

since it's purely local and it would give a spirit of compromise to this bill so that some of us could support it as it wends its way through Final Reading in this special session. And I would ask you all to give some attention to the spirit of what we are trying to do, to mend some walls that have been built between the ag community and others in this state and to attempt to have some small thing that we can take back to our rural constituencies and say, we've helped you a little, not a lot, because that unfair depreciation tax on all the rest of the personal property would remain. And I would ask you to seriously consider this in the spirit of compromise so that we can accomplish and some of us who can't otherwise support this will be able to. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Before we continue with debate on this amendment, I would like to call the senators' attention to the south balcony. Special guests today of Senator Moore are 40 fourth graders from Centennial Elementary School in Utica, Nebraska. They are accompanied by their sponsors. Would you please rise and be recognized. Welcome to the Chamber. Thank you. I will now recognize Senator Hall, followed by Senators Coordsen, Wesely and Schrock. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members, I rise to oppose Senator Elmer's amendment although I do appreciate the comments that he makes about cooperating on this issue and looking at things that might allow folks to walk away from this debate feeling good about having to pass LB 1. The amendment that he offers is approximately a \$5 million hit on the total revenue that's raised under LB 1 and that is a significant amount of money and it's 5 percent of the total raised in LB 1. I believe that there are, you know, options that we have to look at if we are going to adopt an amendment such as Owen's that would raise additional revenue to cover the cost of the breeding livestock amendment. So I'm going to go about the process of, if you will, fully funding those exemptions and that is what we are going to have to do here in this debate. And I, as I stated the first time I spoke this morning, feel that what we are doing here may not be the most joyous of events we've had to participate in lately but it clearly is one that we have to address. Again, it's only the issue of raising the revenue to pay for the expenditures that we made, \$97 million, in fact, that went to local subdivisions. What Senator Elmer's amendment does, plain and simple, regardless of the purpose behind it, is