

SENATOR WITHEM: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I commend Senator Lynch for bringing this amendment. I do not, and I hope he doesn't have the delusions that this is going to be a public policy that the full Legislature will end up supporting, but I think it has a great deal of value in that it points out to us and to the public what it is we're really talking about because we're not talking about, with LB 1120, repealing all personal property at this point. Senator Lynch gives us an opportunity to demonstrate whether we truly believe if you say you support 1120 that we ought to repeal all personal property, then you ought to be doing that. You ought to be repealing the tax on motor vehicles. The only reason you're not repealing the tax on motor vehicles is because there is a separate clause in the Constitution that allows you to treat them differently. If you don't support the Lynch amendment, you don't really believe in repealing the tax on personal property. You merely believe that you're taking care of a particular group of individuals that have been lobbying hard not to have their property taxed as personal property. As a state senator representing a suburban area, I can tell you that in my time in this Legislature there has not been a single issue around which I have not heard more spontaneous citizen concern than the tax on their motor vehicles. It's not one which is organized. It's not one which, like the thing on the cigarette tax we got the other day, I got one of those letters coming in that gave the specific instructions on how they're supposed to send a letter and tell us and make sure you put this in your own words so it doesn't look like a form letter; well, they wrote it on the form and sent it on in, so it's not one of those sorts of things. It's not one that is generated by an interest group. But when you get a group of citizens around in a group and they talk about their frustration with taxation, particularly somebody that comes from another state, that they come in and they pay personal property on their motor vehicles, in other places they just pay a fee and usually a fairly low fee, this is a high level of frustration to them. If you were serious about wanting to see 1120 become policy of the State of Nebraska and expect the citizens to endorse it in a referendum that they will have to endorse in a constitutional amendment, you'd be supporting this because that might be one way in which you could get support out of the urban areas for this particular proposal. There is no distinction in my mind, we have two categories of property in this state. We have real property which is the land and which is any permanent attachments to that. We're talking