

understand it because you don't pay those taxes. Secondly, in regard to the depreciation formula, it's kind of interesting that the reason we are in the tax squabble we are in is because the court said we are not treating all of the owners of personal property equally and equitably. Time after time we went to the drawing board and tried to do something about it, finally they said, okay, we can't do it. So a logical proposal then, in my estimation, was to take it all off, because 75 percent was not being taxed. The other proposal might have been to put it all back on. But, no, those staunch defenders of the equal and proportionate clause for year, after year, after year on this floor suddenly said we'll abandon the equal and proportionate clause, we will engage in whatever chicanery, underhandedness, mistreatment of individual taxpayers as necessary to get the votes to pass this piece of legislation. I was going to say garbage, but that will come later. The facts are these, as of now approximately one-third, less than 40 percent of all personal property will be on the tax rolls. I do not know if the removal of equal and proportionate clause will allow the Supreme Court to say, okay, you folks out there just have to take your licks; the Legislature saw fit to remove that, therefore they can abuse those taxpayers who can't defend themselves in whatever manner that the majority wishes to exercise their authority. On the other hand, maybe the Supreme Court, maybe the court will fall back upon the equal protection clause of the Constitution and say, wait a minute, wait a minute, a cow is a cow, and a cow with a calf on her, if that's going to be depreciated and taxed, then the cow in the feedlot ought to be depreciated. I found judges who wouldn't know a bull from a cow or a heifer, and they all look a lot alike. And if you can tell me why 15,000 head of cattle in a feedlot ought not to be taxed, but the same 15,000 head of cattle on a ranch ought to be taxed, and you can justify it, then, by golly, I will stand corrected. The time will come, ladies and gentlemen, when someone will challenge it, and we'll be back here again, some of us, and some of us will not, and they'll say, well, it looks like we got to straighten out the mess. Ladies and gentlemen, why put ourselves in that position? Why should we deliberately foster one inequity after another? I am embarrassed that I was a part of a procedure which took some of the taxes off and did not follow up and take them all off. We tried several times, we were never successful. The facts are as of now those inventory businesses are going to walk away scot-free, and it is those other entities, such as have been described, that are going to pay the taxes. And someone says,