

policy. There was a desire to have the exemption on sales tax. And it was through a great deal of negotiation that we ended up with a system that we have in place. And it wasn't a minor matter, whether it be a refund or an exemption. I think there was a strong desire, by many of us, if we're going to go the route of exempting the sales tax, that it be done through a refund provision. That way we can track and monitor the activities involved, and, I think, as Senator Warner and others have said, there are other reasons for that provision. So it wasn't a decision that we made that we have to stick to that's simply a technical matter. It is, in fact, a fundamental issue to me, and I think a number of other people. A bargain was struck, and now people want to go back on what the details of that bargain were, and I think that's wrong. The ink isn't even dry on the constitutional amendment or the bill that we passed, and people want to make changes, that I thought, when we went into this Special Session, we weren't going to do. We were going to come in and reenact the bill, we were going to do some technical changes that nobody had any problem with, and we're going to get out of here and get the job done, and look at, maybe, some policy decisions, and I agree with those that desire to see further changes next session, it's appropriate and proper. But this Special Session isn't the time, I think, to go back on what, just a few months ago, we reached an agreement on. And again, we keep coming back to the policy decision was made, the policy decision was made. This is just carrying it out in a more clear fashion. In my view that's not the case, the policy decision was to do a refund, not to do an exemption. And now we want to change that policy decision that we made last year. I feel so strongly about it that I hope if we can get the Hall amendment I'll be happy, but if we can't, I would think the Governor should consider vetoing the bill, because when he called us into Special Session, I thought the understanding he made and others agreed to was that we were not going to have substantive change in this policy, at this point, in this session. And so I think there would be grounds to argue the Governor should veto the bill, and I don't think the other sponsors of the other provisions of this bill that are technical in nature would want to see that happen. I think we'd want to take care of the technical problems of the bill that are in LB 3 and not see it jeopardized by this amendment that Senator Moore had adopted continuing on the bill. I support the Hall amendment to strike that previous amendment and to go forward with the bill in its original form.