

sense, I think there is good reason to choose what the committee has sent out and has been amended by the floor and to reject this form of the amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Lynch, you're next.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. Speaker and members, I don't know if anybody else got any phone calls this morning, but I got two from Old Joe Six-Pack back home. And it's important I share this with you. I'm sure if he called just now, Senator Landis, he would probably want to know what you meant by obeisance, because I don't know what that means either, but that's okay. But you see that points out the problem with the amendment as developed by 219. Called to tell me he doesn't understand what the heck it is. And until Senator Hall offered an explanation in his amendment, he finally started to understand what maybe we were talking about. I don't know if there's anything else better can be used to justify the support for Senator Hall's amendment than that. You've got to all know that it's not what we want to tax, but also what we don't want to tax that's at issue here as well. And I think you all know, after talking to some people, I'm sure all of us have on occasion, that are centrally assessed, I'm sure some of those feel, with the language that we now have, that in fact these good citizens are going to be forced to sue. And I think it's the intention of some of the people on the floor here to force these kinds of important citizens of Nebraska to sue, to test the folly of the language that we now have in 1019. Is that good business? Is that good for the state? I don't really think so. All he asked me was if, you know, if we're going to start taxing personal property do you think he could get his pipe cutting machines, his tin bending machines, and a couple of other fabricating a piece of equipment that he has that he's always paid tax on off the rolls, and how does he do it? He maybe thinks with the Hall amendment maybe it will force us to talk about it at least, or not tax it at all. Makes sense for us to keep language in whatever we provide to the voters in a form that they can better understand. And I really think at this point the reason we don't want to change the language is there possibly could even be a hidden agenda there that we don't understand, at least some of us that are more Joe Six-Pack than constitutional scholars. Say again the Constitution is pretty sacred. I don't care if it's been around 30 years, 50 years, or 100 years. I don't think we ought to screw around with it too much. And I support the Hall