

1992. I offered a bill in committee to just exempt property for 1992, strictly on the basis of, hey, let's allow for some stability at least for this calendar year into the future, not gambling on what may or may not happen at the ballot box. Look at the figures for cattle on feed, December of 1990 and December of 1991. They're 60,000 head apart. The State of Nebraska has lost 60,000 head of cattle specifically because of this issue. They've moved 50,000 of them to Kansas and 10,000 to Iowa. They picked up in direct proportion to where they left the State of Nebraska because of the personal property tax issue. Now, you can argue that that's not why those decisions were made but you can't, at the same time, then stand up and say that it's good to exempt inventory for purposes of taxation and fair tax policy as it relates to decisions that business must make and that it's time for the Legislature to act on this issue, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. I mean, ladies and gentlemen, the issue here is what...how do you deal with this and what is going to happen for 1992 if that constitutional amendment doesn't pass? I mean, people need to know that. They don't need more of wondering about what could happen. I guess, you know, what it does is this is the kind of an amendment that says, well, who gets the advantage? Who gets the advantage? Do the people that argue it's all on, all the property is on if you don't vote yes? Does that automatically mean that they're going to vote for the constitutional amendment because that's the alternative? Or do you take this approach which says, look, if it doesn't pass at the ballot, in other words, if you don't have that threat hanging out there and if you don't let people make a fair decision without the threat of all property going back on, all that fell under the MAPCO decision because, clearly, it doesn't all go back on, if you don't take that away, then people...I could argue, I guess, as a proponent of a different approach, that you're not giving them a fair choice. You're basically using blackmail...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...in terms of the constitutional amendment as it relates to the voters at the ballot box. All this says is that make your mind up knowing full well that at least for 1992, fully, you know, five months into the year, that your decisions in terms of your business property, your inventory, are not going to be affected by what may or may not happen at the ballot. And that's all...all this discussion is predicated on the fact that it's going to be a May issue, which I believe it