

\$17 million. Now, which ones of these priority bills then are we going to fund to come to that \$17 million total? All those against the gasohol bill raise their hands. The ethanol bills, all those..nobody is against that. Okay, we got \$1 million left now. We have \$1 million left in that \$17 million. Now you have quite a list there to choose from, but of course all those bills that are more than a million dollars doesn't keep us within the limit, and LB 106, for example, is pegged at \$5.7 million on this list. Well, I hope that begins the discussion because I'm going to be real interested in seeing why it is we're spending more time on this bill when we obviously cannot fund this bill. If this bill were something that of its nature was such an unfairness or such a moral imperative, then I suppose that would be one thing, but I think it's been amply demonstrated that this is not like other things in the sense of something being incorporated into the product. It is a business input, but it's more like a piece of equipment than a part, and therefore I see no reason to be exempting this, unless you're going to exempt business equipment generally. And so in the...bottom line is this bill probably shouldn't happen in any event, but I just don't see how it can happen in the context of the \$17 million that we have for A bills, the \$16 million that's gone for ethanol-gasohol and the fact that there are another dozen bills there requiring or for your consideration for some type of A bill funding. It seems to me that we are not being realistic today, and that's the reason that finally I put up the kill motion. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I'm going to support Senator Beutler's motion. I've been thinking about this bill and the debate we had on it the last time we discussed it. There was talk about border bleed and seepage and things of that kind to justify giving these sales tax exemptions. I was told, we all were told about border states not taxing this, not taxing that or taxing it at a lower rate, therefore Nebraska's tax policy ought to equate with theirs. What that does, members of the Legislature, is something which I don't like to see done, even if it's done by the executive branch of this government, namely turning our taxing authority over to somebody other than this Legislature. To adopt the attitude that was discussed the other day means that Iowa sets the tax for Nebraska, Kansas sets the sales tax for Nebraska, Colorado and Wyoming and South Dakota set the sales tax for