

out of Nebraska. Well, when we raised the sales tax a couple of years ago, I don't recall that our economic condition in this state went down. It doesn't mean the people weren't dissatisfied because we made the change to support LB 1059, but we made it because we thought there was a good public policy reason for doing it to support our local governments. I would suggest this is the same scenario in a sense. It is not revenue being collected for the State of Nebraska. It is revenue being collected by the State of Nebraska to restore funding that will be lost through the repeal of personal property to our local political subdivisions. I think it is the proper way to go, at least at this time this morning. In my opening, I was saying that there is a feeling in the country, at least in the rural area that I represent, there is a feeling that this Legislature is on the verge of basically rescinding a promise that was made to the public when the sales and income tax was instituted back in the Tiemann era. They feel like this is a decision that is reprehensible to them, and I guess I am saying I agree with them. I think that we are going back on maybe a promise that we made, not by our choice, but by a choice being presented to us by a Supreme Court decision. When you get to the real heart of the matter, Senator Hall brought this up last year, the problem with whether you are talking about personal property or whether you are talking about real property, it is not the way we institute or who we pick and choose, it is the ability to pay those taxes. And you have a class of citizens that are being selected out here by the Supreme Court, business and agriculture, that in some cases simply do not have the ability to pay those taxes, whether I grow a crop, whether I am able to sell my inventory. I don't have a recourse. At least with income and sales, I have got a choice whether to spend the money, whether I want to or not. When that property tax bill comes due, they don't say, well, I am not worried whether you made money or not, it just comes due and you have got to pay it or you lose your property, and that is unfair, inherently unfair. I think that is the most regressive tax. We talk about regressive tax, I see this as the most regressive tax that we can impose upon our constituents. The only other thing I would have to say is over the course of the years this Legislature, maybe not all of us, but certain members as we've gone along, made decisions to provide exemptions through our personal property. We did so for good public policy reasons.

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.