

taxation on personal property that is currently exempt. My position is that...is to adopt the amendment that several have been talking about, which seems to me to be the most level field. And I ask that we just simply amend this bill in such a fashion as the amendment does, which puts everything back like it is today. As of January 1, 1992, business equipment would be taxed, farm equipment would be exempt, livestock would be exempt, all things that we know we may have a problem with would be right back there. And that certainly then says what we're passing today is a temporary solution, it's not even a solution, it's to get us temporarily through until next session in order for the 3-R Committee and the Revenue Committee and others who will be working on this to come up with a single system. But it makes more sense to me to try that kind of a route. By the way, we keep talking all the time that the courts have declared the personal property tax unconstitutional. You know, as a matter of fact, that's not what has happened yet. The only thing that's happened so far is that the Supreme Court ruled that LB 7, which put rolling stock on railroads over as an exemption, was unconstitutional, because that class was too narrow. And I don't know...we had several judges that suggested, in their individual opinions, as to what they might do. But we really don't know that all this is unconstitutional, although we suspect it is. But if you really look at the opinion, that is not, in fact, what was done by all of the judges, and which they all agreed to. So a little time for...some of the cases are still pending, may not be all bad. Maybe we really only want a temporary solution. And under the proposal I am suggesting a little later, whenever it comes up, it makes it very clear...

**SPEAKER BAACK:** One minute.

**SENATOR WARNER:** ...that it's a temporary solution. Let's think this through for a few months, until a plan can be brought back to us in 1992. And I feel that the suggestion of taking everything off, at this point, does leave an advantage that I'm not comfortable about, but I also am not comfortable about what the funding source is going to be to take its place. And I think the more prudent thing to do is to stay with the amendment that will come up a little bit later, which still keeps everybody's interest, we all know we've got to make a change then, and no one has any particular favorable position staked out for their interests.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Thank you, Senator Warner. Next up is Senator