

to pay taxes and I think we have to recognize the differences in people in this state, their ability to have the different things that we would consider adequate in terms of their lifestyles, in terms of their ability to take care of their kids, take care of their families, and I think we have kind of lost sight of the differences in this state, and probably in this country, because this sort of tax policy isn't something that is confined to Nebraska. It is one that has been pretty much the standard across the nation in the last few years. I did pass out a Bloom County cartoon that kind of talked about this with a Donald Trump conversation, and what we are seeing is a reaction of that, I think not only here in Nebraska, but around the country of people saying that the decade of the rich and famous has got to come to an end, and we have got to talk about the poor and forgotten. We have got to talk about individuals that are the working folks, the elderly, and other individuals that don't have the ability to gain from LB 775 and LB 773, the people that won't have \$5,000 in capital gains, let alone \$500,000, the kind of people that won't have the ability to take that \$500,000 in capital gains and have it tax exempt under the state law. You know we only limited it to those companies that you work for, so there are other people out there that might have stock in some other company or some other way in which they gain in capital gains, and they won't have this exemption. Why we provide it in the narrow focus that it is and why aren't we providing it to just anybody, whatever their income or assets, I have to raise question with that. I do support the targeting into the companies because I can see why you would want to provide some incentive for the entrepreneur, some incentive for the working people of this state to take stock in their companies they work for, to look for capital gains out of the very companies that they are an employee of. I think that is a good idea, and so that is why I cut it off at \$500,000, and that is all negotiable. Frankly, I would feel more comfortable if it were much lower than that, but at \$500,000, it certainly raises the issue of ability to pay.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: And so I bring it to you with that idea in mind, but in my estimation, we could lower that down to \$100,000 and still have a very fair exemption in place. Now my time is about to run out, and I don't know if I am going to get very much support whatsoever for this. I am sure most of you would rather not have the issue even brought to the floor, but I feel