

requirement is going to be. We don't know what the compliance is going to be, and with this amendment, what we try to ensure is that the cost is not shifted to the homeowner, the cost is not shifted to the individual, that the cost is borne in the area where the ad valorem tax used to be, and that be with business, in this case, with business and agriculture. I would offer the amendment, would urge its adoption.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Kristensen, followed by Senator Lamb.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature. Senator Hall, if I understand your amendment right, and you can do whatever if I am not correctly characterizing this amendment, but what you are really saying is is that under 1063 when it will pass and if the constitutional amendment, as is presently being proposed, that we could do a wide variety of things. We could tax personal property 150 percent of its net book value. We could tax it at 5 percent of its actual value, and sooner or later what this amendment will get around to is showing the different ways that you can tax property. This isn't an amendment, necessarily, designed to either make LB 1063 a better piece of legislation or do anything else. It is designed to show you and a way to attack the constitutional amendment. I find this to be unfortunate because that debate truly belongs in the constitutional amendment debate, not on LB 1063. Be that as it may, once you start to head down this line of discussion, and I think that we would like to get the discussion back into what the merits are of 1063 rather than showing what its possibilities are or are not, is that that debate truly belongs to the constitutional amendment. This morning we had some debate and some indication that a constitutional amendment is not necessary. That is something that can't go unchallenged. That is just not true. There has got to be a change in the Constitution no matter which bill passes, and it becomes very apparent if we are going to be working on 1063 that that constitutional amendment needs to be done and needs to be crafted as closely as we can to not only comply with MAPCO, with the other decisions. So with this, I am...Senator Hall probably has and certainly will use that example throughout the day, or at least I think maybe he will use that example, but that debate belongs on the constitutional amendment, not on LB 1063. And sooner or later, we need to sit down and talk about the merits of 1063 and not the collateral issue of the constitutional amendment because we are not there