

little bit.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Okay, that would be fine. It's just...I brought this up again to point out that it really isn't the end of the world or the end to have amendments offered to people's bills, that there are probably always things we can do to add to the preciseness of the language in bills. I get very frustrated with Senator Chambers when he does this with my legislation. He knows I get frustrated with that. He gets frustrated with me when I offer legislation that he doesn't like, but the process is one of which we debate legislation and we try to improve it and we try to stand when he has legislation that we don't like, we try to defeat that legislation and that seems to be an element of this Legislature that members, unless it's something coming to us from outside of the Legislature, it appears to be one of those parts of our legislative process that is increasingly being frowned upon and I think when we have legislation that we don't consider to be good legislation we ought to stand on our feet and oppose it. And we think we can improve legislation, we ought to be trying to improve it. And I think this change would do that. I would in this case honor Senator Dierks' desires to not act upon this precipitously, he's not seen a copy of it, he wants to take an opportunity to think about it. I would withdraw that amendment but ask that if there is a successful vote, Mr. Clerk, if there is a successful vote on advancement of this, I would like to see this motion refiled as an amendment for Select File.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Hall. Excuse me, the amendment is withdrawn. We are back to a discussion of LB 106, Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members, again I rise in opposition to LB 106. I think the bill is bad tax policy. I think what it does is it erodes further the sales tax base in the state and I've yet to hear a good, rational reason for why we should allow for additional exemptions in our sales tax base, especially sales tax base to the tune of \$3.42 million and that's what we're talking about. We're talking about taking a hit on the revenue side of approximately three and a half million dollars, could be higher, could be lower, depending on who you want to listen to, but the fact of the matter is that's what the experts, those folks that we rely on to put these fiscal notes together have told us and I think we have to use that as a barometer by which we justify the fiscal impact to the