

compare that and we're talking the Californias and the New Yorks and other people who in many cases have a much higher cost of living period and yet we rank right up there in fourth and fifth depending on how you calculate what it costs to license an automobile in the State of Nebraska. And I believe that that in itself detours many people from looking to upgrading the automobile, whether they be poor or rich and we talk about rich, I think there was a story one day the richest man in the State of Nebraska I believe is still Warren Buffet and the last I knew I think he drove a '68 Dodge or something. He's probably paying \$3.00 a month for it, so it isn't a question of rich versus poor. An automobile in many cases is the tool of one's trade. It may be a farmer who has a pickup and uses it in that capacity. He goes out and wants to buy a new pickup and sees that he may spend 12, 13, \$1,400 more for that pickup than the sticker price by virtue of what it takes to license it and put it on the road. So as we keep alluding back to the current system we have, Senator Elmer was a good example when he described a car that was old but is very valuable. I have one that is old and isn't that valuable but is quite valuable and the tax on that is literally ridiculous and so in terms of helping or hurting me, it goes both ways. If I were to purchase a newer automobile I would be considerably helped. If I was going to go out and continue to get the benefits of the State of Nebraska's taxing system on that older automobile I would lose that under this bill so it truly does go both ways. Those people who are driving the older vehicles I firmly believe ought to be willing to pay at least \$10.00 to license that vehicle and put it on the road. And most of these people when you're talking about and the letters that Senator Robak got from her constituent who is driving this old beat up car may be paying seven, eight, nine dollars on that vehicle now and we move her to \$10.00. I don't think, no matter how poor you are, that one dollar variance or two dollars or three dollars variance on the course of a year is going to make that much difference in their general economic status. It's a situation where we look at our old system, it's flawed in so many ways. It purports to be something that it's not and this is an idea that I presented to the body for consideration. The question relative to whether or not it is a boon for the car dealers, I'd like to reiterate that yes, they support the bill and rightfully so because they firmly believe that if an automobile is cheaper to purchase, they're probably going to sell more, therefore, adding to their economy and the general economy of the state. I submit from an economist's perspective that if they're having that much of a