

investment, and has created between 550 and 600 new jobs, every one of these people paying taxes, buying homes, upgrading their homes, buying shoes, buying clothes, buying automobiles, all of those things putting more taxes back into our system. I question that this is where we should be challenging this. And I would strongly urge you, please, this isn't the place to get even. This isn't the place to break what isn't broken. Come back and look at the system, okay. Come back and look at LB 775, okay. But do it in an interim study, do it in committee, do it where it can be analyzed and see the benefits, and the cost-benefit ratio, but please vote against Senator Moore's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Byars. Senator Kristensen, you're next.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Legislature, I'm going to share a little bit of my time later on, but Senator Schellpeper struck my interest with his speech and Senator Moore alluded to it but didn't quite get up all the way to say what I think really is happening. This is an unfortunate amendment and the reason it's unfortunate is, is that it's done because Senator Moore knows that this is a real source of irritation and the more irritation that he can raise, this further confuses the issue. Confusion is the last thing you need here. I mean, the State of Nebraska is standing here watching us, wanting to know what you're going to do with the personal property tax crisis and we start to interject things like 775. If we could find other ways to do it, Senator Moore, what I really think is occurring here is if you can find an argument that will say, look, if this is out of here, then here's a reason to vote for the constitutional amendment. Well, I'd suggest that you'd be better off by giving state senators a \$50,000 pay raise that if they didn't pass the constitutional that was going to occur, you'd probably have better luck in getting people to vote against or for the amendment. So, I mean, I think that's really the purpose of what you're doing here. Senator Schellpeper, quite frankly, the court did not deal with 775 in any of its decisions. It didn't deal with it in MAPCO, it didn't deal with it in trailer train. Those decisions were not challenged, but they certainly were discussed. I mean, we know that from the dissent in MAPCO. We know that in reading MAPCO the court probably discussed 775 at length at some point and they chose not to put it in there. That gives me a pretty good hint that they are probably not