

March 5, 1992

LB 1063

LR 219

are going to treat everybody the same with one exception, and that is what continues to bother me and will continue to bother me. In this particular language, it says we are either going to tax it by market value, we are not going to tax it at all, or we are going to tax it by the depreciated value, and that last language that says you can do it by market value and do it...treat it uniformly, I think that same language should apply to the depreciated method of taxation. And I think Senator Hall has an amendment to do just exactly that, and I will support that. And I think if this body wants this amendment to be passed by the voters of the State of Nebraska, they still must try and maintain some semblance of uniformity within class. LB 1063 does not do that in its present form. It says all properties are treated equal, but some property is treated more equally than others, that is what I find most offensive, that is why I continue to sit up here and whine, if that is what some of you want to call it, and I will continue to do that. With that, I rise to oppose Senator Warner's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, I also oppose the amendment and I oppose the bill, and I would hope that we would all read each of them carefully and thoroughly, and understand that when we begin to put this kind of language into the Constitution, I believe that it does what I don't want it to do. It means that, it may not mean that to Senator Warner, he has more experience in this than I do, but when you have a bad feeling about something, you have to express it, and I am concerned that we will...we are, in effect, doing here what I don't want to do. I do not have confidence that some of you have that the depreciated method of taxing personal property is going to be constitutional, and, therefore, I am concerned that with the adoption of this language that we then just say, well, we will automatically fall back to something else and proceed business as usual. There is also in the other...in the constitutional amendment language which is specific, which I think should not be there, and I think that it is a mistake, for example, to include language that says "may exempt inventory from taxation." I don't know, I have not read the definition as to what constitutes inventory. I do not see that here. Maybe that will be in the bill, probably is, but inventory is going to mean a variety of things to different people, and I would suggest that this constitutional amendment will not do that which you want it to do, and will subject us to further criticism of the court,