

harder to narrow the tax base and easier to broaden the tax base. The original compromise that we had offered did that. Thirty votes to get the exemption, 25 to lose it. That's not what we're talking about here. And I simply will not go along with this compromise. And it's this close to being acceptable, but it's crossed that line again from what I believe to be compromise and into what I believe to be capitulation. For those of us who have concerns, we give up too much under this proposal. So, again, I'm suggesting if we want to get back to a reasonable middle ground we go back to the concept of 30 votes to exempt, 25 to lose an exemption. And now let me again argue that on the exemption side I don't think any of us are saying that all exemptions are bad. There's a higher test to getting the exemption, and it should be there because, again, the whole philosophical base, but possible...I would support the amendment because I do think some exemptions make sense, some tax incentives make sense. The question is, what makes sense and what doesn't? How do you target it? And so, if you have a 30 vote limit, you...I would feel more comfortable that those exemptions are the ones that make the most sense, and the 25 vote is just simply too easy. We all know how hard it is to lose an exemption, we just saw it on LB 775. I mean that clearly, in my view, should have been included as among those exemptions wiped out by the court ruling, that we didn't want to cut that off. And it was hard to get rid of it, and it's still with us right now, as is the earthmoving equipment. Yeah.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: So let me again emphasize on the exemption side of it I'm not suggesting that all these exemptions go away and that we don't have them. I think, you know, Senator Ashford talked about partial taxation. Others have talked...Senator Beutler talked about taxing maybe just farm equipment and letting the other exemptions go. But again it seems to me when we get into that discussion the 30 votes is absolutely necessary to protect the public, the general public from the very powerful special interests from getting their way when there isn't really that strong a justification. Once they get it, though, it seems to me I think to have 30 votes to ever get rid of it will mean it's essentially locked in. And this is the Constitution we're talking about amending, 30 votes would be locked into the Constitution, and those exemptions, when passed statutorily, in my view, with 30 votes would be locked in to the statutes and simply make it impossible, I think, to have the sort of