

has criticized us and have brought onto this floor the doctrine of equal protection of the taxpayer for the first time since I have been here. If we continue on this course of trying to develop legislation which will specifically outline, in this instance, items that belong to certain pipeline companies, specifically Enron, I would suggest that we are going to get criticized again by the court who says we are not providing equal protection to the taxpayer. Number two, if LB 2 passes, we are going to be accused of not providing or allowing for due process. We are going to repeal the taxpayer's right for redress in the courts. I would suggest that we cannot do that. I would suggest that we'd not only look foolish, we'd look as if we are becoming paranoid. And I would suggest that eventually, eventually, ladies and gentlemen, we ought to learn from past mistakes. We are going to have to take the tax off personal property. We just as well do it. If we don't do it this session, we probably can't get it done during the short session either. We will have a whole hodgepodge of lawsuits after which time we will come back and we will do it. Now I don't like to say I told you so, but during the 1989 session, I had a little bill, LB 497. It was promptly without fanfare killed by the Revenue Committee. At that time, I made the statement, this bill will resolve a portion of the problem. You will get rid of the problem of the railroads at this point. You are striking a deal, and we made a proposal. For whatever reason, I didn't hear the debate in the committee, the bill was killed. Now the bill has been brought back under the form of LB 7. It has some merit, although it is I think attaining less merit with some of the amendments I have seen, but the point is this. The bill, that was bad in 1989, January, February, of '89, has now suddenly become good. I do not suggest it has become good or was bad because I introduced it. This body would not face the music at that time. We would not face the issue. We just wanted to put it off. Now we don't want to face the issue again of exempting all the personal property, but if it is fair, if it is fair to tax 20 percent of the personal property in the State of Nebraska, is it not fair to tax the other 80 percent? Now we have said we have passed an amendment which says we can classify. Yes, we did, but then how do you classify? What rational means do you have to classify? I suggest that we are splitting hairs and we are going to be right back in the same dilemma we were before. If you pass my bill, you will remove from the tax rolls approximately \$118 million worth of property. If you pass the complete amendment, you will add to the tax rolls about the same amount of property. We didn't plan it that