

this is just the beginning of another series of legal battles revolving around this issue. And I think that because we are attempting to, in some fashion, other than a uniform one I would argue, and one that taxes the vast majority of personal property, we are going to have problems and the issue is going to be before the courts. It's just that plain and simple. What Senator Moore does is say, well if we're going to have that problem we ought to recognize it. It's a lot like the argument on the...if it's good enough to exempt personal property tax, then why not do it on automobiles. You know. And then why not have the fee schedule in there as well by the proponents on the other side. Recognize what you're going to be looking at. You're going to be looking at huge legal expenses, a tremendous amount of time that the AG's office is going to have to spend defending this specific proposal. The constitutional amendment, I would argue, as well. They're going go hand-in-hand together. And know that full well. And I appreciate the amendment that Senator Moore offers probably a little tongue in cheek, but it does put the body on notice that it may not be in this amendment, but it may be in an appropriation bill next year that funding like this will have to be allowed, because you're going to see that issue before the courts, it's only a matter of time.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Before we proceed any further, I would like to introduce some guests of Senator Wesely. They are in the south balcony. We have 13 tenth through twelfth graders from Northeast High School in Lincoln and their teacher. Would you folks please stand and be welcomed by the Legislature. Thank you for being with us. Next speaker is Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I, too, assume from Senator Moore's comments this is sort of a discussion item as opposed to a serious one. I would assume, number one, that it couldn't be serious, because at least historically we have...there are some constitutional restrictions to putting an appropriation in to substantive law where it affects a constitutional officer, in this case it's the Attorney General's office, which at least casts doubt on it as a matter of practice of putting it in substantive legislation rather than an A bill. And I would imagine that Senator Moore, as Chairman of Appropriations, has taken that into account. And I can appreciate doing this for discussion. But it seems to me there's another responsibility that goes with this. I would like to ask Senator Moore, if he would yield, how much the