

million, that the actual property taxes collected today, real property taxes collected, compared to what would have been collected from them had everything stayed on the tax rolls, that is if all personal property would have stayed on the tax rolls the actual reduction in sheer dollars is about 55 million. From that, two things you'd have to do. One is to...I do not believe those numbers are adjusted for inflation, that is we're comparing dollars with dollars, we're not comparing 1967 dollars with 1992 dollars, which would change that number. But I want to mention it because the court has brought up this new issue of replacement of the revenue to local government. And in total, again, statewide figures, it is very clear that replacement has been provided for all of those items that have been treated in some different fashion since we commenced this route in 1967, going to sales and income tax. More precise numbers will be available. But I think it's important to know that, when we talk about shifts, that those shifts look at the total state aid that goes back to local government, schools, cities, counties, programs that the state has taken over fully funding, at one point governmental subdivisions had to share in the burden or pay the full cost of, in some cases, those, too, have provided some equity that, at least in the latest court decision, which restricted their shift concern of taxes solely to property tax, and chose either to ignore or was not presented to them the full picture, and one that, as a matter of tax policy, this Legislature has talked about time, and time, and time again, including on the discussion of 1063, and that is that there is an issue of where the shift occurs in taxation. There is no question about that. But you have to include sales, income, property tax, and in some cases excise taxes to fairly evaluate whether that shift is good tax policy, number one; and equitable tax policy as well. So the issue is complex. But I think that Senator Hall indicated in his opening remarks on LB 1, I think we are at a stage where at least in the future we have a level of stability in our local property tax system now that can be retained and the state can move ahead. This is not to say that we do not have some cleanup problems, obviously, from the last court decision, to deal with yet. But I think a lot of progress has been made and it's been done over a long period of time.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Warner. Does anyone else wish to speak to this bill? Seeing none, do you have closing, Senator Warner? Closing is waived. We will now vote on the motion to advance LB 1. All those in favor please vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted on the motion to advance LB 1?