a point that at least it's a package that we can live with for a year, and I think that's the important thing to remember, this is a one-year proposal. This isn't anything that we're writing in stone, this is something that is simply intended to get us through a year with a personal property tax system that is reasonable and that can probably be accepted by the courts. Sure there is no guarantee that this will pass 4-R muster, there's no guarantee that this will pass constitutional muster. Frankly, anything that we do, outside of the original LB 829, which would have put all property back on the tax rolls, anything that we do, other than that, is probably open to challenge in court because frankly our Supreme Court is in relatively uncharted waters on issues of this type. They've taken a path and interpreted some things in our Constitution in ways that we probably never would have predicted just a few years ago. I think anything we do because of that, again, outside of the original LB 829, is probably open to question. I think we've reached a point where, as I said, we have a package that is not perfect, but we could probably live with it. I think the important thing to bear in mind is that it is only for one year. I think we probably...the best course to follow at this point is to read the bill and vote on it today. With that, I would urge your opposition to the motion. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam President and members, several times during the course of the debate on this floor individual legislators emphasized that it was the intent of this Legislature to get the money where the exemptions came from. In other words, if the railroads were exempted for \$100 in taxes, we would get the \$100 back from the railroads. That was the first mistake we made, I believe, and I emphasize that I was wrong, that even my constituents told me just raise the sales tax, income tax, and get it there and be done with it, stop all the rest of the rearrangement. Number two, Senator Rogers and myself offered an amendment, pretty tough for you to swallow it, no one liked it. But the facts are it would have been a safe amendment, would have been equitable, although it might have not been very politically satisfying to some of us who would have