

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Kristensen, would you respond, please.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR ASHFORD: You know, I was listening to your analysis and I agree with you that there is a difference between real and personal property and it's important to make that differentiation in the Constitution. Explain to me one more time why it is not appropriate to put the uniform and proportionate language there and how that relates to the differentiation between real and personal property and why that is relevant.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, and I didn't speak specifically to Senator Hall's amendment, but I will now in response to your question. If I'm taking too much time, you tell me and I will...

SENATOR ASHFORD: I just want to understand it.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: What I think that does is you put that back in there and it says that you shall not...no, you shall all be taxed at uniform and proportionate based on depreciated cost, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. I think what that does is that reinstates the uniform and proportionate clause at that point. You read the Constitution and you get to that point and you say uniform and proportionate first, then you come on and read that. And I think the court, in my opinion, the court will read that, will stop and say, aha, uniform and proportionate, I think Senator Lindsay has got...if I heard him right, he's not sure either, at this point in time, he probably...he would like to treat those classes uniform and proportionately within the class.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Well, let me just give you an example. Is that...is that...Senator Moore was alluding to the exemptions, the personal property exemptions in LB 775 and the impact that that language would have on those exemptions. Do you have a thought on that?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Well, this might take...

SENATOR ASHFORD: Well, I mean,...