

SENATOR HALL: No.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Or printing? What does it do for the newspapers?

SENATOR HALL: Nothing. Does not affect the sales tax issue that we dealt with at least a couple times on the floor previously to this session so it would not impose a sales tax on newspapers.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Well, after that cartoon this morning, I was ready to support your amendment, but now I'm in doubt whether I will or not because I was all set to start putting the sales tax on the publishing of newspapers, so I'll have to think about whether I'm going to support your amendment or not, but the cartoon this morning generated a lot of calls from Omaha this afternoon and somehow I should not be angry about it because it makes people very angry and it would...I'm not a vindictive person, but because of that cartoon, I'm almost tempted to amend your amendment to include the newspapers. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Labeledz. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature, I did have a brief conversation on the telephone with Governor Nelson. He did say that he thought the amendment was inconsistent with his personal pledge of trying to solve the personal property tax issue without tripping obligations for people who are not now bearing this burden, and because it affected citizens, the general public, he thought as opposed to the corporate sector or those who are currently enjoying the exemptions for personal property, he did not support the amendment and I promised him that I would relay that message to my colleagues and I have kept my word. I also told the Governor I was going to vote for the amendment and thought it was good public policy. I have been here for 13 years and that the need to make our tax base more dynamic and progressive really warranted this, but that remains a difference of opinion. Senator Lindsay has one of the two or three classical strategies that I've seen used by others. John DeCamp was one of the masters, by the way; oh, this is okay, but what you really need is to go a lot further. I can't vote for this because it doesn't go far enough which is an attempt, I suppose, to argue for consistency. Remember that we're talking about a one-year stopgap measure. We're looking for a way to solve a one-year