

reject it. That will depend a great deal, of course, upon the kind of campaigns that are waged both in support of and against it during the time that it comes up. At least, it is something which I believe the public could understand. I do have a question, and I am not sure, maybe Senator Hall can answer this, or else one of the attorneys on the floor. Is this a new item on the agenda, Senator Hall, and if so, does a constitutional amendment such as this come under the five-day rule or are we all right on that?

SENATOR HALL: No, Senator Schmit, that's a good question. I introduced this as LR 9CA, a variation. We had a hearing on it in the Revenue Committee. Nobody came to the party, and as a matter of fact, folks chuckled about it thinking that it was a rather hair-brained idea. Then they considered the source and they chuckled again, but I don't think we have a problem. That was in the session when it was called prior to being expanded. So I mean we have gone more than five days.

SENATOR SCHMIT: All right, thank you. I thought I had seen the amendment around somewhere but apparently the reason I didn't come to the hearing, Senator Hall, was I wasn't aware you had the hearing on it, but I do believe since you had introduced the five day rule would not be a problem here. I would recognize that I think, and I heard a lot of people talk about the impact, adverse and otherwise, upon businesses if we reenact the personal property taxes. I know that there will be a better time and a better place, I believe, to debate the issue of a tax policy. I think again, as has been pointed out on this floor by almost everyone, that we have a major overall tax problem which faces the State of Nebraska, and it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to address that in any kind of fashion in only 10 days. I have offered several solutions. I called them interstate out of a maze. Senator Moore said he would prefer to take the back road. I think that if we want to find a way to reasonably approach the problem this will work. I did not support the Wickersham amendment because I think it throws doubt upon the wisdom of placing in the Constitution certain language, selective as it is, which could be most damaging in the long run to an overall tax program. This amendment I do not believe would. I believe it retains some of the protections that are necessary. I handed out a little earlier some of my concerns relative to the abolishment of the uniform and proportionate language in the Constitution. I pointed out that the 1920 convention was most concerned, especially the farmers at that