November 17, 1989 LB 7

drop in the bucket and, I'm sorry, but that's just the way it's going to be. So...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR ASHFORD: ... I don't see any reason to expedite this, it's just not going to make any difference.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Abboud, please.

SENATOR ABBOUD: Question.

SPEAKER BARRETT: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question before the body is, shall debate cease? Those in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed nay. Voting on ceasing debate. Have you all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 9 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Debate does cease. Senator Warner, would you like to close on your motion to reconsider the bill?

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I did not vote to cease debate, I don't want any interpretation if there is others' argument that someone needs to make is being excluded. There are several things that have been said that I can only give you my opinion, I guess, which I assume is what is true of others who have spoke what is their opinion. First, Senator Ashford, my understanding of the Enron case it did not say that we could not classify personal property. To my knowledge, the only case that has been before the Supreme Court, in fact, was the Stahmer case which did uphold. LB 7 is based upon a fact that the statute that identifies taxable property, personal taxable property includes the railroads which, not by this bill but by federal court action only relative to rolling stock, was exempt. The basis of LB 7, as I repeatedly tried to explain when it was earlier discussed, is the establishment of a reasonable distinct class currently authorized by our Constitution, conceptually as approved in other cases, and the basis for that exemption is spelled out in the bill as a reasonable distinct class. There has been reference made in the course of discussion to other cases in which the court has acted. My understanding is that all of those cases that were cited at least dealt with real property rather than the personal property tax issue that we are