

February 21, 1992 LB 1120

more faith in the electorate in Nebraska than some of my colleagues do. I think they can read a constitutional amendment and understand it. I think they can read the press and understand it, and I think we are taking them for granted. And if you believe by any stretch of the imagination that another constitutional amendment with a different type of implementing legislation has a free ride at the ballot...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...you're looking through rose-colored glasses, ladies and gentlemen, because the voters are going to say, no, they are going to say no, that the exemption is still out there. You're just crafting it a little differently. At least under the old personal property tax system everybody paid. Now what you're doing is you're saying you are creating an exemption and you're saying that if you don't depreciate, you don't pay. If you're big enough or old enough, if you're not new and out buying machinery or equipment, you don't pay. You're creating another system of exemptions and you're building it into your personal property tax and in the process you're offering a constitutional amendment that bastardizes all of the protections in the Constitution to allow for that system to exist. I would urge you to oppose Senator Johnson's amendment and I do appreciate the fact that he has offered it in good faith.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Ashford.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise to oppose Senator Johnson's amendment, but I also rise to echo to some extent what Senator Hall has said about Senator Landis's argument. I don't buy the argument that the voters of this state will reject the constitutional amendment because we do or don't implement a particular tax here. I think that the voters of this state will look at what the problems would be if they don't pass the constitutional amendment and they will make their determination based on that. But what I think or what Dave thinks is not important because it's what the voters think that is important and we can speculate all night about that, but I appreciate his point. I just don't buy it at all. I just don't think it's an arguable point that can be supported. I would oppose Rod's amendment because I think it's increasing a tax that is already too high and I just can't agree that that is the viable way to do it, but I think it was a good faith amendment as did Senator Hall. I'm one of the senators, as is