

debate now, I'll debate now so we can call the question in a little bit, so I'll go ahead and talk briefly. But I rise to strongly support the committee amendments, for the committee amendments because they struck the inventory portions of this constitutional amendment out. I think that is the fair and most understandable thing to do and if it's one of those things we need to start the slate clean, you ought to do it that way and I commend Senator Hall and the Revenue Committee for making that very proper change of what the Governor brought to us. Obviously, part of the battle is for us to get 40 votes in here for this constitutional amendment. That is only a small part of the battle. When we begin to try and educate the public on just what it is this constitutional amendment is and just why the people of the State of Nebraska should vote for it and why it is worth spending the half million to three-quarters of a million dollars it's going to cost us to put this on a special election, and all those things are indeed worthwhile, certainly in my opinion. And you're going to have certain people come from all different directions saying maybe why you shouldn't pass this amendment. Obviously, there may be some more of the avid protectors of the homeowners and say, hey, the homeowners are getting the shorter end of the stick for a long time in this state and the only way you're really going to get property back on the tax roll is not to pass this constitutional amendment and then you will be forced through crisis to put everything back on. And I guess, I think people need to think of that long and hard because that's probably not going to happen. You can call us what you want, but I think, given some examples of votes all of us have placed in here, the possibility of everything going back on the tax roll is certainly slim to none. If everything doesn't go back on and if the court is indeed correct, the only correct real property is to continue to exempt everything, and then your attempt to try and protect the homeowner actually penalizes them much more because you can only raise the sales and income tax so much. If you do not raise it so much, you're going to get the rest of it from the remaining real property tax base and that means the homeowner and the ag land owner. For those that are centered with the homeowner, the best thing you could do is pass the constitutional amendment, then as Senator Landis so adequately explained, then you can at least put some personal property back on the tax rolls. Now as far as many rural interests may be of the concern about, hey, why would you want to do this? You know, by doing this maybe you put that depreciation surcharge that we placed in 829, maybe you perpetuate that forever. Well, the only chance you have