

a risk of fooling the public, to an extent, if we put on LR 219 in its original form, or in the committee amended form, and then pass it on the basis of what LB 1063 says, when we know we can come back the next session and change that. And I'm not saying that's all bad, because I think it is important that we do have specific legislation out there that lets the voters know what we're doing. But I think that to a great extent Senator Hall's approach has a lot of appeal. I'm going to seriously consider voting for it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. Again, I rise in support of the amendment. It does, I think, simplify things. It is an issue that...well, constitutional amendments similar to this, other constitutional amendments very similar to this proposal have been introduced in the last few years, specifically on this issue by members of this body. It is an approach that strikes "tangible", which is where we have had some problems with the courts, makes uniformity apply to real estate, real property, which is what the proponents of LR 219 hope to do. The mention, with regard to tangible, personal property, is no longer there, which means that the provisions of uniformity and proportionality do not apply to personal property. The Legislature would have the ability to do that any way they chose. And that's exactly what we have right now, under the committee amendments. There is no uniform or proportional basis on which depreciated costs would be dealt with, the net book value approach. Clearly, it's laid out, as I pointed out last night and the first time I spoke on this, that the...it applies, if we choose to go the valuation route with regard to personal property, but that is not what's before us. That is not what we're dealing with in 1063. That's what we are abandoning in 1063, that's where we're moving away from that system. Although we see fit to mention it in the Constitution as one of the options, we are legislating the fact that we don't want to do that in 1063. So this amendment allows us to do everything that LR 219, in its amended form, would do, and yet gets rid of the excess baggage, if you will, that I believe is going to cause tremendous amounts of confusion and will be the basis on which the opponents of the measure have the opportunity to go out and argue against it, and I think the chances of them being successful at that are very great. In a stripped down version, such as this would be, that accomplishes the same thing. It doesn't build in some of the protections, granted,