

whereby the taxes will be administered and collected. And if you think you have trouble now, ladies and gentlemen, I predict that that trouble will increase dramatically in the future. Senator Hefner's amendment is a small step toward trying to correct a massive inequity in a terrible bill, and I just cannot understand today or will I understand at any time during this session how anyone on this floor, who has for years committed themselves to some kind of equitable taxation proposal, can support a proposal which is today, in my estimation, the least equitable of all. I know that there are those who will say we have to do it this way to raise a certain amount of money. You might just as well tax telephone poles, light poles, outhouses, anything else you want to tax, but to just decide that based upon raising X number of dollars we are going to tax various items of personal property on a depreciable basis is unforgivable. I would like to suggest also that at some point we are going to find that the public will not accept this kind of proposal, and the other alternative then is that there are those who hope that we can put on the ballot a constitutional amendment, and that the constitutional amendment will fail, and then we will revert back to the proposal that everything goes back on the tax rolls. Ladies and gentlemen, that does not concern me any more. I am the foremost proponent of the removal of person property taxes. I do not think it is fair, I do not think it is equitable, I think it is an antiquated system, but prior to the time that I would ever vote for the 3-R proposal that would tax personal property on a depreciated basis, I would vote to put everything back on the tax rolls, including household goods, automobile inventories, the Nebraska Furniture Mart inventory, the whole ball of wax, and I want to have my urban friends explain to Jim Earp and Roy Smith and Michael Daniel and Mrs. B why it went back on.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: If we are going to skin the cat, we just as well skin the cat from top to bottom and head to rear and that no hide, no hair be left, because at the rate we are going, all we are doing is trying to reimpose the personal property tax on a very small segment of the population. Someone said if it all goes back on, it would be a 48 million dollar hit for agriculture. When we took it off in 1977, some of you weren't around in those days, it was a 66 million dollar item. How then can you put it all back on today and it only cost agriculture 48 million? If those numbers are off, and I am sure they are,