to be exempted from taxation, or if you want legislation passed in this body. No, Jimmy Ryan's not pretty, but that's...the point I'm making is this, this bill will, in fact, allow certain of these machines to be exempt from taxation...those that are owned by farmers. Those that are owned by businesses will have to continue to pay. The natural thing is there will be a movement the other way. I think the problem is very clear. I think Senator Merz should act very strongly in this case, and ask again that Senator Koch not help him out so much, so that his bill this time might pass. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Johnson and then Senator Sieck.

SENATOR JOHNSON: Mr. President and members of this body, a few days ago Senator Wesely brought in a relatively innocuous amendment to LB 94, which was as you recall the infamous funeral directors and embalmers act, and he explained his amendment very carefully. But I read his amendment, and reread his amendment, and I finally got up and said, you know, I can't understand the amendment and exactly what it's doing. Well Senator Wesely said, that it's doing exactly what I say it's doing, trust me. I didn't trust Senator Wesely and I voted against the amendment, and this morning Senator Wesely came in and said, you know, your trust was misplaced and I'm glad that... I'm sorry that so many persons trusted me, and he withdrew the amendment, which was a very wise and courageous act. I think we're faced with the very same situation with this amendment to LB 23. We don't fully understand its ramifications. We don't fully see how it works. Senator Beutler has raised an excellent question with whether or not the amendment is overbroad. Senator Newell is raising some questions concerning the actual tax consequences. I spent a little time going through my statutes during the debate, and I don't think that this amendment is going to have adverse tax consequences. I think the tax consequences are going to be about the same if the amendment passes or doesn't pass, but because of the kinds of questions which the amendment itself raises, it seems to me important that we not adopt this amendment, but rather let the amendment again be studied by the appropriate committee, so that when we come before this body, we have full and complete information as to exactly what it would do, as to what its tax consequences are, as to which implements of husbandry, which floating fertilizer vehicles, which combines, and the like would be affected, and therefore, I would urge a vote against the amendment and I believe against Senator Koch's motion.