

## PRESIDENT MOUL PRESIDING

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: I am not sure it is. My guess is that the amendment is offered so that those of us who are bearing the burden of supporting 1063 will continue to carry Senator Hefner's public policy without him sharing the load. My guess is that this is not the place in which Senator Hefner throws up his arms and says, Eureka, we have found it. I am now a 1063 supporter, let's carry this home to our districts and I will carry my fair share of the load. As a supporter of 1063, Senator Hefner's amendment here really is one of the opponents trying to burden the bill, diminish its public policy virtue towards an end which can otherwise be achieved and yet not bring us any political support for the bill. I would urge you to reject the amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Schmit, followed by Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR SCHMIT: First of all, Senator Landis, I am pleased to know that livestock, we almost always sell the livestock for more than they cost. Of course, sometimes that is after we put \$300 worth of feed in them and \$100 worth of interest, and \$100 worth of other assorted costs. It does not mean that we make money on all those operations. My concern with the proposal, as has been outlined before, is that it has been identified here as saying that we have set up the class, depreciable and nondepreciable property, and that if we follow Senator Hefner's lead, we are diverting from that procedure. Well, shucks, haven't we done that anyway when we vacate the uniform and proportionate clause of the Constitution? We have thrown the rules away. We have thrown the rules away and, in effect, you might just as well go with my proposed constitutional amendment which says the Legislature can do anything you want to do. Now you are going to say, well, but we have some guidelines; we are trying to bring some sanity, some degree of levity, some degree of reasonableness into this proposal. Reasonableness, ladies and gentlemen, is in the eyes of the beholder. In this instance, I do not deem it to be reasonable at all. I deem the proposed depreciation schedule method of arriving at personal property taxes to be nothing less than chicanery. It is a fraud. It ought not to be proposed by reasonable people, honest