

**SPEAKER BARRETT:** Thank you. Discussion on the reconsideration motion. Senator Hall, followed by Senators Chambers, Labeledz and Hefner.

**SENATOR HALL:** Mr. President and members, I rise in opposition of the reconsideration motion. As I stated earlier, I think the will of the body was stated in the IPP motion, and I have no intention of reconsidering LB 288. I have only the intention of keeping the provisions that 288 had, other than...and I'm not sure I even want to do that now. We might as well just let the state go ahead and run the homestead exemption and the counties run it in a poor fashion, as it's being run currently, and why should I waste an A bill that I have on Final Reading. But I would oppose the reconsideration motion. I understand why Senator Remmers is bringing it. It probably makes good sense, but I have no intention of supporting it at this time. Thank you.

**SPEAKER BARRETT:** Senator Chambers.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, if it is best on occasion to let sleeping dogs lie, it certainly is best to let a dead hyena stay dead. This bill already has shown itself to be divisive beyond the mere terms of the bill itself. I have no reason to believe that anything other than worse divisions will result should this bill be brought back to life. The contents of the bill are now secondary, those contents will not be discussed. This might be the pivotal bill to plunge us into a lot of other side issues that can be very damaging, not only on a personal basis among members of the Legislature, if I get involved in that I can take it, I'm used to it, I thrive on that. But it makes me uncomfortable to see others, who might be neophytes at that deadly game, get into it at this late stage in the session. I would hate to see this bill brought back alive for any purpose. I would hate to see 288A become a vehicle for Senator Johnson's nefarious plan of increasing the sales tax when he has argued in the past about how regressive that tax is, how it is the most regressive tax that is available for a state to impose, while on another occasion, either earlier in this session or prior to the session, talking about having a progressive income tax because progressivity is what you should attempt to have in a tax. The more ability a person has to pay, the more they should assume in the way of a tax burden. But, as he and everybody else knows, a sales tax places the same exact amount on every individual regardless of ability or inability to pay. The reason I'm