

March 6, 1992

LB 1063
LR 219

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. I would like to direct the senators attention to the south balcony. Special guests today of Senator Moore are 12 third and fourth graders from Centennial Elementary in Gresham, Nebraska and their teacher. Would you please rise and be recognized. Welcome to the Chamber. Thank you. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. Frankly, I don't know at this point whether I'm going to support Senator Hall's amendment or not. I do think that Senator Hall makes some very good points with his amendment. I have been voting on the legislation with the supporters of LB 1063, and I probably will continue to do so. I've not been active in the discussion on that bill, and frankly I decided to get active on the constitutional amendment because in a large measure whatever we do with LB 1063 doesn't matter, because it's legislation, and we're going to be back looking at amendments next year anyway. What we do on LR 219 is going to determine what's in front of the voters in May, or in November, or whenever, depending on how many votes it gets. And I think this is the crucial thing that we're discussing this session with respect to property taxes, because this is what sets the parameter for what we can do, what we're mandated to do, what we're prohibited from doing as far as property tax legislation in the years to come. I think I've been somewhat nervous about the LR 219 as amended by the Revenue Committee and as originally introduced. I know that there are...the plus side is that it has been drafted to specifically address a lot of the concerns of the Supreme Court as interpreted by the people that drafted it. I think the downside, as pointed out by Senator Hall, is that it is a complex amendment that, frankly when it is before the voters, if it's before the voters in the form that the Revenue Committee has amended it, the focus of the vote is not going to be LR 219, it's going to be LB 1063, it's going to be the provisions of the specific legislation that we pass. I think in the interests of having the voters make an informed decision on a constitutional amendment, certainly the approach that Senator Hall was suggesting is a much more preferable one because it does just clearly set out that we are removing personal property from the uniformity clause, that we are allowing inventory to be exempt. And at that point, if that's what's in front of the voters, then it's up to us, as legislators, to go out there and explain to them what this means. This means that these things can happen, that personal property can be completely exempted, that it can be taxed on a different basis. In effect, I think we're running