

March 6, 1992

LB 1120
LR 219

Senator Warner's AM3187. The handout that you have before you that was distributed yesterday and was divided, each of the five parts were voted on and adopted. The amendment would, committee amendments would become LR 219 and I would ask, Mr. Clerk, at this time that when they come down in E & R, they be in a white copy form so that they are a solid piece so we can work with on Select File. The issue is put now in the form that the introducers prefer it. So if you choose to adopt the committee amendments, you adopt what the proponents of LR 219 would prefer to be its form. That is the way it is set out. I just completed my job as Chairman for the purposes of the committee amendments. Now I rise to oppose them and I oppose them based on the fact that we don't need a constitutional amendment to do this. I agree with Senator Kristensen. Let's focus the debate on whether or not there is a need for a constitutional amendment or not and I'm ready to do that. I will be very ready to do that on Select File and will lay out the case for why we don't need that, and I welcome that discussion because I firmly believe that that is just what we need to do. The argument is, is that if you believe in the need to tax personal property, you need a constitutional amendment. Otherwise you'll be...you have to tax it all, the all or nothing approach. I don't know that that's necessarily true. I don't believe that it is. I do know that the vast majority of personal property has been exempt and been exempt in this state for a number of years by acts of the Legislature. All LB 1120 would have done is completed that act. We talk about the economic disaster that will occur if we don't put personal property back on the tax rolls, if it all goes back on, if we don't put it on in the depreciated way that 1063 would have it. I'm sure those same arguments were made about the economic disaster at the time we repealed personal property back in the seventies. I'm sure those same arguments were just as earnest and just as heartfelt then as they are now. And I would argue that really they are trying to accomplish the same thing. They're just trying to protect a certain class so that it does not have to pay and that there will be those other classes who don't have the ability to carve out their exemptions that will continue to pay. And, ladies and gentlemen, what about the economic disaster that took place for the individual when those personal property exemptions were granted and real estate prices went up, real estate taxes went up for the individual homeowner? That's what happened back then. And I'll guarantee you under the scenario that is coupled with 219, 1063, that's exactly what will happen for many people in the urban areas for my constituents. Their real estate taxes are going to go up. To