

I think it was Senator Wehrbein and Senator Warner the other day. And Senator Warner gave a good rationale for the reasons that we can't look at intangibles. And as I started thinking about it, I heard what he was saying, but I also said to myself, wouldn't it be easier now than it was in 1967 to tax intangibles. I mean we're so computerized. We have so many records now, wouldn't it be easier to track intangibles now than it was back in 1967, when we took them off? I'd like to be able to at least examine that again. I'd like to be able to examine sales tax on services. We talked about it in the regular session, I'd like some facts and figures, I'd like to really do some research into this. I'd like to see a broadened tax base, and I would like to see some of the things that legitimately should probably be exempted just because of reasons of having a strong economy, or the difficulty of collecting. I'd like to see some of those exemptions eventually. But if we start exempting now, then the pressure is not going to be there later on to do a gosh darn thing about the overall tax policy. And we'll come back, next session, and the 3-R Committee will report back, and nothing substantial will happen, and I don't think that's what any of us in this body want. And I think there is room for agreement, and I think there is room for further examination of our tax policy. For that reason, Senator Ashford, even though I like the idea that you've put forward here, I'm going to vote against your proposal. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Rogers, you're next. I don't see Senator Rogers right now. Senator Hall, you're next.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I rise in conceptual support of what Senator Ashford is doing. I think the issue that he presents, in terms of some type of percentage of taxation, not necessarily the version he has, but the floor and ceiling approach that he talks about, would be one that were we able to address tax policy as a whole, and look at this and how it affects the various sectors of the local economy, not only that but the local taxing authorities, the impact it will have on state aid and other things, that this could very well be the kind of, I hate to use the word compromise because it has some bad connotations, lately, but compromise proposal that folks might be able to live with. But maybe not. And there is nothing wrong with having reasonable people disagree, as I was told a number of times the other day. Reasonable people do tend to disagree, and there is nothing that we tend to disagree more