

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members, the motion is to return the bill to strike the emergency clause. I have no intention of following through with it. What I'm going to do is not vote on the bill with regard to the E clause. I support the concept in LB 137. I don't think there's a constitutional flaw in it. I don't think there's a problem with the Legislature saying we are going to basically adopt in statute what the policy is of the Board of Equalization, and that's exactly what the bill does. Senator Warner is absolutely right. In August, the board said, here's where we're going to be. I prefer an aggressive as opposed to a passive Board of Equalization. The problem is that there currently are some counties, Douglas County happens to be one, and it's across Douglas County, Senator Witek, that the problem exists, it's not...and I did not say there was limited fury here, I said it probably was more profound or more aggravated in your area than it might be in others. The problem is, is that we are moving very fast to correct what was found by the Board of Equalization to be a valuation process...problem in Douglas County. LB 137 says this is where the board thinks we ought to be for tax year 1995. By not having the emergency clause on the bill, I don't think we impact that to any great extent. And I would again hope that people will just lay off the bill for purposes of the E clause. I'm not going to vote no on it because I agree with what the concept in the bill is. When I chaired the Revenue Committee for four years I supported these kinds of measures to try to get valuation to be fair across the board. I don't think that this, in any way, without the E clause will impact the integrity of the property tax system. If 100 percent of value is where we ought to be then, you know, the argument could be it ought to be for all classes of property, not just residential and commercial. With that, I mean, there are other counties that are showing this can be done, that you can get as close to 100 percent, Lancaster County is one of them. They have shown that it can be done. The problem is, is that the speed with which it has happened in Douglas County to pass 137 with the E clause will send a message that folks won't quite understand. Doesn't mean I don't agree with the policy. I support the policy. I endorse the policy. I would hope that we would not support the E clause on 137 and then read it and vote on it rather without the E clause and pass it because it's good public policy. It's where we ought to be. To say that we're going to let 12 months pass roughly before the time that it's put into law or used is not a problem. To pass it today, have it signed into law, I think, creates a perception of a problem that may