

carefully went through it again and amended 691 and this body has now adopted those committee amendments. Now if we believe in the committee process, if we believe in entrusting our responsibilities to a committee who takes a hard, conscientious look at an issue, this is one of those times in my opinion that we truly ought to stand by, behind the committees work. 691 is a concensus committee bill designed, mind you, I think to provide a lasting peace in this personal property tax dilemma. Now you have to realize in the end that the committee looked at a whole host of concepts including the reimposition of the personal property tax on business inventory, farm equipment and farm livestock. The committee rejected it. The committee decided that they wanted a bill that could be acceptable to urban interests, that could provide a growth factor that in the end, in the end, would not totally affect adversely rural interests. But the committee realized that it had to be conscientious in the redistribution of state monies to all of the state subdivisions. It had to work out something that was just and that is why 691 is before you. Now in the meantime you and I know that the group that put together the personal property tax exemption continued to work to take care of the constitutional defect. That group gave us LB 882. The committee sent LB 882 to our Attorney General and the committee said it kind of looked to us as though LB 882 still contains the same constitutional infirmities that 518 contained. Would you please comment, Mr. Attorney General? The committee did receive from the Attorney General an opinion which said that some of the most negative features of 518 have been clarified, that there was still a constitutional problem with LB 882. So the committee said you know it is very hard for us in good conscience to support this measure.

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have one minute.

SENATOR JOHNSON: Now in the end the committee did send to the floor LB 882. There were several reasons for that. One of the reasons is that LB 882 has to be one of the most heavily lobbied bill in the history of the session and sometimes people do respond to well placed pleas of the lobbying groups. But in the end of course the committee did conclude that the body should make the decision. But, I submit this is truly a time for us to accept a solution which has some degree of permanence to it and is not likely to be here next year and the year after and the following year and the like. I believe that 691 is a bill that if passed can easily stand for a decade. 882 would not do that. I urge you to defeat Senator Schmit's kill motion.