

going to close on this? All right. Senator DeCamp, may I introduce some guests of Senator Pirsch first. In the north balcony, we have 6 fourth graders from Bethany Christian School in Omaha with their teacher. Would you folks please stand so that we may see where you are. Thank you for visiting us today. Also I am reminded that Senator Lowell Johnson has a visitor. He is our doctor of the day, Dr. William Heusel of Hooper, Nebraska. Would you please stand. Thank you. Senator John DeCamp, you are going to close on the kill motion.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President and members, I am going to raise four points. I ask you, because I don't think the votes are here to kill it, now I ask you to examine what I say with whoever you believe is the best accountant or the best tax man in the state, and see if there is truth in what I am telling you, and the reason I ask you to do this, I feel handicapped. Senator Johnson, Chairman of Revenue, and Senator Warner, Chairman of Appropriations, just like if I were speaking maybe on a banking matter, they have a certain strong credibility, and there is a reluctance on your part to doubt that what is going on here is good, and what I am going to try to prove in my few minutes here on four points is their bill and their amendments do everything that they claim doesn't want to be done, shouldn't be done. Number one, the argument is that we want to make sure we tie into the federal tax system, and don't jeopardize that for the future, but the first thing the amendment does, and the bill, is to repudiate the heart of the new federal tax system which is indexing. Something Nebraska thought most important, something the entire nation thought most important, we now repudiate which we are a beneficiary of as a part of that federal tax system. So we are taking ourselves out of that major portion. The second thing, the second thing has to do with the corporate linkage. The first thing their bill does is acknowledge that this is a major problem now, and so for one year, this new plan doesn't apply. I am merely trying to make it a permanent thing, but for one year under their proposal, because it would louse things up, it doesn't apply, and then they are going to come back next year and figure out what they have done. So, that reason is gone. Third, the new system that you are seeing here proposed is a repudiation, in my opinion, of the federal tax system itself as a system. Read your bill. What it does, is no longer the system important, but the new God under this bill is a quantity of money, and the system, the federal tax system, is merely a device to extract a determined quantity. No longer is the system so important. The quantity is. You establish as a bench mark, a permanent part, your