

February 21, 1992 LB 1120

that's exactly what we're doing. We're being rather hypocritical when we attack these types of proposals and then are going to argue that for reasons other, in another revenue scheme, that it is a very valid provision. There's no control that those centrally assessed companies have over their personal property except maybe moving it from the state I guess is one of the arguments that you always hear. We hear those arguments time and time again about how it impacts the economy. I guess, you know, based on that argument you wouldn't expect to see businesses exist in states like South Dakota or Florida or some of the other areas where they have extensive sales taxes in the area of services, some more than other. South Dakota, there is very little that doesn't have a sales tax on it. The return to that is, well, but they don't have an income tax. Florida has an inventory tax. I mean, Texas has an inventory tax. Maybe we ought to be looking at those. That was one of the questions that was raised at a forum that I was on. Why not tax inventory? Why do you accept the premise that we don't want to tax inventory? Maybe you tax it in a different way, but you can't stand up and say, this selected tax as it adversely affects one company is bad, but when you can point to the same kind of adverse effect in another scheme, but yet then argue in favor of it, I think is hypocritical at best. I think to resolve this problem at some point down the line, we're going to have to understand that. And we're going to have to adversely impact somebody. Again, it's always the tax that hits home that is a bad one. Those that fall on somebody else aren't adverse and I guess I would hope that at some point we begin to realize this in the debate. I would again urge that you reject the amendment. I think it's a fair application. The policy decision in terms of utilities as they relate to individuals is a fair one. I guess I could argue that the little old lady does have the ability to regulate what she keeps her thermostat at when it's 30 below zero. She could keep it at 50 so her taxes and her utility rates wouldn't be near as high. The flip side is that there is no cap on the sales tax rate as it applies to her bill and that's...and her bill is at the full rate of the sales tax as opposed to one-half and the \$100,000 cap. I would argue that, you know, on a fixed income maybe it means a heck of a lot more to her than it does...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...to that manufacturer who is out there in a for profit enterprise. Again, I would urge that you reject the