

have found the \$4 million, just like that, just came to me. All you have to do is vote to put the constitutional amendment on the ballot and we will have the lottery and the first \$4 million will replace the \$4 million that we will lose on the sales tax on equipment or repair parts. I think that not only will we find the \$4 million for that but we will also find the \$5.5 million to fund the homestead exemption. I am certain that every farmer in this state would be willing to go out and buy one \$1 lottery ticket in order to fund the \$4 million that is going to be required in LB 219. I just wanted to put that in there. I am willing to help the farmer in any way I can. Thank you.

SENATOR CARSTEN: I am sure you are, Senator Labeledz. Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Mr. President, in listening to the discussion of possible ramifications of this bill on revenue and budgets, I was sitting here kind of reminding myself of the phrase, if you don't know where you are going, any road will get you there. And I would like to suggest this might be a road you don't even want to start down. And the reason is that it takes no imagination at all to understand that there is going to be other amendments for other worthy exemptions, just as sure as shooting, that is what is going to happen. I suppose if you don't want to kill the bill, the next best thing to do is to leave it on General File which I would urge you to do. But I wish you would only think of it in one term and that is tax policy. That is all we are talking about. I am...I wouldn't stand here and argue that this bill is going to trigger a tax increase or it is not. I wouldn't stand here and argue that we need \$4 million to spend. But I think this is poor tax policy. You cannot consistently narrow the tax base and we have consistently done it. And I have helped do it in the past, but not in recent years. It doesn't make one bit of difference, you exempt something, you shift it to those who are left to pay and that is the long and the short of it. That is how it is. And if there is an inequity in agriculture paying for parts, the way you correct that inequity is not one of giving an exemption to but if you think there are other things that are exempt and shouldn't be, then put them back on. I know that is easy to say and almost impossible to do, and because it is almost impossible to do, you shouldn't add another one to the list that you will never get rid of. I would like to argue the social