

taxes. This Legislature many years ago before any of us were here except Senator Warner decided that sales taxes and income taxes ought to be utilized. Most of us have at one time or another endorsed that proposal and that concept. We continued to endorse that proposal through '71, '77 and later years. All of a sudden now because of some arbitrary treatment which we, and I was a part of it and I'm as guilty as anyone, we're aware of but which we hope would probably not bother us, we find ourselves embroiled in the all or nothing debate. Only in this instance all or nothing isn't really all or nothing. We want to pick and choose. We want only to address those four items included in the MAPCO. Were not farmers or rural people so fragmented they would do exactly as the railroads did, pipelines and the telephone companies, they would challenge the issue in court. Instead, agriculture gets what it deserves in all honesty because those of us who represent agriculture on the floor here do not have the resources to challenge in the court system the unfairness of the exemptions on intangibles, the unfairness of the exemptions on household goods or other property while taxing those items that are necessary to earn a living. No one would seriously argue that \$100,000 worth of household furniture is necessary to the living style of the average Nebraska family as many homes in this state possess that amount of furniture and much more. Yet that same amount of money invested in business equipment or in agricultural equipment would be taxed and taxed severely under any kind of a system which we propose. What we are proposing to do here is if we're going to go back to the antiquated, outdated system, then let's go back all the way. Let us not just go part way because there will come a time, as Senator Moore has pointed out, when someone will exercise the challenge and we ought not to just do that which the court directs us specifically to do. It reminds me of telling your children to pick up their clothing, then you have to point at each sock and each shoe with a yardstick to get them to do it. That's exactly what we are doing here. The court has said bang, bang, bang, those four points and so we say well let's not look at the rest of it. I would hope that before this session is over, this Legislature...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...as pointed out by Senator Coordsen, will follow not the path of expediency, but the path of reasonableness and will move away from the taxation of property as a basis for the support of government. If the more people