

people in the State of Nebraska that will not pay personal property tax on their depreciated items will be one entity, and that's the LB 775 entities, I don't know how on earth you can go to the people and ask them to do that. I don't know why they would vote for that. I know I, myself, as a person, certainly would not vote for that. I mean, we're talking about \$180 million in valuation, we're talking about \$4 million in taxes levied at the local levy, I don't intend this to be the first dent in LB 775, but if we're revamping our entire system and we're going to say we're going to do that in the name of equality by treating everybody the same, I think the least we can do is do just exactly that from the beginning. That would treat everybody equally, treat everyone that depreciates personal property equally, treat everybody that depreciates their property, all that will be treated the same and be on the tax rolls. Now last week when we debated the breeding livestock there was a great deal of discussion about oh, no, do not adopt that amendment. If you adopt...and I was the one that advanced some of those theories, if you adopt that amendment, you're going to drive a hole in the whole scheme, in Senator Conway's words, that...a hole in the 4-R Act that a coal train could drive through. Well, that hole is already there. I know Senator Conway already gave a defense in response to Senator Hefner as to why that may be a problem, but nevertheless, I'm not going to buy the legal argument and even with that legal argument, you cannot take it out in the public and convince people of that, that dog don't hunt. You're going to say we're going to treat everybody the same with one exception, I have a real problem with that. Plus we're going to repeal the uniformity clause so we can treat them differently. Because if you believe what Senator Landis and Senator Warner and others have said, saying the uniformity clause is supreme, if we go home and do nothing, 775, if you believe their words, has to go on the tax rolls via the court. If that sentence on page 9 of MAPCO is supreme, that does happen. And so while we're changing the Constitution let's at least keep uniformity within class. You can make the argument that, well, 775 is different because it's in the common good of the people and serves a public purpose, but nevertheless, if we're changing the Constitution and repealing the uniformity clause, how on earth do you expect people to really trust us to do this? How on earth can you trust them to do it where in the very bill that you've set up as the example of what you're going to do with the constitutional amendment, you simply hand only one entity an exemption and that is the one who can buy it. Yes, they buy it for public purposes