

those costs up to the producer level, the people that supply you. And I'm afraid that that's oftentimes much easier to do in the agricultural sector than it is to pass the costs the other way through the retail chain. So I think this issue needs to be discussed and we need to realize that the impacts of that kind of a tax are potentially fall unevenly through the economy in the State of Nebraska and in particular, they will impact segments of the economy that we wish to encourage. And again, I think food processing is one segment of the Nebraska's economy that we do need to encourage. We do not need to put disincentives into the law. We have all of the raw materials. We can greatly stabilize our economy and cause our economy to grow if we will simply become more involved in the manufacturing and the processing of the raw products that we already have. So, again, I wish to express my appreciation for Senator Hillman to bring this issue to the body so that we can have some recognition of what the impacts were. I fully intend to support the amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam President and members, appreciate Senator Hillman and Senator Wickersham pointing out again that in the event of the energy tax on food processing, it's much easier to take it out of the hide of the producer than it is to pass that tax on to the consumer and that is where it will come. But I would have to say this, Senator Hillman, that any concern that this body would show for trying to "alleviate" the producer, that will be short lived and will, of course, will not carry over into other aspects of this bill or any other bill. I really have no strong feelings about the bill. As far as I am concerned we can take all of the revenue producing factors out of the bill and I'd still vote for the bill because I have consistently told this body and everyone else that the attempts to replace the money dollar for dollar are futile and when we do that, when we try to do that all we are doing is raising revenue that will eventually go back on a population basis to certain areas and those areas which lose the revenue will not necessarily get it back on this kind of a basis. And for those who say well, if you take all the revenue out of the bill, you don't have anything left. I have said otherwise. There are other ways in which you can handle it and, of course, no one wants to talk about local entities cutting back services either because that's a no-no. That provides jobs and that's votes. That's almost as ridiculous as a democracy day being proposed by