

Haberman, excuse me. Senator Wesely, then Senator Haberman, Sieck, Miller, Hoagland, Warner, and Higgins.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President and members, listening to Senator Schmit and others speak, clearly there is a difference of perspective on this issue depending perhaps on the background that you have. I happen to have a district that has a little bit of a rural background. Of those three people, I don't remember having much interest in this issue, particularly, that are in that rural area in my district, three out of 33,000, and so I guess you would call my district pretty urban, and my speaking against LB 219 might be interpreted as antirural, prourban, but I want to tell you the concern I have is inequity. The concept in LB 219 is that replacement farm equipment would be sales tax exempt. There is another bill, LB 1076, brought to this Legislature by Senator Goodrich and some other people that would have business replacement equipment as sales tax exempt. The concept is very similar, you know, one business being farming, the other business being manufacturing. The one bill, the business bill, the manufacturing bill was killed in committee. This bill is now before us out on the floor, and I am saying to you in terms of fairness, if you are going to provide a sales tax exemption for replacement equipment, it should apply not only to farm equipment but to business equipment as well and, frankly, if this is not killed, if Senator Johnson is not successful, I will be up there with an amendment either on General or Select File to add in LB 1076. Now why is that not an unreasonable thing to do? As I said, it is the same concept, but more than that, it is the same price figure. This bill was estimated to cost 4 to 6 million dollars. That bill, 1076, was estimated to cost 4 to 5 million dollars. It is about, approximately the same amount of money. Now I think we all realize that if we did both of these things we are talking almost \$10 million annually lost in revenue. That is a pretty big chunk to lose, but in terms of equity, it would be the right thing to do. Either we do it across the board or we don't do it all, and I am suggesting at this point, perhaps because of the budget consideration, we ought not to do it at all, but I am just telling you from my perspective, I see an argument here that can be applied to another piece of legislation, and if we don't kill this bill, you had better be prepared to argue why it is all right in one case but not in the other when the concepts are the same.