

be made clear, is there are several people who cling to that choice and it's, I think, certainly a valid choice. My suggestion is and the reason I am on board this compromise, because I think it is a good compromise and good tax policy, I think we have to look at the broad range of things. First of all, what are we doing here and that is we're trading...and maybe not an equal trade, but we're trading uniformity clause protection on personal property taxation for a super majority, a 30-vote protection on taxation. Without that, some of the alternatives that we have talked about are taxing inventory which may be an economic disaster, may not be, but it's a choice that's out there. The second thing that we can be talking about is exempting inventory, taxing farm machinery. What that neglects to do or what that fails to do, keeps out of our reach, is the ability to again bring back on board or onto the tax rolls the pipelines, the railroads, the people that have...that first started to challenge this and started the domino falling. This amendment, the constitutional amendment, if adopted, would allow that ability to go to work around that, to give us the flexibility to bring some of those back on legally. But in order at least for me to support that, I had to have the 30 votes, they had to have some protection so that we don't get, as Senator Chambers referred to, steamrolled or mowed over. Getting back to the reason why this amendment is part of that compromise is included on LB 6 and that is, I think, Senator Kristensen laid it out very well, we can lose the issue, the three numbers from a session we've had, I don't know, two or three 775's since then, but everybody knows what 775 is and it's this group of tax incentives and credits. We tend to lose the issue and that is the question of how should property tax policy be set. I think we can lose that if those are included. And the second...and I think the intent of that is to keep the issue from being muddled. There's certainly the other half and that deals with earthmoving equipment. I don't think anybody is going to say that I want earthmoving equipment off the tax rolls because I disagree with it. Senator Warner makes very valid points. Maybe these two are not good tax policy but it's certainly something I think that will be included in the discussion next year, assuming this all goes, in the entire tax policy. It's something that will be considered, certainly more difficult to pull them off but they can certainly be considered at that time. I will be voting in favor of the amendment to LB 6. I would urge that the majority of us do so also.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. We will now vote