

the present Warner motion, those that think our tax policy presently is so horrible, I think in the Warner motion, you have got a lot better deal because everything goes away in 10 years, and the burden is to get 25 votes to put it back on. And as I...if you strike the Warner amendment, I would not have a problem with Senator Lindsay's amendment. My concern is not 1990s, my concern is the year 2000 and beyond, and the years that I am as old as Senator Warner and Senator Schmit, those are the years that I am concerned about. And that is what we have to understand if we place that in the Constitution. And though I respect Senator Warner's desire to try and strike the compromise that could bring this issue to a resolution before midnight, I do not think we should be forced to, by time, to do that. If the Lindsay motion...well, if the Lindsay motion or Senator Warner's motion is successful, the pursuing motion I have is to strike the Warner amendment, strike the Warner amendment and take the 10 year review out. And I think, you know, I think that is exactly backwards. I think the red votes on LR 186 we'd certainly be losing ground and in their zeal to try and get the 30 votes into the bill they would have lost a whole lot more, and I think the Warner amendment as it now stands, protection and the 10-year review gives the guarantee placed in the Constitution that those exemptions will be reviewed every 10 years. But with the Warner amendment that we adopted last week in the bill, I cannot support LR 186. I will oppose it, if it gets on, I will most vociferously oppose the resolution.

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

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam President and members, I was greatly relieved when I learned that a group of mostly younger democratic senators had gone to Governor Nelson and voiced their opposition to LB 186CA (sic). I was relieved because normally we expect that kind of action from the Republican moderate, if not conservative legislators. But it was a group of persons from the other side of the political spectrum who said, whoa, this is not good tax policy. We do not want to try and solve this problem so to speak on the run. And I think Senator Schellpeper and Senator Moore touched upon it also, Senator Schellpeper more directly, when he referred to this kind of amendment to a constitutional amendment at eleven nineteen on the 90th day of the session is, in my opinion, an attempt at trying to solve something which is not going to be resolved in the next 40 minutes. And I think that regardless of what