

March 5, 1992

LB 1063
LR 219

it is is that the words that were used defining depreciable property, that is that one of the options shall be taxed at depreciated cost using the same depreciation method, in itself requires equal treatment instead of the method of depreciation that would be used. That, in itself, then gives the kind of uniformity within that system. The reason you would not want to put the words in, in addition, which really add nothing because you have no discretion, in any event, but the reason for doing it is that we do not get involved in that issue. The historical interpretation the court has given to uniform and proportionate is to make it clear that that concept is applied to valuation essentially by market which is traditional, but that under this alternative, if it is one of the three that the Legislature chooses, there just simply is no need because you have no option under the words that are there now that it shall be taxed at depreciated cost using the same depreciation method within reasonable class as determined by the Legislature. It just simply does not give to the...to anyone the ability or to future Legislatures the ability to discriminate. It's restricted very narrowly. And I would be concerned if you add these words. First, they're not necessary because it's duplication, but, more importantly, that you may end up with court decisions that somehow or other ties this back to the original problem that we have all along and that is trying to separate the real and personal property.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker and members, I think this is once again an important amendment, an important vote that people better watch how they vote because it's going to send a message to the public what it is we are trying to do with this constitutional amendment. As I have stated in my debate on 1063, and I've stated it in several dialogues I had with Senator Warner, one of the concerns I have is that, you know, we'll cut to the meat here is it...LB...one of the problems under LB 1063 is you're no longer...you're repealing the uniformity clause and as you do that, you're no longer treating people equally. I think if you want to put...Senator Warner said there's three...there's three options that we've got. One is exempt everything and treat them uniformly. The second thing is put everything on at market value and treat them uniformly. The third thing is tax them on a depreciated basis and, for some reason, we don't want to treat them uniformly. And that's what causes me great concern because that is what LB 1063 does. That