

seriously consider reconsideration of adoption of the amendment purely on the policy issue that's involved, forget the property tax issue for awhile.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Kristensen. The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed no. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 2 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SENATOR WILL: Debate has ceased. Senator Withem, you are recognized to close on your motion.

SPEAKER WITHEM: I would like to yield the first minute of my time to Senator Elmer.

SENATOR WILL: Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you Senator Will. When we first voted on this, on the spur of the moment, I thought this was an excellent idea. Thinking about it, at this point, I don't think we want things like LB 775, like the UP bill, like the sales tax rates, like criminal sentences, like how much we fine people or speed limits in our constitution, anymore than we want specific valuation levels or, as could be, that we are actually doing this for the possibility that levy limits and caps are constitutional. I don't think that it is proper that we put specific numbers in the constitution, it's a misuse of the constitution. We can fight the battles statutorily, and I am going to support the reconsideration, and I relin...I give my time back to Senator Withem.

SENATOR WILL: Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Elmer, and I want to be very brief and give Senator Warner a little bit of my closing time also. What this motion would do would be simply place us back in time prior to the adoption of the Schrock amendment, and I would ask you to do that. I think we've had some good debate and some good discussion on the potential impact of the Schrock amendment, both as policy, as Senator Warner has indicated, and both as politics, quite frankly. The politics of it are that real or imagined, and I will grant to those of you the side of