

and county fairs across the state. I think what Senator Warner is bringing to us and he's probably right, the Constitution is not the best place for it but the only way to really guarantee that it happens is to put it there. And actually, I certainly would disagree with Senator Schellpeper and Senator Wehrbein, the fact that I seriously do believe this brings strength to the amendment because one of the concerns is, is that if you're saying you're going to take, exempt things permanently by the Constitution or allow things to be exempted permanently, then they will be that way forever. This way you're at least saying that, yes, we can exempt things but we have to review it on some sort of biennial basis and I think that makes sense. And as far as the people will be concerned about, well I'm not going to vote for that because in 10 years livestock may go on, or in 10 years farm machinery may go on. That would be very, very shortsighted because if they don't the amendment it may go back on next year. Think about it that way. And I think if anything it's the people that do not see a direct benefit one way or the other for many exemptions they're going to look at this and see if it makes sense. Let's give the Legislature the tools to create a tax policy that makes sense and then to force them on a regular basis to examine that tax policy and anything that can't withstand the scrutiny every 10 years, you have to wonder why and I guess I just seem to think it makes sense. I would ask the body to support Senator Warner's amendment. I think it does indeed strengthen the Constitution. It certainly will strengthen my arguments as I, along with the 48 others of you, are going to have to go out and sell this across the State of Nebraska because we are putting some repealing, in essence, repealing a portion of the uniformity clause but with Senator Warner's amendment, you repeal that, you place back in there some sort of precautionary measure that you can convince the voters that some, the big fat cat is going to get an exemption forever. It leads to whoever it is that we decide in '92 or '93 deserves an exemption, but will have to be reviewed on an annual basis by a new body as we change faces and change representation every 10 years. So with that I'd ask the adoption of Senator Warner's amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Hefner.

SENATOR HEFNER: Madam President and members of the body, I rise to oppose this amendment. I think that LR 186 is good just the way it is and that's our primary problem here today is to separate real estate from personal property. Now we come in