

lot of options earlier. I still go back to the concept that we were not going to increase property tax and we were going to devise a method that would tax those who had benefited from the exemptions to make up for lost revenue. It's very hard to come about. I'm very willing to sit here until we see if a motion that Senator Landis has somewhere down the list, which is the Governor's proposal, will go. I'm not particularly anxious to go home and have a bunch of more telephone calls tonight or in the morning or another half a dozen proposals. I would like to see if that would go. I'm not at all sure if some people voted for the sales tax to strip out the employer occupation tax which I understand isn't liked. The only asset that that has is it does fall across the board generally from people who also benefited from the exemptions. That's the only basis for it. But I'm interested in looking at any one that does. And I guess I will probably continue from this point forward of voting no until we get to the motion that Senator Landis has because I would like to see what will happen to that. If that won't go, if that isn't feasible for 33 votes, why then we're going to have to continue the process that we're in which is meeting as a committee as a whole to come up with a solution. But the bottom line for whatever we do is that we've got to come up with a bill that's framed in such a way that we can get 33 votes because I think that is essential.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Madam Speaker and members, I...Madam President, I am not going to speak long. I just find it ironic that I have long been supportive of the sales and income tax and, obviously, that's not on the table at all and been stomped on pretty good about that the last two weeks that that was not to be a solution to this. And, in fact, I've had much input and it isn't necessarily all from agriculture, it's from nearly all over my district saying that if we have to have a solution, that is the one that they think is appropriate. But evidently it's not to be in here and I find it interesting as we talk about where this falls fairly here and fairly there and unfairly here and unfairly there and that this what we just passed is not fair either but it is to do it on energy, for example, which is one that's coming up now in the Governor's proposal, it is fair. One we've had considered on telephones, that was fair but it's not fair now to do selective sales tax on services in this case. I just am interested as we talk about fairness for every argument that's made for one issue there's a competing argument