

leads us to the day when our Supreme Court tells us you have a little policy in your policy, it is no longer constitutional. I have had people say, you know, gosh, we can't tax newspapers because we don't tax TV. TV is a service. It is not a good. We tax goods. We don't tax services. But the argument is going to be made here that, gosh, it is discriminatory to tax one and not the other. We tax books. We tax educational software. We should tax newspapers. That there is one business out there in rural Nebraska that is up against it because of taxes, in this case, means we are going to have an exemption? What, then you are not going to have an exemption for sales tax on all kinds of other goods that are out there, because they are certainly in the same boat? There are a lot of empty stores up and down main street in small town Nebraska. This is privilege. This is political power and privilege at work. It is here. It is in our tax against litter. This is exempted from that tax, newspapers. It is also, not only here, and in our litter tax, it is in our public notice laws requiring us to publish notices where we even know that there is no public value that is being secured. By the way, you can find it in the probate code to the point of a million dollars a year for probate notices which there is no lawyer in this state who has ever found anybody that the probate notices capture and bring into the process. This pattern is one of political power and the effect of the establishment on the body, and this amendment is going to go, and it is a big, big mistake. There is no sensible stand-alone reason as to why this good, unlike so many others, should be exempt, but it will wind up being exempt today. I know it.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: And this is one of the first times in the whole Legislature when I am going to go home angry tonight. I am going to go home mad because we aren't going to be able to say to the powerful elements of the political establishment, we are going to treat you just like we treat everybody else. We are going to take your privilege away, and that disturbs me. This is not a discriminatory amendment. What happens with the Hartnett amendment is to continue existing discrimination, and to allow privilege to continue to exist because we get good treatment; we get columns that are offered to us that we publish and put ourselves in so that we don't even have a newsletter. We just write to our constituents directly in small town newspapers. We get endorsed come election time on their editorial pages. We have good working relationships with our