

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam President, members, I want to say again I do not challenge the integrity or the good intentions of anyone on this issue. Each of us have our own personal philosophy, our own political philosophy, and of course multitude of pressures from our constituents. Each of us must, in the final analysis, vote our conscience, and that's good enough for me. And I believe in most instances it will be good enough for your constituents. My concern, as I have expressed many times, is that I believe, and Senator Hillman came to me and said, do you know what the first exemption granted in Nebraska, I don't know if it's statutory or constitutional, I suppose statutory, ever was? I said, no. She said, it was for trees. There was an exemption for trees from taxation because there were so few trees in Nebraska that they were considered...it was desirable to encourage the planting of trees. The situation changes. And, of course, I felt, back in 1967, prior to the time I was in this body, that the imposition of sales and income tax as a means of support of state government was a valid one. I did not at that time, and I wasn't here so I couldn't vote, argue with the removal of the tax on intangibles. Those arguments made sense. Each succeeding year we adjusted and changed the tax structure, many times. We did so with some reservation. It was not rural votes alone, ladies and gentlemen, that brought about the exemptions from personal property taxes. We had a number, a large number of votes, as I recall 35, 40, 38 votes to bring about the exemptions that we did have. Senator Hall raises another point that is very valid, why pay personal tax on an automobile. Why pay personal tax on some of the other items. And it's something which, of course, merits some justification. We were told time, after time, after time that automobiles were treated differently under the Constitution, and therefore there was no constitutional problem with those. We're told the same thing about household goods, that they were treated differently, and therefore there was no reason to be concerned about it. I just want to make this point, that, ladies and gentlemen, if you reject this amendment then you must agree, or at least acquiesce to the idea that certain items of personal property will be replaced upon the tax rolls. It will be a small percentage of the total personal property out there. Now someone says, well, if we're going to tax automobiles, then why not tax everything. We all own an automobile. We make a conscience decision whether to drive a \$1,000 used car, or a \$30,000 new automobile, that's a decision we make. But most everyone owns an automobile. Not everyone owns farm tractors, not everyone owns business equipment, not everyone has to own livestock, therefore if this