

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Moore, would you respond, please.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Scotty, would you really tell us what you're attempting to do with this amendment and what this amendment does? I think we're getting a little off of what you're really trying to do here.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, I welcome the opportunity to do that because the discussion has been on the values of 775 and that's not what the amendment does. All it says that if you're going to strike Sections 8 and 9 of the exemption statute, 8 being, I believe farm machinery...livestock and inventory, no, 8 being farm machinery and 9, off the top of my head I can't remember what they are, you ought to strike 10 too and treat them all the same. And so if you're going to tax everything that is depreciated in the State of Nebraska, let's tax it all. That's what this amendment does and the only exemption that would remain would be Section 7 which is the exemption for inventory. The rest of them, all the rest of the exemptions are struck, all personal property that's depreciated in the State of Nebraska will be taxed.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Senator Moore. He's exactly right. Everybody is getting up and talking about how great 775 is. You're not even really considering what the amendment is. How can we tax farm equipment and not tax household goods? How can we tax farm equipment and not intangibles such as CDs or stocks and bonds? If you have to have a constitutional amendment passed, which you do with LB 1063, how are you concerned or be so positive that the people are going to support that? You're not willing to take a look at LB 775. You think it's great for Nebraska and it is good for Omaha and I think yet you're going to go out and you're going to put a tax on farm equipment and you're going to say that's good for Nebraska. I don't know how you can really do that and still expect the voters to approve a constitutional amendment. If you look at the MAPCO case, as several of them have made the comment this morning, they are saying that you have to change what we're doing and that's right. But nobody has challenged LB 775 up to the present time. If somebody was going to challenge it, they would throw that out also. If somebody would challenge the household goods, they would throw that out. That's why that you have to have the uniformity clause that's in the Constitution right now, that has to be taken out and that I have a hard time really supporting because that was put there for a reason. It