

of the exemptions, all in all, add up to just too much uncertainty, and I just think I need to oppose both of those.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Our next speaker is Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I shouldn't say Speaker, Mr. Chairman. I also rise in opposition to both of these amendments. I think if you are going to put things in the Constitution, you need to put things in there that the people would approve of, and I am afraid when you put these in there, if you want to really kill LB 186 in the election is to put the Lynch amendment on. I think it is going to be bad enough if we would have the Warner amendment on, but if you put the Lynch, especially, that would especially do it in. So if we really want LR 186 to pass, I think we need to keep both amendments on (sic), because you have to realize that the Constitution is something that the people are going to approve, it is going to be there for years, to probably forever. Because it seems like whenever there is something in there, we never take it back off. So I would be opposed to both amendments. Thank you.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you, Senator Schellpeper. Next speaker, Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Okay, I just want to talk a little bit more on the concept, and, again, I'd remind people this only deals with tangible personal property, it does not deal with real property, but there is a benefit...now this is kind of what we used to call sunset, maybe it still is, but we have had some experience with sunset legislation back in the early...middle eighties, I guess it was, which was not very appealing to me at the time. But, nevertheless, it was done by the Performance Review and Audit Committee, and when I look back, while though the agency was abolished, well, there was one but that is another story, what did occur that was extremely beneficial was that there were many, many changes made in how operations took...how the law affected the operations of various agencies, which I don't think probably could have been done. And it seems to me that at least once every decade in this area we ought to be looking at a broad tax policy. If it is done one at a time, we all know what the argument, how come you are picking on us; but if it is done across the board, it...those who have a concern about it, if the policy is right, there is no reason to believe it is not going