

February 21, 1992 LB 1120

for a full discussion of this issue. And you know I hear these terms equal and fair, well you know I look at equality as that little, you know, that little scale like that. Well it's sort of like this, you know, when we look at some of these issues. Last thing you said, I don't know if I got this right or not, you said something about we want to put it on sales and income, let's do it, or did you say I'm for putting it on sales and income?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I was referring to the body.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Okay, thank you, appreciate it.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Robinson. Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Madam President. I think Senator Robinson was getting towards some of the things I was going to try to say. This amendment that is being put forward by Senator Kristensen and Senator Withem seems to be a further erosion of what we're trying to accomplish by removing personal property from the tax rolls. Personal property should not be taxed, and I sincerely believe that. And in order to replace that revenue we need to come up with other ways to charge for things. All of these people that we're talking about have degree of personal property that they're paying tax on now that they would not under the 1120 scenario. And with the \$100,000 add-back we're taxing mostly those individuals who would have been taxed in the centrally assessed type of a system. And though there are some shifts we know, from one to the other, there is no tax we're going to put together that's going to eliminate that all completely. But in the large view that we are going to have to take here I believe that we should not do what this amendment asks, and would ask the body to help us reject it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Madam President, members of the body, just wanted to respond to a few things that are already mentioned...that have been mentioned. I think I'll...I'll confine it to three points. And the one point I want to make is the one I just heard Senator Elmer mention, and I can't believe a gentleman of his understanding of this issue would have uttered what he just did. What he said, cutting through everything else, he said the value of this depreciation add-back, exempting the first \$100,000 is it's a way to get to