

upper income on the income tax side, 90,000 and above, married, 54,000 and above, single. And then a sales tax increase of a half percent raises \$15 million. The total of those three raise \$94 million. Added to the two things I just mentioned, \$7 million, retailer collection fee, with the depreciation add-back that is still in the bill, you have a total of \$127 million, which leaves you room to distribute the money as mentioned under the Hall plan in its original form, leaves you room to increase your dollar amount reserve, and also hopefully leave you room for a period of two or three years to pay back any refunds that we may want to choose to pay back on LB 391. That is what the amendment would do, I think it is, in my opinion, probably an easier sell than the Johnson amendment. Either way, they are both superior to the 3-R plan in its raw form. I don't know if Senator Hall...if Senator Hall, if Senator Hall would...I would ask for adoption of the amendment. I guess it is the best form we can get it in. With that, I would ask for its adoption and to Senator Hall I give the balance of my time.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and Senator Moore. I rise in support of Senator Moore's amendment to the amendment because I believe it puts the bill back in a better form than it presently is in, although I prefer the Rod Johnson amendment to nothing, which is virtually where we were at in terms of the revenue source. What Senator Moore does here is bring back to the bill the basic argument of doing an approach that includes both sales and income tax. I want to broaden it out. Those amendments are coming, but I think that this amendment is along the lines of what Senator Johnson is talking about but even more so in terms of the additional revenue coming from the income tax. You reduce the sales tax down to the half percent and you broaden into the income tax area, which is, frankly, very similar to what is taking place in the Governor's income tax plan that I prioritized this year for him. But the issue is clearly going back to a two-prong approach with regard to revenue, looking at it on both the sales and income tax side. I prefer to expand the base, broaden it. I am going to try and attempt to do that at a later time, but for right now I think what this does...this amendment does is move us in that direction and away from just strictly a sales tax base for purposes of funding this proposal. As a matter of fact, the...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.