

don't quite understand the opposition to this, because this should be the main reason for the bill. I'm going to oppose returning this bill. I think that I'm inclined to go with Senator Hall in this case. He makes the case, in my mind, that this is a legitimate way of...with the surcharge on the centrally assessed property. I guess I'm willing to take that risk, if it be a risk. The other areas have been worked out carefully. I think in the...almost literally the 23rd hour, 22nd hour in the 90th day that we don't need to mess around anymore. I, too, agree that we're not going to make much more progress, and I would urge you to not consider this. Let's go ahead and read the bill and get on with some other important things. Another thing is, Senator Hall, could I ask you one more question. We were talking about, there's 4 million short, roughly, in this bill. That doesn't mean...and some are saying that if we are in the hole, the Governor can veto this back to 93 million also, and make the subdivisions eat that 4 million rather than us, is that true?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Wehrbein, I don't think that's accurate. The provisions in this bill are as a whole, and the Governor would have to veto the bill as an entire proposal, an entire piece of legislation. I don't think he can line-item a revenue bill, but maybe he'd try. I...I don't....The answer to your question is, I don't think so.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: But with the scenario that you're feeling that we could raise 97 or closer to 97 than 94 in the estimate, is that true?

SENATOR HALL: I believe it is...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: That I interpreted...

SENATOR HALL: I believe that the surcharge on depreciation estimates are extremely conservative. And they should be that way because again it is a new tax, and we don't know, so we erred to the low side. I believe we're going to come out all right. But it's my opinion, that's all it is.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Right. The point would be today, for our purposes, to balance a budget, or at least close to a balanced budget. If we were 4 million short, we'd then have...we really would have to gamble on not replacing that 4 million, because if your scenario would come true and we would raise 97, the