

do support Senator Witek's proposal. I think we do have to change the Constitution to allow for these ranges, but we don't know that and we have several letters into the Attorney General to ask for his opinion. So, to that end, I would like to support Senator Witek in this return and I think we need to think seriously about the constitutional problem that we have with this bill also. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I would rise to oppose the proposed constitutional amendment. I would like to speak directly to the issue because the constitutional amendment essentially is the vehicle, I guess, to talk about it. The reason this bill was introduced is very simply. Last year, those of you who filed with the Board of Equalization would know that earlier in the year, in 1994, they indicated to every county a percentage that they would be expected to adhere to as far as their valuations, and a great many counties adhere to it; a handful did not, but a great many did. And then when the board met, they backed up and made it a lower range from what they had told people across the state that it might be expected but at the end of all of the discussion, back in August, the Board of Equalization met and passed a motion and that motion stated that for this year that the ranges that are contained in LB 137 would, in fact, be the ranges that they would expect the Board of Equalization to use for calendar year 1995. And the bill was merely put in to endorse, reflect what the Board of Equalization had already voted to do. Now, admittedly, they could change; admittedly, they could modify it in some way, for whatever reason, but there was certainly no indication that that was going to happen. From my viewpoint, property tax administration at the state level, certainly since 1967 but probably since we became a state, has not been very good. There was an effort last year, there's been an effort a time or two before by governors that were not successful, but last year there was an effort to comply what I believe both the Constitution and certainly the statutes say as to the intra and inter and intracounty equalization is fundamental to equity in this state for property tax administration for a whole variety of reasons, not the least of which is the distribution of state aid. But it was my feeling, and I think other members of the committee, although they'll have to speak for themselves, that it was appropriate that we support, endorse what the Board of Equalization voted to do last year, that we indicate that that