

Their sales tax base will be increased. It will be broadened under the way the bill was introduced. That's what they want. That's what they want. The issue of we're going to broaden the tax base under the 3-R proposal is a fallacy. What we're doing, ladies and gentlemen, is carving out another exemption. We're carving out another exemption for those folks who own personal property tax. We're saying that, on the one hand, we're going to let the court tell us what we can or cannot do because they have decided they're going to do that. So we're going to, first of all, change the Constitution, which I guess I agree right now that we need to do to a certain extent, then we're going to say that for purposes...

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Rogers, you're next. Senator Rogers. I don't see Senator Rogers right now. We'll go to Senator Ashford.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Mr. President, and members, I just would like to make a few general comments and then make a proposal that I've worked through and just talk about that briefly. First of all, I think that there is a little bit of a red herring out here on the service tax and that is this. I'm told that the reason that we shouldn't enact just any kind of service tax is because it really is a signal to the state that what we really are doing is increasing spending and that if we can't maintain or retain our spending within the limits of...of the personal property tax base, that...and if we have to go to a sales tax on services, that that's really a signal to increase spending. And I just don't see any correlation between the two and I see that as a...as a red herring. I oppose Senator Johnson's amendment but I do support LB 1120 and I think that it seems to me illogical, although I'm sure there are some good arguments to go to LB 1063 when we already have a vehicle out there that deals with this issue. I don't know what...it's a vehicle that has come out of the Revenue Committee, I don't agree with all of it and I voted against the commercial real estate portion of it, but I think there are some good things in 1120. I don't see any reason why we have to abandon 1120 to go to LB 1063 when we have a vehicle. That seems to be something that we haven't done in the past here in these kinds of areas. I know in 775 there was a Revenue Committee matter, it just