

tax policy and the need for a sunset provision. I had hoped that Senator Hall would propose the amendment which he has now withdrawn in the hopes that it would be adopted, but in the ensuing time that has passed we have lost 10 members of the body. I think he is right that we simply don't have the support for that change, so I continue to feel that the bill should be opposed and I will do that. Lastly, I didn't mention and I should for the record, that in addition to those two reasons I cited on General File just a little bit ago, the fact that we did not proceed with the Landis amendment, the Dierks amendment to have the income tax replace the lost revenue is another reason I believe we ought to oppose this legislation, that I really think that we're putting in place...well, we already know that the lost revenue is there but we actually put this into statute so it, in essence, legitimizes or prolongs or into perpetuity the exemptions that are being provided through the courts and I, for one, think that in taking that step, going back to the public and saying we're making up the loss of revenue through the corporate income taxes is the way to go. So for the record, I know what's going to happen and we're about to do it and that's the way it is, the majority rules, but I, for one, object and feel that there is good reason to oppose this bill and most of what we're doing this session.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Abboud, your light is on. Thank you. Senator Warner, discussion on the advancement.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would again urge that the bill be advanced. In my opinion, at least, the sunset provision which is being considered by some, in my opinion it would weaken the classification and should not be done. The other argument that was used that in the event that the federal legislation is changed, that a sunset provision somehow or other would respond to that. I again call your attention to what I indicated earlier that in part the justification for a distinct, unique classification is tied to the pending federal court, not the pending, but the finalized court, federal court actions. And should the federal legislation in some way be changed or the federal court some way change, that would not bring the issue back in any event. I look upon LB 7 as an opportunity at least to go back to the court and not expand the loss of revenue beyond what we have no control over, which is the rolling stock which there is the final injunction. And I would just urge that the body vote to advance the bill and to put it in a position to