

think if you would look on your desk, we have some more amendments coming forth. I guess, first of all, I wish the body would advance LR 1 and let the 3-R Committee attempt to do their work. I made a statement yesterday, I don't think I've ever seen an impasse like we are at this time the few short years that I've been here. And something else, Senator Lynch, and some of the rest of you, you continually talk about protecting the homeowner. Now I don't live in one of the larger cities in the state but I'm a homeowner in Ord, Nebraska and I think every...basically every senator in here is a homeowner. So I think we're all going to try to protect ourselves. You know, what we need is a simple amendment that I had with Loran Schmit in the last session. Why can't we talk about a little increase in sales and income tax? At least if you make the money, you're able to pay these taxes. I've used an example sometimes when you talk about property tax. I have a couple of son-in-laws in Omaha and they used to complain about their property tax on their home. So I had them bring their statement home once and basically every three or four weeks I paid as much property tax as they pay in a whole year. So, as far as protecting the homeowner, I think we're all homeowners and I still think that a more equitable way is to let the 3-R Committee do its work and, hopefully, we can come back next year and maybe do some work on income and sales tax because I think it's one of the most fairest taxes that we could arrive at from this body. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Rogers. Senator Beutler, you're next.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I was hoping that this would not degenerate into an urban-rural kind of thing because it was not intended to advantage either side, particularly. What it was intended to do was take an area of an agreement and put it into the Constitution. It's interesting that the argument is made that this destabilizes rather than stabilizes. How can it be that an amendment that, if it were voted up or down separately, would have probably 47 votes destabilizes a vote that needs only 40 votes? Now I don't think there is any way you can combine the combination of people voting and say that this is destabilizing other than if people vote against their own basic philosophies, which they shouldn't be doing. In any event, I want to address the rural areas in the sense that I want to suggest to you what I really believe and that is that there are certain opportunities in this