

amendment, the amendment being to strike the Baack, et al, amendment, AMO54S, as found on page 117 of the Journal.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I know I ought to quit while I'm ahead, Senator Baack, got one without a problem. But this is a substantive motion and it's offered in seriousness. As LB 6 was originally written, the 775 exemptions were to be treated as all other tangible personal property. Senator Baack and some of his cohorts successfully had an amendment adopted with 26 votes to shield those amendments. I guess we could call what they did the Great Plains Shield, something like Desert Shield, and now we need to have a storm of indignation to overturn that vote which I think creates an unfair boon to that particular classification of property. When we came into special session, the public was told that we were going to deal with the issue of how personal...tangible personal property should be dealt with. There was to be a separation between tangible personal property and real property and then we would be allowed to deal with personal property as we chose, including granting total exemptions or, I guess, assessing partial value and taxing that as we see fit or any number of other combinations. But to come in with a specific and deliberate vote to say that a special category of property for one of what I feel is the strongest...not one of but the strongest economic force in the state, namely Mike Harper, is inappropriate. LB 6, if it contains that shield, should not be enacted. There are other provisions that I support and I had supported LB 6 until Senator Baack's amendment was adopted. I see that amendment as so poisoning the bill that there is no way that I can support it. I didn't support those exemptions in 775. I argued against them at that time and I'm not going to take each one of them and show why I think it is such an improper thing to do. We know what items are to be exempted and they have nothing to do with the essential operation of Mike Harper's business. In other words, that property does not have to go untaxed in order that he can continue to operate this multinational corporation which has, for the fifth year in a row, enjoyed record earnings. Were it not Mike Harper and ConAgra, that amendment would not have been adopted. I don't believe there is a soul on this floor so naive or believing that anybody in the state is so naive that we would say that if an amendment of this kind would be for the purpose of exempting the property of ordinary garden variety citizens,