

going to go, might go back on the tax rolls after an over 20-year hiatus. So this body, by 1063, is going to put \$1.8 billion worth of valuation back on the tax rolls after over 20 years of being off there and it's going to do that in the name of uniformity. It's going to do that in the name of equality. It's going to do that in the name of constitutional uniformity even though in the very amendment we want to try and adopt with this we're going to repeal the uniformity out of the Constitution. And, basically, there has been several people that have said time...you know, Senator Beutler, Senator Warner, others have stated incorrectly that 1063 places all the depreciable property on the tax roll and treats it uniformly in the state. That is not true. LB 1063 does not do that. There's about \$6 billion worth of, using the Department of Revenue's numbers, about \$6 billion worth of depreciable personal property out there. Of that little over \$6 billion worth of depreciable property, 1063 taxes all but about \$180 million of that property; all of it, about \$180 million, and that is the 775 personal property tax exemptions. As I said, I said 50 times last week, the Speaker corrected me and said I had mentioned it 53 times, this will be the fifty-fourth time. I'll say on this floor I'm not opposed to LB 775. I voted for the bill and I'm...sometimes I'm crazy enough to go out and try and defend it to some people. I still feel that way. But on the other hand, if you're going to pass 1063, you're going to put farm machinery, breeding livestock back on the tax rolls and in the name of uniformity and fairness how on earth can we not put everything back on the tax rolls, everything being the 775 exemptions as well. And you'll hear a lot about, well, there's a contract that has been signed, it's the word of the state. Well, it's one of those things, if the Constitution doesn't allow you to do that, if we're afraid the Constitution needs to be changed to treat everybody the same, I think the Constitution is at least as valuable to me, as important to me as the word of the state in those contracts. Now, obviously, if you adopt this amendment and we return that personal property to the tax rolls, certainly there is a binding contract there that must be worked out. And I am not opposed to the state doing something else to make up the difference that the state pays. I think we could and should honor our word, but if we are going to go to the people of the State of Nebraska, repeal the uniformity clause, put before them a constitutional question that repeals their seventy some year protection from the big boys coming in and getting special exemption and in that ballot question you frame around that a bill which the only