

SENATOR LANDIS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, we are all trying to do what we perceive as the best thing for the state, probably viewed through the eyes as we know them of our constituents, how they would see the personal property tax problems. And we come from diverse districts and those eyes vary in which community you live and which occupation you labor and I do not doubt the sincerity of the opponents of 1063, the dire circumstances and consequences that they believe that the bill carry and the dislike that this bill has particularly among our agricultural community. Reporting for my constituents, I tell you that I think that they support 1063 because it broadens rather than narrows our tax base. I think they support 1063 because it offers the most likely prospect of finding a method of keeping Nebraska businesses competitive by forestalling an inventory tax. Third, I think they support it because it allows the railroads to be taxed and they would rather see them taxed than not to be taxed and in so doing it also ensures the continued participation of the centrally assessed property taxpayer and, lastly, I conclude that a system other than 1063 would not pass muster with the voters in my district. When I compare the alternatives to 1063, this is the form in which if they felt the Legislature was empowered to act, that it was going to move, they could support a constitutional amendment permitting us this kind of freedom of action. That constitutional amendment I think is necessary not only for the business community, but for the farm community and I support 1063 in its current form. I hope that we do not indefinitely postpone it, but advance it yet today.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Madam Chair, members of the body, I will hopefully be brief, just indicating that I am opposed to the indefinite postponement of this bill. I've been asked by a few people, somebody needs to make a parliamentary point reminding people that this we are on General File and a vote to indefinitely postpone carries with the majority of those voting on General File as opposed, this motion does not need 25 votes, so if people are making decisions on how to vote or not vote, assuming that 25 votes are needed for this motion to pass, they should not be deluded in that effect. I don't know if everybody is aware of that or not, but at least it has been noted. I'd like to be able to stand here as one of the cosponsors of 1063 and to tell you that in fashioning LB 1063 we have created the