

the minority from the rural sector voting against those. From tax policy point of view was why I did it then and, once again, this body I think ought to have the opportunity to have a straight vote on that. The other thing that concerns me about the procedure we are following here today is the next amendment, the referred to as compromise amendment, is filed as an amendment to an amendment, and we have no opportunity to amend that. We either have to swallow the thing in whole or not at all. And I think that once again, one, Senator Johnson's motion, you can't vote for the bill you really want to vote on; two, the compromise amendment, you aren't going to have a chance to amend in any way, shape, or form. I think when it comes down to giving people a little choice to do some things, you call it a compromise and, indeed, it is in certain facts, and I think it is unfortunate that it has come to that. We've spent two weeks going through the process, I think we should take the time while people have the opportunity to make their votes. I have the first amendment up on the bill. I would volunteer that to Senator Warner to file his amendment on so we can get straight to that. I think that would be the better way to go. That way we can talk about the compromise amendment. We can amend the compromise amendment and, eventually, work something out. But, one, to deny the body the opportunity to vote on something that has been on the table for months, two, you have a compromise that you are not allowed to add any amendments to, I think does not bode well for trying to build coalitions. I don't think it is, if you are talking about the spirit of compromise, that certainly doesn't appear to me to be in the spirit of a compromise mode and I certainly urge the body to think about both of those situations.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Haberman, you are next.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Well, Mr. President, members of the body, I have been sitting back here and I have heard a lot of senators say I have got to take care of my homeowners; I have got to see that my homeowners aren't taxed. Well, they act as if I, for example, don't have any homeowners, and I have just as many, if not more, if not more homeowners, than some people who live in Omaha. That is correct. I have more homeowners. How does that figure? I have no condominiums. I don't have any duplexes. I don't have any apartment houses. But all 33,000 of my people live in homes, and all 33,000 of Dave Landis's people live supposedly in homes, but he has the other factions. So we are