

problem constitutionally, that one does too. It is that simple. And, you know, people can accuse me of being parochial, they can accuse me of...I think I was accused of grandstanding my constituents a while back, they can accuse me of taking care of my own business interest on the farm, but I don't know what you are going to accuse Senator Hall of. He has none of those things. He has looked at it and he is convinced that the only thing you can do is exempt it all or tax it all. If you tax it all, it is not just the MAPCO version of everything, it is going to have to be the 775 version of everything. That has to go away. And it could well be household goods, and it could well be charitable goods as well. And people will say, well, he is just blowing smoke trying to scare people, but on the other hand, if you want to say the uniformity clause is supreme, supreme, then everything after it has to go out the window, everything, household goods, and charitable as well. And tangibles is in a different set of the Constitution, and the uniformity clause says all tangible personal property. And unless you wanted to go that route, and maybe some of you do, I don't think that is good tax policy, unless you really want to go that route, unless you want to have some gamble that somewhere in between may work, why do you have to change, why is it necessary to put just farm machinery and breeding livestock on the tax rolls to take that chance. You don't have to. If you are convinced you don't want to exempt it all, you don't have to put farm machinery and breeding livestock on to make it work, and if you have concerns about this plan, the same concerns, and I agree with Senator Hall once again, Senator Lindsay's arguments I am going to read verbatim on LB 1063 because they are exactly the same arguments, and we all know that. So the question is if you don't want to exempt all personal property from taxation, what do you want to do? If you want to keep things on the tax rolls, then if your goal has been and continues to be to right what I would argue probably is an inequity, now how do I argue if my tractor, as a farmer, is exempt, and the construction worker's tractor is not. That is a tough argument to make, I agree with that, but my solution is I'd exempt them both. Others solution is, well, let's have the farmer's tractor go back on the tax rolls as well. I am opposed to that, and there is two ways to skin that cat. I prefer to go the route of exempting it all, but you don't have...if you change the State Constitution, you don't have to put things back on the tax rolls. We can go back to the status quo, and I would argue the 3-R plan, as unpredictable as that is, that we don't know what...Senator Schimek asked a good question, we don't know